

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
MARCH 23, 2010

1. Discussion on SALDO – Mike Kmiecinski, Tri County Planning Commission

Ms. Brock stated the Planning Commission would like to have a discussion on the comparison of the Perry County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO).

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that at the end of the Design Standards there is reference to the document that was used in the preparation of Article 5. He thinks it would be useful to go through the original document.

Ms. Brock stated that she wishes we could just incorporate the model ordinance.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that some of Article 5 may not relate to Marysville because most of Marysville is built out.

Ms. Brock stated that most of Marysville is built out but not all of it.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the PA Standards For Residential Site Development is a good reference for preparing a SALDO. He emailed everyone with the link and the password to access the document.

Mr. Brown asked if there is an electronic version of the Perry County Planning Commission SALDO so making changes would be easier.

Ms. Brock stated that Mr. Kmiecinski provided a disc; Ms. Hardman has it.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Lancaster County SALDO was emailed to everyone. He read two articles of the Ordinance and feels it would be a good ordinance to review.

Mr. Vaitl asked if the Lancaster County SALDO is more practical.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that a lot of the Lancaster County SALDO must be done by the engineer. A lot of the community design standards in the SALDO looked good.

Mr. Zehring stated that Lancaster County is flat land.

Ms. Brock stated that Lancaster County has regulations on horse and buggies.

Mr. Zehring asked what community is growing the fastest.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that Lancaster County is growing the fastest based on the census estimates they received. They have been doing a lot of progressive planning.

Ms. Brock asked Mrs. Stoner if she looked at the Lancaster County Ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she has not looked at the Lancaster County Ordinance. Ms. Brock stated that they need to decide what ordinances to review and compare to determine the design standards for the Marysville SALDO.

Ms. Brock asked what the status of the zoning ordinance review was. The previous Borough Manager, Brian Harris, was to go through the zoning ordinance and make sure it was correct and proofread the entire document. She requested that the Borough staff send her the zoning ordinance so she can proofread it. The Planning Commission has been working on Chapter 4 of the Marysville SALDO to make a way to get applicant's to do sketch plans. The applicant could choose to do a sketch plan and get that reviewed. Once that was done, the applicant could request a waiver from the preliminary plan requirements. So there would be a cost incentive to get a review before everything is done.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the preliminary plan approval gives the applicant the go ahead to start a lot of activities.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the applicant is still required to submit a final plan which is a complete plan with everything in it. There is also a list of everything that is needed.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the Planning Commission is looking for direction on how to begin the review process of Article 5 Design Standards.

Mr. Kmiecinski recommended that the Planning Commission start with reviewing the Lancaster County SALDO. The Tri County Planning Commission model ordinance does not have requirements for sidewalks. The Perry County Planning Commission must review whatever the Marysville Planning Commission submits

Ms. Hardman asked why the Tri County Planning Commission could not assist the Marysville Borough Planning Commission in the preparation of the SALDO.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that Tri County Planning Commission can assist the Marysville Borough Planning Commission in the preparation of the SALDO for a fee. He will asked Mr. Reardon what the fee is. The Borough Engineer should review the SALDO.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Planning Commission could draft the SALDO they way they want it.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that there is a list of things on lighting, landscaping and other design standards that could be discussed with the Lancaster County planners on how successful the regulation is.

Ms. Brock stated that the Lancaster County SALDO has progressive planning tools.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Lancaster County SALDO is better organized and easier to understand.

Mr. Vaitl suggested using Lancaster County ordinance to review along with other ordinances and pull the information that best suits Marysville Borough.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that most of Marysville is already built up. Most communities have two areas – urban growth area and new/infill area.

Ms. Brock stated that Marysville has infill development.

Mr. Vaitl suggested reviewing the existing SALDO to see if it is sufficient.

Ms. Brock stated that Marysville SALDO should be compared with Lancaster County SALDO.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that a lot of the older ordinances just have one standard for street widths.

Ms. Brock stated that Marysville SALDO best defines streets as collector, minor, arterial and local. The Lancaster SALDO regulations are better for traffic.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Tri County Planning Commission SALDO model has a block length maximum of 1,600’.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the Marysville SALDO block length is 1,200’.

Mr. Brown stated that the blocks are longer in Ridgeview than in town.

Ms. Brock stated that the blocks in town are very short.

Mr. Brown stated that Ridgeview is close to 1,200’ in block length.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that a quarter mile is 1,200’.

Mr. Zehring asked if the SALDO addresses the change of road names.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that Lancaster County SALDO addresses street names.

Ms. Hardman stated that the Planning Commission should receive a copy of the Lancaster County SALDO for the next workshop meeting on April 14.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Lancaster County SALDO is 70 pages.

Mr. Brown stated that the Tri County Planning Commission model ordinance has addendums and charts.

Mr. Vaitl stated that both ordinances should be reviewed.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Planning Commission could review several ordinances. The Planning Commission could divide up and do a matrix to assign sections for review.

Ms. Brock stated that one person could review streets.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she likes the feel of the Lancaster County SALDO.

Ms. Brock stated that the Lancaster County SALDO is more readable.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Lancaster County SALDO should be used as the framework.

Mr. Brown stated that he likes the details in the Lancaster County SALDO.

Mrs. Stoner stated that standards change over time. The PennDOT publications should be referenced.

Ms. Hardman stated that when a standard is referenced, the standard is not available for review.

Mr. Vaitl stated that referencing the standard is sufficient for what Marysville's SALDO needs to have.

Mr. Brown stated that if the Lancaster County SALDO has the structural number standards which will allow the engineer to do a design.

Ms. Brock asked what is the structural number.

Mr. Brown stated that the goal is to get to three. A structural design uses stone in pavement when referencing PennDOT design manuals. The Lancaster County SALDO put in the structural number design in their ordinance. The other approach is "design by standard". Municipalities have an inventory of the roads in their municipality with the road designation if they have a standard design in their SALDO. The new roads are built to a higher standard. Stone is cheaper than asphalt.

Mr. Zehring stated that Pennsylvania roads are worse than other states.

Mr. Brown stated that Pennsylvania has higher truck traffic.

Mr. Vaitl stated that Pennsylvania has more paved roads and is spread out further.

Mr. Brown stated that Maryland has county roads. Pennsylvania doesn't compare turnpike roads.

Mr. Vaitl stated that he likes the structural number design better.

Mr. Brown stated that he prefers design standards. The structural approach would use more stone than asphalt. He will get a copy of the Lancaster County SALDO to review.

Ms. Brock stated that the Lancaster County SALDO can be divided up at the next workshop meeting. The Zoning Ordinance needs to be reviewed in order to keep that moving toward adoption.

Mr. Kmiecinski stated that the Planning Commission should also use the book, "Pennsylvania Standards for Residential Site Development. It is lengthy but it is easy to read. He emailed the pass code to everyone.

Mr. Brown stated that he needs the pass code emailed to him.

Ms. Hardman stated that the checklist and application for the current ordinance needs to be reviewed and finalized.

Ms. Brock stated that she wants the Zoning Ordinance amendments sent to Borough Council after it is proofread.

Ms. Brock stated that at the April 14th workshop the Planning Commission will review the checklist and application for the current ordinance and assign sections of Article 5 – Design Standards to the Planning Commission members for review.

Mr. Brown stated that he will look at SALDO's and make a recommendation on the ones he prefers.

**MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 23, 2010**

CALL TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 7:33 pm

ROLL CALL:

1. MEMBERS PRESENT

Jennifer Brock, Chairman
James Zehring
Art Vaitl
Stephanie Stoner
Monte Shearer

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Ron Brown, Borough Engineer
Mike Kmicinski, Tri County Regional Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT:

Scott Weaver, Borough Manager
Ann Simonetti, Borough Council

2. MINUTES:

a. February 23, 2010 Minutes

Page 4, paragraph 2 and 3 change “gravitated” to “grouted”.

Page 3, 4 and 5, change “geo thermal” to “geothermal” (one word).

Page 3, remove next to last sentence.

Page 4, paragraph 11 add, “when results are below”.

Page 8, paragraph 4 and 6 add “in Lemoyne.”

Page 7, #6 change “Grown” to “Growth”.

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

3. PUBLIC COMMENT.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that on Monday, May 31, 2010 at 10:00 am the Veterans Committee will have a Memorial Day event inside the Moose Club. There will be free lunch for the community. Representative Mark Keller will be the speaker.

4. OLD BUSINESS.

a. Article 4 Subdivision Amendment - Plan Specifications and Procedures

Ms. Brock stated that Article 4 review has been completed.

b. Article 5 Design and Improvement Standards.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission has direction now on how to proceed with the ordinance. At the next workshop meeting, the Planning Commission will review the SALDO's from Lancaster County Ordinance, the Perry County Model Ordinance and the existing Marysville ordinance to recommend changes to the Borough Engineer.

c. Well Ordinance.

Mr. Vaitl asked where the well ordinance should be located in the ordinance.

Ms. Hardman recommended putting the well ordinance in the code of ordinances as a stand alone ordinance.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if Rockville Estates was approved with any wells.

Ms. Brock stated that there were seven large lots at the top of the mountain that was discussed for wells.

Mrs. Simonetti asked if a variance would be required for Rockville Estate to do wells.

Ms. Hardman stated that a waiver would be required from the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Vaitl stated that he would not recommend wells.

Ms. Brock stated that the preliminary plan that was approved was for public water.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the developer's engineers stated that public water could be provided to the development early in the review process.

Ms. Brock stated that a lift would be needed to do wells because there is not enough pressure.

Mr. Zehring stated that they would also need a tank.

Mrs. Stoner stated that water pressure of 30 PSI at the connection is required at the street. A two story home on a hill would need a lift, which is the homeowner's responsibility.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that in 2011, sprinklers will be required in homes.

Mr. Vaitl stated that most wells will be geothermal. A permit is not required for a geothermal well right now. The ordinance will make sure that geothermal wells are done right.

Mrs. Stoner volunteered to review the Chester County Well Ordinance and Centre Township Well Ordinance and make recommendations on an ordinance for Marysville.

Ms. Brock asked if there are any requirements for wells in the current ordinance.

Ms. Hardman stated that is no requirements in the current ordinance for wells.

5. NEW BUSINESS.

a. Submission of Plans – Application and Checklist.

Ms. Hardman stated that changes were made to the application. The revised application was passed out for everyone's review.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the application has two different terminologies, "modification of requirements" and "waiver".

Mr. Vaitl stated that the application should be consistent and should be worded as stated in the current ordinance as "modification of requirement".

Mrs. Stoner stated that a solid line is needed above Official Use Only.

Ms. Hardman stated that the checklist was revised. The checklist items were taken word for word out of the subdivision regulations, preliminary plan procedures. The section of the requirement was included at the end of each line item. The checklist will be emailed to all the Planning Commission members for review at the next workshop meeting.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

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

Ms. Brock stated that the meeting was canceled and rescheduled for April 28, 2010. She plans to attend.

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

Mrs. Stoner stated that she and Mrs. Simonetti attended the meeting on Thursday. There were three meetings throughout the county. The meeting she attended was for the eastern part of the County. Representatives from Duncannon, Penn Township, Marysville, and Shermansdale were present. The participants put the greenway trail projects on a map. Discussion was held regarding the extension of the Darlington Trail that might happen. There was good exchange of ideas. She voiced her concern about information that is gathered but nothing is ever done with it.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that Tri County Planning Commission oversees the Perry County Greenways, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there was discussion regarding how Shermans Creek could be promoted for boating. The issue is preservation versus bringing people into the area in order to get parks and trails.

Ms. Brock stated that parks and trails immediately benefit the people of Marysville.

Mrs. Stoner stated that signage is important to pull people in.

Ms. Brock stated that there are parks all over the place that people don't know about.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that there is a Department of Tourism.

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

Mrs. Simonetti stated that she sent a text to the department of DCED that teaches planning and zoning and they suggested putting the well ordinance in the SALDO.

Ms. Hardman stated that if the well ordinance is put in the SALDO it will only apply to subdivision or land development plans.

Mr. Brown stated that he is in the process of doing engineering to separate the storm sewer and sanitary sewer system. They are working on the north end of the Borough right now because it is the smallest area. Valley Street, Ridgeview Drive and Park Drive are separated.

Mr. Weaver stated that the whole storm sewer and sanitary sewer system is being done because of the way the piping is in the Borough.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the storm water separation can be done with H2O grant money that is a part of the stimulus bill.

Mrs. Stoner asked when the separation will occur.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that it is supposed to be done by 2020. She cannot answer the question of when it will occur in Marysville at this time.

Mr. Vaitl asked if the grant money that was been approved is enough for this project.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that the grant money is not enough for this project.

Mr. Vaitl asked if there is other grant money available to fix the roads from the work on the storm sewer and sanitary sewer separation.

Mrs. Simonetti stated that there is grant money available for road repairs.

**8. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING DATE 4/12/09 @ 6:30pm/NEXT
REGULAR MEETING 4/27/09 @ 7:30 pm, WORK SESSION @ 6:30 pm.**

MOTION: Mr. Zehring moved, seconded by Mr. Shearer to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer