

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
JUNE 26, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephanie Stoner
Robert Zimmerman
Jennifer Brock
Art Vaitl

STAFF PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

None

Part 4 Plan Processing Procedures

Mrs. Stoner stated that Article 4 was reviewed at the May 8, 2013 workshop meeting. The review stopped at the top of page 4-19.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Page 4-19 #29 Borough Ordinance 561 change Section 22-701; #30 from “Section” to “Zoning Ordinance, Part 13”.

Mr. Finnerty stated that on page 4-10, Section 22-407.3.A.2) add subdivision or land development in front of the word “development”; .4) add “email address”.

Mrs. Stoner stated that on page 4-20 change, 15) change Municipal to Marysville Borough; 16) change Municipal Governing Body to Marysville Borough Council; 17) add The Perry in front of County Planning Commission, and 18) change Municipal to the Borough.

Ms. Brock stated that on page 4-19, Section 22-409.4.A.4) add “email address”.

Ms. Brock stated that page 4-20, 11) both modification of requirements and waiver is used. The definition section was checked for a definition for modification of requirement or waiver. There was a definition for modification but not waiver. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to keep both words in the sentence but everywhere modification is used add waiver with parentheses.

Mr. Finnerty suggested that #9 be added on page 4-21 to add a requirement for property outline.

Ms. Brock stated that 4-20.B.2) addresses requirements for remaining property.

Part 5 Design Standards

Mr. Finnerty asked what chapters from the Lancaster County Model SALDO were consolidated to make Part 5.

Ms. Brock stated Chapter 8-Urban Growth, Chapter 9 Development Areas and Chapter 10-Rural was consolidated to make Part 5.

Mr. Finnerty stated that (2) on page 3 deals with aesthetics of a structure. Anything dealing with aesthetics should be in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-501 Intent on page 1 in the first paragraph states “sustain the economic vitality while being sensitive to design context “and in the last sentence, “to allow the coordinated expansion of such facilities and the economic vitality while being sensitive to design context and individual neighborhood character.”

Ms. Brock stated that a lot of minor subdivisions in Marysville involve a larger lot being subdivided into two lots that the Planning Commission thinks should be consistent with the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Finnerty stated that consistency with the neighborhood is good for design standards but feels that the statement needs to be quantified so it is Zoning Ordinance related.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that on page 3, (2)(a) states “A distinctive architectural or building design that does not represent standard franchise architecture.”

Mr. Finnerty stated that he is concerned with page 3, (2)(a) being enforced because it is more catered to open space regulations found in a zoning ordinance.

Ms. Brock suggested putting in the reference to distinctive architectural or building design in the requirements for park and recreation.

Mr. Finnerty stated that fee in lieu of park dedication is covered in the ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that the SALDO regulates the creation of a lot or the review of land development; the Zoning Ordinance regulates how a structure is placed on a lot.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he would suggest photos or renderings of the architectural design. This could be considered an improvement.

Mrs. Stoner read the definition of improvement and public improvement. The goal in the SALDO for architectural design is for lots that are existing within an established neighborhood so that the structures conform to what is there.

Mr. Finnerty suggested that the architectural design apply to land development only.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the intent is for continuity not level of detail, just sameness.

Mrs. Brock stated they don't want identical architecture.

Mr. Finnerty stated that due diligence is provided if the application addressed one or more of the requirements in (2).

Ms. Hardman stated page 3, (2) (d) change Section 9.10.2.C to Section 22-524.7.

Mrs. Stoner stated page 3, Section 22-502.1.-Appendix H (Street ROW Matrix) should be removed.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he does not think Section 22-502-General is needed because a sketch plan is addressed in Part 4.

Mr. Finnerty stated that some sections have an intent such as 22-505 and 22-511 but other sections do not.

Other discussion

Mrs. Stoner stated that the billboard on the Essis property is blinding between screen shots causing a problem for traffic.

Ms. Brock stated that a billboard can be programmed and built so they can adjust to ambient light. In the day time it can be brighter so it can be read and at night it can be adjusted because it doesn't need that much light.

Mr. Vaitl stated that a billboard that changes lighting should not be permitted.

Mr. Finnerty stated that billboards fall under freedom of speech. The billboard is internally lit and it is not around residents.

(For the record, Mr. Albright arrived at 7:33 pm)

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 25, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER. The meeting began at 7:35 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephanie Stoner
Art Vaitl
Robert Zimmerman
Jennifer Brock
Chris Albright

STAFF PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

2. MINUTES:

a. May 28, 2013 Minutes

Page 5, 4.A. change Article to Part.

Page 1, 3rd line from bottom, change Article to Part.

Change Mrs. to Ms. for Janine Parks throughout.

MOTION: Mr. Albright moved, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

4. OLD BUSINESS.

A. SALDO

Part 4 Plan Processing Procedures.

Mrs. Stoner stated the Planning Commission finished the review on Part 4 during the work session.

Part 5 Design and Improvement Standards.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Part 5 is in the final review stage. The Planning Commission reviewed some of Part 5 during the work session and stopped at Section 22-506 on page 3.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the period is reversed on Section 22-506.2.B(1.) should be (1).

Mr. Albright stated there are no periods on any of the parenthesis.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there is an official order for numbering and lettering.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there are words that are capitalized that should not be throughout the ordinance.

Ms. Hardman stated that there are illustrations that are duplicated for a stop sign and a street sign. The Planning Commission needs to decide which one to use, the small or the large illustration.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the large stop sign illustration on page 20 is clearer.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the 7' minimum distance from the ground to the bottom of the stop sign is not what is in the Whitetail development.

Mr. Finnerty stated that 7' distance is used so people can walk under them.

Mr. Finnerty questioned if the street sign illustration meets NENA standards. He will check the NENA standards. Liquid fuel funds can be used for signage if they meet the NENA standards.

Ms. Brock stated that page 5, section 22-509 flag lots discusses flagpoles.

Mr. Finnerty stated that flag lot and flagpole is defined.

Mr. Vaitl stated that page 15, #7 refers to hammerheads but the illustration for a hammerhead was deleted.

Mrs. Stoner stated page 15, #7 should be removed.

Ms. Brock stated that the roundabouts that were installed on Linglestown Road have depressed curbing.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that cul-de-sacs should be designed so that fire equipment can drive over them.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the best thing for cul-de-sacs is to keep them open. A tear drop center tends to work because it has a better radius.

Mrs. Stoner stated that page 15, #9 should add if a cul-de-sac has a center island it must use depressed curbing.

Ms. Hardman stated that the text in italics on page 23 should be removed.

Mrs. Stoner stated that page 6, H. refers to Appendix G and Appendix H needs to be changed to just Appendix E.

Mrs. Stoner stated that page 7, Section 22-512.1. change Appendix G to Appendix E.

Ms. Brock stated that page 7, Section 22-512.2. first sentence change "if" to "of".

Part 7 Supplemental Requirements, Tests and Studies.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Part 7 will need to be reviewed.

Appendices.

Mrs. Stoner stated the Appendices will need to be reviewed the Planning Commission.

B. Zoning Ordinance/Chapter 7 (2007)

a. Part 14 Development Standards. No discussion was held.

b. Part 15 Performance Standards. No discussion was held.

5. NEW BUSINESS. None

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

A. Simply Moving Guide to Public Parks in Cumberland and Perry County.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Cumberland County sent a book entitled “Simply Moving Guide to Public Parks in Cumberland and Perry County” to the Planning Commission for review to make sure the information was correct. She reviewed it and made some comments. She will leave the book at the Borough office if anyone else wants to review it.

B. Perry County Comprehensive Plan Summary form.

Mrs. Stoner stated that comments requested by Mr. Finnerty were provided by the Planning Commission. Mrs. Stoner asked Mr. Finnerty how some of the questions related to jobs and the top five issues in the County in the survey related to the comprehensive planning.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the top five issues came from the plan that the Greater Harrisburg Foundation prepared from a survey of eight municipalities for enhancing communities. The survey was to give counties a chance to make suggestions to refine the plan. They are trying to keep the issues local to evaluate what chapter they want in the comprehensive plan and to look at the goals and objectives.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the issues are not traditionally covered in a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that economic development looks at transportation and where employees will be housed. Each component in the comprehensive plan will be discussed to advance the county along.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there is a chapter in the comprehensive plan on housing.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the reason DCED headed down this path was to show that planning can accomplish issues in a community and to tackle those issues.

Ms. Brock stated that it makes sense of why we are planning because these issues need to be addressed.

Mr. Finnerty stated that there will still be a future land use section in the comprehensive plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there are specific items that the comprehensive plan needs to address.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the idea was to get the basic studies done for all communities so that the municipality does not have to focus on or pay a consultant to do the basic studies. Then hopefully the community can focus on their issues.

C. Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he is working on a hazard mitigation plan using GIS to get the numbers for damage estimates on flooding. There are 154 structures in the flood zone.

Ms. Brock asked if the study looks at structures in the 100 year flood zone or the 500 year flood zone.

Mr. Finnerty stated they are looking at the 100 year flood zones and 500 year flood zones.

Mr. Finnerty stated that ordinances need to be written to discourage development in the 100 or 500 year flood zones. The flood zone lines are moving so the 500 year flood zone could be in the 100 year flood zone soon.

D. MS4 Designation Study of Culverts

Mr. Finnerty stated that the Borough is looking at getting an inventory of all culvert measurements for the MS4 designation for stormwater.

Ms. Brock stated the Borough just installed most of the culverts as part of the sewer separation project.

Mr. Finnerty stated that entrance and exit sizes of culverts and inlets need measured. Even private driveways with culverts need to be measured.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she thought the Borough has been on a waiver from the MS4 requirements in the past.

Mr. Finnerty stated that a scope of work is needed to get the time and price for the study. Twenty foot or greater span can be reimbursed with liquid fuel money.

E. July 10, 2013 workshop meeting.

The July 10, 2013 workshop meeting was canceled.

7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING - NONE (Next Council Meeting July 8, 2013).

8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 7/23/2013 @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING @ 7:30 pm, NEXT WORK SESSION 7/10/13 @ 6:30 pm-canceled.

Adjournment: Mr. Vaitl moved, seconded by Ms. Brock to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer/Recording Secretary