

**PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2015
7:30 P.M.**

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

BOARD 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
Cheryl Cherico, Recording Secretary

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

OTHERS PRESENT:

Charles Graham, 105 Aberdeen Dr.
Jeff Sabo, 101 Cobblestone Court
Kurt Meeske, Clover Construction
Mark Schmidt, Hampton Technical Associates
Richard Neville, Clover Construction
Kim Gales-Dunn, J.R. Gales & Associates

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Mr. Cosnek called for a motion to approve the minutes from the January 20, 2015, meeting.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. BOB OWENS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 20, 2015, MEETING. MOTION CARRIED.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. Application 2015-01 PRD – Bright Oaks Revised PRD Tentative Approval (2nd Revision) – Application for revised tentative approval of a Planned Residential Development (PRD) for 66.6401 acres of land to consist of 245 apartment units located in 6 buildings, a**

clubhouse, and 34.9877 acres of preserved open space along North Branch Road in a R-2 Suburban Residential/ PRD Zoning District. **(Resubmittal)**

NOTE: Bright Oaks was previously approved for a total of 5 buildings and a maximum of 200 units in 2011. They are seeking approval to build an additional 6th building that will consist of a maximum of 45 total units. This would bring the total number of units in the Bright Oaks community to 245 units.

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

Ms. Gales approached the Board. She said Bright Oaks is located on Old Mill Road off of North Branch Road and the Phase 1 buildings have been completed and are occupied. The Phase 2 buildings on the other side are currently under construction. She said the proposed new section, Phase 3, would come off of a private road from Old Mill Road and go to the left (she pointed to a drawing to show the Board where the new phase would be located). Hopefully, she said that gives the Board a clearer picture of what is remaining on the site that would be open space. She said the access that was previously approved came up to a cul-de-sac with an emergency access to Quarry Drive for the second entrance. She explained that there are two ponds currently built that were way oversized during the design of Phase I and Phase 2 and the bridge was built during Phase I as well. There are 200 units right now, and this new building would add 45 more units with parking.

As for the sanitary sewer, Ms. Gales said it would come down and connect into the existing sanitary sewer that runs along North Branch Road. She said the stormwater would go into the existing pond with a small portion of the building having a direct discharge into the stream and go into the other pond.

Ms. Gales said one of the modifications that was granted the last time was for the height of the building at 48' versus 35' which reduces the actual square footage of the building in length and width by going up, instead of out. She said there would really be no direct visual impact to any of the neighbors in Stonebridge. She said the emergency access road was previously approved. She said there are 11 parking spots in one area here before there is a landscape island and the code requires 10 prior to an island. She said a modification was granted the last time to have 13 spaces in between parking islands and 2 to 1 parking per unit with a graded area for additional parking if ever needed. She said the plan would call for an additional graded area for this building as well in the event that additional parking would ever be needed and paved at a later date. She said there is one sidewalk along one side of Old Mill due to the access on North Branch and what was approved was different sidewalks and walkways throughout the neighborhoods to basically connect everyone to the clubhouse and pool. She said they are asking for asphalt curbing versus the concrete curbing, basically for snow removal, and there would also be concrete curbs and sidewalks along the front of the buildings.

Ms. Gales said the requirement for 20 percent of the interior parking area to be landscaped is another modification the applicant is requesting. She said they would prefer to put the landscaping on the outskirts of the parking lot and along the front and sides of the building. She said this goes along with the requirement that 20 percent of the parking area has to be shaded. If they don't have the parking lot planted, she said the lot can't be shaded.

Ms. Gales said this application is for tentative approval only, then they could go through the hearing and come back later with final construction drawings. She asked if the Board had any questions.

The Board reviewed the comments of Ms. Ludwig and Mr. Wingrove.

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments:

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 245 apartment units located in six (6) buildings, one (1) clubhouse, and 34.9877 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 Bright Oaks was previously approved for a total of five (5) buildings and 200 units in 2011. They are now seeking approval to build an additional and final 6th building that will consist of a maximum of 45 total units. This would bring the total number of units in the Bright Oaks community to 245 units.
3. The original PRD approval from December 11, 2007 limited the total number of units to be constructed at 270.
4. Upon discussions with Kim Gales of Gales Engineering, the project's engineer, the applicant is only applying for tentative approval of the revised PRD at this time and will be coming back to Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for final approval. As such, the applicant is requesting that several items be addressed at the time of final approval, including several items related to grading and stormwater management.
5. There are six modification requests that have been submitted by the applicant. Similar, if not the same, requests for modifications were granted when Bright Oaks received their previous PRD approvals. The following is a summary of the modification requests submitted by Bright Oaks LP from the Township's Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 27 of the Township's Code of Ordinances, Ordinance No. 418, for the Bright Oaks PRD revision:
 - Section 205.3. of the Zoning Ordinance allows a 35-foot maximum building height. – *The applicant has requested a modification to allow a structure height of 48 feet.*
 - Section 207.2.B. of the Zoning Ordinance requires that at least 20% of the interior parking area be landscaped, including one tree for each 10 parking spaces. – *Bright Oaks LP has requested a modification of this requirement.*
 - Section 207.2.B.(2).(c). of the Zoning Ordinance requires that no more than 10 parking spaces be provided in an unbroken row. – *The applicant has requested a modification to this requirement as the proposed plan contains parking rows with 11 spaces.*
 - Section 207.2.B.(2).(g). of the Zoning Ordinance requires all landscape islands to be enclosed by appropriate curbing at least 6 inches wide and 6 inches in height above the paving surface. – *The applicant has requested a modification of this requirement and proposes to use bituminous wedge curbing.*

- Section 207.2.B.(2).(h). of the Zoning Ordinance requires 20% of the area occupied by parking spaces be shaded. – *Bright Oaks LP has requested a modification of this requirement.*
 - Section 302.D. and 607.6.C. of the Zoning Ordinance requires 2.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit for garden apartments. – *The applicant has requested a modification of this requirement to allow 2 parking spaces per unit.*
6. In regard to the proposed open space and conservation areas, I have a meeting scheduled with the Hollow Oak Land Trust to discuss the possibility of the Trust taking over those proposed open space and conservation areas. It is the Township's hope to work with Hollow Oak Land Trust on them taking over and managing this area. If that does not work out, the Township will take it over and look at ways of forming our own type of land trust. Either way, moving forward, the area deemed to remain as open / conservation space will be as such and hence will not be available for future development. The Hollow Oak Land Trust has a great presence in the Airport Area. In fact, they currently manage about 7 acres of land near the Montour Trail that was deeded over to them as part of the Forestbrooke development.
 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 updated review letter dated February 11, 2015.
 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.

Ms. Ludwig said Ms. Gales commented on most of the modification requests. She referred the Board to a list in her review comments and said those are the ones for zoning and she did not include the modification request for sidewalks in her review letter because that applies to the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance and could be part of final land development.

Ms. Ludwig said Township staff has been in communication with residents of Stonebridge and the homeowners association. She said their concerns are not the location of the building and they would agree that it doesn't really impact them because it is on the other side of the parcel and the other side of the development. She said their concern is mostly that moving forward, they would like the area that has been designated as open space and conservation areas to formally be made as such this time around. She said she has had some preliminary discussions with AR Building, Bright Oaks LP, and they are willing to either deed the rest of that acreage to the Township or some other entity. She said the Township's hope is that some other entity would be interested, maybe an existing land trust. She has a meeting set up for later this week with the Executive Director of the Hollow Oak Land Trust and they have a presence here in the airport area. She said there was also about seven acres near the Montour Trail from the Forestbrooke development that was deeded to that land trust. She said Hollow Oak Land Trust

could do some really exciting things such as turn this conservation area into a dog park that the residents of Bright Oaks and Stonebridge could use. She said they do trails and a lot of other cool and exciting things at some of their other properties like in the Moon Township area so there is also the potential for that. If that wouldn't work out, she said the Township would certainly do whatever they can to work it out and take over the open space and AR Building, Bright Oaks LP are willing to work with the Township.

Ms. Gales said that is correct that it is fine with AR Building, Bright Oaks LP.

Ms. Ludwig said this would be the final and the sixth building there and the green space, open space would be formally established in that area and deeded to whomever at that time. She said this would be the last building that could be constructed there.

At this time, Ms. Ludwig said the revised tentative PRD application filed by Bright Oaks LP looks to be complete. She recommended that the Planning Commission make three motions related to the application this evening. The first motion would be to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to set a public hearing date for the Bright Oaks Revised Tentative PRD application. The second motion would be to recommend to the Board of Supervisors as to whether to approve or deny the applicant's modification requests to the following sections of the Zoning Ordinance – Sections 205.3., 207.2.B., 207.2.B.(2).(c)., 207.2.B.(2).(g)., 207.2.B.(2).(h)., Section 302.D., and 607.6.C.. Lastly, the final motion would be to recommend to the Board as to whether to approve or deny the Revised Tentative PRD application.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments.

We have completed our review of the above referenced Tentative Planned Residential Development, dated December 16, 2014, prepared by J.R. Gales & Associates, Inc., as received by our office December 18, 2014. The application proposes revision to a previously approved planned residential development. The approved planned residential development proposed five residential buildings, a recreation building and pool. The current submission proposes construction of a sixth residential building and associated access road and parking area. 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 February 6, 2015. The items in *italics* are a previous comment, which has not been resolved as of the date of this letter.

The following listing presents items identified during our initial 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 allows a 35-foot maximum building height. (Section 205.3.) **Previous Comment:** *The plan proposes a four story structure similar to those constructed in Phases 1 and 2. A modification was granted in the previous PRD approval to allow a structure height of 48'.* **Status:** **A modification of this requirement is requested for the PRD revision.**

2. The Ordinance requires one deciduous tree be planted for each dwelling unit one tree for each 10 parking spaces. (Section 207.1.D. and 207.2.B) **Previous Comment:** *55 trees are required, however, only 49 have been provided.* **Status:** **The plan proposes trees in the future parking area. A note should be added to the plan indicating that these trees must be replaced in kind should those parking spaces be paved.**
3. The Ordinance requires at least 20% of the interior parking area be landscaped, including one tree for each 10 parking spaces. (Section 207.2.B.) **Previous Comment:** *A tabulation of interior parking landscape area has not been provided.* **Status:** **The applicant has requested a modification of this Ordinance requirement.**
4. The Ordinance requires no more than 10 parking spaces be provided in an unbroken row. (Section 207.2.B.(2).(c).) **Previous Comment:** *The plan proposes parking rows containing 11 spaces. A modification was granted in the previous PRD approval to allow an unbroken row of up to 13 spaces.* **Status:** **A modification of this requirement is requested for the PRD revision.**
5. The Ordinance requires all landscape islands be enclosed by appropriate curbing at least 6 inches wide and 6 inches in height above the paving surface. (Section 207.2.B.(2).(g).) **Previous Comment:** *The plan proposes bituminous wedge curb. The applicant has requested a modification of this requirement.* **Status:** **A modification of this requirement is requested for the PRD revision.**
6. The Ordinance requires 20% of the area occupied by parking spaces be shaded. (Section 207.2.B.(2).(h).) **Previous Comment:** *The applicant has requested a modification of this requirement.* **Status:** **A modification of this requirement is requested for the PRD revision.**
7. The Ordinance requires 2.5 spaces per dwelling unit for garden apartments. (Section 302.D. and 607.6.C.) **Previous Comment:** *A modification was granted in the previous PRD approval to allow provision of parking equal to 2 spaces per unit with the area for the additional 0.5 spaces to be graded and seeded, but not built unless needed at a later date. The Phase 3 plans propose provision of parking in the same manner.* **Status:** **Status: A modification of this requirement is requested for the PRD revision.**
8. The Ordinance requires lighting used to illuminate parking area be designed to reflect the light away from adjoining residential uses. (Section 309) **Previous Comment:** *A photometric plan showing spot illumination values has not been provided.* **Status:** **No change.**
9. The Ordinance requires the ownership of the common open spaces be identified. (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:** **Pending.**

10. The Ordinance requires all the requirements for a preliminary and final plan per the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance be provided. (Section 607.10.D.(1). and 608.2.A.(1).) **Status: The following comments are provided per a review of the plan for conformance with the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance:**
- A. The Ordinance requires a Completion Bond in the amount of 110% of the cost of the required improvements. (Section 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 bond amount.* **Status: This item to be addressed at the time of final approval.**
 - B. The Ordinance requires a Development Agreement be executed with the Township. (Section 209.) **Previous Comment:** *The Developer should contact the Township Solicitor to initiate the preparation of the Development Agreement.* **Status: This item to be addressed at the time of final approval.**
 - C. The Ordinance requires the layout of lots showing scaled dimension, lot number and areas for each lot be provided. (Section 302.G.) **Previous Comment:** *The overall site plan shows only the PRD perimeter lot line. Provide a plan showing property lines and parcel information for each lot within the PRD.* **Status: The applicant has indicated that a subdivision plan will be prepared at the time of final approval.**
 - D. The Ordinance requires a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. (Section 318.) **Previous Comment:** *Documentation that the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has reviewed, approved, and included the revision to the existing NPDES Permit has not been provided.* **Status: Pending.**
 - E. The Ordinance requires all grading, cut and fill conform to the requirements of the Township Grading and Excavation Ordinance (Chapter 9). (Section 503.1.) **Status: The following comments are provided following a review of the plan for conformance with the Township Grading and Excavation Ordinance (Chapter 9):**
 - i. The Ordinance requires a plan showing a base line with locations of cross-sections. Cross-sections of proposed grading must be provided at 50-foot intervals. (Section 103.2.D.(2).(g).) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status: The applicant has requested this item be addressed at the time of final approval.**
 - F. The Ordinance requires drainage easement for the existing watercourse that traverses the property. (Section 508.) **Status: Not provided.** **Status: The applicant has indicated that this will be included on the final subdivision plan, however the location of the easement should be added to the PRD plan also.**
 - G. The Ordinance requires permits be obtained from DEP for construction or changes in a watercourse as required by DEP and the Corps of Engineers.

(Section 511.G.(2).) **Previous Comment:** *Provide documentation that necessary permits have been issued for the proposed twin 60” pipes.* **Status: Pending.**

11. The Ordinance requires Stormwater Management be addressed. (Section 607.10.D.(6).) **Status: The following comments are provided following a review of the plan for conformance with the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance (Chapter 19):**
 - A. The Ordinance requires a list of approvals/permits relative to stormwater management that will be required from other governmental agencies and anticipated dates of submission/receipt. (Section 402.B.(17)). **Previous Comment:** *The applicant should indicate status of required permits for installation of the twin 60” pipes, and provide documentation of permit issuance upon receipt.* **Status: Pending.**
 - B. The Ordinance requires all calculations, assumptions and criteria used in the design of the storm sewer system including hydraulic and energy gradelines. (Section 402.C.(1)). **Previous Comment:** *Calculations have not been provided for the proposed site storm sewers.* **Status: The applicant has requested this item be addressed at the time of final approval.**
 - C. The Ordinance requires all plans and profiles of proposed storm sewer and open channels. Swales and channels must provide 1 foot of freeboard above the energy gradeline. (Section 402.C.(2).) **Previous Comment:** *Calculations or details have not been provided for the proposed diversion channel.* **Status: The applicant has requested this item be addressed at the time of final approval.**
 - D. The Ordinance requires discharge of stormwater runoff to be to a well-defined drainage course which has a bed and bank. (Section 601.11.F.). **Previous Comment:** *Endwall #2 does not appear to discharge to a well-defined drainage course.* **Status: The applicant has requested final design of this outfall be completed at the time of final approval.**
 - E. The Ordinance requires post-construction stormwater management be addressed. (Section 804.1.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided. The report address the peak rate of runoff only. Provide documentation that the development complies with the DEP requirements for water quality and water quantity.* **Status: The applicant has requested this item be addressed at the time of final approval.**
12. The Ordinance requires copies of the proposed covenants for the development. (Section 604.10.D.(14).) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status: No change.**

General Comment

1. *Provide a sanitary sewer easement for future use to service the property located north of the Bright Oaks PRD.* **Status: The applicant has requested this item be addressed at the time of final approval.**

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), and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22). Additional comments may be made and we reserve the right to comment further pending submission of revised plans.

Mr. Cosnek asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments.

Mr. Sabo said he is a resident of Stonebridge and he and some others met with Ms. Ludwig and Township staff last week to discuss their concerns. He said they don't really have any objections to the building or its location; they would just like to see the loop finally closed on the open space property whether it is the Township or a conservancy that would take it over. He said one item that wasn't mentioned has to do with the gate that was to be put up where the temporary, emergency access is located at Quarry Road. He said the residents would like to see that put up at the time of or prior to the construction of the sixth building. He said where Quarry comes out and hits Cobblestone Drive, people have been taking liberty and using that path as a road. He said there are things in place to prevent that but a real permanent solution from an aesthetic standpoint and a functional standpoint is to have that permanent gate installed. From discussion that they had with Township staff, he said he believed the gate has been ordered.

Ms. Ludwig said the Township had approved the design of the gate and thought it had been ordered. She said she was surprised it hadn't been installed yet. They were going to hold off on landscaping it until spring, but she thought they were going to put it up. She said she would check back with them and believed it was a condition of previous approvals that it would be installed. She said they can ensure it would be installed by not issuing any occupancy permits on Building 4 or 5 until this has been addressed. She said that gate and the access drive are directly related to the previous phases that were approved. It may have been weather related that it hasn't been done yet.

Mr. Lutz asked if it was a locked gate or a knock down gate.

Ms. Ludwig said it is a knock down gate. She said it is a decorative looking sort of fence but it knocks down and it is very similar to the fencing that is around the pool area now, aesthetically it matches.

Mr. Kyle asked if Mr. Sabo was at the meeting as an individual or if he was representing the homeowners' association.

Mr. Sabo said he is on the board of the homeowners' association and is the secretary/treasurer.

Mr. Kyle asked if his capacity this evening was as a representative of the HOA or a resident.

Mr. Sabo he was in attendance for both.

Mr. Kyle said he just wanted clarification if he was just one homeowner or if he was representing all of the Stonebridge residents.

Mr. Sabo said when they met with township staff last week, he and the Vice President of the HOA were in attendance. He said he was there to represent all of the homeowners.

Mr. McDermott said thank you, he believed the Chairman, Vice Chairman and the Board members wanted to be comfortable that his statement that they don't have a problem with the building or the building location and that the main concerns he voiced are actually those of the body's expression in addition to his own.

Mr. Sabo said yes, he was in attendance to follow through and put it on the public record.

Mr. Cosnek asked if motions for the modifications should be done separately.

Ms. Ludwig said they could be done separately using the section numbers.

Mr. Cosnek asked if anyone had any further comments or questions. Hearing none he asked for a motion to set the public hearing.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SET A PUBLIC HEARING DATE FOR BRIGHT OAKS REVISED PRD TENTATIVE APPROVAL.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the modification requests.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if the Board could go into Executive session before voting on the modification requests.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion to go into executive session.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:54 P.M. MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting resumed at 8:15 p.m.

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the modification request for Section 205.3. of the Zoning Ordinance that allows a 35-foot maximum building height.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. BOB OWENS, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF

SUPERVISORS FOR THE MODIFICATION REQUEST FOR SECTION 205.3 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, A 35-FOOT MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT, TO ALLOW A STRUCTURE HEIGHT OF 48 FEET.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the modification request for Section 207.2.B of the Zoning Ordinance requiring at least 20 percent of the interior parking area be landscaped, including one tree for each 10 parking spaces.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A MODIFICATION REQUEST FOR SECTION 207.2.B. OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE REQUIRING AT LEAST 20 PERCENT OF THE INTERIOR PARKING AREA BE LANDSCAPED, INCLUDING ONE TREE FOR EACH PARKING SPACE.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	NO
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the modification request for Section 207.2.B.(2).(c). of the Zoning Ordinance requiring no more than 10 parking spaces be provided in an unbroken row.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. BOB OWENS, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A MODIFICATION REQUEST FOR SECTION 207.2.B.(2).(C). OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE THAT NO MORE THAN 10 PARKING SPACES BE PROVIDED IN AN UNBROKEN ROW AS THE PROPOSED PLAN CONTAINS PARKING ROWS WITH 11 SPACES.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the modification request for Section 207.2.B.(2).(g). of the zoning ordinance requiring all landscape islands to be enclosed by appropriate curbing at least 6” wide and 6” in height above the paving surface.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A MODIFICATION REQUEST FOR SECTION 207.2.B.(2).(G). OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE REQUIRING ALL LANDSCAPE ISLANDS TO BE ENCLOSED BY APPROPRIATE CURBING AT LEAST 6” WIDE AND 6” IN HEIGHT ABOVE THE PAVING SURFACE IN ORDER TO USE BITUMINOUS WEDGE CURBING.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a modification request for Section 207.2.B.(2).(h). of the Zoning Ordinance that requires 20 percent of the area occupied by parking spaces be shaded.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE.

Mr. Cosnek said there was no second on the motion so it failed. He asked if that should be termed to deny.

Mr. Kyle said the only statement he would make on it is that he didn't know if they don't have the islands, how would they get the shaded area. He said that was his reasoning behind the motion.

Ms. Gales said it would be very difficult mathematically to get to 20 percent shaded.

Mr. Cosnek asked what their options are at this point.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he understands that they are going to put in some parking cover.

Ms. Gales said that was correct for the first phase.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he also understands that some of the requirements for what was supposed to be planted there already have not been met.

Ms. Gales said she wasn't sure.

Ms. Ludwig said she thought they had all of their plantings. She said they were going to have to move some of them as the result of this.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he thought he read somewhere that even though they had to move some of the plantings, they were still below where they were supposed to be from the last time.

Mr. McDermott asked if he was talking about a previous approval.

Mr. Fitzgerald said yes.

Mr. McDermott asked if they could get confirmation on that.

Ms. Gales said if that is the case, she can make sure it gets taken care of.

Ms. Ludwig said they haven't released any bonds from the previous phases yet. She said some of the trees are going to have to be moved.

Mr. Fitzgerald said before the Board says they can put in less vegetation, maybe they could put that vegetation in the green space.

Mr. McDermott said he wanted to ask two questions. In the context of these modification requests and the description before of how they have put different trees in different places, he asked if they could put all of the planting that they wish to not have to place in the parking lot somewhere else.

Ms. Gales said yes, it is on the plan for this phase. She said she hadn't gone out and physically counted what was required from the previous phases as to whether they are all planted or not. She said if they haven't all been planted, they can take care of that. She said the 55 trees that would be required for the parking lot, would all be planted somewhere else on the property.

Mr. McDermott asked if they were granted the modification requests as submitted on this present application and they were all approved, tree for tree, every single tree that they don't have to put in the parking lot, would be planted somewhere else.

Ms. Gales said that was correct.

Mr. McDermott asked if in addition to that, Mr. Fitzgerald was asking whether there would be bonus trees in there.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he was just asking for the minimum. If they aren't going to put them in the parking lot and there is going to be green space, could those trees be placed in the green space to act as additional buffer? He said that would be a good thing.

Ms. Gales said yes, they are meeting the tree requirement; it just wouldn't be in the parking islands.

Mr. Cosnek asked if that was where she indicated that they would be putting trees along the driveway and around the building.

Ms. Gales said yes, they would be planted along the driveway and the outer perimeter of the parking lot. She said there is a 5' bufferyard required. One thing that they did do previously was along Stonebridge where a 35' bufferyard was required, she said they added an additional 20' of bufferyard to make that a total of 55' of bufferyard along Stonebridge. She said they would be more than happy to meet with North Fayette staff in the spring to make sure everything has been taken care of. She said they have been under construction over the last few years so it's possible everything hasn't been planted yet.

Mr. McDermott said anything that has been previously approved would just be matter of verification. He said that would be the case before they are done, it would have to have every tree planted that they are required to plant under the previously approved plans.

Mr. Kyle asked if that was whether it would be in the parking lot or somewhere else.

Mr. McDermott said that was correct. He said from what he is hearing, every tree they are requesting now to not have in the parking lot has already been depicted on the plan somewhere else.

Ms. Gales said that was correct. She said the requirement is for 55 trees and they will still be planting some of them in the islands and the rest on the driveway and around the building.

Mr. Cosnek asked if there was another motion on modification request for Section 207.2. B.(2).(h). of the Zoning Ordinance.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BOB OWENS, SECONDED BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A MODIFICATION REQUEST FOR SECTION 207.2.b.(2).(H). OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE REQUIRING 20 PERCENT OF THE AREA OCCUPIED BY PARKING SPACES BE SHADED CONTIGENT THAT EVERY TREE NOT PLANTED IN THE PARKING LOT BE PLANTED TREE FOR TREE SOMEWHERE ELSE ON THE PROPERTY THAT IS ACCEPTABLE TO THE TOWNSHIP.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the modification request for Section 302.D. and 607.6.C. of the Zoning Ordinance that requires 2.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit for garden apartments to allow 2 parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Kyle asked if there are provisions for additional parking in the event that more than 2 parking spaces would be needed.

Ms. Gales said yes, in all of the phases.

Mr. Kyle said there is no reason why additional parking wouldn't be added if needed because it would be tenants who would want it.

Ms. Gales said in the previous phases, grading has been planned for the additional half spaces for future parking if needed.

Mr. Owens asked who would put the additional parking in and when.

Ms. Gales said it would be AR Development because they maintain the property and have approximately 10,000 units around the city that they manage. She said these would all be one and two bedroom units.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BOB OWENS, SECONDED BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR MODIFICATION REQUESTS FOR SECTIONS 302.D. AND 607.6.C. OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE REQUIRING 2.5 PARKING SPACES PER DWELLING UNIT FOR GARDEN APARTMENTS TO ALLOW 2 PARKING SPACES PER UNIT.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the application.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. BOB OWENS, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR BRIGHT OAKS REVISED PRD TENTATIVE APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON PERMANENT DEEDING OF THE GREEN SPACE TO THE TOWNSHIP OR TO A CONSERVANCY ENTITY, THAT THIS WILL BE THE FINAL REQUEST FOR ANY MODIFICATION, REVISED, TENTATIVE OR OTHER APPROVALS WITH REGARD TO THIS DEVELOPMENT AND SATISFACTION OF ALL OUTSTANDING COMMENTS OF THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER AND TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

2. Application 2015-05 CU – Lancaster Land, LP/ Clover Group Conditional Use

Application - Application for a conditional use for Garden Apartments, approximately 119-126 units, on 7.12 acres of land at 7430 Steubenville Pike in a B-2 General Business Zoning District.

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

Mr. Schmidt approached the Board. He said the developer wishes to construct a three story building in a u shape with ancillary parking in the front and some parking in the back with additional garages that would be available for rent. He said this is a senior citizens apartment complex that would be age restricted to people 55 and older. He said the site currently has two ball fields on it. The development would have entry through a driveway on the eastern side of the property off of Steubenville Pike. He said there would be a stormwater management pond on

the southwest corner of the property that would discharge to an inlet on Steubenville Pike. He said they also have a detention system as part of the NPDES permit located in the interior of the island out in front of the building. He said one thing he would like to clarify is that the application says 119 to 126 units and he would like to amend that to 119 to possibly 134 units, depending on the final architectural plans that are starting to be developed now. For the Board's review, he said he prepared some three dimensional renderings to offer some different perspective views of the property. He distributed those drawings to the Board. He said there is an existing neighborhood to the west side of the property and they prepared a view to show how the site would look from there. After the bufferyard would be planted, the residents of the neighborhood wouldn't be able to see too much of the building. He also said one of the drawings is a view from Steubenville Pike. He said they would also be requested several variances or modifications.

Ms. Ludwig said it is confusing because the previous development application was associated with a PRD so some of those were modifications. She said this is not a PRD so some of these requests would need to go before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. McDermott said anything arising from the Zoning Ordinance would have to go before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Schmidt said some of the requests would be similar to what the Board just heard. He said the parking requirement is 2 1/2 spaces per unit. He said Clover Development has been doing these all over the country and since this development is for senior citizens, their experience is that the number is actually closer to 1 per unit based on the actual usage. He said he has requested a parking count on some of their existing facilities so there would be some actual numbers to show. The other variance request would be for density which limits the number of units in a building. He said since this is one structure with 119 to 134 units, they would need a variance on that also. He said the intention is to submit the variance request application this month to make the March Zoning Hearing Board meeting. He asked if the Board had any questions.

The Board reviewed the comments of Ms. Ludwig and Mr. Wingrove.

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments:

1. This is an application for a conditional use for "Garden Apartments" at 7430 Steubenville Pike in a B-2 General Business Zoning District.
2. Please note: The applicant has chosen to apply for the conditional use first and will submit a separate land development application in the next few months, pending the conditional use approval. It is my understanding the applicant will be applying for any necessary variances from the Township's Zoning Hearing Board prior to submitting the land development application as well.
3. Lancaster Land, LP/ Clover Group is proposing to construct a 3-story garden style apartment building consisting of approximately 119-126 individual units on 7.12 acres of land on the former Hankey Farms ballfields.

4. The development, as proposed, will be an age-restricted (55+), affordable senior housing community. Based on my discussions with the applicant, the apartment building will be serviced by an elevator and will also have a library, community room, and hair salon for residents. A hair stylist would come in approximately three times per week for a certain number of hours each day to provide styling services to residents.
5. North Fayette Township's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, approved on April 22, 2014, identifies senior housing as a need within the community. Many seniors currently living in North Fayette are looking to downsize and sell their homes but want to remain residents of the community. These folks have limited options in the current housing market. The proposed affordable senior housing community would provide for-rent units that could meet the housing needs of several existing senior citizens in the community. The location along Steubenville Pike is ideal as it will be close to various services and amenities along the Pike and in the Tonidale and Pointe at North Fayette Shopping Areas.
6. The area and bulk regulations listed in Table 27-2 of the Township's Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 27 of the Township Code of Ordinances, Ordinance No. 418, states the maximum density allowed per acre in the B-2 District is 15 units per acre. The proposed parcel consists of a total of approximately 10 acres (7.12 of which will be disturbed). Thus, 150 units would be allowed on the site. Based on the proposed number of units, which is 119-126, the applicant will not need to apply for a density variance. However, they will need to seek a variance on the total number of units per building, as stated below under item number 7.
7. Based upon a review of the site plan provided, Lancaster Land, LP/ Clover Group will need to apply for several variances from the Zoning Ordinance from the Township's Zoning Hearing Board, including (but not necessarily limited to) the following:
 - Section 27-703.B.(5) states the maximum number of units per building shall not exceed 30. The proposed development proposes approximately 119-126 units. Thus, the applicant will need to apply for a variance from the Township Zoning Hearing Board to allow this larger number of units per building.
 - Section 27-302.D., Table 27-6, outlines the parking requirements for garden apartments. A total of 2.5 spaces per dwelling unit are required, which would equate to roughly 298-315 spaces total on-site. The proposed site plan shows a total of 124 parking spaces provided.
 - Section 27-207 covers the landscaping requirements in bufferyard areas and off-street parking/ surface parking areas. The site plan does not show any landscaping on-site and the proposed parking area does not include any interior landscape islands. ***The applicant should review this section of the Ordinance to further determine what applicable variances need to be requested from the Zoning Ordinance prior to submitting any applications to the Zoning Hearing Board.***
8. The applicant's engineer provided a trip generation summary noting that an estimated total of 32 vehicles would enter and exit the proposed development during PM peak hours.
9. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer per LSSE's letter dated January 28, 2015.

10. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.

At this time, the conditional use application looks to be complete. As such, Ms. Ludwig recommended that the Planning Commission make a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors set a public hearing date for Lancaster Land, LP/ Clover Group's Conditional Use application for Garden Apartments.

In addition, Ms. Ludwig recommended that the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board as to whether to approve or deny the conditional use application.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Conditional Use application, dated January 16, 2015, as received by our office January 22, 2015. The Conditional Use application proposes to construct a 3-story affordable senior housing development. The property is located along at 7430 Steubenville Pike, and is Zoned B-2 – General Business. Please note that this review was completed to determine conformance to the Township Zoning Ordinance for the requirement of the proposed Conditional use only. LSSE will perform a complete review for conformance with the Township Zoning Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance at the time of application for preliminary and/or final land development.

The following listing presents items identified during our initial review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (No. 418, Chapter 27):

Zoning

1. The Ordinance requires that the maximum number of units per building shall not exceed 24 units (Section 703.B.(5)). **Status: The Developer's consultant requested a variance to construct a 3-story structure housing 119 to 126 units.**
2. The Ordinance requires slopes to be graded at a maximum of 3:1. (Section 703.B.(10)). **Status: The Developer's consultant requested a variance to grade the site at a maximum of 2:1.**

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 application, as submitted, will conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (No. 418, Chapter 27) with resolution of the above noted items. Additional comments may be made and we reserve the right to comment further pending submission of revised plans. The applicant should note that all requirements for preliminary and final land development approval must yet be satisfied.

Mr. Owens asked if these would be rental units.

Mr. Schmidt said yes.

Mr. Lutz asked what size the storm sewer pipe would be that the retention pond would empty into.

Mr. Schmidt said 18”.

Mr. Lutz asked if that would be sufficient since it would be going down through Hankey Farms.

Mr. Wingrove said at this point the only review that has been done was based on the Conditional Use. He said they hadn't submitted any storm water reports or any real land development plans at this point. He said that would be part of the land development application and something that they would certainly need to take a look at. For the sake of Lennon Smith's review here, they didn't have that information yet and it wasn't required with the Conditional Use application.

Mr. Lutz said that stormwater would come out down by the Township's swimming pool.

Mr. Schmidt said the developer's concern at this point is that they want to get approval of the actual use of the property before they proceed with full development plans.

Mr. Cosnek said his concern was the number of units that were going to be in one structure and if it would pass fire safety when he originally looked at the plan. He said there are other large buildings in the Township but they are commercial buildings. He said these are residents in one structure.

Ms. Ludwig said it would actually be a commercial building. She said the Bright Oaks buildings are all commercial even though they are for residents. In terms of fire codes, building codes, she said she would need to check with the Building Inspector Mike Saville.

Mr. Lutz said it would have to have sprinklers.

Ms. Ludwig said yes, it would need sprinklers. She said she didn't believe there was anything in the building code that would limit the number of units; it's just the Township's zoning code that limits it to 30 units per building.

Mr. Cosnek said his other concern was about the parking.

Mr. Schmidt said one thing they plan to do to address any of the neighbors' concerns, along with the Township's notification of the public hearing, is provide an invitation for a meet and greet at a location such as the Township building in order to meet with the neighbors on an individual basis to see if they have any concerns and what could be done to address them.

Mr. Cosnek asked if these would all be one bedroom units.

Mr. Schmidt said they would be one and two bedroom units, but mostly two.

Mr. Cosnek asked roughly what the square footage of the units would be.

Mr. Schmidt said he didn't know.

Mr. Neville said about 950 square feet.

Mr. Owens asked if they have any other units in the Pittsburgh area.

Mr. Schmidt said he believed this was their first entry into the Pittsburgh market.

Mr. Kyle said they had originally intended to have 119 to 126, but thinking it might be more.

Mr. Schmidt said it might be as many as 132 units.

Mr. Kyle asked if that would be in one building or would there be another building.

Mr. Schmidt said within the same building.

Mr. Cosnek said he did a quick count and it looked to be about 120 units which is why he was asking about the size of the units.

Mr. Schmidt said they had a geotechnical study done and there were no specific concerns identified in that study other than a rock layer down about 6' below the current surface. He said they were cognizant of that when they selected the location.

Mr. Lutz asked how far above the mine would it be.

Mr. Schmidt said he didn't believe there was anything identified in the report with concerns to a mine.

Mr. Cosnek said he thought he saw it was 100' when he read through the report.

Mr. Schmidt said there is usually concern if it is less than 100'.

Ms. Ludwig said they would need the variance for the density because the ordinance only allows for 30 units in a building.

Mr. Cosnek said they would be limited to either a 30 unit building or would have to break the property into several parcels.

Ms. Ludwig said if they would break the property into several parcels, it would then need to be subdivided. She said the way the site is with the topography, number of acres and the way it is positioned, it may not allow for that. In terms of acreage, they would be fine. She said they hadn't received a full set of site plans because they had only applied for Conditional Use at this time. She said applicants can apply for everything all at once and all can run concurrent or they can do it one step at a time like they are now with the Conditional Use and then apply for the variances and then go to land development. She said she would just caution that if they need to have a pre-application meeting early next week to review preliminary plans, to go ahead and schedule it. She said she wouldn't want them to go to the Zoning Hearing Board with a list of

what they think are all of the variances needed just to find out they would need three more variances when they get to land development and get delayed. She said Township staff is available to meet and review everything. As of now, she said it is the number of units per building, number of parking spaces and possibly parking islands. She said she hadn't noticed any islands on the plans, but didn't know if they intended to request variances for that as well.

Mr. Schmidt said he would need to discuss that with the developer.

Ms. Ludwig said there is also landscaping and tree coverage, sort of what was talked about with the previous applicant. She said if they are going to need additional variances, it would be better to have a complete list so they wouldn't have to go back to Zoning Hearing Board again later.

Mr. McDermott said at the same time, the Planning Commission can make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors subject to obtaining variances. He said he understands that they want to get Conditional Use approval before spending the money on engineering to go through the land development process, but he wanted to make it clear that the Board of Supervisors does not have the power to issue a final zoning decision if the applicant does not have the variance to get the number of units they desire. He said in other words, this is going to have to be tabled either now or between the Planning Commission's recommendation and the application going to the Board of Supervisors for a final decision while it goes to the Zoning Hearing Board. He said the Planning Commission could recommend approval conditioned upon obtaining a variance for the number of units, but the Board of Supervisors couldn't approve it including the number of units in a building if the applicant doesn't yet have variance that allows the Board to say yes it could be approved with that number of units. He said the Board of Supervisors doesn't have the power to say they could put 132 units in a building if the Zoning Ordinance says they can't unless somebody hands them a permission slip by way of a variance.

Ms. Ludwig said as it would go right now, the Conditional Use could move forward and the public hearing date could be set, correct?

Mr. McDermott said yes.

Ms. Ludwig said that hearing date would be March 24, the same night as the Bright Oaks public hearing. She said if they would get their application for the Zoning Hearing Board in by the deadline, February 26, that hearing would be March 26 and it wouldn't go to the Board of Supervisors until the next meeting on April 14.

Mr. Schmidt said that was their intention all along.

Mr. McDermott said they would end up at the finish line at the same time. He said they wouldn't want to go to the supervisors without having the variance they need for the concept plan.

Mr. Cosnek said the Planning Commission only had one motion to make on this tonight then, to schedule the public hearing.

Ms. Ludwig said that was correct.

Mr. Cosnek said as far as any conditional use approval, it should be tabled until the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. McDermott said the Planning Commission could still make a recommendation. He said this Board is a recommending body, not the final approval body. He said they could make a recommendation on it contingent upon the applicant obtaining a variance, but it would have to wait until they actually get the variance for it to move on to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Owens asked if it would be better to just table it until next meeting if it isn't holding anybody up either way.

Mr. McDermott said they could do that.

Mr. Kyle said he didn't know if they even know how many variances they need at this point to make it contingent.

Ms. Ludwig said the other variances are part of the land development and the design hasn't been fully finalized. She said they anticipate that they are going to need the parking variance, but it isn't required at this time. She said the only one that is required as part of the Conditional Use is the number of units.

Mr. Cosnek asked if anyone had any further comments or questions.

Mr. Meeske said he is the director of real estate and development for Clover Construction and wanted to make a comment concerning the senior housing component. He said one of the reasons that they go with a single building is that they deal with seniors, predominantly elderly seniors, with a typical occupancy age of 78 years. He said that is just the reality of who moves into these kinds of facilities. He said these are typically people who are tired of maintaining their homes and looking for an independent lifestyle without the additional burdens. He said they are also looking for security and one of the nice things about these buildings is that they have a single entrance with a secure environment and community rooms for activities. He said with the age, comes reduced parking. He said they find that their occupants, even in a two bedroom unit, have one vehicle. He said people also start losing their driver's license around 75 years of age. He said they have about 20 of these buildings up across the country and most of them are in their 70's and 80's. He said it is a low burden on traffic.

Mr. Kyle asked if the age was deed restricted.

Mr. Meeske said the age restriction comes from HUD. He said the government expanded federal fair housing to allow for a category for seniors and allow for age restriction. He said there is another classification that they could restrict to 62 years of age. He said they are pretty quiet facilities.

Ms. Ludwig said she would coordinate with Mr. Meeske on the meet and greet. She said all of the neighboring property owners would receive a notice of the Conditional Use public hearing and maybe a flyer for the meet and greet could be included with that notification. She said the Township offered to assist him with scheduling the meet and greet and with some outreach.

Mr. Cosnek asked if anyone had any further questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked the Board for a motion to set the public hearing.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SET THE CONDITIONAL USE PUBLIC HEARING FOR LANCASTER LAND, LP/CLOVER GROUP.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Mr. Cosnek asked for a motion on the application for conditional use.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BOB OWENS, SECONDED BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, AND CARRIED, TO TABLE A RECOMMENDATION ON THE CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR LANCASTER LAND, LP/CLOVER GROUP UNTIL THE MARCH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	BOB OWENS	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

COMMENTS:

Mr. Cosnek asked if there were any questions or comments about anything. There were none.

ADJOURNMENT:

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Cherico
Planning Commission Secretary