

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 27, 2009

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

ROLL CALL:

1. MEMBERS PRESENT

Jennifer Brock, Chairman
Monte Shearer
James Zehring

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer

OTHERS PRESENT: NONE

2. MINUTES:

a. September 22, 2009 Minutes

The minutes were tabled due to a lack of a quorum to take action.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT. None

4. OLD BUSINESS:

a. Subdivision Amendment - Plan Specifications and Procedures

Ms. Brock stated that comments were received from Perry County Planning Commission on Article 4 (see attached letter dated October 21, 2009).

Ms. Hardman stated that the big issue on the Perry County Planning Commission comments is regarding the requirement for a pre-application meeting. The remaining comments were for clarification purposes.

Mr. Zehring stated that comment #2 states that Traditional Neighborhood Development should be removed. Is a Traditional Neighborhood Development similar to what was discussed at the meetings in Duncannon?

Ms. Brock stated that a Traditional Neighborhood Development has a bunch of little houses on little lots.

Ms. Hardman stated that a Traditional Neighborhood Development has residential development with commercial development such as restaurants, bars, stores and similar businesses within walking distance.

Ms. Hardman stated that that biggest item for discussion is the pre-application meeting. The County recommendation is as follows, *“Pre-application Meetings – Section 22-401, Paragraph 7 establishes a requirement for a pre-application meeting and Section 22-403 establishes the pre-application meeting procedures. Since this is not a step in the Municipal Planning Codes’ review process, we have several comments on this section and recommend that Borough Council remove this section in its entirety as structure for the following reasons.”*

Ms. Brock stated that she does not think the pre-application meeting should be taken out.

Mr. Zehring stated that the pre-application meeting gives the Planning Commission time to consider what is being submitted.

Ms. Brock stated that the pre-application meeting will make sure what is being submitted is complete. The pre-application does not involve the Planning Commission. The section needs to be reviewed to determine who should attend the pre-application meeting and if fees are applicable. The engineering review is for completeness.

Ms. Brock stated that the engineering review at the pre-application meeting should be to determine completeness; not engineering feasibility.

Ms. Hardman stated that if the ordinance does not require the pre-application meeting, no one will do it.

Ms. Brock stated that the Planning Commission needs to discuss the pre-application meeting to find a way to keep it in the ordinance.

Mr. Shearer stated that the Perry County Planning Commission comment is explicit to remove the pre-application meeting in its entirety.

Ms. Brock stated that a sketch plan and a pre-application meeting are different. The sketch plan is an idea that the applicant wants to discuss with the Planning Commission. The sketch plan does not involve any engineering details. Ms. Brock stated that she will discuss the Perry County Planning Commission’s comment regarding the pre-application meeting process with Mr. Kmiecinski, Tri County Regional Planning Commission.

Ms. Hardman stated that the pre-application meeting process is in the West Hanover Township Ordinance. The pre-application meeting works well for subdivision and land development plans that are submitted in West Hanover Township. The West Hanover Township ordinance states, *“the purpose of the preapplication conference is to: 1. Foster informal plan review between the applicant and the municipality. 2. Reduce subdivision site plan design and development costs for the applicant. 3. Expedite the Township’s review and approval process.”* The ordinance further addresses preapplication conference requirements for the plan content, fees and submission deadline as follows, *“A preapplication conference shall be held with the municipality and/or the Township Engineer, the application shall be prepared as a completed subdivision or land development in accordance with Articles, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and IX, as necessary, and any other descriptive materials, the preapplication conference shall be scheduled at least 28 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the applicant may be charged reasonable fees for the preapplication services for the*

Township Engineer's attendance, due to the informal nature of the preapplication conference, the applicant or the Township shall not be bound by the determination of the preapplication conference."

Mr. Zehring stated that he is in agreement with the pre-application meeting idea.

Ms. Brock stated that well ordinances were discussed at the September workshop meeting. She will get with Ms. Mohr on the well ordinance. The Planning Commission should start working on Article 5 – Design and Improvement Standards at the November 11th workshop meeting.

Ms. Hardman stated that Article 5 is a big section with 135 pages of text.

Ms. Brock stated that an outline of the headings along with the first 20 pages of the ordinance should be provided at the November 11th workshop meeting to start discussion. The Planning Commission should ask the Borough Engineer what are the biggest problems with the current ordinance. She would like to refer to standardized methodologies instead of reinventing the whole ordinance. It will make for a better and clearer ordinance and is better for the design professional to follow.

b. Revitalization of the Square

Mr. Shearer asked if the recommendation of the Planning Commission was forwarded to the Borough Council. Mr. Shearer asked what the status of the revitalization of the square is.

Ms. Brock stated that Mrs. Simonetti was present at the last meeting to get the Planning Commission's recommendation on the option for the square to forward it to the Borough Council at the reconvene meeting. Borough Council was to make a final recommendation to the Cairo's Group so they can finalize the design.

Ms. Zehring asked if the revitalization project is moving ahead.

Ms. Brock stated that the revitalization project is moving ahead. There were three different plans to review. Ms. Brock showed Mr. Zehring and Mr. Shearer the three plans. The purpose of the design is to clarify the roadway and the parking area. Diagonal parking was proposed in front of the Moose Lodge. The owner of the apartments beside of the Moose Lodge dedicated additional land in order for the sidewalk to become ADA compliant.

Mr. Zehring asked if the grant money could be used to purchase land for additional parking such as the parking area behind the Parrot Head that is now out of business.

Ms. Brock stated that the parking behind the Parrot Head is private property. The land would have to be purchased and there would need to be an agreement. There is not enough grant funds available to purchase land for parking.

Ms. Brock stated that the design will define parking and the roadway.

Mr. Shearer stated that the design proposes brick pavers for sidewalks.

Mr. Zehring stated that he would like to see the boat launch revitalized.

Ms. Brock stated that the boat launch plan is not realistic because there is not enough land.

Mr. Zehring stated that there was an option to purchase the house for additional land.

5. NEW BUSINESS: None

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS. None

7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING (Next Council Meeting 11/9/09)

Ms. Brock stated she will not be able to attend the November 9th Borough Council meeting.

Mr. Shearer stated he may be able to attend.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer