

**NORTH FAYETTE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2010
7:30 P.M.**

The meeting was called to order with Mr. Bob Owens presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bob Owens, Chairman
Bill Fitzgerald, Vice Chairman
Fred Lutz, Board Member
Billie Budner, HDR Engineering
Brian Temple, Director of Community Development
Cheryl Cherico, Recording Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT:

David Cosnek, Board Member
Kristopher Kruze, Board Member
Tom McDermott, Township Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jim Morosetti, Gamble Road
Andrea Iglar, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

A motion was made by Mr. Fred Lutz, seconded by Mr. Bill Fitzgerald, and carried, to approve the minutes from the January 19, 2010, meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. Application 2010-2 – Princeton Place Plan of Lots** - Application for preliminary and final land development and subdivision for 54.10 acres to be subdivided into 72 lots located on Seabright Road in an R-2 Zoning District.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

No representative was present.

Mr. Temple said he had emailed his comments to the applicant earlier in the day and they had called back saying they would not be in attendance.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Temple and Ms. Budner.

Mr. Temple made the following comments:

1. This is an application for preliminary land development and subdivision approval for 54.10 acres of land to be developed into 72 lots adjacent to Seabright Road in an R-2 Zoning District.
2. The following information has been submitted as part of this application.
 - A. Land Development Plans (28 sheets) revised on 2/1/2010 prepared by Triangle Engineering.
 - B. Stormwater Management Plan dated May 2009 and revised on January 21, 2010 prepared by E.A. Thaner & Associates.
 - C. Hydrology/Hydraulic Calculation dated February 2009 prepared by E.A. Thaner & Associates.
 - D. Memo from Kevin Bittner of Gibson-Thomas Engineering Co., dated May 1, 2009 concerning traffic.
 - E. Letter dated August 28, 2008 prepared by Wright Engineering Services, LLC concerning test boring investigation of soil and rock conditions.
 - F. Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan revised April 16, 2009 prepared by E.A. Thaner & Associates.
 - G. Wetland Identification and Delineation Report dated November 2008 prepared by Gibson-Thomas Engineering Co.
 - H. Post Construction Stormwater Management Plan dated March 2009 prepared by E.A. Thaner & Associates.
 - I. Buildable Area Analysis prepared by Donald R. Housley PLS.
 - J. Copy of Deed for 913-S-1 recorded on January 3, 2007.
 - K. Copy of FIRM Map, panel 295 of 558.
 - L. Model Deed restriction for "Conservation Area".
3. The Township Engineer should determine that the buildable area analysis has been properly completed.
4. For all applications which propose fifty (50) or more dwelling units, a traffic report prepared by a qualified traffic engineer shall be submitted. What has been submitted is incomplete and does not meet the requirements of a traffic report as outlined §303.2(d) of SALDO. The applicant will not need to complete a structural analysis but the Traffic Report is required. Also the applicant should be aware that the Township has adopted a resolution establishing an impact fee

advisory committee and a notice of intention to adopt an impact fee ordinance which provides for the application of a fee of \$1000.00 per PM peak hour trip.

5. A landscaping plan showing compliance with all applicable buffer area and landscaping requirements of the Township Zoning Ordinance has been forwarded to Environmental Planning & Design, LLC for review and comment.
6. The Township Board of Supervisors shall consider whether safety requirements are warranted to reduce traffic hazards which endanger public safety. The landowner and/or developer shall be responsible for construction of any required islands, acceleration, deceleration or turning lanes and shall bear the cost of installing any required traffic control devices, signs or pavement markings. (§302C of Zoning Ordinance #360) Once the Traffic Report is complete this can be addressed.
7. Section 206 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a landscape plan, which has been forwarded to Environmental Planning & Design, LLC for review and comment.
8. The applicant is proposing that Parcel A be by a Homeowners Association. The Association documents must be submitted for review by the Township Solicitor.
9. The applicant will be required to enter into Stormwater maintenance agreement covering all stormwater control facilities which are to be publicly or privately owned and pay the amount due to the Special Stormwater Facility Maintenance Fund which is described in Section 803.D of the Stormwater Management Ordinance prior to or in conjunction with any approvals.
10. This area is included within the PRD overlay district of the Township and a clustered type development might make more sense to preserve the sensitive areas of the property. The developer states that they do not wish to pursue this type of development.
11. The new culvert design must be approved by the Township Engineer.
12. The Township Engineer must review and approve all construction drawings.
13. The Township Engineer must review and approve the stormwater management plan.
14. The Township Engineer must review and approve the geotechnical report.
15. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer,
16. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.
17. Refer to comments from Allegheny County.
18. This review is only based on the information provided as it relates to ordinance requirements and general design comments. There could be additional comments on any resubmission of this application.
19. Where evidence exists of undermining, strip mining, land-slide prone soils or other geologic hazards on the site, a geologic report by a qualified registered professional engineer regarding

soil and subsurface conditions and the probable measures needed to be considered in the design of the development, the location of structures and the design of foundations, if any. (§303.2(a) of SALDO) Until this item is completed, The Township cannot accept the application as complete.

20. The developer is proposing that the Culvert under the entrance road will be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association. The solicitor's office should comment on this as to how a proposed Township owned road will go over a privately owned culvert. What happens if the association is dissolved in the future and the culvert fails?
21. Parcel B is defined as a flag lot (A lot that has any portion of its front lot line or front yard abut the rear or side yard of an adjacent lot rather than a public road right-of-way and where access to the public road right-of-way would typically be by a narrow, private right-of-way or driveway) and does not meet the Zoning Ordinance Lot requirements a zoning variance would need to be granted by the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Temple recommended that the Planning Commission reject the application as incomplete based on no complete traffic report (§303.2(d) of SALDO) and no complete geotechnical report (§303.2(a) of SALDO) being submitted, and said he would ask the applicant to resubmit when the information was included in the application.

Ms. Budner made the following comments:

HDR Engineering has reviewed the second submission of information for the above referenced Application, No. 2009-07, for Preliminary Site Plan approval for the development of 74 single family lots on 54.2 acres. The proposed project is located along Seabright Road.

Our review comments are in response to the information that was prepared by Triangle Engineering and Planning Services, Inc., E. A. Thaner & Assoc, and Wright Engineering Services. The applicant's submittal included the following information.

- a. Buildable Area Analysis Calculation Worksheet
- b. Deed of Ownership
- c. Allegheny County Block and Lots system informational page and map
- d. FEMA Firmette of property
- e. Model Deed Restriction
- f. Photos
- g. Engineering Land Survey
- h. Revised Wetlands Report
- i. E&S Manual
- j. Post Construction Stormwater Management Report
- k. Revised Stormwater Management Report

Our review comments are as follows.

General Land Development

1. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 303.2 a; Provide a copy of Report from U.S. Conservation Service concerning soil conditions and water resources.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Soil conditions and water resources are a part of the narrative report required as part of our E&S submission. Please review the ACCD NPDES submission for compliance. In addition, we have enclosed a copy of our narrative, drawings & “approval” letter with this revised submission.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

2. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 303.2 (b); A Traffic Report will be required since the development proposes over 50 dwelling units. Update current traffic report in accordance with the requirements of the Ordinance.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Please see Plan Note 2 on sheets 1,2,3 – “Plan for Recording” Additionally, PA DOT shall have jurisdiction over the entrance and all existing roads being served by this development. As such, we believe the ordinance section 303.2(d), sections (1)a,b,c &d address existing Township roads and concerns and does not really apply to this development. North Branch is SR 3108 and Seabright Road is SR 3053.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Developer has not addressed HDR comments. By Ordinance, a traffic report is required.

3. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 306 (d)(3); Provide at least three (3) cross sections at intervals not to exceed one hundred (100) feet and extending fifty (50) feet on each side of the street centerline or twenty-five (25) feet outside of the street right of way, whichever is greater;

Developer Response 2-01-10: The cross sections have been completed. See sheet #13.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Provide additional dimensions on cross sections. Pavement width, back to back of curb, ROW width.

4. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 306 (d)(3); Sanitary sewer plan shall include the location of each “Y” proposed for installation. Sanitary sewer profiles shall include Pipe invert grades at fifty foot (50’) intervals.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Wyes has been shown and identified as SAN WYE on the drawings.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution Accepted.

5. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 306 (g)(14); Provided a notation on the plat that access to a State highway shall only be authorized by a highway occupancy permit issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation under Section 420 of the State Highway Law (P.L. 1242, No. 428 of June 1, 1945). Based on the proposed traffic volume of 788 vehicles

per day the driveway entrance meets the requirements for the design of a medium volume driveway.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Please see Plan Note 2 on sheets 1,2 &3 – “Plan for Recording”.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution Accepted.

6. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 607.3 Double Frontage; Lot 47 is a double frontage lot showing two proposed building options. Vehicle access to this lot shall be from Regent Court which is the lower volume road. As stated in the ordinance a note is to be added to all double frontage lots restricting vehicle access to one frontage.

Developer Response 2-01-10: See note #3 of “Plan Notes” on the revised drawings.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution Accepted.

7. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 609.3 Inlets; Inlets at street intersection shall be placed on the tangent and not on the curved portions. Adjust inlet locations at the intersections of Sovereign Drive / Royal Court and Polo Drive/Royal Court.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As we discussed at the workshop, the Inlets at Sovereign Drive/Royal Court are located at a low point and can not be relocated. As requested, we did add the second or “flanking” inlet. However, the inlets at Polo Drive/Royal Court have been relocated as requested.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

8. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section 604.3, Grading requires shoulders to be graded 6-feet behind curb. The Standard detail shows 5’. Verify with Township which is correct.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As discussed at the workshop, the plans do comply with the Township code. (the code contradicts itself)

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

9. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Proposed radius of Cul-de-sacs (to face of curb) on Royal Court and Regent Court is 50’. Standard Cul-de-sac standard requires 40’ radius which allows for a 20’ turnaround easement (60’ radius to right-of-way line). If 50’ radius is proposed should easement for Turnaround be 70’ to maintain 20’ easement. Verify with Township.

Developer Response 2-01-10: We now have a 60’ right of way shown with a 40’ paved radius as required.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

10. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Zoning Ordinance, Article V; A Buildable Area Analysis shall be completed and submitted as Part of any Development Plan or Subdivision.

Developer Response 2-01-10: A buildable area analysis has been completed and is herewith submitted to the Township.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

11. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Vertical Curves, Street Design Standards; The vertical curve (PI Sat. 0+75.00) on Polo Drive does not meet the minimum Design Standards. The minimum curve length is 190-feet.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As we discussed at the meeting, the is a “stop condition”. The code does not address “stop conditions” only continuous flow through design calculations. As this is considered a safe design at a “stop condition”, The developer hereby requests a waiver of this condition by the Township Supervisors.

HDR Response 2-16-10: HDR assumes the developer is requesting a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board. If so, the developer should follow proper procedure called out by this Ordinance for approval from the Township.

12. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Maximum Leveling Grade, Street Design Standards; The vertical profile grades at the intersection approach on Royal Court Road to Sovereign Drive exceed the allowable 6% within 25’ of the intersecting Road’s Right-of-way (Sta. 0+42.00 @ 6.0% to Sta. 0+50.00 @ 6.43%).

Developer Response 2-01-10: Only 3’ of this intersection exceed the minimum requirement near the extreme edge of the design area described and would only involve hundredth’s of a foot. As this requirement is met in kind, The developer hereby requests a waiver of this condition by the Township Supervisors.

HDR Response 2-16-10: HDR assumes the developer is requesting a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board. If so, the developer should follow proper procedure called out by this Ordinance for approval from the Township.

13. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Detention Basin: A security fenced with access gated needs to be added to Detention Pond A.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The required fence and access gate has been added.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

14. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Detention Basin: Emergency spillway needs to be designed and added to the Detention Pond A.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The emergency spillway and construction details have been added to the revised drawings as submitted.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Construction detail is needed.

15. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** In addition to inlet placement at the low point on sag vertical curves, additional inlets shall be placed on each side of the low point. Additional flanking inlets need to be included at the low points of Sovereign Drive (Sta. 1+32.03), Royal Court (Sta. 2+64.29) and Polo Drive (Sta. 4+95.11).

Developer Response 2-01-10: We can not find this requirement in the Township Codes. However from the workshop, the developer has agreed to this concept and we have therefore added the requested flanking inlets.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

16. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Grading Ordinance; Storm drain design calculations need to be submitted along with the plans.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As requested, storm drain design calculations are provided in Appendix D of Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

17. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Grading Ordinance; The existing topographic survey does not show any existing tree lines, verify that this is correct and include locations on any trees with a diameter of twelve inches or greater at a height of two feet above the ground.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Existing tree masses were on the original set as submitted. They are designated as a scalloped line through the site development area. For your convenience, we have added this delineation to the legend. In addition, we have added the tree 6" in diameter as located by field land survey crew as sheets 21, 22 & 23. Your letter requested 12" or larger as stated in the SALDO – this is in conflict with zoning ordinance which requires the 6" trees as we located.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

18. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Side Walks: Four foot sidewalks are proposed. Provide detail for sidewalk construction.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As requested, we have added a sidewalk construction detail.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

19. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** In accordance with ADA standards for Accessible Design curb ramps are to be provided wherever an accessible route crosses a curb. Provide curb ramps at intersection locations since sidewalks are provided.

Developer Response 2-01-10: We have added the required handicap ramps to the site plan and a detail of the ramps are located on the detail sheets.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

20. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Provide design and headwater calculations for Culvert (Head Wall 5 to Inlet 12) and assess impact to neighboring properties.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Headwater calculations for headwall 5 have been provided in Appendix D of Stormwater Management Plan narrative. The roadway elevation (top of embankment at headwall) is approximately 1085 and the adjacent lots (Lot no's 51 and 72) have minimum basement elevations of 1086. Therefore, in a worst-case scenario, if the storm sewer does not function at all, stormwater will discharge to roadway drainage system prior to impacting adjacent properties. Furthermore, a trash rack has been added to headwall 5 to mitigate the possibility of the storm sewer being obstructed.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Proposed trash rack is not an acceptable option. Without approved cleaning provisions, the trash rack could cause flooding issues. TO prevent flooding, HDR recommends placing another inlet in that area.

21. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Verify the skew angle for storm pipe entering/exiting inlets do not exceed 45 degrees.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As discussed at our meeting, pipe connections to inlets to reduce skew angles have been adjusted between interconnecting inlets to avoid severe angles.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Add note in plans that the Inspector may realign a drain if it appears "skew".

22. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The Reforestation Area shall be plated as a separate Parcel C and noted as a conservation area. This Parcel should encompass the wetland to the south.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Parcel B has been created for the re-forestation area. As we discussed at the workshop, the conservation area identified within this parcel and as shown upon lot 51 has been established by meetings with the PADEP and ACCD as a part of our permitting process. They have requested special wording to be placed in the deeds for this parcel. In as much as they maintain jurisdiction of these wetlands, we are following their conditions. This deed wording has been attached to this submission.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

23. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The property Line for Lot 8 should be adjusted so that delineation of the existing wetland area falls within the boundary of Parcel A.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As this is not a requirement of the Township Code, the developer has decided not to relocate statement will appear in the deed for lot 8.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

24. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Inlets should be installed along the curbed entrance to the development (intersection of Sovereign drive with Seabright Road).

Developer Response 2-01-10: As discussed at the workshop, this is a high point of the development entrance, Seabright Road does not contain curbing with runoff being directed into the site. This comment is therefore deemed as unnecessary and is therefore not addressed.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

25. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** What is the purpose of Inlet 21-A? If this is functioning as a yard drain show proposed lot grading/channel to divert flow to inlet.

Developer Response 2-01-10: A “fan” has been added to the development plans to assist with the collection of surface runoff water.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Please provide details on a “fan” for our consideration. Also, submit details on how this will collect the surface runoff water.

26. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Grading plans need to show final contours for all grading required for the project including lot grading, proposed drainage channels/swales and roadway.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Grading plans do show final grading of lots, drainage, and roadways.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Note shall be included in the plan to say that grading of lots shall be done at the time the house is constructed and approval of the grading will be a part of the building permit process. On the plans, list the ones to be approved as part of the building permit process.

27. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The roof drain conductor system needs to be manifolded wherever practical to eliminate individual taps into the storm sewer system. A note needs to be added to the plans stating that that roof drain conductor system is to be privately owned and maintained.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The plans have been revised where possible. In addition, Roof drain drainage easements have been identified on the plat for recording as “Privately owned and maintained...” and are to be retained by Homeowners Association”.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Any roof drains proposed to have an individual tap into the storm water system should be identified and explained.

28. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Only the cover sheet of the plan set have not been sealed and signed by a Professional Engineer licensed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Developer Response 2-01-10: An engineer’s seal will be added to the complete set of approved drawings as applicable. All of the consultants associated with this project are uncomfortable with “submission” or “application” drawings being sealed and possibly being mistaken later as “approved originals”. We offer that each consultant will seal and sign the approved sheets based upon their particular profession as required by Pennsylvania Registration Law.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted. Engineer’s seal will be added at the time of final approval.

29. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Portions of the storm water system that is dedicated to the collection and conveyance of storm water from private property such as roofs and driveways cannot be located in a public easement parallel to public sewer lines. These lines must be located in a private easement. Furthermore, all private easements must be labeled on all plans as follows; “Privately Owned and Maintained”.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The plans have been revised where possible. In addition, Roof drain drainage easements have been identified on the plat for recordings as “Privately owned and maintained...” and are to be retained by Homeowners Association”.

HDR Response 2-16-10: No private utilities should be in “public easements”. If for whatever reason they are installed in the easements, they need to be identified and proper approval must be obtained by the Township.

30. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** In several instances the applicant is showing a joint occupation of a proposed 25 foot wide public easements of both sanitary and storm sewers. This design would only be approved for use under the following conditions;

- a. Both the sanitary sewer and storm sewer were dedicated exclusively for public use and ownership by the Township.
- b. A minimum separation of 10 feet horizontal would be maintained between the two sewer lines.
- c. No common trench construction would be considered for approval.

- d. Dual lines would not be approved for construction in fill areas.
- e. A minimum distance of 10 feet horizontal would be provided from the outside edge of the sewer line to the edge of the easement.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Please consider the following responses:

- Both Storm and Sanitary sewers are intended for dedication to public. (except as noted).
- The easements have been widened to 30' to allow 10' between lines. And then 10' clearance to edge of easement on both sides.
- No common trench construction is proposed.
- As was discussed at the work shop, fill will be “engineered” by a soils engineer and reports will be provided to the township. Therefore, this condition will be permitted.
- The easements have been widened to 30' to allow 10' between lines and then 10' clearance to edge of easement on both sides.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

31. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The plans do not include the size of sewer lines, manholes, and inlets.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Pipe sizes have been added to the plans.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

32. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The plans do not show the location of roof drain connections.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Roof drain collector wyes have been added to the plans.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

33. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The storm water outfall from the proposed retention ponds is approximately 250 feet from the stream along Seabright Road. What measures does the applicant plan to use to prevent soil erosion and excessive future maintenance?

Developer Response 2-01-10: As discussed at the workshop, the outfall for the detention pond has been relocated. As set forth by PADEP and ACCD requirements, appropriately sized rip rap has been added to the drawings.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

34. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** On Lot No. 51 the plan shows a storm water outfall and an inlet structure that recaptures the storm water and conveys it under Granite Court. Why is this storm water being released onto Lot No. 51? The Township will not own or maintain any open channel storm water features.

Developer Response 2-01-10: This is part of the current infiltration requirements of the PADEP. Additionally, other storm sewers do not exist in this area. Furthermore, to construct a sewer collector to bring the private roof drain water to the endwall would have an encroachment on the wetlands which would be considered a negative and unnecessary impact. Also consider the fact that other overland flow from upstream will need to be collected and therefore it will be necessary in this area to keep the wetlands alive! So to add additional flow will not be a negative impact.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

35. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** At the lower end of Stoneledge Drive a storm water outfall is shown on the drawings. Please provide information on how erosion will be prevented.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Rip rap will be provided in accordance with PADEP and ACCD regulations and as set forth in our permit.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

36. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** In the cul-de-sac on Feldspar and Granite there appears be only one storm water inlet. Please provide how you intend on draining an 80' diameter cul-de-sac effectively with one inlet.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Inlets have been removed from both cul-de-sac's as being unnecessary.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Developer has not addressed HDR's comment. Provide details on how the draining of the cul-de-sac will perform with no inlets.

37. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Who do you intend as owning and maintaining Parcel A and B?

Developer Response 2-01-10: Parcel A has been identified on the plat for recording as "Area for stormwater management, utilities, and conservation area to be retained by Homeowners Association". As discussed at the workshop, due to maintenance issue, the original Parcel B has been eliminated and added to the road right of way area. The "new" parcel "B" (or the large conservation area in the center of the Plan) will also be owned by the Homeowners Association".

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

38. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The plans do not show an Emergency Spillway for the Storm Water Retention Pond.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Emergency spillway design and corresponding details have been provided as requested in Appendix A of Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: The emergency spillway detail should show side slope information for the channel, the cutoff wall and the riprap thickness for the overflow path.

39. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The applicant has used two different scales for the plan drawings. The drawing scale must be consistent.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Although we do not agree that this use of scale is a requirement or an issue. We have adjusted the scale of the revised drawings to match.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

40. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The sanitary sewer and storm sewer plan drawings are difficult to interpret due to poor print quality and the use of 1" = 60' scale. Please resubmit the drawings at a scale no smaller than 1" = 50'.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As we discussed at the workshop, no one knows what was meant by "poor print quality".... Also, see comment #39 – hopefully the current submission meets with your pleasure?

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

Stormwater Management

Ordinance Section 402.A – Part I - Narrative Report

1. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section A.3 states that the narrative should provide a description of the erosion and sedimentation control plan. This information was not included in this portion of the report.

Developer Response 2-01-10: General description of E&S control plan provided in General discussion section of Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

2. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section A.4 requires that the narrative discuss the expected project schedule. This information has not been provided with this submittal.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Expected project schedule has been added to General discussion section of Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

3. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** A brief soil description has been provided in accordance with Section A.8. The description should discuss how the previous strip mining done on the project site modified the soil characteristics shown in the Allegheny County Soil Survey for this site.

Developer Response 2-01-10: A brief soils description has been provided in the Pre-Development Conditions portion of the Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

Ordinance Section 402.B – Part II - Preliminary Plan

1. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section B.2 requires that the 100-year floodplain be shown on the development site. This information has not been shown and/or discussed.

Developer Response 2-01-10: See note #4 of “Plan Notes” on the revised drawings.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

2. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section B.4 states that the basis of design for the street sewers, storm sewers, other storm drains and items related to the outfalls and receiving channels be discussed. This has not been provided in this submittal.

Developer Response 2-01-10: A discussion of the basis of design has been added to the General description section of the Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

HDR Comment 6-16-09: Section B.6 requires that existing features to be maintained and new channels to be constructed must be discussed. Maintenance of the existing detention facility for mine water located on the property has not been discussed as required here and in Section B 8.

Construction of new swales or channels, such as that required to guide flow from Outfall 17, Outfall 18 and roof drains to Headwall 5 has also not been discussed.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As we discussed at the meeting, the existing “mine pond” is under the jurisdiction of the PA DEP – Bureau of Mines and will be eliminated upon authorization and current permit conditions. The developer or landowner does not own or control this pond. The pond is a land reservation by a prior coal lease. Construction of new swales and channels is discussed in Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

3. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Construction of new culverts is required to be discussed in the Stormwater Management Plan per Section B.7. This information was provided in a separate report, but needs to be discussed in this submittal also.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Construction of new culverts is discussed in Stormwater Management Plan narrative.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Construction of the new culverts was only minimally discussed in the narrative as a “minimal road crossing” at the plan entrance. It was hoped that more discussion of these new culverts would have been provided in the narrative.

4. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section B.14 requires typical cross sections for the proposed drainage facility showing the existing land and the proposed changes, along with the 100-year high water elevation for the post-developed controlled condition.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Typical cross section for detention facility added Stormwater Management Plan accordingly.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

5. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section B.15 requires the locations of existing and proposed buildings, sewers, easements and rights-of-way. The drawings submitted with the Stormwater Management Plan (SWM-1, SWM-2 and ID-1) did not provide this information.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Information provided on Drawing No. SWM-2 accordingly.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

6. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Section B.17 requires a list of other approvals and permits that will be required, and the anticipated dates for these items. This information was not provided in this submittal.

Developer Response 2-01-10: List of other permits and approvals provided in Stormwater Management Plan narrative accordingly.

HDR Response 2-16-10: The narrative only mentioned the PaDEP permit. It does not mention anything in regards to if an NPDES permit is required or if the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has received approval from the Allegheny County Conservation District. These items should be in the Stormwater Management Plan narrative and related information should be provided.

General Comments – Stormwater Management

1. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The text in the report mentions that there are 74 properties planned on the site, but only 2 are shown on the drawings included with this submittal.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The stormwater management plan has been designed for the possibility of two additional lots in order to provide a more conservative design and provide for possible future conditions.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Discussion should be included to indicate where these two “future” lots would be provided. The future location is not immediately evident on the submitted plans.

2. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The text states that the embankment will only be built up 10 feet to create the detention pond, yet the pond depth is shown as 14 feet. Based on this information, the pond needs to be excavated to create this depth. A discussion should be provided that discusses the interaction of this excavation on the soils at this previously strip mined property.

Developer Response 2-01-10: A geotechnical engineer shall oversee detention facility grading. Note – also see Section 3 comment below.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Developer has not addressed HDR’s comments. Developer shall provide appropriate details showing some kind of key way locking the embankment to existing soil. It a geotechnical engineer will need to confirm the acceptable construction of the embankment.

3. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The narrative states that the emergency spillway shall provide 1-foot of freeboard to the top of the embankment. The Standard Construction Details for the Township of North Fayette indicate that 2-foot of freeboard is required.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The plans have been revised to provide 2 feet of freeboard.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

4. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** In Appendix A, the Owner of the facility is not specified. The owner of the facility needs to be specified and coordinated with the Township.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The facility owner is specified in Appendix A.

HDR Response 2-16-10: The ownership of the detention pond is not noted in the Stormwater Management Plan. The submitted plans seem to indicate that the Homeowners' Association will maintain the property, but this information should be noted in the narrative of the Stormwater Management Plan.

5. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** In Appendix A, the annual cost for inspection and maintenance appears to be a little low. This amount should be reviewed to insure that it provides for both scheduled and unscheduled inspections along with normal maintenance of the detention facility.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The annual cost for inspection and maintenance has been revised.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

6. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** In Appendix B, the hydrograph indicates that the top of the outfall structure and the emergency spillway are at the same elevation. The emergency spillway over the embankment should be at a higher elevation than the grate on top of the outfall structure to ensure that storm flow in the pond flows in to the outfall structure before it becomes necessary to use the emergency spillway.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The elevation of outlet structure and emergency spillway has been revised.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

7. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** It appears that the time required to reach "0 flow" from "peak flow" in the post-developed condition (Appendix C) takes considerably longer (from 12.2 hours to 26 hours for the 5-year event) compared to the pond routing (24 minutes to 60 minutes). This discrepancy in time needs to be explained.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The detention facility routing calculations is based on the peak hour flows.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

8. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** During the 100-year storm event, the high water elevation in the pond is shown as EL 1058.92. Since the top of the outfall structure is at EL 1059.00, flow through the 1'x3' rectangular orifice will be impeded by the 2'x4' grate and any related support members.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The detention facility outlet structure and emergency spillway has been revised.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

9. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Appendix D shows storm sewer sizing calculations and inflow for inlets. The information provided should be verified to ensure that adequate flow is considered at all areas. One point of concern is that all inflow to HW 5 is considered from the contained area in the middle of the development. Since both EW 17 and EW 18 provide 25.8 CFS into the central area and HW 5 receives just 31 CFS, routing through this area needs to be discussed and total flow needs to be verified.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Headwater calculations for headwall 5 have been provided in Appendix D of Stormwater Management Plan narrative. The roadway elevation (top of embankment at headwall) is approximately 1085 and the adjacent lots (Lot no's 51 and 72) have minimum basement elevations of 1086. Therefore, in a worst-case scenario, if the storm sewer does not function at all, stormwater will discharge to roadway drainage system prior to impacting adjacent properties. Furthermore, a trash rack has been added to headwall 5 to mitigate the possibility of the storm sewer being obstructed.

HDR Response 2-16-10: The answer provided here is the same as provided for Comment No. 20 under the "General Land Development" responses. The answer did not address the previous review comment regarding the combination of the flows from headwalls No. 17 and No. 18 along with the flow collected throughout the wetlands area upstream of headwall No. 5. A discussion of how the flows combine in this area, along with why a smaller rainfall intensity is applied in the calculations, should be provided to verify that the inflow Q is 31.0 cfs as noted in the calculations.

10. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The sizing of the storm sewer at HW 5 should be large enough to ensure that all flow in the interior area will be passed, including any debris that may be carried along with this storm flow. If the pipe is not properly sized, it could become clogged at HW 5 and create a "pseudo-dam" which could flood adjacent properties. This situation must be avoided to avoid property losses and insurance claims.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Storm sewer headwall 5 has been appropriately sized and further discussed in previous item.

HDR Response 2-16-10: The response for No. 9 is not adequate to answer the impact to the properties. The use of a trash rack is not advisable. With no procedure in place for cleaning the trash rack, it will clog and cause backup of flow intended to enter headwall No. 5. Overflow on to the roadway and into catch basin inlets is not an acceptable alternative to providing an adequately sized pipe and inlet to ensure all storm flow enters the pipe at headwall No. 5.

11. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Flow into the 2'x4' grate on top of the outfall structure is not discussed in the submitted plan.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Flow into the top of the outlet structure is not considered in order to provide a more conservative design. All routed storms enter outlet structure through orifices and the emergency spillway is designed for the maximum peak flow with the outlet structure not functioning.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

12. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** No calculations have been provided for the emergency spillway.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Emergency spillway calculations are now provided.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

13. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The emergency spillway is not shown on the submitted drawings.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Emergency spillway is no provided on drawings.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Additional detail information is required for the emergency spillway. This additional information should show a section at the spillway to show the side slopes, information on the spillway lining (riprap mat and thickness), and cutoff wall.

14. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** A discussion should be provided for flow from roof drain collectors. Also, rip-rap should be provided at the outfall from the roof drain collectors.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Rip-rap is provided at discharge of roof drain collectors.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

15. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The submitted plan does not include uncontrolled flow volumes in the post-developed flow analysis, since all of the site does not flow in to the inlets shown on Drawing ID-1 yet will flow off the property site. This additional flow needs to be addressed.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Any uncontrolled runoff areas have been reduced substantially under post-development conditions.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

16. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Verify that the post-developed flow analysis includes the flow from Inlets 1 through 4 routed in to the detention pond.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Flow from inlets 1 through 4 is not conveyed to the detention facility.

HDR Response 2-16-10: The flow from Inlets No. 1 through 4 should be addressed as uncontrolled flow and added to the controlled flow from the detention basin to obtain the actual post-developed flow from the site.

Review of Post-Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) Plan

1. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Use of the rain garden/bio-retention facility needs to be approved by the Township since it is not in accordance with the Township's Ordinance.

Developer Response 2-01-10: We understand that this may need to be reviewed. However, as currently planned, a Homeowners Association and not The Township will own the proposed facility. Also, please note that the post-construction stormwater management (PCSM) plan has been approved by Allegheny County Conservation District and an NPDES permit has been issued.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Where is it noted that you have received approvals from the Allegheny County Conservation District and received an NPDES permit? This information is not evident in the submitted plan.

2. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Although the proposed facility is trying to provide for a BMP in a "sensitive natural resources" area, the need for this facility needs to be discussed with the Township prior to approval.

Developer Response 2-01-10: We understand that this may need to be reviewed. However, as currently planned, a Homeowners Association and not THE Township will own the proposed facility. Also, please note that the post-construction stormwater management (PCSM) plan has been approved by Allegheny County Conservation District and an NPDES permit has been issued.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Where is it noted that you have received approvals from the Allegheny County Conservation District and received an NPDES permit? This information is not evident in the submitted plan.

3. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The breakdown to 4 cover types for the developed condition (worksheet 4) needs to be discussed since it does not match with the Stormwater Management Plan calculations of CN.

Developer Response 2-01-10: As discussed in the stormwater management plan, a runoff coefficient number for ½ acre lots is used to provide a more conservative design. Therefore, the SWM plan is more conservative than the post-construction SWM plan.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

4. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Worksheet 4 states that a weighted CN value cannot be used for volume calculations, but that appears to be the calculation method used on the worksheet. This worksheet will need to be corrected before presentation to the Township.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Please note that the post-construction stormwater management plan has been approved by Allegheny County Conservation District and NPDES permit has been issued.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Where is it noted that you have received approvals from the Allegheny County Conservation District and received an NPDES permit? This information is not evident in the submitted plan.

5. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Explain why only 54 acres is used in this submittal for the developed condition versus the 60 acres used in the Stormwater Management Plan.

Developer Response 2-01-10: In the PCSM plan, protected environmentally sensitive areas and other credits are subtracted from gross site area.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

6. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The elevations shown in the Stormwater Management Plan do not match with the elevations shown for the rain garden/bio-retention facility. As shown, the rain garden will not be able to drain in to the outfall structure due to invert elevations. The rain garden sketch also shows the low-flow orifice occurring 1 foot above the planting level in the rain garden.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The elevations have been revised accordingly in the stormwater management plan. Note the low flow orifice is intended to be 1 foot higher than the planting area.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

7. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Some discussion should be provided that explains how this proposed rain garden/bio-retention facility will work with the previously strip mined property. A geotechnical report and/or recommendation of installation should be provided to ensure the proposed rain garden will function properly.

Developer Response 2-01-10: The geotechnical report shall address the rain garden / bio-retention facility – see next comment section.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

As submitted, these two documents need to be revised before the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan can receive approval and before the PCSM can be presented to the Township for consideration.

Geotechnical

HDR has reviewed the feasibility study represented by the Wright Engineering Services, LLC (WESL) two page letter dated August 28, 2008 and four drawings with the plan name of Princeton Place dated October 3, 2008. WESL's letter lists the borings, sections, coal mines, and prospective lot grading of a site on the border of two USGS quadrangles. A topo map with 4 borings illustrated indicates the section locations for the sections on 3 drawings.

HDR review comments / questions are as follows:

1. The letter does not reference a specific location and the topo map does not indicate a township location for the proposed development.
2. Besides coal mining, what is the site condition such as wooded, or fallow and the site's current use, etc.?
3. What were the site observations of the driller or engineer that are relative to the proposed development?
4. Were standard penetration tests and rock core drilling part of the test borings? Drilling method?
5. Were ground water observations made? Were samples of soil and rock recovered and tested?
6. Note that boring B-2 is illustrated above existing ground surface on Section B-B.
7. Coal mining and limited coal mine cover indicates that mine subsidence will be an issue to address for grading, drainage, and building foundations in a future report based on the analysis and recommendations.
 - a. Conditions of the mine and the mine spoil will determine appropriate remediating recommendations.
8. All recommendations must be supported by analysis of existing site conditions, based on testing of the soil and rock at the site. Recommendations must be illustrated on the site development drawings and supported by the site development specifications.
9. Also, the future submission of grading and drainage plans are expected to address among other things:
 - a. The "special consideration for the type of foundation" mentioned in the letter.
 - b. The erosion and sedimentation control plans and details.
 - c. The preparations of existing slopes for construction of stable embankments.
 - d. The control of drainage for surface runoff and subsurface ground water.
10. Also, the future submission of foundation plans, roads and utilities must incorporate the geotechnical investigation results in providing a safe and permanent development.

Developer Response 2-01-10:

Mr. Charles Richard (Dick) right of Wright Engineering passed away on Tuesday night, January 26th, 2010 at UPMC Presbyterian Hospital in Pittsburgh. As we are sure you understand, it will now be necessary for us to secure a new geotechnical engineer (or firm) to reconstruct Mr. Wright's report or complete a new study for this site. We have forwarded solicitations to several firms asking for their help at this point. As such, we would appreciate your patience in allowing us to provide this required information to the Township at a future date.

We understand that the Township can not provide approvals until this information is provided.

However, we wish to proceed with review of the other material in order to resolve any other issues that may still exist. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

HDR Response 2-16-10: No comments at this time. Additional comments will be issued at such time a new geotechnical reviewer is named and revisions are submitted.

Hydrology and Hydraulics

1. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** No output files have been included in the report.

Developer Response 2-01-10: All appropriate files are included with revised report.

HDR Response 2-16-10: It is unclear where the appropriate files for the design of the two new 60" culverts are provided in this resubmittal.

2. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** The drainage area (620 acres) is above the acceptable limit for the Rational Method (200 acres). TR-55 should be used for modeling a watershed of this size.

Developer Response 2-01-10: TR-55 worksheets are included with revised report.

HDR Response 2-16-10: No calculations seem to be provided to indicate how the flow at these road crossing culverts was determined.

3. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Manning's Equation and the Orifice Equation are not acceptable methods for modeling culvert hydraulics. The procedure contained in FHWA's Hydraulic Engineering Circulars No. 5, No. 10 and No. 13, and in Hydraulic Design Series No. 5 shall be used for the design of pipe culverts.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Revised calculations included in this report.

HDR Response 2-16-10: No calculations seem to be provided to indicate how the flow at these road crossing culverts was determined.

4. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Since culverts are set a two different slopes, they should be analyzed separately.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Culverts analyzed separately.

HDR Response 2-16-10: No calculations seem to be provided to indicate how the flow at these road crossing culverts was determined.

5. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Will wingwalls be installed at the inlet and outlets of the two culverts? If so, were they considered in the hydraulic modeling?

Developer Response 2-01-10: Wingwalls are not proposed at the culvert crossing, rip-rap protection is proposed at the intake and outfall. Please note this design is in accordance with PA DEP requirements and subject to BDWM GP-7 permit from PA DEP.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

6. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Include design headwater elevation on the stream enclosure drawings.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Headwall elevation on stream enclosure drawings included in revised report.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

7. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Include design floodplain limits on the plan view drawing.

Developer Response 2-01-10: See note 4 of “Plan Notes” In addition, I have attached a copy of the Firmette for this area.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

8. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Include calculations for the R-7 riprap protection at the culvert outlet.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Rip-rap outlet protection sizing is included in revised report.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted. Although, No calculations seem to be provided to indicate how the flow at these road crossing culverts was determined.

9. **HDR Comment 6-16-09:** Include photographs of the existing culvert and site location upstream and downstream of the proposed culvert.

Developer Response 2-01-10: Photographs of existing culvert included accordingly.

HDR Response 2-16-10: Resolution accepted.

Ms. Budner said the application, in its present condition, cannot be accurately reviewed for the purposes of Preliminary Approval. The applicant should successfully address all of our comments contained herein prior to any recommendation being given by the Planning Commission. If you would like to discuss this matter, or have any questions regarding our findings, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Owens asked if anyone had any further questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked the Board for a motion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO REJECT THE APPLICATION FOR PRINCETON PLACE PLAN OF LOTS AS ADMINISTRATIVELY INCOMPLETE BASED ON THE COMMENTS OF Mr. TEMPLE AND Ms. BUDNER.

ROLL CALL:	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES

- 2. Application 2008-06 – Bright Oaks PRD, Phase 1** – Re-approval of application for final PRD land development and subdivision approval for 3 apartment buildings to consist of 90 units on 66.6401 acres of land located adjacent to North Branch Road on Old Mill Road and Rolling Road in a PRD Zoning District.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

No representative was present.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Temple.

Mr. Temple made the following comments:

1. This is a revised application for final PRD land development and subdivision approval for 3 apartment buildings to consist of 90 units on 66.6401 acres of land located adjacent to North Branch Road on Old Mill Road and Rolling Road in an PRD Zoning District.
2. This plan was previously recommend for approval by the Planning Commission on May 20, 2008 and subsequently the Board of Supervisors on June 24, 2008 approved the plan contingent upon the Developers Agreement, Stormwater Maintenance Agreement and Road Improvement Agreement being executed and financial security being posted to the satisfaction of the Township Solicitor.
3. A revised plan that had Old Mill Road (entrance road) moved east on North Branch Road approximately 163 feet to minimize the impact on environmental concerns from PA DEP was recommend for approval by the Planning Commission on February 17, 2009 and subsequently the Board of Supervisors on March 10, 2009 approved the plan contingent upon the Developers Agreement, Stormwater Maintenance Agreement and Road Improvement Agreement being executed and financial security being posted to the satisfaction of the Township Solicitor and all governmental permits being issued for the project.
4. On July 15, 2009 the DEP Issued the Water Obstruction and Encroachment Permit for the site. The only change on this revised plan is some slight grading changes that was a requirement on the DEP Permit.
5. The tentative approval granted on December 11, 2007 required the following information to be submitted, this information has all been submitted previously:

- A. Prior to the submission of any Plan for Final Approval of all or any phase of the development, the applicant must submit to the Township for its approval an amended Plan for Tentative Approval (“Amended Plan”) conforming to the conditions of this Decision.
 - B. At the time the application for final approval of Phase One is submitted, a development outline must be included and updated annually for the remained of the development.
 - C. In order to enhance buffering and to foster a harmonious relationship between the Bright Oaks Plan and the adjacent Stonebridge Plan, the applicant’s Amended Plan shall show no disturbance (grading, clearing, improvements) of any kind located within the required thirty five (35) foot bufferyard A.
 - D. In order to enhance buffering and to foster a harmonious relationship between the Bright Oaks Plan and the adjacent Stonebridge Plan, the applicant’s Amended Plan shall show at a minimum an additional twenty five (25) foot bufferyard B along all parking areas to the east for buildings 3, 4, 5 & 7.
 - E. In order to enhance buffering and to foster a harmonious relationship between the Bright Oaks Plan and the adjacent residential property at the entrance, the applicant’s Amended Plan shall show a thirty five (35) foot bufferyard A along the recreational area.
 - F. In order to enhance buffering and to foster a harmonious transition between the Bright Oaks Plan and the adjacent Stonebridge Plan, the applicant’s Amended Plan shall rotate Building #4 clockwise to pull the south corner farther away from the property line to the satisfaction of the Township.
 - G. In a form suitable for recording with the plat, any covenants, grants of easements, rights of way or other restrictions to be imposed on the use of the land and structures.
 - H. Provisions for the maintenance, ownership and operation of common open spaces, common recreation facilities and other improvements.
6. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer.
 7. Refer to any comments from the Solicitor.
 8. I have no additional comments.

Section 605.3. Final Approval clearly states; If the application for final approval has been filed with all drawings, specifications, other required documents in accordance with this Ordinance, and the official written communication of Tentative Approval, the Township Planning Commission shall recommend approval of said application to the Township Board of Supervisors. The Township Board of Supervisors shall, within forty-five (45) days of the filing of the application with the Township Planning Commission, grant such Development Plan final approval.

Mr. Temple said the Planning Commission so desires they could recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors contingent upon the Developers Agreement, Stormwater Maintenance Agreement and Road Improvement Agreement being executed and financial security being posted to the satisfaction of the Township Solicitor.

Mr. Owens asked if anyone had any further questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked the Board for a motion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND RE-APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR FINAL PRD LAND DEVELOPMENT AND SUBDIVISION OF BRIGHT OAKS PRD, PHASE 1.

ROLL CALL:	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES

COMMENTS:

Mr. Owens asked if anyone had any comments about anything. There were none.

ADJOURNMENT:

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, AND CARRIED, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:37 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Cherico
Planning Commission Secretary