

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 24, 2009

1. Subdivision Amendment – Plan Specifications and Procedures.

Ms. Brock stated that the zoning amendments were sent to Borough Council. Borough Council referred them back to the Planning Commission for revision and resubmission. Mr. Harris, the Borough Manager will review the ordinance for changes and put them back on the Borough Council agenda for action.

Ms. Brock stated that the other issue discussed at Borough Council was the grant to fix Kings Highway where the mobile home was moved back at the creek because it was too narrow and water backs up.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that this must be another grant. The revitalization grant money must be used for revitalization.

Ms. Brock stated that the Borough is applying for a Growing Greener Grant to do storm sewer separation through the tunnel. There will still be some combined sewer and storm sewer in the Borough that will overflow but at least the amount of overflow will be reduced. Getting the separation done through the tunnel is the next logical step.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Borough does have a Transportation Enhancement Grant.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Planning Commission was concerned with the grants received for the square for beautification being used for something rather than be given back.

Ms. Brock stated that the Kairos Group, the engineers that designed the square project.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Transportation Enhancement Grant money should fund a specific project. The Borough can't use the money on another project.

Ms. Brock asked if it could be used for bank improvements.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that it is usually for sidewalks.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the Kings Highway project was to widen the road which was to include a bike path.

M. Kmiecinski stated that if there is a problem spending the Transportation Enhancement Grant money it could be returned and awarded to another community. He can help Marysville get the project going.

Ms. Brock stated that she does not know if the Transportation Enhancement Grant was used for the Kings Highway improvement which was to install a bigger culvert and widen the road with a bike bath. This work has been done.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the funds for Kings Highway were not a part of the square project for revitalization.

Ms. Brock stated that the other thing was that the bid came in low for the Kings Highway project.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the main concern was that the Borough did not let the funds evaporate. No one was supporting the downtown revitalization project any more.

Ms. Brock stated that a big problem was that the Moose Club backed out of giving additional right of way for parking in the front of the building and the telephone poles could not be moved. If the curb was being done it would have to be ADA compliant. If the curb was made ADA compliant, the fire trucks could not get through.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the Kairos Group was paid.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the Kairos Group was not paid.

Ms. Brock stated that the Kairos Group was paid some. The Borough Council is having an argument with the Kairos Group.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that consultants come up with plans that do not work.

Ms. Brock asked if there are unused funds, can they be rolled into the next year.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that if the project is not moving that is using the Transportation Enhancement Funds, he will call PennDOT and find out the status.

Ms. Brock stated that she thinks the funds are being used.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated there is only one project in Marysville.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the funds could be used to pave Kings Highway.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that paving Kings Highway does not qualify.

Mr. Vaitl stated that Kings Highway was supposed to be widened. It only runs to Park Drive.

Ms. Brock stated that the widening was only at the creek. The improvement was to stop the creek from backing up. She will ask the Borough Manager to find out what the project entails and funds used.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that you cannot take funds for one project and put on another project.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that he had a couple questions about the subdivision amendments. Who initiated the changes?

Ms. Hardman stated that the Comprehensive Plan recommendations were to revise the zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that the amendments to the zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance are to bring them up to date.

Mr. Kmiecinski asked if the Borough Council is behind changing the subdivision and land development ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that the Borough Council hasn't given the Planning Commission any direction other than to bring the ordinances up to date.

Mr. Kmiecinski asked if the zoning amendments were submitted to Borough Council.

Ms. Brock stated that the zoning amendments were submitted to Borough Council. There is also a revised zoning map. Most of Marysville Borough is developed. The zoning was written to be more in conformance with existing lot area and width. This is a subdivision amendment. The main goal with this section is make sure plans are not vague at submission.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Planning Commission should organize the ordinance shortcomings first. He has a model subdivision and land development ordinance. Marysville Borough should have a copy of the model ordinance and a CD.

Mrs. Stoner asked if he is suggesting they start with the model ordinance.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that that West Hanover is a township. They used the model ordinance but revised it to fit the rural character of the Township. There are a number of things, such as the requirement for the submission of 17 copies of the plan, that is different.

Mrs. Stoner stated that if there is a CD they could take pages and work off them and delete and revise as appropriate.

Ms. Brock stated that the number of copies submitted can be changed.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Plan Specifications and Procedures chapter should be the same for Townships and Boroughs since it indicates what should be on a plan such as location map, primary control point, north arrow, etc.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that there is also a new Floodplain Management Act coming out.

Ms. Brock stated the floodplain ordinance was added to the zoning ordinance by incorporating the latest map revision.

Mr. Kmiecinski asked if the floodplain ordinance was an overlay.

Ms. Brock stated that the floodplain ordinance was an overlay.

Ms. Brock asked if the floodplain overlay needs to be delineated in the sketch plan.

Ms. Hardman stated that a sketch plan does not have to delineate the floodplain. The difference between a sketch plan and a preapplication meeting is that a sketch plan does not have to be

reviewed prior to submission. A completed plan with all engineering must be reviewed by staff and the Borough Engineer prior to submission at the preapplication meeting.

Mrs. Stoner asked if everything is spelled out on the sketch plan.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that a sketch plan submission helps the applicant get advice.

Mrs. Stoner stated that a sketch plan is informal.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that a sketch plan is not official.

Mrs. Stoner asked if West Hanover Township has an engineer on staff.

Mrs. Hardman stated that West Hanover Township does not have an engineer on staff.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the model ordinance permits sketch plans.

Ms. Hardman stated there is a difference between sketch plan and preapplication meeting.

Ms. Brock stated that a minor subdivision should not be required to do a preapplication meeting.

Ms. Hardman stated that all plans that need to come before the Planning Commission should be required to do a preapplication meeting.

Mr. Vaitl stated that they need direction on what they are doing with the amendment.

Ms. Brock stated that the big issues should be delineated.

Mr. Vaitl asked if all the Planning Commission members have a copy of the existing subdivision regulations.

Mr. Shearer and Mr. Zehring stated that they do not have a copy of the existing subdivision and land development ordinance.

Mrs. Hardman stated she would have the Borough send them a copy.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that you can only do so much to get a plan submitted to meet ordinance requirements.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the preapplication meeting is mandatory.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the preapplication meeting puts seriousness on the submission of a plan. She has learned that when charge an amount you get a better response because it is worth something.

Mr. Kmiecinski asked where the Borough Engineer's office is located. Will the Borough Engineer be on call to set up a meeting?

Ms. Hardman stated that the preapplication meeting is set up to fit everyone's schedule.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the engineering review fee covers the cost of the engineer's review at the preapplication meeting.

Ms. Hardman stated that the review fee does cover the cost of the preapplication meeting.

Ms. Brock stated that it needs to be defined what size plan qualifies for a minor subdivision. Right now a minor plan is required to submit a waiver from the preliminary plan requirements.

Ms. Hardman stated that the normal standard is 3 or 4 lots with no new streets.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that a minor plan can be defined as a lot add on which has five criteria; which are that it cannot be nonconforming, no drainage easements or right of ways offered, access not changed, street alignment not changed and no new building lots or a center line separation which is dividing existing tract on existing lot divided by a street. The center line separation subdivision usually involves rural land. When there is a subdivision of land and the residual tract is being used for farming, it is considered a non building lot.

Ms. Brock stated that there are two things to consider as minor plan which is an adjustment of property lines and no new roads.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the sample ordinance, a minor subdivision is not automatic. A waiver is still required from preliminary plan requirements.

Ms. Brock stated that a minor subdivision should not have to submit a formal waiver from preliminary plan requirements.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the requirement of a waiver from the preliminary plan requirements is more restrictive for the Planning Commission because it requires approval. He recommends leaving a waiver a requirement or have some thresholds.

Ms. Brock stated that she will come to the Tri County Planning Commission Office and pick up the disk for the model subdivision and land development ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner asked Mr. Kmiecinski if he could make the procedures section a separate document and email it to the Planning Commission members or send it to the Borough Office and the Borough Office can send it to the Planning Commission members.

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 24, 2009

Call to order and roll call. The meeting was called to order at 7:36 pm

Roll Call:

1. MEMBERS PRESENT

Jennifer Brock, Chairman

Stephanie Stoner
Monte Shearer
Shawn Vaccaro
Jim Zehring
Art Vaitl
Lori Mohr

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Mike Kmiecinski, Tri County Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:

Cliff Dillmann
Pat Devlin

2. MINUTES:

a. January 27, 2009 Minutes

Page 1, Jim Zehring was not present
Page 1 change date from January 28 to January 27

MOTION: Mr. Vaccaro moved, seconded by Mrs. Stoner to approve the January 27, 2009 minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT. NONE

4. OLD BUSINESS: NONE

5. NEW BUSINESS:

a. Pat Devlin – Land Logics

(For the record, Ms. Mohr arrived at 7:40 pm)

Mrs. Devlin stated that she is from Land Logics which is a landscape and architectural firm in Camp Hill. They are representing the Susquehanna Water Gap Landscapes Project. The Susquehanna Water Gap Landscapes reviews municipality's ordinances to help with drafting ordinances and proposed revisions to existing ordinances. The project is part of the Kittitanny Ridge and Susquehanna Greenway Plan.

She has reviewed Marysville's comprehensive plan, current ordinances and proposed ordinances. Mrs. Stoner and Ms. Brock attended the workshop held last year. Land Logics plans to hold another workshop on March 30th and April 2nd.

Since the last workshop she has compiled feedback and did audits on ordinances and plans. The Smart Growth Audit using the Keystone Principals adopted in 2005. The purpose of the audit is to enhance community character. There are three copies of a 46 page document summarizing the

comprehensive plan and ordinance review that identifies gaps. It is a tool to be used internally. An Ordinance Audit Brief was passed out to the Planning Commission members – see attached.

The reason she was present at tonight's meeting was to get feedback on the audit and to ask a couple of people to review the 46 page audit.

She was not sure if Marysville's code permits center islands for storm water control.

Ms. Brock stated that the zoning map was one of the first the things the Planning Commission worked on.

Mrs. Devlin stated that she was talking about an official map. An Official Map is a tool a lot of municipalities don't use. It identifies lands that should be retained for certain purposes. This is different from a zoning map.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Official Map is not used because it puts the municipality of the hook to pay for the improvement.

Mrs. Devlin stated there is a lot of strong language in Marysville's Comprehensive Plan. She thinks our ordinances are missing implementation for the community to look the way we want it to look. The zoning ordinance doesn't support the Comprehensive Plan. Open space design is only permitted in the Conservation zoning district. The zoning map shows the outlying areas as the area for higher density.

Ms. Brock presented the revised zoning map. The R-1 zoning is a less dense area. The R-2 zoning is denser. It was defined by existing lot sizes to retain the character that we have. The C-1 zoning district is commercial and residential mix. The C-2 is straight commercial or commercial highway. The digitized version on the zoning map is available from Tri County Planning Commission.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the zoning map has not been adopted.

Mrs. Devlin asked if the draft zoning map reflects the new zoning language.

Ms. Brock stated that the draft zoning map does reflect the new proposed zoning language. The ordinance and map is subject to change through the approval process.

Mrs. Devlin stated areas of improvement are the mixed uses. The workshop will help with the areas of improvement. The italics are noting that changes are contemplated. The last few pages have direct recommendations that the Planning Commission should look at. Marysville is an older borough so there is potential for mixed use districts and expanding the option for open space in the higher density zoning.

Ms. Brock asked how can they do open space design in areas in other zoning districts since they are already primarily developed.

Mrs. Devlin stated that the open space design can be done in other zoning districts by retrofitting or land infill areas.

Mr. Dillmann stated that the entire riverfront is zoned R-2. The area is mimicking R-1 but is zoned R-2. Seidel Park is an open space area.

Mrs. Devlin stated that green space planning and design is a concept that could be used for open space. She presented a map showing the area in red that can be developed, the green area is permanently protected and the yellow area could be developed in some way. She will ask people to identify areas that could be protected in order to create a green infrastructure map to be used as a framework for development.

Ms. Brock stated that there is a single lot owned by the Borough up the river from the dock that would make a nice park. People could carry canoes to the river and fisherman could access the river through the lot. How could it be zoned recreation without creating spot zoning? There are single family dwelling uses on both sides of the lot.

Mrs. Devlin stated there is always ways to use land if there is support for it. There could be planning tools implemented rather than regulation. She thinks a recreation plan could address more trails for connectivity.

Ms. Brock stated that they area always looking for ways to enhance businesses in the Borough. There are a lot of people going to the landing to launch boats. How do you incorporate that into getting people to one of the businesses in the Borough and make the Borough more friendly for them.

Mrs. Devlin stated that this is a public participation process. She wants to introduce some techniques. The Borough does not have a recreation plan and cannot require fees or dedication of land for recreation. There should be some joint planning efforts.

Mrs. Stoner commented on a joint recreation plan. There is not a lot of support for joint projects especially if a certain municipality were to get most of the benefit.

Mrs. Devlin stated that there is more funding available for joint efforts. There is protection for slopes over 25%. View sheds and steep slopes from 10% to 25% should be protected. There could be a view shed overlay for façade protection. These are things to think about.

Mrs. Devlin stated the workshop will be Monday, March 30th from 5:45 to 8:30 pm. There will be a quick review of the audit findings and they will be introducing techniques such as transfer of development rights. Marysville would be a good receiving area. It would enhance tax base but it takes cooperation and it takes work. They will also be discussing effective ag zoning and introduction to green infrastructure planning.

The second night is Thursday, April 2nd from 5:45 to 8:30 pm. They will be discussing tools and techniques to preserving agriculture and forest land, urban forestry and tree canopy. They will also be discussing ways for retrofitting streets for tree enhancement. The end goal is to get municipalities interested to preserve further. She passed out fliers for the Planning Commission to hand out. She is working on fliers to put out in the community for residents and businesses. She encouraged everyone to provide addresses and contact names for her to contact.

Mrs. Devlin stated that they will be showing built out maps by taking areas that are open for development and plotting out permitted uses.

Mr. Dillmann asked how this could help with final plan approval of Rockville Estates for roof top color, façade color, trees and other issues. Another plan could be submitted at any time. The land north of the Borough has been consolidated, the heirs have settled the estate and it is now available for sale.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Mrs. Devlin could contact the Planning Commission as well as Borough Council for comment.

Ms. Mohr asked how the interview went with Borough Council.

Mrs. Devlin stated she contact the Borough Council President but was not successful getting comments on their initiative. However, she did discuss issues with the Borough Manager.

Ms. Mohr stated that they should focus on Marysville’s businesses and getting more businesses into the Borough. They need to find ways to do revitalization activities that is at a low cost or no cost.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough is concerned about spending money on beautification instead of roads.

Ms. Mohr stated that the perception on joint planning needs to be improved. A joint recreation plan or transfer of development rights would be criticized.

Mrs. Devlin stated that the educational workshops are to entice people to work together and look at the region as a whole.

Mr. Dillmann suggested formally discussing the workshops with the bank board.

Ms. Brock stated that the bank board has more at stake in the community.

b. Subdivision Amendment -Plan Specifications and Procedures

Ms. Brock stated that the subdivision amendment for plan specifications and procedures will be further discussed.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS. NONE

7. Report on Borough Council Meeting (Next Council Meeting 3/9/09):

Ms. Brock stated the Borough Council approved the Heckert subdivision plan.

Ms. Mohr asked why the cell tower that is being proposed on Cameron Street by the fire department was not coming before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Hardman stated that they are requesting a use variance for a cell tower in a R-2 zoning district and setback variances. A cell tower is a conditional use in the C-2 zoning district. A conditional use would come before the Planning Commission but variances must be acted on by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Ms. Mohr stated that the cell tower that was proposed before did not service residents of Marysville.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Zoning Hearing Board meeting will be held March 18, 2009 at 6:00 pm.

Ms. Brock stated that there were a number of people at the Borough Council concerned about the proposed cell tower on Cameron Street.

8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 3/11/2009 @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING 3/24/09 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.

MOTION: Mr. Vaitl moved, seconded by Mrs. Stoner to adjourn the meeting at 8:43 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer