0MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
FEBRUARY 23, 2010

1. **Application and Checklist for submission of a Subdivision or Land Development**

Ms. Brock stated that she did not get to review the checklist for plan submission. The review of the checklist needs to be done to move forward.

Mr. Vaitl asked where the checklist came from.

Ms. Brock stated that the checklist is an addendum to the Perry County Planning Commission model ordinance.

Mr. Vaitl stated that Ms. Hardman should review the checklist.

Ms. Brock stated that the idea behind the checklist is to have plans submitted that are complete by giving more information to the applicant to provide at the time of submission.

Mr. Vaitl stated that some of the application for plan submission is redundant. The application needs to refer back to the checklist.

Mr. Zehring asked what a minor final approval was on the application for type of approval.

Ms. Hardman stated that a minor plan is referred to in the ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that a minor final plan is a plan with three lots or less. Some of the information on the application may not be relevant to a minor plan.

Ms. Brock stated that if the plan is just a lot line adjustment, the linear feet of sewer question would not be relevant.

Ms. Brock stated that the questions for sewage module submission should be revised to state "or DEP waiver".

Ms. Hardman asked if the Planning Commission has ever received a copy of the application with the plan.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission has not received the application with the plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that if the question is not applicable, the answer would be NA on the application. Responding to the question means that the applicant read it. The Planning Commission can come from a different angle when asking questions.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the questions, *"Are any modifications of requirements being required?"* should be any "*waiver of a requirement*."

Ms. Hardman stated that the ordinance wording is modification of requirement.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the questions should just say, "Are there any modifications of requirements."

Ms. Hardman stated that the question asking if there have been any variances granted should be revised to state, "have any variances been granted by the Zoning Hearing Board."

Ms. Hardman suggested moving the filing fees under the signature line.

Mr. Vaitl suggested adding "Borough use only" before filing fees.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the usual wording is Official Use Only.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the application being reviewed is used now. Does the application generate any questions by the applicant?

Ms. Hardman stated that the application is currently being used. The application does not generate questions by the applicant.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the regular person would not have the information needed to fill out the application.

Ms. Hardman stated that the applicant's engineer fills out the application.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the application and checklist should be completed before the plan can be submitted.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the checklist needs to be referred to on the application.

Ms. Brock agreed that the application should refer to the checklist.

Mrs. Stoner stated a question about the checklist should be added after *Improvements required.*

Ms. Brock stated that the words "and checklist" should be added to the statement above the signature line as follows, "*I hereby certify the plan submission represented by this application* ***and checklist*** *is complete and is prepared in conformance with all the applicable Marysville Borough Ordinances."*

Mrs. Stoner stated that the title of the checklist is long.

Ms. Hardman stated that the title needs to state the ordinance name which is the "Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance."

Mr. Vaitl stated that there should be a "yes" or "no" commitment regarding the checklist question.

Mrs. Stoner suggested changing "required" to "included".

Mr. Vaitl stated that if the sewage module question is checked no, there should be a line after "no" for a waiver.

Mrs. Stoner that no could be a valid answer if it is a lot line adjustment.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the submission of plans within two weeks was changed.

Ms. Brock stated that the submission of plans was changed for the new ordinance. The application is for the current ordinance.

Ms. Hardman suggested adding a sentence for the checklist and a space to mark yes.

Mrs. Stoner asked Mr. Weaver if she and Mr. Vaccaro were reappointed by the Borough Council at the last meeting.

Mr. Weaver stated that Mrs. Stoner and Mr. Vaccaro were reappointed by the Borough Council at their last meeting.

2. **Well Ordinance**

Ms. Brock stated that she passed out a sample well ordinance from College Township which is not as comprehensive as the Chester county well ordinance. The College Township ordinance references AWWA (American Water Works Association) standards.

Mr. Vaitl stated that Section 198-6 of the College Township ordinance references AWWA Standard A100-06.

Mrs. Stoner stated that well construction was done primarily for drinking water wells. Geothermal wells would not require a 100 foot setback.

Ms. Brock stated that a 100 foot setback is required for a septic system.

Mrs. Stoner stated that if you put in a septic system it must be 100 feet from a well.

Mr. Weaver stated that in the Rye Township ordinance, you must know where you are putting your septic system before you request a well. The septic perc and probes must be done first. Then the well is located.

Mr. Zehring asked what a NUISANCE was referring to in Section 500 of the Chester County well ordinance.

Mr. Weaver stated that an artisan well goes across properties.

Mr. Vaitl stated that page 27 of the Chester County ordinance addresses geothermal wells.

Ms. Brock stated that the casing is exposed.

Mr. Vaitl stated that he does not see a 50 foot setback.

Mr. Zehring asked if geothermal wells are required to be grouted.

Mr. Weaver stated that geothermal wells are required to be grouted.

Mrs. Stoner questioned MBAS on page 24, Section 501.14.2.2.3.

Ms. Brock stated that MBAS is not regulated.

Mr. Zehring asked what turbidity means.

Ms. Brock stated that turbidity means how muddy the water is.

Mrs. Stoner stated that turbidity must be under .3 NTU.

Mr. Vaitl stated that there are state requirements for water quality.

Ms. Brock stated that there are no state requirements for private wells.

Mrs. Stoner stated that it is recommended that water is treated when the results are above those listed in Section 501.14.2.2. of the Chester County ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that nitrates and nitrites should be kept separate.

Mrs. Stoner stated that if 25 people or under uses a public well it is not required sampling to meet state requirements.

Mrs. Stoner stated that churches are a public water supply and must test their wells if they service at least 25 people year round as defined by Community Water System in Section 501.3.17 of the Chester County ordinance.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the College Township ordinance does not have standards.

Ms. Brock stated that the College Township ordinance has the basic requirements. It does require water to be free of coliform.

Ms. Brock stated that the casing on the well also extends down.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the grout is 50 feet below grade.

Mr. Zehring stated that the casing must be in bedrock so far.

Mr. Vaitl stated that well casing that is to be 50 feet below grade is not grouted.

Ms. Brock stated that the College Township requires grout 50 feet below grade after you hit bedrock.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the casing is solid.

Mrs. Stoner stated that we need to know more about the geology of Marysville.

Ms. Brock stated that requirements for casing are in Section 501.7.2. on page 9 of the Chester County ordinance.

Mr. Vaitl stated that casing is needed for geothermal bore holes.

Mr. Weaver stated that casing is required so the bore does not collapse.

Mrs. Stoner stated that it is better to have definitions than not to have definitions.

Ms. Hardman stated that definitions assist with interpretation. Definitions should not contain regulation.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the definition of construction of wells in the Chester county ordinance, Section 501.3.18 states that, "*such term does not include an excavation made for the purpose of obtaining or for prospecting for oil, natural gas, minerals, or products of mining requarrying, or for inserting media to re-pressure oil or natural gas formations or for storing petroleum, natural gas, or other products and services.*"

Ms. Brock stated that the exclusion from the definition of construction of wells could be covered by another ordinance.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the Chester County ordinance is a lot more detailed and covers more than the College Township ordinance.

Mr. Zehring stated that Chester County has a larger area and more situations regarding wells.

Mr. Vaitl stated that Marysville is 2 ½ square miles. Does Marysville need a well ordinance that is as detailed as the Chester County ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there may not be that many people doing drinking wells, but with electric bills going up more people may be doing geothermal wells.

Mrs. Stoner suggested that the Planning Commission keep reviewing the Chester County ordinance and the College Township ordinance for the next meeting.

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 23, 2010

CALL TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 pm

ROLL CALL:

1. MEMBERS PRESENT
Jennifer Brock, Chairman
James Zehring

Art Vaitl
Stephanie Stoner
Monte Shearer

STAFF PRESENT:
Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer

OTHERS PRESENT:
Scott Weaver, Borough Manager

2. MINUTES:

a. January 26, 2010 Minutes

Page 2, paragraph 6 change "every" to "ever".

Page 5, paragraph 9, change "should" to "could".

Page 6, Members Present, add Monte Shearer

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

3. PUBLIC COMMENT. NONE

4. OLD BUSINESS.

a. Article 4 Subdivision Amendment - Plan Specifications and Procedures

Ms. Brock stated that the workshop scheduled for February 10th was cancelled due to the snow storm.

Ms. Hardman stated that Article 4 was completed except for the pre-application conference section. The last review of the preapplication conference section was done at the regular meeting on January 26th by the Planning Commission. The next step in the process is to send the ordinance the Borough Engineer for review, then the Borough Solicitor for review. After the Borough Engineer and the Borough Solicitor reviews the ordinance it can be sent to the Borough Council for a review and public hearing.

Ms. Brock stated that Article 4 needs to be sent to the Borough Engineer for review.

b. Article 5 Design and Improvement Standards.

Ms. Brock stated that Article 5 is engineering design standards and should be sent to the Borough Engineer for review before the Planning Commission reviews it.

Mrs. Stoner stated that we should explain to the Borough Engineer that the Planning Commission did not discuss Article 5 because it is technical requirements.

Mr. Weaver suggested that the Planning Commission should send Article 5 to the Borough Engineer and ask him to attend the next meeting.

Ms. Brock stated that the Borough Engineer may not be able to review Article 5 by the next workshop meeting on March 10th.

Mrs. Stoner stated that it may be better for the Borough Engineer to attend the next Planning Commission work session meeting on March 23rd regular meeting.

Ms. Brock stated that an email should be sent to the Borough Engineer asking him to review Article 5 and attend either the March 10th workshop meeting or the March 23rd work session meeting, whichever meeting is more convenient for him.

5. NEW BUSINESS.

a. Well Ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that the well ordinance was discussed at the work session. The Planning Commission needs to further review the well ordinance for the next meeting.

b. Submission of Plans – Application and Checklist.

Ms. Brock stated that the application and checklist was discussed at the work session meeting. Ms. Hardman will review the checklist. The application was revised at the work session. The revisions should be made and provided to the Planning Commission for the next meeting.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

a. Tri County Regional Planning Commission and RETTEW invitation to discuss Regional Growth Management.

Ms. Brock stated that she would like to go to the ½ day roundtable discussion to be held on Tuesday, March 9.

b. Perry County Greenways, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan public meeting.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she plans to attend the meeting on Thursday night at Penn Township. She is on the committee.

c. Using Civic Tourism to Create Healthy, Sustainable Susquehanna Communities Presented by Susquehanna Greenway Partnership.

7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING (Next Council Meeting 3/8/10).

Ms. Brock stated that Mrs. Stoner and Mr. Vaccaro were reappointed.

Mr. Weaver stated that the Borough Council approved the Planning Commission's report.

Ms. Brock stated that the Borough Council is not doing the project on the square.

Mr. Weaver stated that at this time the square project is not being done. The Kairos Group provided their final three drafts. There is not enough room in the square to do some of the designs. For example, the root systems for trees that are proposed would pop up the sidewalks sooner or later.

Ms. Brock stated that she liked the cross walks in Lemoyne.

Mr. Vaitl stated that it looked nice.

Mr. Weaver stated that the cross walks in Lemoyne were an inch lower than the road.

Mr. Weaver stated that the Borough Council's priority is the sewer separation. DEP is requiring that the project must start by next year and be finished by 12/31/2012 if grants are received. If the Borough does not get grants, DEP is requiring that the separation is completed by 2020.

Mr. Vaitl asked about the county recycling.

Mr. Weaver stated that Interstate Waste does curbside recycling for Marysville now. Marysville is the only municipality that has curb side recycling.

Mr. Zehring stated that Rye Township separates recycling but does not have curb side pick up.

Mr. Weaver stated that Rye Township has a dumpster at a location where people can bring their recycling.

8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 3/10/09 @ 6:30pm/NEXT REGULAR MEETING 3/23/09 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.

MOTION: Mr. Vaitl moved, seconded by Mr. Zehring to adjourn the meeting at 8:22 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer