

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
JUNE 28, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jennifer Brock, Chairman
Shawn Vaccaro
Stephanie Stoner
Lou Simonetti

STAFF PRESENT

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer

1. Well Ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she checked on the five day period for an abandoned well in the definition in Section 501.3.1. The five day period is too short to consider a well abandoned. It was recommended that the time period be 30 days or 90 days. A permit is required to drill a well.

Ms. Brock asked after the drilling process is completed, how long the well will sit there can before it is considered abandon.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the original ordinance had a 90 day period before a well could be considered abandoned. The draft ordinance states that after the 90 day drilling process, information must be submitted to the Borough. She feels this should be consistent.

Ms. Brock stated that Section 501.13.11 states that within 90 days of the completion of the well drilling process, the permittee has 90 days to submit drilling information.

Mrs. Stoner stated that we should consider adding a protection from the day the drilling begins to the 90 day period that the well drilling is completed to protect ground water.

Ms. Brock stated that the well needs to be protected in the well drilling process from the time the welling drilling process begins and from the time the well drilling process is completed.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she still needs to create the well permit application form.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she can add a statement in the permit process that between the drilling and completion of well, effective protection of well bore must be maintained so that surface water contaminates do not enter the well.

Mrs. Stoner stated that it is common for a homeowner to require proof that water can be provided when a lot is being sold by drilling a well. It could be years later before the lot is sold.

Ms. Brock asked what it would take to protect an open well bore.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that a locking cap could be required.

Ms. Brock asked about the casing.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the casing is done right away.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there should be effective erosion and sedimentation control around the well bore.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that once the well is cased and grouted, it is sealed.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the well driller does not come back to grout the well. Grouting is done where it meets bedrock.

Mrs. Stoner stated that a locking, water tight cap should be required.

Ms. Brock stated that flow rate tests are done while they have the rig there.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that they need to know the flow before they stop drilling. There is a standard that they go by.

Mrs. Stoner verified that the change was discussed for Section 501.13.5 to 15 days.

Ms Hardman stated that the change is referenced in the April 24, 2011 minutes.

Mr. Simonetti stated that he has never seen a well drilling. How big is the drill hole?

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the casing diameter is six inches.

Mr. Simonetti asked what the casing is made of.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the casing is made of steel. The casing hole may be smaller because the casing is driven in.

Ms. Brock stated that the drill must go to bedrock. The reason for casing is twofold - to keep the top of bore hole from caving in and to keep surface water from going into the bore.

Mr. Simonetti asked if the pipe is dropped through the casing making the drill hole eight to ten inches.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the drill hole is usually six inches.

Mr. Simonetti stated that the reason for a cover is to keep contamination out.

Mrs. Stoner stated that a cover with a clamp to hold it down and seal it should be required. There is a rubber seal.

Mr. Simonetti asked if the top of the casing is threaded so that an expandable boot could be used.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the cap is bolted like a clamp. The locking clamp gets clamped to pipe and the top part latches and covers the latching mechanism.

Mr. Simonetti asked if the casing is the steel pipe that would go as far as 150 feet.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the casing goes to bedrock which is usually around 60 feet.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the casing pipe is welded in 20 foot sections.

Mr. Simonetti asked what the water pipe material is.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the water pipe material is plastic.

Mr. Simonetti asked if the pump is in the well and kept in the casing.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the pump is in the well and kept in the casing which is called a submersible well.

Ms. Brock stated that the pump itself is at the bottom of the water pipe.

Mr. Simonetti asked if there is a screen on the pipe.

Ms. Brock stated that the pump is attached to the pipe. The screening is after the intake of the pipe.

Mr. Simonetti asked once you hit bedrock, how far down is bedrock go.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the bedrock is all the way down once bedrock is hit.

Mrs. Stoner stated that artesian wells pushes water out.

Mrs. Stoner asked where the well protection language should be placed in the ordinance.

Mrs. Brock stated that the well protection should be where the installation of the casing is located.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the casing installation is under the construction requirements.

Mr. Simonetti asked if you have a well in the Borough, can you be connected to sewer.

Ms. Brock stated that you can be connected to sewer and have a well.

Mr. Simonetti asked what if you are not connected to sewer.

Ms. Brock stated that if you are not connected to sewer you must have an on-lot septic system.

(For the record, Mr. Albright arrived at 7:25 pm)

**MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 28, 2011**

CALL TO ORDER. The meeting began at 7:31 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT
Jennifer Brock, Chairman

Stephanie Stoner
Shawn Vaccaro
Chris Albright
Lou Simonetti

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ann Simonetti

1. MINUTES:

a. March 22, 2011, April 26, 2011 and May 24, 2011 Minutes

March 22, 2011 minutes

Page 1, paragraph 1, last sentence, change “allow” to “promote:

Page 2, paragraph 11, add “geo thermal” in front of wells.

Page 2, paragraph 17, change last sentence to read, “Mrs. Stoner stated that there are a lot of lots in Marysville which are not big enough for well trenching.”

MOTION: Mrs. Stoner moved, seconded by Mr. Albright to approve the March 22, 2011 minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mrs. Stoner to approve the April 26, 2011 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mrs. Stoner moved, seconded by Mr. Albright to approve the May 24, 2011 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT.

a. 4th of July Celebration:

Mrs. Simonetti stated that on Sunday, July 2, there will be a Freedom Celebration at Bethany church to celebrate the 4th of July and to honor veterans and people who are still serving and their families.

b. Franchise funds.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that she attended a seminar regarding chord cutting which was informing municipalities to not depend on the franchise money received from cable companies. The Borough receives \$25,000 a year from Comcast Cable in franchise fees. People are now cutting back by eliminating their cable service by using their computers to watch movies, etc. 350,000 people pulled off cable this past year in Pennsylvania. Municipalities need to start weaning themselves off the money received from franchise fees.

c. Sewer Separation.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that she attended a meeting at the Department of Environmental Protection with PennVest on the \$500,000 match required for H2O grant money for the sewer separation. The Borough will be required to borrow the money for the match. The Borough is higher on the eligibility list because of the consent order to have the sewer separated by the end of 2012. Mrs.

Simonetti stated that she and the manager met with the bank regarding a line of credit for the 20% required match for the grant. They are waiting for the next process to happen.

Ms. Brock asked when PennVest will provide an answer.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the engineer is working on the RFP's now. The project will go out to bid in four months. The project is anticipated to begin in the spring of 2012. It is hopeful that DEP will grant an extension to the consent order when they see that the project is moving forward. The two representatives at DEP that the Borough has been dealing with are retiring. They were going to require a revision to the Act 537 plan. However, the new representatives may only require a Component 3m Minor Act 537 Plan update revision. The Component 3m is not as detailed as an Act 537 plan revision.

3. OLD BUSINESS.

a. Article 4 Subdivision Amendment - Plan Specifications and Procedures

Article 4 review has been completed.

b. Article 5 Design and Improvement Standards.

1. Snow Easements. Discussion at the May 24, 2011 meeting May.

2. Assignment of chapters:

a. Article 1 General Provisions and Article 2 Language and Definitions – Assigned to Mr. Vaitl at the May meeting

b. Article 3 Administration – Assigned to Mr. Albright at May meeting

c. Article 6 Assurance from completion/maintenance of improvements – NOT assigned.

d. Article 7 Supplemental Requirements, Tests and Studies – Assigned to Mrs. Stoner at the May meeting

e. Article 12 Mobile Home Parks and Appendices - NOT assigned

Chapter 6 was assigned to Mr. Simonetti. Ms. Brock will assist in the review of this chapter.

Chapter 12 was assigned to Mr. Vaccaro.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Planning Commission needs to determine what chapter will be discussed next. The final revisions need to be made consolidating changes for Chapters 8, 9 and 10 – Design Standards. The final draft of Chapters 8, 9 and 10 needs to be reviewed by the Planning Commission as a whole.

Mrs. Stoner had questions regarding Chapter 7 – Supplemental Requirements, Tests and Studies. What is the status of a traffic study? Does the Planning Commission want to require an historic and cultural resources section?

Ms. Hardman stated that a traffic study ordinance was prepared and adopted. It should be incorporated into this section.

Ms. Brock stated that she would like to see what the public interest is in historic and cultural resources.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that representatives from PHMC visited the Borough to address historic structures and places. The Hipple house and the Eppley house were observed. They did not find anything of historic interest. The PHMC stated that the designation of the Hipple house and the Eppley house as an historic structure would have to be done by them.

Mrs. Stoner stated that if the State or Federal Government designates a structure as historic, they should have their own guidelines.

Mr. Vaccaro suggested reviewing the Comprehensive Plan recommends on historic structure designations.

Ms. Hardman stated that the parks and open space section is what is lacking in Marysville Borough's SALDO.

Ms. Brock stated that the July 13, 2011 work session will be canceled. Chapter 7 will be discussed at the July 28, 2011 work session.

c. Well Ordinance.

The well ordinance was discussed in the work session.

4. NEW BUSINESS.

a. Jane D. and J. Patrick Kirwan proposed minor/final subdivision

Ms. Hardman stated that a two lot minor – final subdivision was submitted for the Kirwan tract off of Harold alley. The plans, application and filing fee were returned because there is a street frontage issue. The proposed lot fronts on a paper alley and does not have frontage on a public street. Letter dated June 15, 2011 was mailed to the owners and a copy was sent to Joe Burget, Burget and Associates, Inc. stating that variances were required from **Section 27-810 Access to Structure**, which states, *“Every building or structure hereafter erected or moved shall be located on a lot that abuts a public street or road or with access to an acceptable private street or road, and all buildings and structures shall be located so as to provide safe and convenience access for servicing, fire protection and off-street parking, if parking is required and Section 27-812 Building on Alley Lots* which states, *“No dwelling shall be erected on a lot having access only from an alley. On a lot having access only from an alley, a private garage, utility shed or small utility shed shall be allowed as a non-accessory structure.”* of the zoning ordinance or the plan would need to be revised to dedicate additional right of way and extend Chestnut Street to front on the lot.

Ms. Brock stated that Chestnut Street dead ends at the property.

Ms. Hardman stated that the applicant's can meet the SALDO by dedicating additional right of way and extending Chestnut Street with a cul-de-sac or some type of turnaround at the end.

Discussion regarding the property location and the existing house was held.

5. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Mrs. Stoner stated that an Open Space Plan for Perry County was prepared by an engineering firm and was reviewed at several public meetings. The Open Space plan had two parts. One part identified all parks, open spaces, water trails, fly ways and natural areas within Perry County.

The second part of the plan made recommendations. The big issue was that a committee needed to be formed to focus on taking information and note the different project status such as the projects that are in the process, small projects, etc.

Ms. Brock asked if there is a park and recreation committee for the County.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there is not a park and recreation committee for the County. The open space plan also focused on education of the public to make them aware of the park and open space locations within Perry County.

6. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING (Next Council Meeting 7/11/11) -

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Borough Council is working on the sewer separation project.

Mrs. Brock asked what the dollar amount was for the Borough of Marysville's 20% match.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Borough asked for a grant for \$4 million with the total project cost of \$7 million. The match will be a half million dollars.

7. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 7/13/2011 was cancelled @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING 7/26/11 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.

Motion to adjourn: Mr. Albright moved, seconded by Mr. Vaccaro to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer