

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 16, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephanie Stoner
Jennifer Brock
Art Vaitl
Robert Zimmerman
Shawn Vaccaro

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer
Jason Finnerty, Tri County Regional Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT: NONE

MEETING DATES FOR 2015:

Mrs. Stoner stated that meetings are held the third and fourth Tuesday's of the month. A draft list of meeting dates for the workshop meeting and the regular meeting was in the packet for review. There are notes beside meeting dates that are close to a holiday. Should the November and December meetings be consolidated.

Discussion was held on the meeting schedule for 2015. No changes were made.

SALDO REVISIONS

Mrs. Stoner stated that she made a list of the sections that still need to be discussed which are:

- Section 22-506.2.A. What do we mean by significant effect in the first line?
- Section 22-516A. Permanent access/cul-de-sac streets. Are we okay with limitations on cul-de-sacs that would result in 17-25 residential homes and 1 busy commercial lot (more if they were less trafficked businesses).
- Section 22-522.2.A. We allow trails. Do we want to specify any of the following: type of surface on the trail, how many trails, minimum or maximum length, where they should be located.
- Section 22-525 Lighting: Do they match zoning. Section 22-530 Stormwater. We plan on removing this and making it the New Stormwater Ordinance (Chapter 26).
- Appendix E & F. Dan said to expand Appendix E & F to include private streets standards.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-506.2.A is on page 4 under Lot Access. A. states, *"If a land use is proposed at a location or density that will have a significant effect on current traffic patterns, a traffic impact study shall be required to ensure that the street network can*

accommodate the anticipated traffic demands and to define required street improvements.” The question is “What is significant effect”.

Mr. Vaitl asked if there is a number indicated in the Traffic Impact Study ordinance required for a significant effect.

Mr. Finnerty stated that 25 vehicles trips per day is used in Carroll Township.

Mr. Seeno asked if the trip takes into account the number of people in the car and is a trip consolidated into one or limited to two trips per hour.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the trips are based on the entire development.

Ms. Brock asked what happens if a development grows.

Mr. Seeno asked if a trip is one family.

Ms. Brock stated that a trip is not one family.

Mrs. Stoner stated that a single family dwelling generates 10 to 15 trips per day.

Mr. Seeno stated that he thinks that 10 to 15 trips per day per house is a lot.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the average daily trip (ADT) is being conservative.

Ms. Brock asked if it means that two houses would require a TIS.

Mr. Vaitl stated he thinks 10 to 15 trips per day per house are high.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she asked the Borough Engineer and 10 to 15 trips per day are what they gave her. By over estimating it will trigger a TIS more often.

Mrs. Stoner asked if significant effect should be defined as ADT of 25.

Mr. Vaitl stated that he thinks 25 ADT is reasonable.

Ms. Hardman stated that if it is too restrictive, the developer could request a waiver.

Mr. Finnerty stated that a reason for a waiver could also be large lots and driveways being separated.

Mr. Finnerty stated that he would like to see a development threshold for non-residential.

Ms. Brock stated 25 ADT's for non-residential on a highway is nothing.

Mrs. Stoner stated that residential and non-residential is not separated in the TIS.

Ms. Hardman stated that the TIS is not in the zoning ordinance.

Mrs. Finnerty stated that the ADT could be treated as a performance standard in the ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that if the TIS is a stand along ordinance it would be in the back of the codification book.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-516.4 on page 18 states, "*permanent single access/cul-de-sac's shall be designed to serve a maximum of two hundred and fifty (250) ADT for residential development and a maximum of five hundred (500) ADT for non-residential development.*" The Solicitor's question is whether 250 ADT's is a lot or a little.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the ordinance limits the length of a cul-de-sac.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the minimum length is 250' and the maximum length is 500'.

Mr. Finnerty suggested that the existing cul-de-sac lengths in the Borough be taken into consideration.

Mr. Vaitl stated that there is a 4 unit townhouse in 4 buildings on a 250' long cul-de-sac in the Whitetail Development.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that this example is a tight cul-de-sac.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that there are 6 units in each building and 8 units in one at the end with a total of 22 units on the 250' cul-de-sac.

Mr. Finnerty stated that generally there is an average of two vehicles per unit.

Mr. Vaitl stated that based on 250 ADT there would be 4 trips per unit per day.

Mr. Finnerty stated a cul-de-sac has one entrance and if the entrance becomes blocked people are prevented from doing daily activities.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the 250 ADT can be less.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the cul-de-sac in Whitetail has a one car garage and a driveway for one car behind the garage.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the cul-de-sac on Ridgeview has single family homes and it has a bigger cul-de-sac.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the zoning ordinance has lot width requirements. The ADT on a cul-de-sac could, at a minimum, be determined by the lot width.

Mrs. Stoner stated the single access limits what can be done.

Mr. Vaitl asked if the development is designed for 250 to 500 trips per day road, would the road be wider.

Mr. Finnerty stated that regardless of the road width, the road will still be considered a minor road.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the ADT has nothing to do with dimensions or sub base of the road.

Ms. Brock stated that she thinks lane width is the regulation in question.

Mr. Vaitl stated the ADT should not be based on the design of the road.

Mr. Vaccaro asked if on street parking or no on street parking is a factor.

Mrs. Stoner stated that construction of the road is the same.

Mr. Vaitl asked why there are different standards for road construction.

Ms. Brock stated that the street design standards of the ordinance permits narrow lanes for minor streets.

Mrs. Stoner stated that ADT has nothing to do with road construction.

Ms. Brock stated that Section 22-516.4. states that the street shall be designed to serve a maximum of 250 trips. So it depends on the design of the street.

Mr. Vaitl stated that the street should be designed to allow maximum ADT.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that we have an ordinance on how long a cul-de-sac can be.

Mr. Vaccaro asked if Section 22-516.4. is talking about the design of the street.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the minimum lot width and length allowed will determine the number of single family homes on the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Brock stated that the minimum lot width depends on the zoning district.

Mrs. Stoner asked what the minimum lot width is permitted by the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Hardman stated that the minimum lot width for a townhouse is 20'.

Ms. Brock stated that based on the minimum lot width and maximum cul-de-sac length you would be permit 400 townhomes.

Mr. Finnerty stated that you could reference lots or dwelling units.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the words “be designed to” should be removed and the sentence should read as follows, “*Permanent single access/cul-de-sac streets shall service a maximum of 250 ADT for residential development and a maximum of 500 ADT for non-residential development.*”

Section 22-522.2A. page 22 PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND CIRCULATION, Design Guidelines – Trails.

Ms. Stoner asked if there should be regulations of the trail surface, how many trails to require, minimum or maximum length or location.

Ms. Hardman stated that trail surface could be paved or mulch.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she would not want a trail to be paved.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the surface of the trail depends on the location.

Ms. Brock stated that if the trail is paved there will be a maintenance issue.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the ordinance states that a trail is to be 5’ wide and have a 10’ wide easement.

Mr. Vaccaro stated there should not be any specifications on trails.

Mr. Finnerty asked about connection of a trail to the Darlington Trail within Rockville Estates.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Yingst committed to connecting to the Darlington Trail on Tower Road. It is all theory until it is done.

Ms. Brock stated that the commitment by Yingst was more than just a verbal promise. Yingst was to give an easement to Susquehanna Trail Club which is part of the National Park Conservancy.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the discussion with Susquehanna Trail Club occurred in 2008. The people involved may no longer be there.

Mrs. Brock stated that there was a lot of discussion about when the trail was to be connected and Yingst stated that due to concerns with people accessing the trail while construction was in process they would agree to do the trail when Phase II was developed.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there is a trail up Caroline Street to the old TV tower that came down Little Mountain before the quarry.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Appalachian Trail Club agreed to go in theory to the water fall area. The Yingst plan had a 4 to 5 car parking area.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the Central PA Conservancy could obtain it and provide easements.

Ms. Brock stated that Rye Township would have the easement.

Section 22-525 Lighting page 32. Does this match Zoning

Ms. Hardman stated that the lighting will not match the lighting in the dark sky lighting ordinance that was adopted. She thought it was a standalone ordinance but found it in the zoning ordinance.

Section 22-530 page 41 EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Solicitor asked to put Section 22-530 in Chapter 26 as a standalone ordinance.

Ms. Brock stated that Chapter 26 and Section 22-530 need to match unless the watershed is overlapping.

Ms. Hardman stated that a lot of all the ordinances are standalone.

Mr. Finnerty stated that having standalone ordinances makes it hard for the developer, engineers, and staff.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the stormwater ordinance can be revised by Ms. Hardman to draft Section 22-530 as a standalone ordinance or leave Section 22-530 in the SALDO.

Ms. Brock stated that we need to make a note to change the zoning ordinance to reference the SALDO for storm water and erosion and sedimentation control.

MARYSVILLE BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 16, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 7:38 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephanie Stoner
Jennifer Brock
Art Vaitl
Shawn Vaccaro
Robert Zimmerman

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Hardman, Code Enforcement Officer

Jason Finnerty, Tri County Regional Planning Commission

OTHERS PRESENT: NONE

2. MINUTES:

a. November 18, 2014 Minutes

Page 1, paragraph 2 change “install” to installed”.

Page 1 paragraph 4, change “as a member” to “and a membrane”.

Page 1, page 2, and page 9 change “Derr” to “Kerr”.

Page 2, paragraph 8 delete “stated”.

Page 2, paragraph 13 change “overflowed” to “an overflow”.

Page 2, paragraph 17 add ”original” in front of plan.

Page 3, SALDO REVISIONS, paragraph 5 change “search” to “searched”.

MOTION: Ms. Brock moved, seconded by Mr. Vaitl to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

4. OLD BUSINESS.

A. SALDO and Well Ordinance.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the stormwater ordinance can be revised by Ms. Hardman to draft Section 22-530 as a standalone ordinance or leave Section 22-530 in the SALDO.

Mr. Vaitl stated that he thinks the stormwater regulations should stay in the SALDO to make it easier for staff to review and enforce.

Ms. Brock stated that if the stormwater is a stand alone ordinance there is some wording that will need to be changed.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the stormwater regulations could be retracted from the code of ordinances if it is in the SALDO.

Ms. Brock stated that the zoning ordinance could reference the SALDO instead of Chapter 26.

Appendix E & F The solicitor recommends that Appendix E & F include private street standards.

Mrs. Stoner stated that it was discussed previously that private street standards should be the same as public street standards.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Section 22-512 states that private streets may be used in a subdivision of 3 or less lots.

Mr. Finnerty stated that private streets are not required to be offered for dedication to the Borough. There are design standards for a driveway.

Ms. Hardman stated that Section 22-512.2 last sentence should be changed to read, *“This agreement shall establish conditions under which the street will be maintained in accordance with the design approved on the Final Plan, and shall stipulate:”*

Mrs. Stoner stated that Appendix F will not need to be changed.

It was the consensus that Section 22-512 2.E. be reworded to read, “Private streets shall meet applicable public street standards.”

Section 22-525 Lighting

Mr. Vaitl stated that since it was determined that the dark sky lighting ordinance is in the zoning ordinance what is going to be done with the lighting in the SALDO.

Ms. Hardman suggested referencing the zoning ordinance lighting regulations in the SALDO.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the lighting section of the SALDO has a purpose section.

Ms. Brock stated that there are regulations in the SALDO that is not in the Zoning.

Ms. Brock stated that she will review the lighting regulations in the zoning to see if it complies with the lighting regulations in the SALDO.

Mrs. Stoner asked if the Planning Commission wanted to vote on the SALDO at this meeting or wait until the Lighting regulations are completed.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to wait until the lighting ordinance questions were resolved to recommend the SALDO revisions to Borough Council.

B. Zoning Ordinance/Chapter 27

- a. Part 14 Development Standards. On hold until SALDO and Well Ordinance is completed.**
- b. Part 15 Performance Standards. On hold until SALDO and Well Ordinance is completed.**

C. Rockville Estates Update. None

5. NEW BUSINESS.

A. YINGST HOMES – UPDATED PHASING SCHEDULE FOR ROCKVILLE ESTATES DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough received a phasing schedule for Rockville Estates.

Ms. Brock stated that the phasing schedule should have a completion date not a submittal date for final plan.

Ms. Brock stated that Phase II has 83 units. She thinks that is a lot of units for a phase.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Phase II is in an area that permitted more homes.

Mr. Finnerty questioned why the entrance was constructed.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the construction of the entrance was required by PennDOT.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the total number of units for all phases adds up to 294.

Mrs. Stoner stated that she will check to see if the phasing schedule should have a completion date or a submitted for final plan date.

Mr. Finnerty stated that the phasing plan must be submitted for approval annually. A specific date is not required.

Ms. Hardman stated that phasing schedules always have month and year for phases.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Council must accept the phasing plan.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there are no other updates on Rockville Estates.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there has been no work on Rockville Estates for two weeks.

Mrs. Stoner stated she noticed that work was being done on the street at Ridgeview and 11/15 for water, sewer and stormwater hookups.

B. MEETING DATES FOR 2015.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there are no changes to the meeting date. The meeting dates will be advertised as submitted.

6. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS. NONE

**7. REPORT ON BOROUGH COUNCIL MEETING
(Next Council Meeting January 12, 2015).**

AMBULANCE

Mrs. Stoner stated that there was a lot of discussion regarding the ambulance situation. Marysville Fire Company Ambulance service can no longer be staffed because they don't have the funds. The Borough is contacting East Pennsboro Township to provide ambulance service for Marysville Borough.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that East Pennsboro Township is working out the details.

Mrs. Stoner stated that membership was down.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that membership is from May 1st to April 30th. East Pennsboro Township is taking over on May 1st.

Mrs. Stoner stated that one of the Borough Council members felt that the issue needed to go on the ballot to see if the voters want to fund the ambulance service.

Mr. Zimmerman stated an EMS tax would help fund a crew. Four to six people will be needed for a crew. Notification must be sent to Penn Township, Rye Township and Duncannon Borough. EMS service is not required to be provided however, fire service is required. Membership dues will go up. ALS Life support will be provided by West Shore.

Ms. Brock stated that if you fill out the membership for ambulance service you will also get ALS (Advance Life Support).

Mr. Seeno asked how much the membership was.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the membership is \$50 to \$75 per household. A single person membership is \$40.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Council is offering East Pennsboro Township something similar.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that East Pennsboro is private and is self-sufficient. Response times are the same. The state is making training more difficult.

Mr. Vaitl asked what they are doing with ambulance service.

Mr. Seeno asked what the ambulance tax would be.

Mrs. Stoner stated the tax could be up to 2 mills for the Borough to hire personnel to run the ambulance service.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that it could cost a million dollars or more. Historically, the call volume for Marysville is not there.

Mrs. Stoner stated that there is also the maintenance cost for the ambulances.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that notice must be given to the state to give the ambulance license back.

Mr. Vaitl stated that it makes more sense to go regional with ambulance service.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the state is pushing for more EMS paid crews.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the Borough Council will reconvene to talk about the ambulance service and meet with Rye Township and Penn Township on December 22. The next Borough Council meeting is January 12, 2015.

COMPENSATION FOR BOROUGH COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mrs. Stoner stated that currently the compensation for a Borough Council member is \$780 per year. The most it could raise to is \$1800 a year. Everyone spoke up to not raise the compensation. The increase was to apply to new members. The compensation increase was shot down.

Mr. Seeno asked if borough council is an elected position.

Mrs. Stoner stated that borough council is an elected position.

SECURITY CAMERAS

Mrs. Stoner stated that discussion was held regarding security cameras for the Borough Building. There will be new cameras for the police department side of the building. Discussion was held about security cameras for the entire building.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there may be two cameras in the meeting room and one in the entryway. With updated security cameras, there will be more coverage.

CAPITAL AREA COG

Mrs. Stoner stated that Council was upset with Capital Area COG pay raise request because it was a significant pay raise.

Mrs. Stoner stated that Council was discussing whether they wanted to remain a member. There are big benefits to be a member such as cheaper salt and equipment costs.

HIGH SCHOOL UPDATE

Mrs. Stoner stated that Ivan Yevie gave an update on what is going on at the high school.

PROPOSED ORDINANCES

Mrs. Stoner stated there were four ordinances were adopted at the Borough Council meeting:

1. Air Pollution.
2. Responsibility for snow and ice removal.
3. Designation of snow and ice emergency routes.
4. Conduct and Noise.

Mr. Seeno stated that the newsletter stated that any wood material could be burned.

Ms. Brock stated that treated wood cannot be burned.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that construction materials cannot be burned unless it is clean.

Mrs. Stoner stated that the burn vessel had to have a lid.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the lid must be wire mesh to keep sparks and ashes under control.

Mr. Seeno asked if campfires are exempt.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that campfires are technically illegal.

Mrs. Stoner stated that campfires are not exempt unless it is for a religious ceremony or food preparation.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that people want to burn debris after a flood along the river.

COUNTY SIGNATURE ON ROCKVILLE REVISED PLANS

Mr. Finnerty stated that the Borough contacted the County to sign the revised Rockville Estates plans for the trench detail revision for recording. The County did not formally review the plan so it could not be signed. It will require formal review.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT. NONE

9. ADJOURNMENT/NEXT SPECIAL MEETING FOR DECEMBER -CANCELLED /NEXT REGULAR MEETING 12/16/2014 @ 7:30 pm, NEXT WORK SESSION - NONE

Adjournment: Mr. Zimmerman moved, seconded by Mr. Seeno to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Hardman,
Code Enforcement Officer/Recording Secretary