

**NORTH FAYETTE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2016  
7:30 P.M.**

The meeting was called to order with Chairman David Cosnek presiding.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

David Cosnek, Chairman  
Charles Kyle, Vice Chairman  
Bill Fitzgerald, Board Member  
Fred Lutz, Board Member  
Bob Owens, Board Member  
Tom McDermott, Township Solicitor  
Shawn Wingrove, EIT  
Laura Ludwig, Township Community Development Director  
Debbie Midgley, Recording Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Sara Moore, Moore Design Associates  
Dan Sleva, Ladani Ukani Hospitality  
Jessica Scultz, Ladani Ukani Hospitality  
Sam Patel, Ladani Ukani Hospitality  
Jason Kambitsis, A.R. Building Company/ Bright Oaks  
Geoff Campbell, Rothschild Doyno Collaborative  
Kimberly Gales-Dunn, J.R. Gales & Associates

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

A motion was made by Mr. Bill Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. Bob Owens, to approve the minutes from the January 19, 2016 meeting. Motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **Application 2016-01 – Comfort Inn Land Development Plan** – An application for preliminary and final non-residential land development involving the construction of a 13,320 square foot hotel with 89 rooms on 2.569 acres of land located at/adjacent to 7011 Steubenville Pike in a B-2 General Business Zoning District.

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

Sara Moore from Moore Design Associates approached the Board.

Ms. Moore gave a brief overview of the project, discussing the location along Steubenville Pike and the adjacent existing Quality Inn hotel and Tonidale Restaurant, as well as the overall concept for the proposed new Comfort Inn & Suites. She also presented on the general site layout and design, noting specifically the request submitted for the bufferyard deviation. Ms. Moore stated that they intend to plant the required bufferyard, with the exception of where the access drive and parking spots encroach into the buffer. She stated they will be able to meet the 75% requirement under the conditional use. She noted there are several encroachments including the access drive, some sections of parking spaces, and the utilities.

There was a general discussion on the proposed stormwater management for the site, including keeping some of the existing swales that are already present and that are functioning properly.

Ms. Moore said there is an existing pipe about 45 feet down, located in the rear of the property. She said it was likely put in there prior to the fill and the manhole was brought up to grade.

Ms. Moore said the storm water management concept was to connect the storm outlet into that pipe as it has been reduced by the required ordinance. She said she thinks she has a different alternative that Jen from her office has talked to Mr. Wingrove about. That plan is to leave the pipe as is and treat it with bio swales instead. She said they have big gravel bio swales running along the property. She said their work on that underway and those calculations will be submitted for review once completed, likely within the next few days. She said they just had a preliminary conversation about the alternative method with Mr. Wingrove at this point.

Ms. Moore asked if there were any other big outstanding items in the Planning Commission's opinion.

Ms. Ludwig said the only other item was in relation to the sidewalk waiver. She said they need to provide the cost estimate.

Ms. Moore answered yes.

Ms. Ludwig said that needs to be reviewed by the Township Engineer so the Township can establish what the fee in lieu of amount is going to be. She said the Planning Commission can only recommend to grant the waiver provided that the fee in lieu be paid. She said at this time they do not know what that number is.

Ms. Moore said yes, they can do that.

The Board reviewed the comments made by Ms. Ludwig and Mr. Wingrove.

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments.

I have reviewed the application filed for land development and my comments are as follows:

1. This is an application for preliminary and final non-residential land development involving the construction of a 13,320 square foot hotel with 89 rooms on 2.569 acres of land located at/adjacent to 7011 Steubenville Pike in a B-2 General Business Zoning District.
2. On November 19, 2015, the Township's Zoning Hearing Board granted three (3) variances related to this proposed development, including variances concerning the surface parking area interior landscape islands, surface parking area shading, and the minimum number of parking spaces. Please see the enclosed letter from the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor dated November 20, 2015 concerning the variances granted for the proposed development.
3. The applicant has submitted a request for two waivers from the Township's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, Chapter 22 of the Township's Code of Ordinances, Ordinance No. 418, as follows:
  - Section 307 which requires that a Phase One Environmental Assessment be completed. The applicant notes that they have provided the PNDI review and a Geotechnical Report in their request for a waiver of this particular requirement.
  - Section 404.2. which requires sidewalks to be installed along all street frontages for all land development projects. The applicant has stated they will provide the required fee in lieu associated with the sidewalk waiver. They must submit a cost estimate for the sidewalk that will be reviewed and approved by the Township Engineer to determine the fee in lieu for this.
4. The applicant has submitted a separate application related to this proposed development which is a conditional use application to deviate from the bufferyard requirements to allow access drives, parking spaces, and utilities within the bufferyard between the existing Quality Inn and the proposed Comfort Inn. Please refer to my review letter on the conditional use dated February 15, 2016 for more detail on this particular issue.
5. To access the public sewer system, the applicant has proposed to connect to the sewer system of the Municipal Authority of the Township of Robinson (MATR). North Fayette does not currently have any sanitary sewer lines or manholes servicing the area near and around the proposed site. The existing Quality Inn adjacent to the site is serviced by MATR. The applicant has prepared a sewage facilities planning module that is currently under review by the Township Engineer. While there are not any North Fayette sewers near the site, the site does appear to be located in the ALCOSAN sewershed service area according to our mapping files, which may pose a concern and at the least may delay an approval of the planning module.
6. Based on the resubmittal provided by the applicant on February 12, 2016, several items appear to have been cleaned up and addressed from LSSE's original review letter, including the provision of an infrastructure demand statement and the buildable area analysis.
7. There are several third party items which are pending or outstanding, including the E&S and NPDES items from the Allegheny County Conservation District as well as the posting of the bond and preparation of the agreements, which typically are part of a contingent approval.

8. There are still several items to be addressed related to stormwater management, including the provision of necessary calculations to show capacity to support the projected flows.
9. A copy of the application and plans was forwarded to the Planning Division of the Allegheny County Department of Economic Development (ACDED) for their review and comment. No comments have been received to date from ACDED.
10. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer in LSSE's review letters dated February 5, 2016 and February 16, 2016.
11. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.
12. Please note: the applicant is responsible for all engineering, legal, and other related review fees associated with this application and if the escrow deposit is depleted, they will be billed for any remaining fees owed and asked to replenish the escrow account.

At this time, there are several items that still need to be resolved, particularly related to stormwater management of the site and also the sewage facilities planning. It is my recommendation that the application be rejected as administratively incomplete. The applicant can provide a resubmittal for the March Planning Commission meeting. Resubmittals are due no later than March 1<sup>st</sup> for the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Ludwig made some additional comments.

Ms. Ludwig said that Ms. Moore touched on most of the main points, particularly the stormwater related items. She said hopefully they have a better plan and that she will leave it to Shawn to talk in more detail as to what he is looking for in terms of calculations to support the stormwater flows. Ms. Ludwig said hopefully that will be adequate.

Ms. Ludwig also commented on the sanitary sewers for the site. She said she knows the Township is trying to find the agreement for the sewer stuff. She said hopefully that can be located soon, so the Township will do what they can on their end for that. She said she will let Ms. Moore know if the Township would need any help or assistance from her in terms of finding those records. She said that Ms. Moore has some typical third party outstanding items at this point. The E&S approval and the NPDES approval from the Conservation District and obviously posting bonds and finalizing agreements. Ms. Ludwig said her recommendation at this time is to reject the application as administratively incomplete. She said that Ms. Moore would need to come back next month with a full resubmittal addressing the additional stormwater requirements and hopefully come to terms on the issue with the sewers and have that resolved. She said that once they have all the items cleaned up for next month, they should be in good shape. Ms. Ludwig said she had no more additional comments.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments.

We have completed our review of the above referenced Land Development Plan Application, dated January 19, 2016, last revised February 12, 2016, prepared by Moore Design Associates, as received by our office February 12, 2016. The plan proposes the construction of a hotel on 2.569

acres. The property at the intersection of Bayer Road and Steubenville Pike (S.R. 3066) and is Zoned B-2 – General Business District.

The following listing presents unresolved/non-compliant items identified during our review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 27), Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22), Grading Ordinance (Chapter 9) and Stormwater Management Ordinance (Chapter 19):

Zoning

1. The Ordinance requires Bufferyard B to be planted for all uses within B-2 Districts adjoining any B Districts. (Section 206.3.) **Previous Comment:** *The applicant has submitted a conditional use application to allow a modified bufferyard including the encroachment of parking spaces.* **Status: Pending.**
2. The Ordinance requires access drive entering State highways be subject to issuance of a Highway Occupancy Permit, issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. (Section 303.E.) **Previous Comment:** *Provide documentation than an HOP has been issued for the proposed utility work in the PennDOT right-of-way.* **Status: The response letter indicates Columbia Gas and Western Allegheny County Municipal Authority will be providing utility work HOP as part of the service extension. Pending.**

Major Land Development

1. The Ordinance requires a Completion Bond in the amount of 110% of the cost of the required improvements. (Sections 208.) **Previous Comment:** *An itemized quantity takeoff and unit price cost estimate has not been provided for review. The cost estimate will aid in the determination of the required Completion Bond amount.* **Status: No change.**
2. The Ordinance requires the Developer execute a Development Agreement. (Section 209.) **Previous Comment:** *The Developer must contact the Solicitor to initiate the preparation of the Development Agreement.* **Status: Pending.**
3. The Ordinance requires a Phase One Environmental Site Assessment. (Section 307.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status: The applicant has requested a waiver in the preparation of the Phase One Environmental Site Assessment.**
4. The Ordinance requires a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. (Section 318.) **Previous Comment:** *Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed, deemed adequate by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD), and that the NPDES Permit has been issued have not been provided.* **Status: Pending.**
5. The Ordinance requires that each lot be served by public sanitary sewers approved by the PADEP (Section 402.). **Previous Comment:** *Provide documentation that a sewage facilities planning module has been approved for the site. Additionally, the plan proposes connection to the MATR sanitary sewer system, however the subject site is tributary to*

**ALCOSAN. Status: Item pending documentation from Township on which entity is to treat the proposed flow from this development.**

6. The Ordinance requires sidewalks be provided along all street frontages for all land developments. (Section 404.2.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided. The applicant has requested a waiver to pay the fee in lieu of installing sidewalks.* **Status: Pending.**

#### Stormwater Management

1. The Ordinance requires one or more typical cross sections of proposed channels or other open drainage facilities, showing the high water elevations expected from the 100-year storm under the controlled conditions. (Sections 403.B.(14).) **Previous Comment:** *The cross sections for the Bio-Swales do not include the high water elevations expected from the 100-year storm.* **Status: No change..**
2. The Ordinance requires certification and seal of the registered professional engineer responsible for the preparation of the plan. (Sections 403.B.(16).) **Previous Comment:** *The Stormwater Management Report and plans have been sealed by a professional landscape architect.* **Status: The response letter indicates a Professional Engineer seal will be added to the final report and plans. Pending.**
3. The Ordinance requires all calculations, assumptions and criteria used in the design of the storm sewer system and detention facilities. (Sections 403.C.(1).) **Previous Comment:** *Routing calculations for the post-development conditions route the entire site area, except for the Uncontrolled Area, through the proposed detention tank, however, a portion of the flow entering Inlet 3 is discharged to the BioSwale and does not reach the detention tank. Provide calculations for each design storm event that demonstrate the discharge to each the BioSwale and the underground tank will be with revised peak rate routing calculations based on these numbers.* **Status: No change. The responses letter indicates that revised calculations will be provided.**
4. The Ordinance requires all calculations, assumptions and criteria used in the design of the storm sewer system and detention facilities. (Sections 403.C.(1).) **Previous Comment:** *Provide calculations that demonstrate that adequate erosion control exists or is proposed at the existing outfall.* **Status: The response letter indicates new computations will be provided. Pending.**
5. The Ordinance requires all drainage facilities shall be designed to contain the energy gradeline for the peak flow rate for the design storm within the structures and pipes. Swales and channels shall provide at least 1 foot of freeboard above the energy gradeline. (Sections 403.C.(2).) **Previous Comment:** *Calculations for the proposed swales have not been provided.* **Status: Calculations have been provided, however, appear to be based on PADEP's E&S Manual for channel design for the 10-year event. Channels must be designed to convey the 100-year storm design storm event.**
6. The Ordinance requires the 1-, 2-, 5-, 10-, 25- 50- and 100-year design storm frequencies to be used for analysis of runoff. (Sections 502.B.(1).) **Previous Comment:** *Analysis of the 1- and 50- year design storms has not been submitted. Also, the rainfall depths used*

*in the report do not match those required by Ordinance. Status: Analysis of each design storm has now been provided, however, the plan now proposes an increase in peak rate of runoff for the 100-year design storm.*

7. The Ordinance requires design of stormwater conveyance structures be consistent with the design of other stormwater management facilities. (Sections 601.3.B.) **Previous Comment:** *The stormwater conveyance system has been designed for the 50-year design storm. Stormwater facilities conveying flow to the underground detention tank must be sized for the 100-year storm event. Provide calculations that the existing 24” pipe that the detention tank connects to has capacity to convey the anticipated flow. Status: The narrative indicates that the 50-year design storm was used. Provide additional information regarding the calculations used to determine the anticipated flow in the conveyance system (ie, runoff coefficients and rainfall intensities used). Calculations for the existing 24” pipe have not been provided.*
8. The Ordinance requires the discharge of stormwater be to a well-defined drainage course. (Sections 801.G) **Previous Comment:** *The plan proposes discharge of the primary outlet pipe onto an adjacent property. Provide documentation of a recorded drainage easement. Status: No change. The response letter indicates additional deed research is currently being completed to determine the limits of the drainage easement.*
9. The Ordinance requires a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement be signed and recorded. (Section 803.3.A.) **Previous Comment:** *A copy of the signed and recorded Stormwater Maintenance Agreement has not been provided. The applicant should contact the Township Solicitor regarding the agreement. Status: Pending.*
10. The Ordinance requires payment to the Stormwater Facility Maintenance Fund for privately owned and maintained facilities. (Sections 803.4.1.a. and 902.3.) **Previous Comment:** *The amount of the Fund contribution will be determined upon approval of the plan. Status: Pending.*

The plans have been reviewed for conformance to the Township Ordinance standards only. The review is based on surveys and drawings prepared by others and assume this information is correct and valid as submitted. Independent confirmation of adequacy or applicability of surveys, design data or procedures has not been provided.

The plan, as submitted, does not conform to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 27), Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22) and Stormwater Management Ordinance. Additional comments may be made, and we reserve the right to comment further pending submission of revised plans.

The Applicant must provide a detailed written response to each item noted in this letter along with the plan re-submittal.

Mr. Wingrove made some additional comments.

Mr. Wingrove said Ms. Ludwig hit most of the items that are under land development. He said he talked to Jen from Moore Design Associates a little bit about conceptually how they want to tweak

the stormwater for the site but that he has not seen a new report yet. Mr. Wingrove said there are a handful of loose ends to tie up there. He said nothing that can't be fixed over the next month or so as Ms. Ludwig mentioned all the loose ends can be tied up. Mr. Wingrove said a resubmittal of a stormwater plan is necessary so that he can review and hopefully issue a clean letter for consideration next month.

Ms. Ludwig said she wanted to discuss the waiver on the Phase One Environmental, as it sounds like the Planning Commission is leaning toward formalizing the work Ms. Moore has already completed into some sort of Phase One analysis to submit. Ms. Ludwig suggested dropping that waiver request for next month and putting her work together into a more formal report to meet that requirement.

Mr. Cosnek asked as far as the sidewalk waiver is that something the Planning Commission should act on this evening or do everything together.

Ms. Ludwig recommended to wait until the following month and to do everything together.

Mr. Cosnek asked if there were any comments from the floor.

Hearing none, Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to reject the application as administratively incomplete at this time.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BOB OWENS, SECONDED BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, AND CARRIED TO REJECT APPLICATION 2016-01 – COMFORT INN LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS ADMINISTRATIVELY INCOMPLETE.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

Ms. Ludwig said Ms. Moore's resubmittal of the application is due two weeks prior to the March meeting, but noted the sooner the application is submitted the better. She suggested to take what time is needed to prepare the additional items.

Ms. Moore responded ok.

Ms. Ludwig said technically the date would be March 1, 2016 to resubmit for the March 15, 2016 meeting.

- 2. Application 2016-02 CU – Conditional Use Application for Deviation from Bufferyard Requirements** (Section 206.3.B. of the Zoning Ordinance) - Application for conditional use for bufferyard deviations to allow parking spaces, access drives, and utilities to encroach into the required Bufferyard B associated with the land development of the Comfort Inn at/ adjacent to 7011 Steubenville Pike in a B-2 General Business Zoning District.

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

Sara Moore from Moore Design Associates approached the Board.

Ms. Moore said the bufferyard is shown on the plans as the dash line. She said as you can see in the bufferyard primarily adjacent to the existing Quality Inn, there are access points into the parking lot as well as the loading area and the utilities. She said the actual property line is the overhead power line, so by definition it is a utility easement. Ms. Moore said there are utilities that cross over that, including the sanitary sewer that crosses over and into it as well. Ms. Moore said there are also parking spaces that encroach in part in the bufferyard.

Ms. Moore said even though they have all these encroachments into the bufferyard, they will still be able to meet the 75% planting requirement for the required bufferyard. Ms. Moore said they made a chart to illustrate how they will meet the ordinance as to what is required landscape wise. Ms. Moore said they compacted all of the landscape in the green areas that they had in order to provide the required plantings. Ms. Moore said that they are actually exceeding the area for green space, because there is a large steep slope that goes down to where the sanitary sewer line is.

Ms. Ludwig asked Ms. Moore to clarify that the only bufferyard in question is along the lot line shared with existing Quality Inn and that the rest of the bufferyard around the site would meet the requirements.

Ms. Moore said they actually are planting the required bufferyard along the whole perimeter of the property.

Ms. Ludwig restated her question, asking if the only in the bufferyard are along that shared buffer line. She said she wanted to clarify where the deviation is concerned in regards to this application and that it is just that shared lot line.

Ms. Moore said with the exception of water and sewer, perpendicular through. She said but that is just a service line.

Ms. Ludwig said that is correct.

Ms. Moore said the power line is the property line here. She said so by definition it is already in the buffer area. Ms. Moore said they were able to meet the landscape requirements.

Ms. Moore asked if there were any more questions.

The Board reviewed the comments made by Ms. Ludwig.

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments.

I have reviewed the conditional use application and my comments are as follows:

1. This is an application for a conditional use to deviate from the bufferyard requirements associated with the proposed Tonidale Comfort Inn Land Development application.

2. The applicant is applying for a conditional use to deviate from the bufferyard requirements as outlined in the Township's Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 27 of the Township's Code of Ordinances, Ordinance No. 418, to allow parking spaces, access drives, and utilities to encroach into the required Bufferyard B on the lot line adjoining the existing Quality Inn. The applicant will still be planting the required bufferyard with landscaping including trees 15 feet apart and including a mix of 30% deciduous and 70% evergreen trees. The applicant plans to install evergreen trees 6 foot in height and will install the evergreen hedge 2.5 on center to grow into a 4 foot lower level shrub to screen parking.
3. Since the applicant is not asking for full relief from planting one of the required bufferyards and is instead asking to deviate from the requirements slightly, this does not require a variance from the Township's Zoning Hearing Board and is instead considered a conditional use deviation that can be granted by the Township's Board of Supervisors. Specifically, Section 27-206.3.F. of the Township's Zoning Ordinance states, "Deviations from the requirements of subsection .3, Appendix 27-A and/or Table 27-5 of this Chapter shall be permitted only as a conditional use in accordance with requirements of Section 27-703.BBB. of this Chapter."
4. Section 27-703.BBB. of the Zoning Ordinance states that modifications to a bufferyard shall be a permitted conditional use provided that a minimum of 75% of each type of plant (tree, shrub, and groundcover) required within the standard bufferyard for the development shall be planted within the modified bufferyard area. Based on the landscape plan provided with the land development application for the proposed Comfort Inn, the applicant is able and must meet this 75% requirement.

At this time, the application for the conditional use to deviate from the bufferyard requirements is complete. The Planning Commission must make two recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concerning the application. The first would be to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to set a public hearing date to review the application. The second would be to recommend a motion on the conditional use bufferyard deviation. It is my recommendation that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the conditional use bufferyard deviation to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Ludwig made some additional comments.

Ms. Ludwig said she did provide a review letter to sort of explain why this isn't a variance and is a conditional use deviation. It is just the way the ordinance is written. She said if you would want full relief from the bufferyard requirements then it would be a variance under the Zoning Hearing Board. She said the one condition that they must meet for this conditional use deviation is that the bufferyard in question needs to at least meet 75% of the required planting requirements. Ms. Ludwig said the applicant meets that requirement, as Ms. Moore has already noted. Ms. Ludwig said she doesn't think there are any issues there. Ms. Ludwig said since this is a conditional use, the Township will have to have a public hearing on it to move forward with that process. Ms. Ludwig said the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors would be to set the public hearing date. Ms. Ludwig said the second recommendation to the Board of Supervisors would be to approve or deny the application.

Mr. Cosnek asked Mr. Wingrove if he had any comments.

Mr. Wingrove said he had nothing further.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors schedule a public hearing.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the Application for Conditional Use Bufferyard deviation.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE APPLICATION 2016-02 CU – CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR DEVIATION FROM THE BUFFERYARD REQUIREMENTS.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

- 3. Application 2015-26 PRD – Bright Oaks Revised PRD Tentative Approval (3<sup>rd</sup> Revision)** – Application for revised tentative approval of a Planned Residential Development (PRD) for 66.6401 acres of land to consist of 200 apartment units and 44 townhome units located in 5 apartment buildings, 44 townhomes, a clubhouse, and 40.2537 acres of preserved open space along North Branch Road in a R-2 Suburban Residential/PRD Zoning District.

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

Ms. Gales from J.R. Gales & Associates approached the Board.

Ms. Gales said to Ms. Ludwig that she had not yet received a copy of Ms. Ludwig's letter.

Ms. Ludwig apologized and said that she sent it earlier that day.

Ms. Gales said she had left her office and must have missed it.

Ms. Ludwig said there wasn't anything earth shattering in the review letter, nothing they haven't discussed over the telephone.

Ms. Gales said this is pretty much the same plan that they brought before the Board the last time. They changed it basically to meet the requirements of the 30 feet between the buildings. She said (pointing to the plans) this is the first pond as you enter in off to the right on Old Mill Road. She said they are requesting the 44 townhouse units. She said they do exceed the parking requirements by a minimum of 3. She said when they spoke last time some of the units will have the option of having tandem parking inside. She said everyone will have a 1 car garage and 1 outside parking space. She said they have an existing connection for sanitary sewer that runs through the property. She said storm sewers, everything works. She said they are only here for tentative approval. She said the storm water management pond that exists will be able to handle this additional impervious area. She said she wanted to address one of the big questions she read in the minutes from the last meeting, noting that the open space did increase. She said the reason being now that this property is taken away from the Trust. She said the old lot line used to come across here and so they were retaining this. She said there really is no reason for them to retain this triangular area (pointing to the plan). She said they are giving the Township 20 foot sanitary sewer easement up to the old Iron Gate property if that were ever to be developed. She said that flow could come down this way instead being forced the other way into the wetlands. She said she would assume the Trust would want that. She said it doesn't really matter one way or another to them. She said she thinks it gives a smoother flow and would give a little bit of lenience on how they design sanitary sewer coming down and then someone could just tie right into the sanitary sewer from the roadway. She said there are other sewers in Phase 1. She said other than that they are here asking for the modification. She said their architect Geoff Campbell is here. She said the modification is for the width of the units to be 16 feet vs. the required 20 feet. She said the end units will be 22 ½ feet wide.

Ms. Gales asked if there were any questions.

The Board reviewed the comments made by Ms. Ludwig and Mr. Wingrove.

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments.

I have reviewed the application submitted for revised tentative PRD approval and my comments are as follows:

1. This is an application for a revised tentative approval of a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on 66.6401 acres of land to consist of 200 apartment units and 44 townhome units located in 5 apartment buildings, 44 townhomes, a clubhouse, and 40.3447 acres of preserved open space along North Branch Road / Old Mill Road (the Bright Oaks apartment community) in an R-2 Suburban Residential/ PRD Overlay Zoning District.
2. Please note that this is the third revision to the overall approved Tentative PRD for Bright Oaks. Bright Oaks' first revision to the PRD was approved in 2011 for a total of five (5) buildings and 200 units. A second revision to the Bright Oaks PRD was approved by the

Township Board of Supervisors on April 28, 2015 for a final 6<sup>th</sup> building that was to consist of a maximum of 45 total units, bringing the total number of units in the Bright Oaks community to 245 units. A copy of the April 28, 2015 written decision from the Board is enclosed with this letter. The original PRD approval from December 11, 2007 limited the total number of units to be constructed at 270.

3. The applicant has requested one modification as part of the third revision to the PRD. The modification requested concerns the minimum building width of the townhomes. Section 205.3. and 607.2.D. of the Township's Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 27 of the Township's Code of Ordinances, Ordinance No. 418, requires a minimum 20 foot width for townhomes. The applicant has submitted a modification request to have a minimum width of 16 feet for the interior units. The end units will be 22 feet wide. Personally and from a land use planning perspective, I do not have an issue with the modification requested. I do not understand the full reasoning as to why we have this requirement in our zoning ordinance. It is not a common requirement across the board in terms of overall zoning nor am I aware of any engineering purpose behind the minimum required width. I think it is just a matter of preference. I do realize we have an ordinance to uphold and if we require 20 feet, than townhomes should be built at 20 feet wide. Other localities do not have a required minimum width for townhomes. As you know, I did do a little research on this topic and emailed my findings to the Planning Commission members on December 11, 2015. I have enclosed a copy of that email and the attachments with this letter.
4. In regard to the proposed open space and conservation area, the last time I spoke with Sean Brady from the Hollow Oak Land Trust, he still had some work to do on his end but it seemed as if the conservation easement agreement between Bright Oaks and Hollow Oak was moving forward. To the best of my knowledge, the delays were on Sean's end and not on Bright Oaks'. We need to ask Bright Oaks for an update on the status of this agreement at the meeting. I did reach out to Sean Brady again today via email for an update. Before moving forward and approving another revision to the PRD, this is something that the Township would need to see executed prior to the granting of any additional revisions to the overall PRD.
5. There were some questions back in November concerning the overall open space acreage amount on site. I promised the Planning Commission I would do some research on this. According to past written decisions by the Board, the original approval from 2007 had a total 9 buildings, 270 units, a clubhouse, and 41.6593 acres of open space. The May 10, 2011 revision to the original PRD included 200 units, 5 buildings, a clubhouse, and 46.24 acres of open space. The April 28, 2015 second revision to the PRD included 6 buildings, 245 units, a clubhouse, and 34.9877 acres of open space. The proposed third revision lists the open space at 40.3447 acres. I have asked LSSE to prepare an analysis of the open space provided in the current and previous versions of the plans so that we can get to the bottom of what is proposed and how it went up from the switch from a 6<sup>th</sup> building to townhomes. Moving forward, the open space must be at least 34.9877 per the Board of Supervisors' April 28, 2015 decision. If the open space increases as a result of the current proposed third revision, that is certainly permissible. It is important to note, however, that the amount of open space provided cannot decrease from 34.9877 acres as most recently approved on April 28, 2015.

6. It is my understanding that the applicant has reached out to the Stonebridge Homeowner's Association seeking their input and consensus in support of this latest revision. I would like to see something in writing, preferably on Stonebridge HOA letterhead, noting they support the change from the previously approved building #6 to 44 townhome units. I would also like Bright Oaks to reach out to the folks that live directly in front of Phase 3 on North Branch to seek their input on the project and the proposed change to townhomes.
7. A copy of the application and plans was forwarded to the Planning Division of the Allegheny County Department of Economic Development (ACDED) for their review and comment. No comments have been received to date from ACDED.
8. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer per LSSE's most recent review letter dated February 11, 2016.
9. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.
10. Please note: the applicant is responsible for all engineering, legal, and other related review fees associated with this application and if the escrow deposit is depleted, they will be billed for any remaining fees owed and asked to replenish the escrow account.
11. At this time, the revised tentative PRD application filed by Bright Oaks LP is complete, pending the finalization of the conservation easement between Hollow Oak and Bright Oaks. I recommend that the Planning Commission make three recommendations to the Board of Supervisors this evening.

The first recommendation is to recommend that a public hearing date be set for the revised tentative PRD application. The second motion concerns whether to approve or deny the modification request concerning the townhome width. The third motion would be whether to approve or deny the overall application to revise the tentative PRD, likely with certain conditions, including that the conservation easement between Hollow Oak and Bright Oaks be finalized and that the subdivision plan is submitted for final approval.

Ms. Ludwig made some additional comments.

Ms. Ludwig said she did supply a letter dated yesterday. She apologized she forgot to submit it to Ms. Gales via email and once she realized that she never sent it, she emailed it right away. She said she did send it out late but had spoken to Ms. Gales by phone. Ms. Ludwig said there were a few items she wanted to confirm. She said it seems like the open space number is 40.3447 acres. Ms. Ludwig said that Ms. Gales provided a nice analysis on the overall sight plan. Based on that analysis, Ms. Ludwig said that she thinks there are 6 parcels total of open space throughout, one very large one and then several smaller ones. She said the 40.3447 acres is the new number. Ms. Ludwig stated that she asked Mr. Wingrove to verify that number in CAD. She said that Mr. Wingrove did say it was roughly around 40 acres based on his analysis. Ms. Ludwig said the open space issue seems to be resolved now.

Ms. Ludwig said her one other comment is that the Township did receive a draft of the Conservation Easement Agreement that will be between the Hollow Oak Land Trust and AR Building. She said that it is moving forward. She noted that she hasn't looked through the whole

20 page document yet. She said one of the first things, again is that open space number. The open space number in the agreement will need to be revised to match the plans.

Ms. Gales said they can give Mr. Wingrove a computer printout of the actuary.

Ms. Ludwig said that she thinks they may have had an older version. She said that some of the steps moving forward is definitely trying to get that done and whatever the Township needs to do to help with that, she will help. Ms. Ludwig said she will review it and provide comments to Jason and Sean from Hollow Oak. . She said wanted to note that the conservation easement seems to be moving forward now, which was a huge issue for the folks at Stonebridge. She said the Stonebridge HOA doesn't necessarily care whether townhomes or a 6th apartment building is built. She said they just really want that open space to be open space so moving forward it cannot be developed. She said that does seem to be moving forward.

Ms. Ludwig said her only other comments concern the width of the townhomes and whether or not the Board feels comfortable or not granting such a modification. She said she knows some have mixed feelings on that, but overall that is their decision to make based on their comfortability level and wishes to uphold the ordinance. She said that is really all she has at this point moving forward to keep this going. She said now that some of the outstanding issues have been addressed that the Planning Commission would make a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to set a public hearing date. She said so that the application can be moved forward to the public hearing process. She said that is the next step in the overall PRD application process. She said and then obviously making a recommendation on whether to approve or deny that modification request. She said they would make a third motion on the actual application this evening.

Mr. McDermott said that is at the Boards discretion.

Ms. Ludwig said those are the three things that need to be done.

Mr. McDermott said that the Board of Supervisors would want your ultimate recommendation before the public hearing.

Mr. Cosnek said that is what is on the application for tentative approval.

Mr. McDermott said yes of the overall application.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments.

We have completed our review of the above referenced Tentative Planned Residential Development, dated October 1, 2015, last revised February 1, 2016, prepared by J.R. Gales & Associates, Inc., as received by our office February 5, 2016. The application proposes revision to a previously approved planned residential development. The approved planned residential development proposed 240 dwelling units, a recreation building and pool. The current submission proposes construction 44 townhouse units located in 8 apartment buildings, in place of the single 45 unit apartment building approved for Phase 3, and an associated access road and parking areas. The property is located along the northern side of North Branch Road, and is Zoned R-2 – Suburban Residential District, and is within the PRD – Planned Residential Development Overlay District.

Previous comments may be found in our letter dated November 9, 2016.

The following listing presents unresolved/non-compliant items identified during our review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 27), and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22):

### Zoning

1. The Ordinance requires a 35-foot maximum building height. (Section 205.3. and 607.2.D) **Previous Comment:** *A modification was granted in the previous PRD approval to allow a structure height of 48'. The maximum height of the proposed structures should be shown on the elevation drawings.* **Status:** **The elevation drawings indicate the proposed structures to be a height of 38 feet.**
2. The Ordinance requires a minimum 20 foot width for townhouses. (Section 205.3 and 607.2.D.) **Previous Comment:** *The plans propose for 16 foot wide townhouses. The applicant has requested a modification of this requirement.* **Status:** **Pending.**
3. The Ordinance requires the ownership of the common open spaces be identified along with proposed covenants, easements, rights of way and other restrictions applicable to the common open space for the development. (Sections 607.4.D., and 607.10.D.(4).) **Previous Comment:** *The owner of the open space and conservation easement should be identified on the plan. The Developer should contact the Township regarding the future ownership on the Conservation Easement Area.* **Status:** **A note has been included on Sheet No. 4 indicating open space and conservation easement will be decided after consulting the Township after approval of plans. Pending.**
4. The Ordinance requires copies of the proposed covenants, easements, rights of way, and other restrictions applicable to the common open space for the development. (Section 607.10.D.(14).) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status:** **The response letter indicates the owner will provide the items upon approval. Pending.**

### General Comment

1. The Ordinance requires the plans must meet all of the requirements outlined in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and Stormwater Management Ordinance (Section 607.10.D.(1) and Section 607.10.D.(6)) **Previous Comment:** *Refer to comments issued under separate cover for the Final Land Development plans for conformance with the SALDO and Stormwater Management Ordinance.* **Status:** **Pending.**

The plans have been reviewed for conformance to the Township Ordinance standards only. The review is based on surveys and drawings prepared by others and assume this information is correct and valid as submitted. Independent confirmation of adequacy or applicability of surveys, design data or procedures has not been provided.

The plan, as submitted, does not conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 27), for tentative Planned Residential Developments. Additional comments may be made

and we reserve the right to comment further pending submission of revised plans. Please note that all requirements for preliminary and final land development must be met for Phase 3.

A detailed written response to each comment identified in this letter along with revised plans for review is required.

Mr. Wingrove made some additional comments.

Mr. Wingrove said they did provide an updated review letter dated February 11, 2016. He said he doesn't believe there is anything substantial to add other than what Ms. Ludwig had in her review letter. Mr. Wingrove said his is very similar, including notes about the modification for the narrower width of the townhouses, open space, and just a general note that there will be more comments when they gets the final land development plans once they complete the thorough review at that time.

Mr. Cosnek asked if there are any comments from the Board.

Mr. Lutz asked Mr. Wingrove on the sanitary sewer easement and whether it should be shown as 20 foot. He asked should there be something ready for construction easement or a temporary construction easement. He said if so, then they should show permanent 20 foot.

Mr. Wingrove said yes, so long as the applicant is ok with that. He thinks it is a good idea actually to show an additional temporary construction easement. He said because they will need more than the 20 feet.

Mr. McDermott asked can it be done in language with a note. Mr. McDermott said because this doesn't exist because this is new to the green area.

Mr. Wingrove said no that it would be taken care of with the final land development. He said they'll have the final subdivision plan to file and that it can be addressed at that time. He said it would get recorded with the subdivision plan so that it is in place.

Mr. Cosnek asked do they just make note of that in the minutes, so that it is taken care of.

Ms. Ludwig said they could.

Mr. Cosnek asked if there were any other comments.

Hearing none, Mr. Cosnek asked recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to schedule a public hearing for the revised tentative PRD application.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>

**DAVE COSNEK**  
**BOB OWENS**

**YES**  
**YES**

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to approve or deny the waiver request for the townhome width from 20 feet to 16 feet.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he had a question. He said this may be for Mr. McDermott or Ms. Ludwig. If the Board denies the modification, does it affect the revised PRD application. He said because if they can't fit that many buildings or townhouses into these buildings does that change the PRD.

Mr. McDermott said although they have the specificity on here, this is still a tentative approval. He said he thinks, and correct him if he is wrong, they actually in their last session told the Township the footprint essentially does not really change the overall square footage and that they could put these buildings on in the same space without the modification. Mr. McDermott asked if that was correct.

Mr. Kambitsis from AR Building said yes, that is correct.

Mr. McDermott said it doesn't change the tentative PRD. They would just need to comply with the ordinance without that modification having been granted so that a final approval plan application would have to show buildings that have the dimensions required as opposed to those that were requested on the modifications.

Mr. Campbell from Rothschild Doyno Collaborative asked if he could answer. He said he understands there has been some discussion about the 16 foot buildings. He said he brought plans of another 16 foot building that they are working on. He said it would be very comparable and he would be happy to walk through them if that is what the concern is.

Mr. Cosnek asked if anyone had any objections to that.

There were none.

Mr. Campbell said that from what was talked about last time the demographics are starting to get smaller so you will see a lot of thinner and smaller units throughout the country. He said he thinks he mentioned last time that they are working on some 16 to 17 foot units throughout the city and actually working on them nationally as well. He said this is one particular project that they are working on with AR Building in suburban Rhode Island (pointing to plans). He said as he was leaving the office today he thought he might as well just print one so that he could show it to the Board. He said the big thing to understand is that if you look at a 16 foot versus a 20 foot you think it is getting smaller and the overall width is getting smaller. He said the thing to consider is that they would also be losing a bedroom when that is done. He said so a typical 20 foot unit has 3 bedrooms in it, but the 16 foot wide is meant to be 2 bedroom townhome. He said as a result those bedrooms actually get a little bit bigger. He said this year in the same development they have a mix, this is a 23 foot and a 16 foot. He said you actually end with 2 bedrooms in the back that are about 10 feet by 11 feet and a master bedroom in the front. He said when you end up doing 16 foot wide you have those smushed 2 in the back because you are always limited to your windows in the front and back whenever you do a townhome. He said so whenever you do this particular one

you get a master bedroom in the back you actually get a bedroom in the front that is pretty comparable as well. He said you get a full width which is about 15 feet wide. He said the living space isn't quite as large as you get in a 23 foot wide but he said if you look at the useable square footage it tends to be close to the same. He said in this particular one (pointing to plans) they added a little bit of depth in order to get a study up front so they get a secondary space in there. He said then through the tandem parking they end up getting a lot of good quality parking space and storage space on the lower floor as well. He said this a model they found has been accepted pretty well and he mentioned they are looking at three or four different projects in the city right now that are looking at 16, 17 foot wide units.

Mr. Owens said by the city, did Mr. Campbell mean Pittsburgh.

Mr. Campbell replied yes.

Mr. Owens asked where.

Mr. Campbell said they are in Lawrenceville, looking at some in the South Side and a couple in Mt. Washington.

Mr. Owens said in every case in the City, they are congested communities in other words you are putting a lot into a very small area. Mr. Owens said the Township does not have that small area here. He said that is his one factor. He said he has been in a lot of the houses in South Side, the Slopes, Smallman Street area. He said he has been in a lot of those places and he doesn't think that that foots the bill here. He said that is his opinion. He said anyway he's sorry, when Mr. Campbell said city he was just questioning that. He said that was what he was looking for.

Mr. Campbell said he said Mr. Owens was certainly right in the city it is typically more congested when they are working with tighter lots. He said that they are finding nationally that there is a new demographic that doesn't want to pay for the larger unit and so by getting this smaller reduced footprint they are able to save some costs on the building and offer a rent that hits a market that typically isn't really served. He said right now there are 1 bedroom and 2 bedrooms and then you go to the townhome and there isn't that in between at all. He said if it is looked at as a tiny townhome then it is narrower, if you look at this as sort of a luxury apartment with 2 car parking underneath, it does hit something that isn't currently on the marketplace.

Mr. Kambitsis said as Mr. Campbell noted they are doing this in other markets similar to this, not in Pittsburgh but in other parts of the country. He said that a unit called Highland Hills is one that they actually have in Rhode Island. He said it is in a community very similar to North Fayette. He said as Mr. Campbell said at the end of the day some people like having an apartment building and some people still want to be able to park their 2 cars and they want to have a feel of a house. He said that is really where this comes in and they see a demand for them and people do want them. He said as Mr. Campbell said it isn't really an urban thing it's really just another market and something people may want still want the 2 cars to be in there and the feel of a house.

Mr. McDermott said the 23's are 810 square feet the others are 688 square feet.

Mr. Campbell said the net square footage is 1350 and 1850/1800.

Mr. McDermott said he means per floor.

Mr. Campbell said per floor roughly a third of that.

Mr. Kambitsis said the bigger is 810 per floor and other one is 688 per floor.

Mr. McDermott asked what do they intend to sell for.

Mr. Kambitsis said the big 2 bedroom rent in the \$1,200 range all in with everything.

Mr. McDermott asked what about the townhomes.

Mr. Kambitsis said no he is speaking about the apartments. He said they would go a little bit higher and then there are the 3 bedroom that are a little bit higher than that. He said so probably start around the 12's for the smaller ones and then higher for the larger ones. He said then there are places that have integral parking that is added in. He said they wouldn't be doing that these are all part of that, so if they lived in the apartments they would pay for garage and the apartment it also starts to even out so they are not pricing anyone out but rather something that doesn't exist in apartments.

Mr. Cosnek said if there is no further discussion.

There was none.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to approve or deny the waiver request for the townhome width from 20 feet to 16 feet.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. BOB OWENS, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO DENY THE WAIVER REQUEST.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>NO</b>
	<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

Mr. Cosnek said as far as the 3<sup>rd</sup> motion they can still go ahead to make the motion to approve or deny the overall application to revise the tentative PRD.

Mr. McDermott said yes.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to approve or deny the overall application to revise the tentative PRD contingent upon the Conservation Easement being finalized between the Hollow Oak Land Trust and Bright Oaks and that the subdivision plan is submitted for final approval.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to approve or deny.

Mr. Kyle said he is still confused how they can approve it if they did not recommend granting the waiver request.

Mr. Cosnek said because it is a tentative approval.

Mr. McDermott said yes, the application has requested that they allow the townhome concept, and the overall architectural concept. He said this is conceptual level approval. He said this is as if someone came in and asked for an overall plan of a street and they also ask for some give on setbacks. He said and you deny the setback but you are willing to approve the overall plan, that just means they have to build buildings back 35 feet instead of 25. He said but the overall plan application and everything else is still the same and in place. He said when they file a final approval application they just have to incorporate the building architecture and the dimensions to meet the ordinance because they haven't been given that modification to do otherwise. He said but otherwise the plan document is submitted and is the same, including the open space dimensions, locations, all the other things on the plan pretty much are the same unless they file a revision to tweak it.

Ms. Ludwig said she thinks the issue gets further hashed out at the public hearing as part of that process. She said overall when the Board would act on the PRD they would issue another written decision anyway where that would be included as to whether the townhomes will need to be 20 feet or 16 feet or 18 feet. She said all of the findings go into that document that is associated with the revised tentative approval. She said the overall concept isn't changing, and that it's that specific width that would be an issue and that would be addressed.

Mr. McDermott said the Planning Commission is good with the overall plan with the exception of they aren't good with the concept of deviating from the minimum dimensions of the building.

Mr. Cosnek said then the Board of Supervisors will make a decision after the public hearing.

Mr. McDermott said that is correct.

Ms. Ludwig said they have 45 days.

Mr. McDermott said 60 days actually.

Mr. Cosnek said then whatever that decision is they'll come back to Planning Commission.

Ms. Ludwig said she will let them know when the public hearing is and they are more than welcome to attend as well.

Ms. Ludwig said if the Planning Commission seems to be overall ok with the concept of switching from the 6<sup>th</sup> apartment building to the townhomes. She said she thinks the issue at hand concerns the townhome width. She said concept wise it's ok.

Mr. Cosnek said yes.

Mr. McDermott said because they have already passed a sub-motion on that modification and it was rejected, that is off the table for the purpose of what is being discussed now. He said so moving on now and make a motion to approve this subject to the usual contingencies then it is not back on the table it's already gone. He said basically subject to complying with that, the concept is ok.

Ms. Ludwig said as the recommending body to the Board of Supervisors they are making the recommendation and the Board of Supervisors can further hash it out at the public hearing.

Mr. Cosnek said ok.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to approve or deny the overall application to revise the tentative PRD contingent upon the Conservation Easement being finalized between the Hollow Oak Land Trust and Bright Oaks and that the subdivision plan is submitted for final approval.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE BRIGHT OAKS REVISED PRD TENTATIVE APPLICATION 3<sup>RD</sup> REVISION, CONTINGENT UPON THE CONSERVATION EASEMENT BEING FINALIZED BETWEEN THE HOLLOW OAK LAND TRUST AND BRIGHT OAKS AND THE SUBDIVISION PLAN BEING SUBMITTED FOR FINAL APPROVAL.**

Mr. McDermott said to clarify the open space dimensions as noted in the application.

Ms. Ludwig said the 40.3447 acres of open space.

Mr. McDermott asked what is the revision date.

Ms. Ludwig said the revision date of the plans is 2-1-16.

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

Ms. Ludwig said that at the Board meeting next week they will make the motion to set the public hearing date. She said with advertising requirements, the hearing will more than likely be at the March 22, 2016 meeting.

**4. Application 2012-20 – 2000 Park Lane Lot Line Relocation Plan – An application for Preliminary and Final Minor Subdivision involving a lot line relocation between two lots on 16.97 acres of land located at 2000 Park Lane in a B-2 General Business Zoning District. (RE-APPROVAL OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLAN FROM 2012 THAT WAS NEVER RECORDED)**

Ms. Ludwig provided a review letter as follows.

I have reviewed the application submitted for minor subdivision and my comments are as follows:

1. This is an application for preliminary and final minor subdivision involving a lot line relocation between two lots located at 2000 Park Lane Drive in a B-2 General Business Zoning District. (Allegheny County Lot and Block Numbers 497-C-1 and 498-R-2).
2. This plan was previously reviewed by Planning Commission on November 20, 2012. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the plan to the Board of Supervisors. Shortly thereafter, the Board of Supervisors approved the lot line relocation plan on December 8, 2012.
3. This application for minor subdivision was tied to the land development application for a parking lot expansion at 2000 Park Lane, or the Cigna Building located on parcel 498-R-2 or Lot 20R as identified on the plan. That project is complete.
4. The lot located on the corner of Park Lane Drive and Summit Park Drive recently changed ownership and was purchased by Burns Scalo Real Estate. Burns Scalo hopes to develop it into office space, potentially a 100,000 square foot+ Class A Office Building.
5. The plan that was previously approved was never officially recorded downtown at the Allegheny County Department of Real Estate. Hence, the need for a re-approval. The County Planning Division prefers that we re-review the plan so that newer, more current dates can be indicated on the plan for recording.
6. The only item that has changed on the plan since the previous approval from late 2012 is the ownership of parcel 497-C-1, or Lot 19R on the plan.
7. Per the Allegheny County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO), all paper plans submitted for recording must have both the embossed and ink seal of the PA licensed surveyor who prepared the plans.
8. In addition, the County's SALDO requires that all signatures be made in permanent navy blue ink or felt tipped pen.
9. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer.
10. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.

At this time, the application for minor subdivision involving a lot line relocation at 2000 Park Lane Drive is complete. I recommend that the Planning Commission recommend approval of this plan to the Board of Supervisors. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Mr. Cosnek said there is no one here to represent the applicant. He said the only thing they need to do is to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to reapprove the previously approved plan from 2012.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the application.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. BOB OWENS AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE APPLICATION FOR 2000 PARK LANE LOT LINE RELOCATION PLAN THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED IN 2012.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

Mr. Cosnek asked Ms. Ludwig and Mr. Wingrove if there is anything else they need to discuss.

Ms. Ludwig said she did not have anything. She said they have a nice stack of applications for next month so expect another full agenda and she will get them out to everyone by the end of the week once she sorts through them.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to adjourn.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING at 8:25 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Midgley  
Planning Commission Recording Secretary