

Minutes approved 6/24/2014 meeting

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
MAY 27, 2014

1. SALDO Summary

Part 5 – Design Standards

Mrs. Stoner stated that Mr. Finnerty got answers to the questions from last meeting. One question was regarding the requirement for an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan for 5,000 square feet of disturbance required by SALDO Section 22-530 or 2,000 square feet of disturbance as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he talked to Neal at the Perry County Conservation District. The conservation district will not review anything under 5,000 square feet. Individuals that disturb ground less than 5,000 square feet are still required to implement best management practices.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-530.1.A.1) states anything over 5,000 square feet is required to submit an erosion and sedimentation control plan to the Borough for review and to Perry County Conservation District for approval.

Ms. Hardman stated that 2,000 square feet in the zoning ordinance is for any type of earth disturbance. If the disturbance is under 5,000 square feet the zoning permit application for earth disturbance is only reviewed by the Borough Engineer.

Mr. Finnerty stated that a land development plan is two homes or more.

Mr. Seeno asked if the zoning ordinance 2,000 square feet disturbance applies to a garden.

Ms. Hardman stated that a garden is exempt.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-530.2.b.1) on page 38 is for stormwater direct discharge.

Mr. Finnerty stated that direct discharge is tied to Act 167 regulations. The fee associated with the direct discharge helps finance a community stormwater facility.

Mrs. Stoner stated that a SALDO can only request a fee for direct discharge if there is an Act 167 therefore, b) was removed.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-530.2.A.8) b) and c) on page 37 both need to be removed.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the Borough might want to allow direct discharge in certain areas. How it effects a watershed would have to be evaluated.

Mr. Finnerty stated that Section 22-530.1.A.8 a) can remain.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-530.B had an incomplete sentence that needs to be removed *“In addition, Act 167 Stormwater Management plan governing in watershed that are enacted provide standards in these plans.”*

Mrs. Stoner referred to Section 22-530.B, 3rd sentence regarding licensing of engineers and architects.

Mr. Finnerty stated that there is a website to check for licensing – www.licensepa.state.us.

Mrs. Stoner asked if a landscape architect can sign stormwater management plans.

Mr. Finnerty stated that there is a civil engineering branch for engineers but it doesn't breakdown categories. The registration process includes details.

Mr. Finnerty stated that both licensed engineer “and” landscape architect could be required instead of “or”.

Mrs. Stoner stated her concern is if the developer just used a landscape architect to do the plans.

Mr. Finnerty stated that architects fought hard to allow landscape architects in the MPC.

Mrs. Stoner stated that both professional engineer and a landscape architect must be registered to perform duties.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the Borough Engineer should be consulted on his opinion on whether a professional engineer or/and landscape architect could prepare a plan.

Mr. Finnerty asked if the Planning Commission has Exhibit 5-3 Rainfall Coefficient “C” for Rational Formula and “CN” Range.

Mr. Seeno asked if the 100 year storm event is for yesterday or tomorrow.

Mr. Finnerty said the 100 year storm event is of record.

Mr. Finnerty stated that most detention ponds aren't sized to deal with the 100 year storm event. Most engineer's target the 10 year storm.

Mrs. Stoner stated the storm water is calculated based on handling the 10 year storm. Exhibit 5-4 Rainfall Intensity Computation on page 42.

Rockville Estates

Mrs. Stoner stated she asked the Borough Solicitor if the developer is bound by the dates they gave on the phasing schedule. The question was if the changes to scheduling invalidated the plan. The phasing plan has a build out of 2022 which started in the late 1990's.

Mr. Finnerty stated that if a developer fails to submit phasing schedule updates on time it would invalidate the plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the question was whether phasing plan updates have been timely submitted.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she wasn't sure about the phasing plan on the preliminary plan.

**MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
MAY 27, 2014**

CALL TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm

1. ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephanie Stoner, Chairman
Robert Zimmerman
Anson Seeno

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Jason Finnerty, Tri County Regional Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:

Maureen Wentzel, 222 Ridgeview Drive, Marysville, PA

Discussion was held regarding a quorum.

Mr. Finnerty stated that a quorum is based on bylaws.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Planning Commission has no bylaws. Roberts Rules of Order is used.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he thinks 4 members out of 7 is a quorum.

2. MINUTES:

a. March 25, 2014 and April 29 Meeting Minutes

March 25, 2014 meeting minutes was reviewed by the April 29, 2014 meeting - No changes.

April 29, 2014 meeting minutes:

The Planning Commission could not vote on minutes because there was not a quorum present.

Page 6, paragraph 2 “Blaine” is spelled “Blain”.

Page 6, E. remove last sentence, “*Mr. Finnerty stated that the Borough’s ordinance pockets off billboard placement.*”

3. PUBLIC COMMENT.

Mrs. Wentzel was present to discuss Rockville Estates current activities. Mrs. Wentzel asked when the vote is coming up for Ridgeview Drive traffic flow.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the traffic flow issue is being addressed by the Borough Council. The next Borough Council meeting is June 9, 2014 at 7:30 pm. She received a call from a Ridgeview Drive resident regarding making Ridgeview Drive one way.

Mrs. Wentzel stated she came to the meeting tonight because she has had runoff from the work being done at Rockville Estates. She called Yingst Homes directly and they addressed her problems. Mrs. Wentzel asked how Yingst plans to address future runoff. They are digging a lot behind the houses on Ridgeview Drive. The 30’ berm was clear cut. The other concern is that survey pins that were set by Yingst’s surveyor shows fences and sheds on their property. The effected property owners are supposed to be getting a letter. Their main concern is the runoff because the clear cut for the berm is closer to the houses than what they thought. Yingst did a good job cleaning up.

Mr. Finnerty asked if there is any silt fence installed.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that originally had chipped wood at detention areas only. The wood chipped area is the only place where the water is being held back. She is not the only property owner having problems. Mrs. Wentzel said the Rockville Estates is on the agenda.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Rockville Estates is on the agenda for discussion. Phase 1 was recorded at the County Courthouse. The Borough office has a copy of the recorded plan. The Planning Commission questioned the 30’ berm also.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that the wood chip pile only extends to her house from the retention basin at Caroline Drive. The water went through her landscaping and into her garage. Her back yard was also full of water. It took three days for the water to be gone. Further down Ridgeview Drive there was nothing.

Mrs. Stoner stated when the berm is completed there is supposed to be a trench along the back with an earthen berm.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that while they are working on the land there is nothing in place to protect the homes. She asked if anyone has inspected what has been done.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission members are not permitted to go on the property.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that there has been a massive removal of trees. The trees were clear cut to Dollar General Store. Her only concern is for the future.

Mrs. Stoner stated she would like to verify that the earthen berm will be installed.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that the person in charge at Yingst said the wood chips are just a temporary measure.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the erosion and sedimentation control plan should have sequencing for when the berm will be installed.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that the street was flooded. Laurel Street intersection with Caroline Drive had more water. Three houses had runoff issues.

Mr. Finnerty stated that there is nothing the Borough can do to get the earthen berm installed.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission will look into the issues.

Mr. Finnerty stated that it doesn't sound like sediment is being controlled.

Mrs. Wentzel stated it got in her fountain at the end of her yard.

Mrs. Stoner stated that to the best of her knowledge none of the other neighbors contacted Yingst.

Ms. Hardman stated that the residents should contact the Borough regarding any complaints so they can be documented and forward to the appropriate person for action.

Mrs. Stoner asked Mrs. Wentzel for her contact information.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that she will contact Mrs. Stoner.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that residents can get a complaint form at the Borough office or go on the website.

Mr. Finnerty stated that Perry County Conservation District should be made aware that there may be issues. The issues should be discussed with the Borough Engineer and Perry County Conservation District.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that she was told that the issues with the boundaries should be discussed with the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Manager told the Planning Commission that the discrepancies are with fences and sheds encroaching onto Yingst's property.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the Borough Manager walked the boundary line that was surveyed and marked off with Yingst's representatives.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that Yingst removed trees that were less than a yard from the property line. She doesn't know why they would want to remove a healthy tree.

Mrs. Stoner stated that in some cases, property owners were asking Yingst to remove trees.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the location of the property line is a civil matter.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that she thought Yingst would be at the meeting tonight since it is on the agenda.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Yingst only comes to the meeting if there is a plan submitted for review.

Mrs. Wentzel asked what Part 14 and Part 15 was that is on the agenda.

Mrs. Stoner stated that part 14 and Part 15 is a zoning ordinance update.

Mrs. Wentzel asked if the zoning ordinance update has something to do with future development.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the zoning ordinance must be adopted to regulate development.

OTHER: COUNTY SURVEY

Mr. Finnerty stated that the County survey was up to 203 responses. His personal target is to get 1% response which is 468 responses. They are getting good feedback.

Mrs. Stoner stated that they are also looking for any individuals to comment on the comprehensive plan survey.

Mr. Finnerty stated that they are asking for comments from any one.

Mrs. Stoner stated she does not see an online link.

Mr. Finnerty stated it is www.surveymonkey.com/s/perrycounty. They also have a Harrisburg Area Transportation survey for new projects in the county.

Mr. Seeno stated that there is no public transportation.

Mr. Finnerty stated that they have PAR Transit.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that PAR Transit is not that good.

Mr. Seeno stated that PAR is for seniors and disabled.

Mrs. Wentzel stated that PAR had a dispute with Somerdale Plaza about parking.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that CAT used to come through Marysville.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the survey deals with transit, bridges or anything dealing with a section of roadway.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the HATS survey showed area north of Harrisburg. When monies were released it went to projects from Harrisburg to Carlisle.

Mr. Seeno stated that the CAT bus service has worked well.

Mrs. Stoner stated that bus service has been challenging. CAT has limited service. There is room for other transit services willing to come to Harrisburg.

Mr. Finnerty stated at the last meeting two counties opted out.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Rockville tried to talk them into funding a stop to service the new neighborhood but they didn't get anywhere. They were looking for ways to reduce trips.

4. OLD BUSINESS.

A. SALDO:

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission will continue to work on Part 5.

B. Zoning Ordinances/Chapter 27 (2007):

Part 14 Development Standards

Part 15 Performance Standards

Mrs. Stoner stated that the zoning ordinance sections will be reviewed when the SALDO review is completed.

C. Well Ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the well ordinance is being reviewed. The well ordinance is referenced in the SALDO.

D. Rockville Estates.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she asked for a copy of the developer's agreement and received it. It looks thick but a lot of it are exhibits such as letters. The final phase 1 plan had a condition of approval that the developer's agreement had to be finalized and approved by the Borough Solicitor which delayed the recording of the plan until July 2013.

Ms. Hardman stated that a developer's agreement spells out everything regarding the plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the financial information, inspections, payment for inspections, etc. is discussed in the developer's agreement.

Mr. Finnerty asked if the letter of credit is auto renewable or is there a lapse date. The LOC should be in place until the completion of improvements.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she will review the developer's agreement.

Mrs. Stoner stated there have been complaints as a result of the rain.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there was muddy water coming down Caroline Street.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she looked down Caroline Street and saw debris had formed on the other side.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she questioned the phasing plan because the dates were pushed out further. The Borough Solicitor indicated that the phasing plan is in accordance with the MPC. The developer has 5 years to do a subdivision on every phase. The legislature passed an act giving developers until 2016 to finish the first phase. Any phases after that has 5 years to complete.

Mr. Finnerty stated that is the case unless the time period gets extended again.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she could not find prior documentation that listed dates. She has an email with a letter in 2010 that has earlier dates.

Ms. Hardman stated that the preliminary plan did not have a phasing plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Final Phase 1 plan was not recorded until 2013 so she doesn't know if the phasing plan was updated on the recorded plan.

Ms. Hardman stated that the phasing plan must be updated every year.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the updated phasing plan must be submitted every year from the date of plan approval by the Borough Council.

Ms. Hardman stated that the phasing plan must be acted on by Borough Council.

Mr. Seeno asked how the erosion and sedimentation sequence differs from a phasing plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the erosion and sedimentation sequencing should be on the plan sheet and the erosion and sedimentation control plan has notes.

Ms. Hardman stated that the E&S and SWM plans are not specifically reviewed by the Planning Commission members.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission wanted BMP's in the SWM plan.

5. NEW BUSINESS.

A. County Issues Survey For the Perry County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the County received funding for the County Comprehensive Plan by the Municipal Assistance program which is a part of DCED.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the County wants individual responses not a response from the Planning Commission as a whole.

Mr. Finnerty stated that they need the numbers generated by individual responses.

Mr. Seeno asked when the results will be published.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the survey will end in July. The results will be shared with the newspaper.

B. Marysville Blight Reduction.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she received a letter from SEADA COG regarding the Borough receiving funds from CBDG program for 114 Valley Street Ext demolition. The building will be demolished and the debris removed. The lot will be filled and seeded. The SEADA COG wants the Planning Commission to review the demolition project for any impact to the Borough such as any positive or negative impact to the environment, any historic properties, etc.

Mr. Seeno stated he was impressed with the building because of its shape but it is in a bad spot.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there will need to be lane closure on Valley Street side heading toward the traffic light.

Mr. Seeno stated that before the building is razed it should be checked for asbestos. The basement is required to be filled in with dirt. The lot should be seeded for a native wild garden with trees.

Mr. Finnerty stated that stormwater needs addressed. A depressed area might help with storm water control.

Mr. Seeno stated that planting should be done for low maintenance. A bench or a park could be designated.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there will not be much greenery.

Mr. Finnerty stated that this area acts as a gateway to the square.

Mrs. Stoner asked who will own the land. The Borough will retain the area as open space with no plans for reuse. A response is required by June 18, 2014 so comments are a part of the environmental review record.

It was a consensus of the members present to forward the Planning Commission comments for inclusion in the environmental review record.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

A. Update of Community Meeting

Mrs. Stoner stated interested focus on senior citizens housing, assistance with mowing, snow removal and gardening. Other issues were traffic safety in relation to children, park, activities for kids and teens, need for a hardware store and grocery store, better dialog between Borough and citizens, inquiries about Rockville Estates. The Borough Manager explained two big PennDOT projects that will cause problems on Rt 11/15 in 2015 and 2016. In 2014 the Duncannon rockfall; 2015 the bridge by Blue Mountain Outfitters and 2016 the rockfall along Rt 11/15.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that Rt. 11/15 will be shut down for three months.

Mr. Finnerty stated that they are closing the road in Duncannon too.

B. Perry County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that there will be a public hearing and then the county plans to adopt the plan. The plan covers all hazards which are natural and manmade.

Mrs. Stoner asked about the Emergency Response Plan (ERP).

Mr. Finnerty stated that the ERP is done by the Emergency Management Agency office of the County of the Emergency Management Coordinator. The ERP priorities hazards in the counties. FEMA has a list of things a municipality can do to reduce flood hazard.

C. Planning Commission University.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Mr. Seeno, Mr. Zimmerman and herself signed up for the seminar on June 9, 2014 at the Hampden Township Building.

D. Subdivision fees for recording.

Mrs. Stoner stated that collecting fees for subdivision plans does not include fees for recording because the developer records the plans.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the best policy for recording plans is for the Borough to do the recording of plans at the courthouse.

Ms. Hardman stated that the recording of the plans should come of the filing fee submitted with the plan and application.

E. Webinars.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the June 10 webinar entitled Welcome to the Planning Commission is one hour long. If anyone is interested she can get a recording of the webinar for \$35.00. Some other topics are: neighborhood blight, proper discipline of police officers, safety training for the trench.

7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING (Next Council Meeting June 9, 2014).

Mrs. Stoner stated that she attended the Borough Council meeting. The following items were discussed:

1. There was an update of the sewer work on the far side of town.
2. Paving was started.
3. Someone talked about Perry County Bicentennial signs.
4. Community aid bins are being installed on Borough properties.
5. Fire Company got a Federal grant for new air packs.

Mrs. Stoner stated that discussion was held regarding no parking on one side of Ridgeview Drive. Borough Council directed the manager to send letters to Ridgeview Drive property owners. The concern is with emergency vehicles and buses. Interested residents should attend the Streets Committee meeting. Another problem with parking on one side is with the snow plow. Mrs. Stoner feels that eliminating parking on one side of the street will increase the speed of vehicles.

Mr. Seeno asked how drivers will know that there is no parking on one side of the street.

Ms. Hardman stated that there will be no parking signs installed.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission discussed sending a letter to Borough Council that the SALDO requires revisions to plans to be sent to the Planning Commission for a recommendation; however, she reviewed the SALDO, Section 22-404.10 and found that it is not required to send a change to the plan to the Planning Commission for a recommendation.

Mr. Finnerty stated that if a lot line is changed it would require a new plan submission.

Mrs. Stoner stated that plan change review came up when the sewer trench detail was changed by Rockville Estates.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he feels the Planning Commission should be consulted if there is a policy regarding the matter.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there is no policy for Planning Commission review of plan changes.

Ms. Hardman recommended that the proposed SALDO include Planning Commission review of plan changes.

**9. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 6/17/14 @ 6:30pm/NEXT
REGULAR MEETING 6/24/14 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer