

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
JULY 23, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephanie Stoner
Robert Zimmerman
Jennifer Brock
Lou Simonetti

STAFF PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ann Simonetti

SALDO Summary

Mrs. Stoner stated that at the last meeting Part 4 was finished and review was started on Part 5. The workshop meeting for July was cancelled so she reviewed Part 5 and made changes. She stopped on page 28.

Mrs. Stoner stated that in her review she had noted some questions. On page 9 # 4. Buffer areas references Section 9.9

Ms. Hardman stated Section 9.9 should be changed to Section 22-524.2.

Mrs. Stoner stated that on page 14, 4 dwellings on a shared driveway are permitted. The current ordinance permits 3 dwellings on a shared driveway.

Ms. Brock stated that if a lot is conducive for a shared driveway it means less entries onto the street and perhaps less street. A shared driveway is a lot like a flag lot.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there is a shared driveway in the development off Kings Highway.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to keep it at 3 dwellings on a shared driveway.

Mrs. Stoner questioned page 15, Section 22-516.3. the length of a single access cul-de-sac of 250'.

Ms. Hardman stated that the minimum length of a cul-de-sac for liquid fuels is 250 feet.

Mrs. Stoner asked if ADT meant Average Daily Trips.

Ms. Hardman stated that ADT means Average Daily Trips. It should be spelled out first with the abbreviation afterward and throughout the text.

Mrs. Stoner state that on page 16, #9 change “contour” to “center” and remove “but not curbing”.

Mr. Simonetti asked what was depressed curbing.

Ms. Brock stated that depressed curbing is sloped curb so cars can drive over it.

Mrs. Stoner asked who assigns street names referenced in Section 22-517.2.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Borough assigns street names.

Ms. Simonetti stated that Mr. Kline has a subdivision with a shared driveway and he came to the Borough Council for approval to change the street name.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-517.2. requires a written notice that the proposed new street names are acceptable.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Section 22-517.2 is not necessary because street names are on the plan and is a part of the approval process.

Mrs. Stoner stated that page 17 has an illustration of a street sign. Mr. Finnerty got back to her on the NENA requirements and said he would get better illustrations for a street sign and stop sign for the ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that on page 25, J. 1. states that if a significant tree is damaged, destroyed or removed it must be replaced. Should the ordinance indicate what the significant tree should be replaced with?

Ms. Brock stated that the tree is significant because it is big.

Mr. Simonetti stated that this section gives the developer an opportunity to remove the tree and replace it with a smaller tree.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that there is a Shade Tree Commission that must approve the removal of a tree.

Ms. Brock stated that should add “approved by the Shade Tree Commission” at the end of the sentence in Section 22-524.J.1.

Ms. Hardman stated that page 30, D.i. change “municipality” to “Borough” in two places and in D.ii.a.

(For the record, Mr. Finnerty arrived at 7:05 pm).

Ms. Brock stated that page 30.D.ii.d. change “form” to “from”.

Ms. Brock asked what Section G on page 34 is trying to say.

Mrs. Stoner stated that if there is storm water facility on or off the tract there must be an easement.

Ms. Brock stated that the word “Applicant” should not be used and recommended that the paragraph be reworded as follows, “Easements shall be reserved where storm water or surface water management facilities exist or are proposed. Alteration of existing storm water management facilities on adjacent and/or downstream properties shall obtain a temporary construction easement or a permanent easement and maintenance responsibilities shall be established.”

Mrs. Simonetti stated that on page 34, Section 22-527.2.C. “(1)” should be changed to “I”.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that capital letters should be removed throughout the text.

Mrs. Stoner asked if it is typical for the Borough Engineer to inspect and certify monuments and markers in Section 22-527.6.C.

Ms. Hardman stated that it is typical for the Borough Engineer to inspect and certify monuments and markers.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Section 22-528.A. (1) and (2) should be changed to I and II.

Ms. Brock stated that Section 22-528.1. should be reworded to remove “The applicant shall provide” to “The type of Sewage Facility shall be consistent”. Also change “municipal” to “Borough”.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Section 22-528.1.C. remove “The applicant shall provide” and add “shall be provided after Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection”.

Ms. Brock stated Section 22-528.1.C. change “application” to “plan” and remove “authority or organization providing such service” to “Borough”.

Ms. Brock stated that Section 22-528.1.D. change “application” to “submission”.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Section 22-528.1.F. change (1) (2) and (3) to I, II, and III.

Ms. Brock stated that Section 22-528.1.F.(1) remove “The applicant shall provide” to “Evidence shall be provided”.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the Borough has a Sewage Enforcement Officer (SEO) for on-lot septic systems.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the SEO is provided by the Borough's Engineering firm.

Mrs. Simonetti asked what a nitrate plume easement was.

Ms Brock stated that a plume is the area a pollutant spreads out into.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-528.1.F. permits an individual on-lot sewage system to be utilized only when connecting to a public system presents an undue hardship not of the developers making.

Ms, Brock stated that the developer should request a waiver from connecting to public sewer instead of allowing it in the ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the requirement to connect to public sewer should be spelled out with a distance.

Ms. Hardman stated that typically the developer must connect to public sewer if it is within 1,000 feet of the development.

Ms. Brock stated that the developer should be required to connect to public sewer and pay to have the sewer line extended to the development.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances addresses public sewer connection.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Act 537 plan should be reviewed.

**MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
JULY 23, 2013**

1. CALL TO ORDER. The meeting began at 7:37 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephanie Stoner
Robert Zimmerman
Lou Simonetti
Jennifer Brock

STAFF PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ann Simonetti

2. MINUTES:

a. June 26, 2013 Minutes

Page 7, D. line 4 change sentence to read, “Mrs. Stoner stated that she thought the Borough has been on a waiver from the MS4 requirements in the past.”.

MOTION: Ms. Brock 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 5 Design and Improvement Standards.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-528 Sanitary Sewage Disposal should be revised to make connection to the sanitary sewer mandatory.

Ms. Hardman stated that a development should connect to public sewer if it is within 1,000 feet of a sewer main.

Mr. Finnerty stated that if CBDG funds are used, the documents mention connection to public sewer.

Ms. Brock stated that if a development has a new street, the development should connect to public sewer.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the model SALDO on the Tri County Regional Planning Commission website has language regarding connection to public sewer on page 5-49, Section 515.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she will review the model SALDO and Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances.

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.

B. Zoning Ordinance/Chapter 7 (2007)

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

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

C. Well Ordinance – no discussion was held.

5. NEW BUSINESS.

A. MS4-Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough may soon need to address MS4. There is a link to the EPA website to review MS4 requirements. There are a lot of misconceptions about MS4.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the sewer separation project, Phase I the MS4 would be first and Phase II can wait five years to address.

Mrs. Stoner stated that that since the Borough had combined sewer overflows we didn't have to do MS4. After the sewer separation there will still be some combined sewer overflow so the MS4 will wait until it is all gone. It appears that the MS4 requirements may not be as detailed.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the MS4 requires you to capture the amount of flow coming out of outflow pipes. Some of the pipes are on private property so we don't know where all the outflow pipes are located.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there are peak flows and average flows so the policy may still be developing.

Mr. Finnerty stated that they may permit calculations in lieu of having an inventory of facilities.

Mrs. Simonetti state that there is a MS4 workshop group that the Planning Commission can join. If the Planning Commission is interested they can contact the Capital Region Council of Governments.

B. Parks and Recreation Plan Committee.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the need for a park and recreation plan was discussed at the last Borough Council meeting. The Borough Council requested that a park and recreation plan committee be formed with three members of the Planning Commission and three members of Borough Council to find ways to develop a plan at minimal or no cost.

Mrs. Stoner stated the committee can look for grants to take care of all of the cost for the development of a park and recreation plan or a grant with a match. The Borough Council was open to in kind utilization.

Mrs. Stoner asked for three volunteers for the park and recreation plan committee.

Ms. Brock volunteered for the committee.

Mr. Zimmerman stated he could be on the committee depending on the date and time.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Borough Council members are Lance, Sherry and herself.

Dates and times were discussed. Mrs. Stoner stated that she will start an email to establish a date and time.

C. Grant Opportunities.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) have grants available for technical assistance. There is no monetary value but there is \$40,000 of technical assistance. She will contact Jake Romig, Ecostruction LLC to see if a park and recreation plan is eligible for technical assistance.

Ms. Brock stated she thinks the grant needs to be tied to the Chesapeake Bay.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that trails that tie the Borough together to make it a walkable community and improvements that permit commutes to the river and streams.

Mr. Finnerty asked if the Lions Park would be acceptable to riparian plantings.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the Borough leases property from the Lions Park that could be used for riparian plantings.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Ecostruction LLC is just one company on the approved list. She can ask Mr. Romig to attend a Planning Commission meeting to discuss the grant.

Ms. Brock stated that conservation objectives are to restore and enhance wetlands and improve conservation private lands. The Borough should do inventory of problem areas in town.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the stream banks are eroding in Marysville.

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Simonetti to look into the overall feasibility of NFWF technical assistance in the development of a park and recreation plan as it relates to storm water management and water quality in the Borough. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Other Business.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the repair work on Kings Highway was delayed until fall.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Manager contacted the billboard company, Lamar, about the lighting of the sign and they stated they would adjust the light.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Act 68 was signed by the Governor allowing for storm water authorities.

Mrs. Stoner asked what Act 68 gives the Borough the ability to do.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that if this was approved before the storm water separation project, the Borough could have established a Storm Water Authority and could have established a storm water fee instead of raising sewer rates by 35%.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the assessment is based on land.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the assessment would be determined by the storm water authority for storm water related issues.

Mr. Finnerty stated that House Bill 515 was adopted that dealt with email notifications during the planning process.

Mrs. Stoner stated the bill addresses how to do an email notice to make it official.

Mr. Finnerty stated that there is no definition of notice in the MPC.

Mrs. Stoner passed around the newsletter entitled Water Ways about the Susquehanna River Trail.

**7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING - NONE
(Next Council Meeting August 12, 2013).**

**8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 8/27/2013 @ 6:30pm/NEXT
REGULAR MEETING @ 7:30 pm, NEXT WORK SESSION 8/14/13 @ 6:30 pm.**

Adjournment: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer/Recording Secretary