

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 24, 2008

CALL TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 6:37 pm.

1. MEMBERS PRESENT

Jennifer Brock, Chairman
Stephanie Stoner
Monte Shearer
Shawn Vaccaro
Jim Zehring
Art Vaitl
Lori Mohr

STAFF PRESENT:

Dan Altland, Borough Solicitor
Ron Brown, Borough Engineer
Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Drew Ames, Tri County Regional Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brian Harris, Borough Manager
Rick Castranio, Alpha Consulting Engineers
John Murphy, Alpha Consulting Engineers
Paul Hepler, Yingst Homes Inc.
David V. Benfer, 131 Ridgeview Drive
Carl L. Saylor, 213 Ridgeview Drive
Sherree Knight, Borough Council
Ann Simonetti, Borough Council
Frank Skirpan, 217 Ridgeview Drive
Cliff Dillmann, 415 Susquehanna Street and Susquehanna Water Gap Coalition
Forrest Troutman, Yingst Homes, Inc.
Mike Goeckel, 3411 Florence Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110
Merrel and Lou Phillips, 127 Ridgeview Drive
Jennine Rhome, 304 Kings Highway
Anna Smith
Milton Sierak, 121 Ridgeview Drive
Erin Labate, 203 Ridgeview Drive
John Carroll, 119 Ridgeview Drive
Martha Troutman, 116 Ridgeview Drive
Amy Martin, 118 Ridgeview Drive
Miriam Glavina, 118 Ridgeview Drive
James Sabo, 100 Willow Street, Rye Township
Roger Barrick, Sylvan Street
Rob Bell, 202 Caroline Drive
Walt Tharp, 208 Ridgeview Drive
David Miller, 223 Ridgeview Drive

1. Rockville Estates Preliminary Subdivision Plan

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission received a set of comments from Drew Ames from Tri County Planning Commission. Ms. Brock asked Mr. Ames if he had enough time to do a review.

Mr. Ames stated that the official review was done in 2004. Mr. Jason Finney from his office reviewed the plan and he also looked over comments and he attached a few additional comments.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission hasn't heard anything from Sewer Committee.

(For the record, Ms. Mohr arrived at 6:40 pm)

(For the record, Mr. Vaccaro arrived at 6:42 pm)

Ms. Brock asked Mr. Brown if he had a chance to review Alpha's comments.

Mr. Brown stated yes, the comments came with the submittal.

Ms. Brock asked Alpha Engineering to give a summary of the plan.

Mr. Castranio stated that since the last meeting they addressed the technical comments on the storm water facilities for the ponds to get more volume. There was a view shed comment that was addressed by moving lot 67 down and made lots 19 and 20 smaller. There is a lot of access to Little Mountain.

Ms. Brock asked how far back from the end is it now.

Mr. Murphy stated that it ends at lot 68 which is approximately 500'.

Ms. Brock asked if there will be major grading in this area.

Mr. Castranio stated that there will be 3:1 cut in the bank.

Mr. Murphy stated there is 500' with areas to park and access to Little Mountain.

Mr. Castranio stated that for 200' there is a no disturbance area adjacent to lot 68.

Ms. Brock asked if the houses are on the south side above the road level.

Mr. Murphy stated that the houses are on the south side above the road level.

Ms. Brock said there is supposed to be a no cut area. They talked about an area to prevent the cutting of trees except what was immediately adjacent to the house site.

Mr. Murphy stated there will be a no cut area except for streets. Once the preliminary plan is squared away they will need to finalize the storm water, BMP's, and sewer so they can minimize disturbance and continue to move forward.

Mr. Castranio stated that one thing Yingst Homes, Inc. has done is to hire a contractor to enforce the erosion and sedimentation control plan through Perry County Conservation District. Surveyors will stake out roads and the area of no disturbance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Mr. Murphy started to explain the difference in the plan from the last meeting and asked if he could continue his explanation.

Mr. Castranio stated that there were mostly technical issues addressed from last meeting.

Mr. Murphy stated that a change was made to open up areas to Little Mountain.

Ms. Brock stated that where the road goes out over the view shed the old plan had 12 lots but now there are 25 lots. Are the lots longer and narrower? The number of lots has doubled from the crest of Little Mountain down on the south side of the road.

Mr. Castranio stated that it was viable to overlook Rockville Bridge.

Ms. Mohr asked if the view shed is looking down on the river.

Mr. Murphy stated that the view shed is looking down on the river.

Ms. Mohr stated that there is one thing that needs put in the plan. The plan should show BMP's (Best Management Practices) that have worked on steep slopes like this. The "Forest Friendly Development" book provided information on the appropriate BMP's to use. BMP's are used to absorb storm water, preserve trees, protect view sheds and keeping natural color of housing when looking up at the development. Ms. Mohr asked Alpha to point out the area for a contiguous tree line.

Mr. Murphy stated the darker green area on the plan has existing trees. The trees help with storm water. They intend to preserve as many trees as possible. They will be implementing BMP's agreed upon by review agencies. They are cognizant of tree preservation.

Ms. Mohr stated that BMP's also help with sales.

Mr. Ames stated that tree preservation should also be done on the building lot.

Mr. Castranio stated that the final plan will have detailed grading for each lot. Conservation will be at the rear of the lots to protect trees.

Mr. Murphy stated there is an advantage to having one builder and one developer because they can control development of every lot. Economics and environment go hand in hand. The goal is to save as many trees as possible.

Ms. Mohr stated that there needs to be long term maintenance of the trees. Covenants are needed to address regulations regarding cutting trees and mowing lots

Mr. Murphy stated there will be restrictive covenants in every deed. The restrictive covenants will also be part of the homeowner's association documents. The developer will go over the restrictions with each potential buyer and there will be an attachment of every sales agreement.

Mr. Dillmann stated that what is in question is what the developer intends to do. The merits of Plan 2 have been discarded. The extended trail on Little Mountain was ditched without consulting the Planning Commission. This is a real disservice to Marysville.

Mr. Castranio stated that the open space on the current plan is 183 acres compared to the previous plan of 172 acres. As they get to the final plan they can look at the grading of each lot and put more private open space at the rear of the lots.

Mr. Dillmann stated that the storm water facilities and grading are in the open space now that wasn't in the open space before.

Mr. Murphy stated that the storm water is only a small amount of the open space which amounts to 2 to 3 acres.

Mr. Brown stated that the density of the development is less. The maximum lot coverage is 30%. His interpretation is that 30% of the lot can be developed.

Ms. Mohr stated that all impervious surfaces are part of the 30% coverage.

Mr. Brown stated that area of disturbance is different than coverage.

Mr. Murphy stated that they will adhere to the Zoning Hearing Board decision.

Mr. Brown stated that the Zoning Hearing Board decision needs to be clarified when it comes to 30% coverage and area of disturbance for sewer, etc.

Ms. Brock asked Mr. Altland what area of disturbance meant.

Mr. Altland stated he did not see a reference to area of disturbance in the Zoning Hearing Board decision.

Mr. Castranio read the definition of lot coverage from the zoning ordinance, "*That percentage of the area of a site occupied by imperious surfaces.*"

Mrs. Stoner asked that they explain the 10% additional area added to the disturbance area.

Mr. Ames stated that the final plan submissions will address specific lot by lot plan.

Mr. Castranio stated that he showed a few detailed lot disturbance in the preliminary plan.

Mr. Murphy stated that the site plan submitted for the building permit will have specific lot disturbance identified.

Mr. Ames stated that he is confident that the 30% coverage regulation can be adhered to.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there is a contradiction on page 1 of the plan that indicates the variance for 5% of lots for lot width that will be 30 ' but no greater than 120' and in another area it states 80' to 120'.

Mr. Ames stated that this appears to be a typo.

Mr. Altland stated that the correct lot area should be 30' but no greater than 120'.

Mr. Brown stated that there was initial discussion on Stone Arch Drive on what it will take to construct the road. There is an opportunity for the Borough and developer to discuss the amount of disturbance in this area. Once the cut and fill is started, there will be a large area of disturbance. The area of the embankment will need to be re-vegetated to minimize scarring effect.

Mr. Murphy stated they the geo-technical and landscape architects will define the appropriate species for the embankment.

Ms. Mohr stated that she reviewed the plan and noticed there will be detention ponds. She asked if detention ponds are required to use native species.

Mr. Murphy stated there will retention ponds and detention ponds.

Ms. Mohr asked if native species can be used.

Ms. Brock stated that there will be a large area of disturbance where the road will be constructed. Can the area be re-planted with trees so that when they grow up you won't be able to see the area from the highway?

Mr. Murphy stated that they will be providing species of trees for this type of grade.

Ms. Brock stated that the biggest difference on what was previously discussed was that the lots were to come down off the mountain which left a large area of trees. Now there is just a row of houses. This is what really bothers her. Stone Arch Drive lots are on the north side of the road which will be below it. Where will the sewer line for these houses go?

Mr. Castranio stated that the sewer line will go to the center of the street at an angle.

Mr. Murphy stated that in order to minimize disturbance there will be the area for over 55 years old. There will be single story, first floor master bedroom homes which will be less visible.

Ms. Stoner asked where the age restricted area will be.

Mr. Castranio stated that the age restricted area will be on the loop street.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if the ranch style home for over 55 will have basements.

Mr. Murphy stated that the customer will have option to have a basement.

Ms. Simonetti stated that the basement homes will need to have the sewer pumped up.

Mr. Murphy stated that each lot will be looked at individually.

Ms. Mohr asked if a play area could be provided in the lower area.

Mr. Murphy stated that a play area is not shown at the present time. They can look at locating facilities at the final plan stage.

Mrs. Stoner stated they originally talked about the water service needing a pump station and storage tank. Is that still the understanding from the water company?

Mr. Murphy stated that a pump station and storage tank may be the case. The water company won't design the water service until they have a final plan that has been approved.

Mr. Murphy stated that what they know with pressure and heights is that there will be some pumping. The water pressure cannot drop for surrounding areas.

Ms. Brock stated that the pressure cannot be too high either.

Mrs. Stoner asked if they have a letter from the water company that they intend to service the site.

Mr. Murphy that they do have a letter of intent to serve the area with public water from the water company.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she would not like to see 300+ wells on this site.

Mr. Murphy stated that wells are not practical. The water company cannot deny service. It is just a matter of what will be needed to provide service.

The work session adjourned at 7:20 pm.

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 24, 2008

Call to order and roll call. The meeting was called to order at 7:37 pm

Roll Call:

1. MEMBERS PRESENT

Jennifer Brock, Chairman
Stephanie Stoner
Monte Shearer
Shawn Vaccaro
Jim Zehring
Art Vaitl
Lori Mohr

STAFF PRESENT:

Dan Altland, Borough Solicitor
Ron Brown, Borough Engineer

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Drew Ames, Tri County Regional Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brian Harris, Borough Manager
Rick Castranio, Alpha Consulting Engineers
John Murphy, Alpha Consulting Engineers
Paul Hepler, Yingst Homes Inc.
David V. Benfer, 131 Ridgeview Drive
Carl L. Saylor, 213 Ridgeview Drive
Sherree Knight, Borough Council
Ann Simonetti, Borough Council
Frank Skirpan, 217 Ridgeview Drive
Cliff Dillmann, 415 Susquehanna Street and Susquehanna Water Gap Coalition
Forrest Troutman, Yingst Homes, Inc.
Mike Goeckel, 3411 Florence Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110
Merrel and Lou Phillips, 127 Ridgeview Drive
Jennine Rhome, 304 Kings Highway
Anna Smith
Milton Sierak, 121 Ridgeview Drive
Erin Labate, 203 Ridgeview Drive
John Carroll, 119 Ridgeview Drive
Martha Troutman, 116 Ridgeview Drive
Amy Martin, 118 Ridgeview Drive
Miriam Slevinor, 118 Ridgeview Drive
James Sabo, 100 Willow Street, Rye Township
Roger Barrick, Sylvan Street
Rob Bell, 202 Caroline Drive
Walt Tharp, 208 Ridgeview Drive
David Miller, 223 Ridgeview Drive

2. MINUTES:

a. May 27, 2008

Page 1, 1. Paragraph 4 change “bridge” to “ridge”.

Page 3, Paragraph 7 change “pond” to “river”.

Page 8.3.a. change “vocal” to “focal.”

MOTION: Mr. Zehring moved, seconded by Mr. Vaccaro to approve the May 27, 2008 minutes as amended. The motion passed with Ms. Mohr abstaining.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT.

a. Carl Saylor, 213 Ridgeview Drive.

Mr. Saylor stated that this goes back to 2004 with concerns he had about the development. He submitted a letter with 15 concerns at a meeting in 2004 but he never received a written

response. He did attend a meeting that the developer's representatives were present to answer questions. He feels a public hearing should be scheduled so that everyone could attend to have their questions answered to understand what is going on. The concerns addressed may bring up some good suggestions. A meeting could change the complexion and feelings about the project. The people on Ridgeview Drive and Park Drive are not in objection to the project but are in a state of ignorance. There are concerns with traffic and storm water. It was suggested coming out of Caroline Drive with a right turn only but the current plan does not show this restriction. Another thing was that the road dimension is restricted but there is right of way to change the size of the road. Ridgeview Drive could be widened to allow parking on both sides of the road so vehicle mirrors won't be knocked off. Park Drive is also in bad shape. The answers to his 15 questions could be answered on the website. There are no minutes for 2008 for Borough Council on the website. There could also be blurbs about the Planning Commission on the website. There is nothing that they can do to provide input. Right now it seems like there is secretive things going on that they know nothing about. He came to a meeting and Mr. Dillmann and Ms. Brock was present but they found out the meeting had been cancelled.

Ms. Brock stated that answers to the 15 questions would be appropriate. Ms. Brock asked Mr. Altland what steps are needed to hold a public hearing.

Mr. Altland asked what is different from a public hearing and the meeting being held tonight.

Mr. Saylor stated that there is a lot of difference. The meeting being held is educational but he would like to ask questions.

Ms. Mohr stated that the meeting being held is a public meeting where they receive public comment.

Ms. Brock stated that when plans are submitted to the Borough, anyone can come to the Borough Office to review them.

Mr. Saylor asked how anyone would know a plan was submitted.

Ms. Brock stated that it has been done as a posting.

Mr. Harris stated he has reviewed the plan with a few people who came to the Borough Office. Anyone can come to the Borough Office to review the plan. He would be happy to go through the plan with them.

Ms. Brock asked if it would be feasible to review the plan at a work session the 2nd week in July – July 9, 2008.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Borough Engineer is not present at the work session meetings.

Ms. Mohr stated that the plan can be reviewed with the residents at the meeting tonight.

b. Jennie Rhome, 304 Kings Highway.

Mrs. Rhome stated that when she attended the Borough Council meetings before. The meeting room was extremely inadequate. Feels whatever meeting there is perhaps it should be held at the

Lions Club so that the people from Marysville can come. Not in a room like this. The website is something that can be accessed at work, at home, etc. The subdivision will impact taxes, road maintenance and everything.

Mr. Altland asked if there is a way to put the plan on the website.

Mrs. Rhome stated that the website is deplorable.

Ms. Brock stated that the issue of a public hearing needs to go to Borough Council.

Ms. Mohr stated that this is the appropriate meeting to make comment and to voice concerns. It would be a good idea to hold a meeting to field questions. The developer's engineer needs to be present to make a presentation.

Mr. Murphy stated this is the third or fourth presentation. He would be happy to make a presentation at the Borough Council meeting.

Mr. Skirpan, 217 Ridgeview Drive, asked if the plan is etched in stone.

Ms. Brock stated that nothing is etched in stone. She gave a short synopsis of the subdivision plan review process. The property owner submits a preliminary subdivision plan for development. The Planning Commission cannot tell the property owner they have no right to build. The plan must meet certain requirements. The plan review process is to make sure it meets the codes. They are in negotiating process to make the development better for Marysville. Public input is welcome. The fact that there will be a development is highly probable but what it is going to look like is not etched in stone.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Planning Commission is a recommending body. It is also very important to discuss the plan with the Borough Council.

Mr. Skirpan stated that there were a number of good elements in the plan that is now off the table. This reminds him of bait and switch.

Ms. Mohr stated that the amount of people in attendance to see and hear about plan shows the impact the plan will have on the community. She feels it would be fair to hear their concerns at a meeting with Planning Commission and Borough Council.

c. Cliff Dillmann, 415 Susquehanna Street

Mr. Dillmann stated that he presented an email from himself to the Borough Planning Commission dated June 24, 2008 which has a copy of an article in Penn Live, The Patriot News by Neighbors-Clifford Dillmann.

Mr. Dillmann stated that the idea of a public hearing is great because a record is kept by a professional of what is said. At the meeting all the plans, Plan1, Plan 2 and Plan 3 should be laid out for public review. The developer can do Plan 2 and it would be a good plan for the Borough. If no waivers and no variance are granted, the plan would be impossible to build. If the developer was required to do Plan 1, the developer may choose not to build. The developer thinks it is possible to go to Borough Council without the Planning Commission's

consent. This is a deliberate attempt to mislead Borough Council with the Zoning Hearing Board decision. The development is very significant thing for Marysville. The residents need to know about the bias and other connections. The Borough has a Solicitor and an Engineer representing the developer. The Planning Commission Secretary/Zoning Officer and other professional employees should be unbiased.

Ms. Simonetti, stated she is a member of Borough Council. The plan has never been discussed at a Borough Council meeting.

Ms. Mohr stated that Mr. Dillmann is specifically asking for a public hearing. She does not recommend having a public hearing. A public hearing is formal and is not a good forum for public review of a plan. There are a lot of costs associated with a public hearing.

Mr. Dillmann stated that there would be a paid recorder of comments.

Ms. Mohr stated it is not plausible to do Plan 1 or 2. They are on Plan 3 now. Comments should specifically address Plan 3. She does not see a need to further discuss Plan 1 or Plan 2.

Mr. Dillmann stated that there has been four years of review of Plan 2. The plan is not unbuildable; it is unprofitable.

Ms. Brock stated that it is good for everyone to come out and it is important to give everyone an opportunity to see what they want and the opportunity to do same with the Borough Council.

Mr. Brown stated that he finds Mr. Dillmann's allegations that the Borough Engineer has an interest in the plan disturbing. The Borough Engineer review's the plan to protect the interest of the Borough. He does not have an interest one way or another. He has never worked with either engineering company that has represented the developer. His comments are based on the Borough's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. He wants this made perfectly clear.

Mr. Altland stated when you cast a stone you need to have evidence to support it and have facts to back it up. He gives recommendations and advice to the Planning Commission and Borough Council, his clients. He is not in any ones pocket. When he is asked for an opinion or a recommendation that is what he gives. He resents any implication of impropriety by him, his firm or Borough Council members. Nothing further from the truth. He recommends against hiring a stenographer. The public meeting is an opportunity for comments to be made. The minutes don't need to get hung up on terminology. It is now 8:15 pm and the Planning Commission hasn't talked about anything substantive. The developer wishes to have the items discussed. Now is a good time to do that. The Planning Commission needs to decide now what they want to do as far as a public meeting. There are a lot of waivers requested and a lot of conditions that needs to be addressed. The Planning Commission needs to move forward in a substantive way. The first order of business would be for the Planning Commission to discuss a special meeting.

Mrs. Stoner stated she would be interested in the Borough Council's level of interest in a meeting.

Ms. Brock stated that she feels that what Mr. Altland stated is appropriate.

Mr. Murray stated that the Planning Commission should review the plan first. The Borough Engineer comments should be reviewed.

Mr. Sabo, 100 Willow Street, Rye Township, stated that he has attended three Planning Commission meetings that the plan has been discussed where Mr. Dillmann was present and there were 20 empty chairs. He came to the Borough Office and reviewed the plans with the Borough Manager.

Mr. Labate, 203 Ridgeview Drive, stated that he attended a meeting four years ago and put his questions on the table. A lot of suggestions have been very appropriate. The plan should be discussed after the fact and during construction of it. There will be water pressure changes, driveway design, more police, etc.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission has been discussing the plan. They need to review as much as they can tonight. She invited everyone to look at the plan and schedule a time for people to review the plan at the Borough Office. She is glad people came to the meeting. It would be good for people to be present while they are reviewing the plan. The plan was delayed for several months because they were working on sewer issues. The Planning Commission could address public issues at the work session meeting on July 9.

Mr. Murphy stated that the sewer, water and infrastructure will be based on the design and reviews will be done by the Borough Engineer. The Borough Council will make decisions regarding Fire and Police as the plan moves forward.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Planning Commission should continue to discussing the plan tonight. A meeting should be scheduled for public comment. It would not be fair to act on the plan tonight.

MOTION: Ms. Mohr moved to answer questions at tonight's meeting and hold a public meeting to obtain public input on the plan.

Ms. Brock stated that public input is important.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Planning Commission has been discussion the plan for a number of years.

Ms. Brock seconded the motion. Ms. Stoner, Ms. Mohr, Ms. Brock, Mr. Shearer voted yes. Mr. Zehring, Mr. Vaitl and Mr. Vacarro voted no. The motion passed.

Mr. Troutman stated that the Planning Commission is still under public comment on the agenda. Mr. Troutman asked if the Planning Commission would be voting on the plan tonight.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission will not vote on the plan tonight.

Mr. Troutman asked Ms. Brock if she could tell him what the action would be.

Ms. Brock stated that the plan would be tabled speculative on hearing public comment.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she doesn't see why they can't review the plan. People can still come to meeting and to Borough Council meeting if there is something that is not cleared up tonight.

Mr. Troutman stated he appreciates the Planning Commission comments and public comments but expects action on the plan at tonight's meeting. They have been working on the plan for a number of years now. He understands that the public wants to make comment and expects the Planning Commission to discuss the plan. He expects the Planning Commission to take a stand. There is plenty of opportunity for public comment.

Ms. Brock stated she understands their desire to move forward. However, there was substantial change made to the plan which is not comparable to other plans and there are a lot of questions. They will see what can get done tonight.

Mr. Troutman stated they would be happy to answer questions but do not want to do it in public comment section of the agenda.

Mr. John Carol, 119 Ridgeview Drive stated that the volume of traffic and water runoff concerns him. He spent \$10,000 leveling his yard to have water diverted.

Ms. Lisko, Blue Mountain Outfitters, asked how the plan got to this point and why there was substantial changes and expectation of a call for action.

Mr. Troutman stated they would be happy to speak on the plan under old business.

4. OLD BUSINESS:

a. Rockville Estates Preliminary Subdivision Plan #2004.3.

Ms. Brock stated there were a couple different lists of waivers that have been submitted. What list should they be working from?

Ms. Hardman stated that the waivers are shown in the Alpha letter dated May 12, 2008. The June 9th letter addresses comments.

Mr. Castranio stated that there was one waiver added after May 12 indicated on the June 10 transmittal. The complete list of waivers is listed in the June 24 Borough Engineer's report.

Mr. Vacarro stated there is no reason for the waiver #13 Section 22-504.1.C. *Generally, the depth of residential lots shall not be less than 1 or more than 2 ½ times their width*

Mr. Murphy stated that the large estate lots at the top of the mountain does not meet configuration.

Mrs. Stoner asked if this is only applicable to the large lots.

Mr. Murphy said yes it is only applicable to the large lots.

Mr. Castranio stated that the lots are not wider because they had to meet the conditions of the variance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the lot depth should not be more than 2.5 times the width.

Ms. Brock stated that there are a number of waivers requested that are not specific and that need justifications. For example in waiver #2 *Section 22-502.9. Maximum grade of a minor street shall be 12%. Applicant proposes maximum street grade of 14%.* The waiver needs to be specific as to where the street will be over 14% grade. There are a number of waivers that need to be more specific. *Waiver #3 Section 22-502.3.D. Approach to intersection leveling area maximum grade is 4%-.* Where are the 6% leveling areas that are proposed?

Mr. Murphy suggested that they start with #1 and go through the list to #13.

Waivers as shown in the June 24, 2008 Borough Engineers report:

1. By definition in the SLDO: The principal entrance streets and streets in a residential development and streets for circulation within such a development are defined as “Collector”. Section 502-7.A.
 - Section 22-502/1/A/ - 60’ right of way and 36’ cartway
 - Section 22-502.6A. – 300’ centerline horizontal curve
 - Section 22-502.3.F. – 35’ curb radius at Intersections
2. Section 22-502.9. Maximum grade of a minor street shall be 12%.
3. Section 22-502.3.D. Approach to intersection leveling area maximum grade is 4%-.
4. Section 22-502.10 Slope of banks along streets shall be no steeper than 1’ vertical for 3’ of horizontal in fill and 1’ vertical for 2’ horizontal for cut
5. Section 22-502.8. Maximum length of cul-de-sac shall not exceed 500’ in length and serve no more than 20 units.
6. Section 22-602.5. Sidewalks shall be provided on each side of street.
7. Ordinance 470.401.k.2.C. All soils shall be considered to belong to Hydrologic Group “c”. Applicant is proposing to analyze actual soil groups.
8. Ordinance 470.402.h. detention pond shall have minimum slope of 2% and bituminous flow channel.
9. Section 22-502.C. Approaches shall follow a straight line for a distance of at least 100’ from the intersection of centerlines. eg. Caroline Drive at Street B and Street C, Street E at Street H, Street e at Street F, etc.
10. Section 22-503.2. Blocks shall to be more than 1,200’ in length. Applicant proposes maximum block length of about 4,600’ with common area connections between the streets.
11. Section 22-504.6. In the case of wedge shaped lots, no lot shall be less than 50’ in width measured along the arc at the front street right of way
12. Section 22-504.9. No panhandle shaped lots shall be created unless terrain dictates otherwise. Minimum width at street shall be at least 75% of the lot width at the building setback line.
13. Section 22-504.1.C. Generally, the depth of residential lots shall not be less than 1 or more than 2 ½ times their width

Ms. Brock stated #1 is *By definition in the SLDO: The principal entrance streets and streets in a residential development and streets for circulation within such a development are defined as "Collector". Section 502-7.A.*

Section 22-502/1/A/ - 60' right of way and 36' cartway

Section 22-502.6A. – 300' centerline horizontal curve

Section 22-502.3.F. – 35' curb radius at Intersections

Ms. Stoner stated that #1 on the waiver requests is not the same as #1 on the plan.

Mr. Murphy stated the plan will be corrected. Local street regulations are requested for a 30' cartway and 50' right of way. The collector street regulation encourages speeding. He does not feel that this waiver needs to be specific.

Mr. Brown stated that he is requesting that a turning template is provided for intersections so they will know if school buses and fire apparatus can make the turns for Waiver #1.

Mr. Murphy agreed to provide specifics for Waivers #2, 3, and 4.

Mrs. Stoner asked the Borough Engineer on Waiver #4 how it would be stabilized because discussion focused on disturbance area.

Mr. Brown stated that they will need to provide a geotechnical analysis.

Mr. Murphy stated that a geotechnical analysis will be provided prior to final plan approval.

Ms. Brock stated that it would be a good idea to see how slopes will be stabilized prior to granting a waiver.

Mr. Murphy stated that the waiver should be granted pursuant to a geotechnical report.

Ms. Brock stated that there was also discussion held regarding slope re-vegetation. There is nothing specific regarding re-vegetation of the disturbed slopes. DEP has references and BMP's.

Mr. Brown stated that the review and approval of the disturbed area will be done by Perry County Conservation District and DEP. He will defer to that.

Mr. Dillmann stated that DEP, DCNR is not the Borough. The Borough has the right to ask.

Ms. Brock called Mr. Dillmann out of order.

Ms. Brock stated that she is requesting they use BMP's. The type of vegetation and when it will be done needs to be specified.

Mr. Murphy stated he will confer with the developer and get back to them.

Mr. Altland stated that conditions can be attached to the Planning Commission's recommendation. He recommends to the Planning Commission to make this a condition and incorporate a standard.

Ms. Brock stated that they need to be specific on what BMP's will be used, how it will be used; when it will be used, and how slopes will be stabilized.

Mr. Murphy stated that this should be a condition of approval.

Ms. Mohr stated the Planning Commission needs to make sure that the waiver and the conditions can be fulfilled in the end.

Ms. Brock stated that waiver #5 lacks specificity.

Mr. Murphy stated that waiver #5 is specific to Steward Court. The waiver is 214'.

Ms. Brock stated asked if waiver #6 is applicable to all roadways.

Mr. Murphy stated that waiver #6 is applicable to all roadways.

Ms. Mohr stated that the sidewalk waiver was discussed in the past to promote storm water.

Mr. Zehring stated that sidewalks will be on both sides of the street on Stone Arch Drive.

Mr. Castranio stated that sidewalks were on both sides when it was a cul-de-sac but they removed the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Brock stated waiver #7 is cantankerous.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the ordinance makes an assumption that all soils are in Group C.

Mr. Murphy stated that they are providing information more accurate than the ordinance.

Ms. Brock asked about waiver #8.

Mr. Murphy stated that they are providing the detention pond bottom minimum slope of 2% to be in concert with DEP regulations which is in conflict with the Borough Ordinance.

Ms. Mohr suggested planting vegetation instead of asphalt for the pond bottom channel with mowing restrictions.

Mr. Murphy stated that they are proposing the pond bottoms are planted with vegetation to aid infiltration. The ordinance requires fencing.

Ms. Brock stated that waiver #9 reference street B,C,E,F and H. The street names are not on the plan.

Mr. Castranio stated that they have 50 feet straight roadway. Straight roadway causes more disturbances.

Mr. Brown stated the waiver is best on sight distance for speed.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the sight distance is met for all intersections.

Mr. Castranio stated that the sight distance is met for all intersections. A sight distance chart will be provided on the plan. There was a need to make a slope adjustment to meet the exhibit.

Ms. Tamm asked if all the intersections meet the ordinance.

Mr. Murphy stated most of them meet the ordinance. He will provide specific locations.

Ms. Brock stated that Marysville has the privilege of naming the streets.

Ms. Brock stated that waiver #10 needs specificity. There was some detail on an earlier submission.

Mr. Murphy agreed to provide specificity.

Ms. Mohr asked what the street names are for the waiver.

Mr. Brown stated High Point Drive.

Mr. Castranio stated that High Point Drive is 4,600 linear feet long in order to provide open space between the lots for pedestrian pathways.

Mr. Murphy stated that will be specific in the justification of this waiver.

Ms. Brock stated that waiver #11 does not make sense, *“Section 22-504.6. In the case of wedge shaped lots, no lot shall be less than 50’ in width measured along the arc at the front street right of way.”*

Mr. Murphy referred to the May 12 correspondence #6 which states *“Applicant is requesting relief from this requirement only for lots 103, 104, 251, 252, 258, 259, 2789 and 298. All other lots shall meet minimum lot frontage. The nonconforming tracts are intended to be large acreage “estate” lots typically set back farther away from the streets than typical dwellings meeting the lot frontage requirements.*

Mrs. Stoner asked the number of lots affected.

Mr. Murphy stated there are eight lots.

Ms. Mohr asked what the frontage will be for the eight lots.

Mr. Murphy stated he will be specific on the width for each lot.

Ms. Brock stated that waiver #12 is next for discussion.

Mr. Murphy stated that this waiver is for the same lots outlined in waiver #11.

Ms. Brock stated that if the width of the eight lots is provided for waiver #11, nothing else is needed.

Ms. Brock stated that waiver #13 on the Pennoni report is the same as and #8 on the Alpha letter dated May 12th.

Mr. Altland stated the waiver pertains to lots 198 and 199.

Mr. Castranio stated that they are concerned about meeting the Zoning Hearing Board variance stipulation.

Ms. Tamm stated that it is very important that it is in writing to what has been agreed to for now and in the future.

Mr. Altland stated that waivers #2,3,4,9, 10, 11 and 13 need specificity.

Ms. Brock stated #12 also.

Mrs. Stoner stated that #12 will be answered with information provided for #11.

Mr. Vacarro asked why the Stewart Court cul-de-sac needs to be 714 - waiver #5.

Mr. Murphy stated with the terrain the street needs to be longer to keep it at that level.

Mr. Brown stated he does not have a problem with waiver #5.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Perry County Planning Commission comments need to be discussed.

Ms. Brock stated that there are storm water comments on the Borough Engineer's report.

Mr. Murphy stated that he read the nine comments on the Borough Engineer's report and he will comply with them. They are minor in nature.

Ms. Brock stated that people have a lot of questions on storm water.

Mr. Murphy stated that Mr. Carol is getting run off through lots. They are providing berming to reduce the amount of storm water through lots. The adjacent properties will have less water coming through properties. They are not increasing water runoff; they are reducing it. It will be a better situation for the property owners along Ridgeview Drive.

Ms. Mohr stated that because of the problems that have occurred with another site on the mountain, they are afraid it will happen to Marysville. She would like to see where this type of construction worked on a steep slope.

Ms. Brock stated that every property has separate issues, but they can look at steep slope plans.

Ms. Mohr stated that the best experiences are where the storm water has failed.

Mr. Castranio stated that the first thing constructed is the berm and combo infiltration channel which will preclude any storm water going onto Ridgeview Drive.

Ms. Mohr stated that she would be interested to see BMP's incorporated. Restrictive covenants should be required as a condition of approval.

Mr. Murphy stated that at the final plan approval, there will be exact wording provided.

Ms. Brock stated the restrictive covenant should cover tree cutting, mowing, and maintenance of swales on private property.

Mr. Altland stated that the restrictive covenants can be added as a condition.

Ms. Mohr stated retention and detention basins have fencing.

Mr. Murphy stated that there will be an easement.

Ms. Mohr stated that she would like to see assurances that storm water will be innovative and creative. Rain barrels should be provided for every property. The owner of the property should be taught on how to use the rain barrel. Educate the people on how to handle storm water on their lot.

Mr. Murphy stated that they can be as creative as appropriate to the site.

Mr. Brown stated that there are no waivers associated with storm water. Storm water has been a great deal of concern throughout process. The design is not done.

Ms. Mohr stated she would like to know what the options are for the BMP's before approval of the preliminary plan.

Mr. Murphy stated that he is not in a position to finalize BMP's until they get past the preliminary plan approval process.

Ms. Mohr stated she wants the BMP options identified so that the Planning Commission can have a say in the approval.

Ms. Brock stated that most of the storm water comments are technical which will need to be addressed. Everyone has agreed that the storm water comments will be addressed. It was agreed that restrictive covenant will be placed on all storm water facilities. The exact wording is not necessary as long as it is acceptable to the Borough Solicitor.

Mr. Altland stated all conditions should be listed separately. A note could be placed on the plan. The engineer needs to provide a list of conditions. The approval of the preliminary plan will be subject to the list of conditions.

Mr. Murphy stated he will provide a list of conditions for staff review.

Ms. Brock asked if there were any other questions on storm water.

Ms. Lisko stated that rain barrels could be in conjunction with rain gardens.

Ms. Brock stated that there are a lot of steep slopes where you cannot use rain gardens. She has done a lot of research on rain gardens. The house will not have a lot of open area around it.

Ms. Lisko stated that if there is big enough areas to build retention and detention ponds, then you can do a series of rain gardens with native vegetation.

Ms. Mohr stated that she went to a storm water conference. The only effective way to do a rain garden is on properties that are back to back. A nature berm should be done along ponds with heavy vegetation. Rain gardens can be done in the big yards.

Mr. Murphy pointed out that trees will have to be removed to construct rain gardens.

Ms. Mohr stated that there can be depressions in rear yards.

Ms. Brock stated that this is not the only way to do it.

Ms. Mohr stated that is the most effective way.

Ms. Brock stated that they are trying to slow down a lot of water in a steep place especially in stream areas. The only place there is flat land is the area between the two stream sheds where there is natural occurring wetlands. There are a lot of basins and a lot of downstream build up. She encourages native spaces as opposed to invasive species.

Mr. Zehring stated the BMPs should not be areas for mosquito breeding.

Ms. Mohr stated she found native plants house species that eat mosquitoes and do not breed mosquitoes.

Ms. Brock asked there are other questions people want to see answered as to how effects residents on Ridgeview Drive.

Mr. Murphy stated that everything is addressed in the storm water report.

Ms. Mohr stated that there are 1,200 pages of computations. What is the time frame for berms and storm water facilities to be constructed?

Mr. Murphy stated the storm water facilities will begin to be constructed immediately. The silt fence will be done first and then the berm and swales. The engineers will be on-site working with the excavators.

Mr. Castranio stated they will keep a vegetative strip between the berm and the property line.

Ms. Brock asked if there was a cross section of the berm.

Mr. Castranio stated that the cross section is on the grading plan.

Mr. Dillmann asked what the design storm and rain event is.

Mr. Castranio stated 10, 25, 50 and 100 year storm events.

Mr. Dillmann stated that they should show 100 year storm events.

Mr. Castranio stated that it is all below rate.

Mr. Murphy stated that the storm water is based on rate not volume.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there is a longer time duration.

Mr. Murphy stated they want to make sure there is no erosion.

Mr. Dillmann stated that the affect down hills can be different.

Ms. Brock stated that once going under PennDOT's culverts into the triangular area by the railroad tracks is a build up of water. This will create an unstable situation. She does not know how the water will get out of this area.

Mr. Castranio stated that they did an analysis. The size of the pipe is not sufficient so the developer is increasing it.

Ms. Brock asked where everything goes once it gets in the pipe.

Mr. Castranio stated that the pipe system goes down Ridgeview Drive and down Rt. 11/15.

Mr. Brown stated that a permit is required from PennDOT. It appears from their analysis that the pipe may need enlarged. That analysis will be reviewed by consultants, Pennoni and PennDOT.

An unidentified man stated that the lower end of Ridgeview Drive has no storm sewer and wanted to know if storm sewer will be put in.

Mr. Brown stated that the developer will put storm sewer in at the lower end of Ridgeview Drive.

Same unidentified man stated he does not know where water goes now.

Mr. Brown stated that the water is going to the park.

Ms. Brock stated that the regulation specifies that they can't increase rate of flow. In some cases the existing storm water pipes may not be adequate. If the rate is increased, they may need to divert the water.

Ms. Rhome asked about the sanitary sewer.

Ms. Brock stated that the sanitary sewer comments #1 states, "*Engineer shall provide calculations that the additional sewage from this development will not cause a hydraulic overload to the downstream sanitary sewer.*" There was a study done using a camera which was run down the sewer lines. The plan was to come down the valley under Rt. 11/15 straight through which means that a new line would need to be put in. The primary reason for the months and months of delay was to try to get Norfolk Southern's cooperation to run the line on

their property but they indicated that notice would have to be given and flagmen was required to repair any lines on their property. The current plan is a lift station.

Mr. Castranio stated that the bulk of the sanitary sewer goes to existing system on Caroline Drive. The systems down stream of parking are in tabulated form in Borough files.

Ms. Brock stated that the sanitary sewer comes down Fishing Creek.

Mr. Murphy stated that they will comply with the seven Borough Engineer's comments. The sanitary sewer system will be constructed at the developer's expense. The developer will be correcting some deficiencies in the current system.

Ms. Brock stated that there are general questions in the Borough Engineers report as follows:

- F.1. Plan must be reviewed by the Perry County Planning commission*
- F.2. Location of proposed fire hydrants will be reviewed by Fire Department serving Borough.*
- F.3. Sidewalk detail. Use Marysville Borough standard detail.*
- F.4. Provide guide rail analysis that meets PennDOT requirements.*
- F5. Waiver statement will need to be revised based on outcome of requested waivers.*
- F.6. Right-of-way from Essis must be acquired prior to plan approval.*
- F.7. Street names must be approved by Borough and Post Office.*
- F.8. Provide PennDOT permit for storm water improvements at the intersection of Ridgeview and 11/15*
- F9. Provide typical proposed lot drainage Use lots 31, 32, and 33. Provide proposed drainage easements if required. How will water be directed to roadside swales?*

Mrs. Brock stated #F6 requires a right of way from Essis prior to plan approval.

Mr. Murphy stated that the acquisition of the right of way can be a conditional of plan approval.

Mrs. Stoner stated that this could be covered by the condition that all engineer's comments must be addressed.

Ms. Brock stated that #F9 that the comment requires a drainage easement. The wording of the drainage easement needs to be reviewed and approved.

Mr. Brown stated that these lots are narrow and have steep slopes which may require driveway grates and swales for water. He picked the worse case scenario.

Ms. Brock stated that the Perry County Planning Commission Comments need to be reviewed. The comments are as follows:

- *We concur with the comments from borough engineer Ronald Brown dated May 27, 2008.*
- *The developer is requesting modifications from the requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance in those cases where the plan does not comply with them.*
- *It is uncertain whether the calculated lot and overall coverage takes into account the area of disturbance, the area of impervious surface, or both. We recommend that the plan show how coverage figures were derived to ensure that the requirements from the zoning variances are met.*

- *We recommend that the zoning officer review the Zoning Hearing Board's 2005 decision, and the letter sent to the applicant/landowner, with the borough solicitor to evaluate the continued application of the board's decisions made at the time. If any conditions were attached to the granted variances, the substance of these conditions will need to be upheld at this time. In addition, the zoning officer should reconfirm that no additional variances will be necessary due to the latest set or revisions to the plan.*
- *The subdivision and land development ordinance (article V, section 500, no. 2) states that "In all subdivision, every precaution shall be taken to preserve all natural and historic features determined to be worthy of preservation by the borough. Examples of such features would include, but not be limited to large trees (six (6) inches or more) or stands of trees, water courses, historic area and structures, scenic views, etc."*

We encourage all parties to reach concurrence on the natural features determined worthy of preservation. The plan should then reflect the precautions taken to preserve those features.

- *As noted in the initial review, this plan is not consistent with the Perry County Comprehensive Plan, nor the Marysville Comprehensive Plan, both of which discourage development in areas with 15% or greater slopes.*

Ms. Brock stated that the first, second and third comments have been discussed tonight.

Ms. Brock stated that the fourth comment requiring the zoning officer to review the Zoning Hearing Board decision has not been done. When the variance was approved, Plan 2 was attached as an appendix of the approval. The purpose of the decision was to protect view shed and over look. The comparison of the existing plan to the Zoning Hearing Board decision can easily be done.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Perry County COG took over the building inspections but not the zoning.

Ms. Hardman stated that she does zoning for the Borough but cannot do a zoning review for this plan because it is a conflict of interest.

Mr. Altland stated that the Borough Engineer could do a zoning review.

Mr. Murphy stated that the Zoning Hearing Board variance is tabulated on the front of the plan.

Mr. Dillmann stated that how much difference can there be between Plan 2 and Plan 3 to apply to the variance. He feels this is a legal question. Can they submit another plan?

Mr. Altland stated yes and no to the revision of the plan. It depends on how different the plans are. The number of lots and open space are relatively the same. The number of lots is less and the open space is more on the revised plan. The difference is the layout of the lots on Little Mountain. Someone would have to take action to revoke the Zoning Hearing Board decision. There probably will never be a consensus that Plan 2 is same as Plan 3. In his opinion the plans are substantially the same and based on the Zoning Hearing Board decision, he feels the variance is applicable to Plan 3.

Mrs. Stoner asked Mr. Brown what would happen if based on a zoning review there are additional variances needed on this Plan.

Mr. Altland stated that the plan must meet the variances as approved by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Altland stated it is up to the applicant to proceed with the plan. It is not up to the Borough to determine.

Ms. Brock stated that a zoning officer will review to determine if the plan complies with the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Altland stated that a zoning officer needs to review the plan to see that it complies with the zoning ordinance and the Zoning Hearing Board decision.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Borough needs to find another zoning officer to do the zoning review.

Mr. Ames stated that it more complicated since the plan falls under the old zoning ordinance conservation district.

Ms. Brock stated that the Borough Engineer has done a lot of review but his review does not cover zoning.

Mr. Ames stated that the Perry County Planning Commission did a review in July 2004. That is the only official review that can be done. At this point they are constrained by time. He looked at the official review to see if there is anything else that could be added.

Mr. Murphy stated that each final plan that is submitted will have an official review by Perry County Planning Commission.

Mr. Altland stated that the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to Borough Council to hire a zoning officer to do a review.

Mrs. Brock stated that Borough Council could hire Tri County Planning Commission to do a zoning review.

Mr. Ames stated that he would have to consult the County Solicitor to see if Tri County Planning Commission can do a zoning review for the Borough.

MOTION: Mrs. Stoner moved, seconded by Mr. Vaitl to recommend to Borough Council that a zoning officer be hired to review the plan.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Pennoni Associates could do a zoning review.

Mr. Altland stated that Pennoni Associates could do the zoning review if they have a qualified person on staff.

Mrs. Lisko stated that the zoning officer that is hired should not have any involvement with the developer.

The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Brock will draft a letter to Borough Council for their July 14th meeting.

Mr. Murphy stated that they will send a separate letter to Borough Council and move forward at their own risk.

Ms. Brock stated that the fifth comment is regarding preservation of natural and historic features. There is only an old shed and tower on hill. The structures could be removed but there are large trees, water courses, wetlands, scenic view and over look on the property.

Mr. Ames stated that the gist of that comment and reason he quoted the ordinance because the ordinance states that precaution should be taken to preserve natural and historic features determined worthy of preservation by the Borough. The Borough and developer need to be concurrent on what the features are.

Ms. Brock stated that preservation of natural and historic features are not specified in detail in the ordinance or specific species of trees. The wetlands are delineated.

Mr. Murphy stated that they will be crossing a wetland in one spot which requires permitting by DEP.

Ms. Mohr asked if they will be putting a culvert under the road.

Mr. Castranio stated that there is a high, flat area that has standing water.

Ms. Brock stated it is important how the large trees will be preserved. The future property owner needs to be notified of restrictions.

Mr. Murphy stated that tree preservation will be a part of the restrictive covenant that will be submitted for review.

Ms. Brock stated that buyers need to know how to minimize disturbance to the land.

Ms. Brock stated that the sixth comment states the development does not comply with the County and Borough comprehensive plan.

Ms. Mohr stated that this is an important comment. That is why she is very concerned because the Borough has never permitted a development on slopes this steep. She wants to make sure that they accommodate for it.

Mr. Phillips asked who will maintain the ponds after they are built.

Ms. Brock stated that the homeowners association will maintain the ponds.

An unidentified man stated that there are eight ponds on the plan.

Ms. Brock stated that they vary in size. The Borough can move in and maintain the pond if the swale is destroyed.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Planning Commission has looked at this for a number of years. Is it too much to ask to table the plan tonight?

Mr. Altland stated that more detail is needed for the waiver requests. It is not appropriate to act on the plan anyway. The developer's engineer will provide a list of conditions for staff and Planning Commission's review.

Mr. Troutman stated that he agrees on that. The Planning Commission is asking for more detail on the waivers to move forward. He thanked the Planning Commission for reviewing the plan comments and waivers.

Ms. Mohr asked Mr. Murphy and Mr. Castranio from Alpha Consulting Engineers if they are willing to come to a meeting to answer questions for the public.

Mr. Murphy stated that he could attend a meeting but feels that the public comment can be accomplished with the normal meeting schedule. He feels that the plan should be reviewed one more time by the Planning Commission and then move forward to the Borough Council to continue the process so they can continue to work on the plan.

Mr. Murphy stated that the public is welcome to call him with any questions.

Ms. Brock stated that Mr. Saylor's written questions need to be addressed.

Mr. Brown stated that a copy of the plan should be provided for display at the Borough Office for public review.

Mr. Ames suggested an open house meeting before the next meeting.

Mr. Brown suggested having the meeting at the workshop meeting on July 9th or the regular meeting on July 22nd.

Ms. Mohr stated that a public open house meeting on July 22nd would not leave much time for the Planning Commission to review the plan.

Mr. Murphy stated that a thorough review was done at this meeting.

Mr. Hepler stated he would agree to send his engineers on July 9th. The plan has been reviewed for four years not three months.

Mr. Murphy asked what time the meeting would be on July 9th.

Ms. Brock stated that the meeting is at 6:00 pm.

Mr. Altland stated that a note could be put on the door that the meeting will be held at the senior center. The meeting does not need to be advertised.

Mr. Dillmann questioned the review time of months versus years. Years of review was done on Plan 2. Some of the changes are substantial enough such as the area on Little Mountain.

Ms. Mohr stated that the meeting will be an open comment forum for specific questions to be answered on the plan.

MOTION: Mr. Shearer moved to table the plan, seconded by Mrs. Stoner. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Vaitl stated that he hopes to see the public show up at the meeting on July 9th. A lot of people don't understand the review process of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission tries to do what the people want but they are bound by the ordinance requirements. Mr. Vaitl thanked everyone for coming to the meeting tonight.

Ms. Mohr stated that the Borough wants public comment and involvement. There is a redevelopment plan for the downtown square area. Grant money has been awarded for the project.

Mrs. Rhome asked if there could be a bus stop.

Mr. Carroll stated that God only knows what will happen once vegetation is removed.

b. Zoning Amendments: NONE

5. New Business: NONE

6. General Announcements. NONE

7. Report on Borough Council Meeting (Next Council Meeting 7/14/08): NONE

8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 7/9/2008 @ 6:00pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING 7/22/08 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.

MOTION: Mr. Zehring moved, seconded by Ms. Mohr to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer