

**NORTH FAYETTE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2015
7:30 P.M.**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Cosnek, Chairman
Charles Kyle, Vice Chairman
Fred Lutz, Board Member
Tom McDermott, Township Solicitor
Shawn Wingrove, EIT
Laura Ludwig, Township Community Development Director
Cheryl Cherico, Recording Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bill Fitzgerald, Board Member
Bob Owens, Board Member

OTHERS PRESENT:

Patrick Connors, Community Development Department Intern
John Kreutzman, 7411 Steubenville Pike
Kurt Meeske, Clover Group
Mark Schmidt, Hampton Technical Engineering

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

A motion was made by Mr. Chuck Kyle, seconded by Mr. Fred Lutz, to approve the minutes from the March 17, 2015, meeting. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. Application 2015-06 – Steubenville Senior Residential Development** – Application for preliminary and final residential land development filed by Lancaster Land LP/Clover Group involving the construction of a three-story, garden apartment building for seniors ages 55 and over on 10.19 acres of land located at 7430 Steubenville Pike in a B-2 General Business Zoning District (Allegheny County Lot and Block # 496-A-1).

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

Mr. Meeske and Mr. Schmidt approached the Board.

Mr. Schmidt said the plan is very similar to what the Board has seen in the past. He said several of the items that were identified during presentations have been addressed such as shrinking the detention pond. He said they were able to pull it back from the property line to allow enough room to move the buffer yard below the detention pond. He said another item was an access road, an emergency access or second alternative driveway. He said they have added that and it wouldn't be an entrance that would be used, but would be available for use in an emergency situation. He said it would be part of their PennDOT application which should be submitted very soon.

Mr. Schmidt said there were a couple of other things he wanted to discuss and one of them is trees. He said they received a variance for the number of trees versus units and also one for the requirement for the number of trees with the parking, adding to about 16 more trees to the count. He said one thing they would like to do would be to count mature trees as required plantings within the building line envelope on the back part of the property. He said they would agree to leave those trees in place subject to if they were ever taken out for any reason, they would have to replant them. He said they would go out and survey those trees and identify them on the plan as to species, type and size with the hope that those would count towards that requirement. He said they feel that is a benefit to the township because there would be a record of those trees and they would still be planting trees in the bufferyard.

Mr. Schmidt said the other item he wanted to talk about is sort of landscape related and in regards to one of the comments from Lennon Smith & Souleret's letter in regards to a requirement that if a parking lot is located next to a residence that they would have to plant 1½ times the trees. In specific, the letter was talking about the side of the property next to the Bashioum residence. He said he would not necessarily agree with the term that the parking lot is between them and the Bashioum lot. He said the access drive is on that side, but the parking lot is certainly in the front yard and behind the building.

Mr. Wingrove said he and Ms. Ludwig discussed this and feel that Mr. Schmidt's assessment is accurate. He said the intent of the ordinance is for a parking area, and this is a driveway to a parking area that is next to the residence. He said at this point, they can strike that comment in the letter based on those conversations.

Mr. Kyle asked if Mr. Bashioum had expressed any displeasure.

Ms. Ludwig said most of his concerns center around the bufferyard and not so much whether that is termed parking or an access drive.

Mr. Meeske said he would like to expand on that topic a little bit. He said Clover Group has been in discussions with Mr. Bashioum about altering the lot lines at that location. He said the way the situation currently exists is Mr. Bashioum has encroached with some landscaping and a shed and some other items onto this property. He said they plan to clip the corner of the lot and deed that little portion of the triangle to Mr. Bashioum to maintain the line that he has established. He said Mr. Bashioum's house is very close, only about 10' away from the actual lot line so this would give him a little bit more of a buffer. In exchange, they would be asking Mr. Bashioum to give them a 5' easement to increase the buffer on that side so they wouldn't

have to move the whole project over. He said discussions seem to be going quite well so the Board should see some minor adjustments in the lot lines as things progress through the process.

Mr. Schmidt said those are the major changes since the last time the Board saw the plan. He said the rest of the plan is very similar with the stormwater facility within the parking island, the main stormwater facility, and it would still be connected to the existing storm sewer. He said they are in the process of performing the offsite calculations to verify the capacity of the offsite system. He said that would be part of the submission along with the other items listed in the Township Engineer's review letter. He said he would be sitting down and meeting with Ms. Ludwig and Mr. Wingrove one day next week to go through everything and then make that re-submission with the corrections on the plans.

Mr. Kyle asked about Ms. Ludwig's letter that talked about the balance of the plantings being distributed to another area of the Township. He asked if part of the applicant's request to count existing mature trees would cut that number of plantings or eliminate it altogether.

Mr. Schmidt said it would depend on how many trees they would find in that area. He said he believed the number of trees they still needed was 50 or 60. He said if they would find 50 or 60 trees that are 4" in diameter or greater on site, they feel that would satisfy that requirement if they pledged to maintain those trees.

Mr. Meeske said if they only found 20 trees, they would still need to plant the balance.

Mr. Schmidt said the area is 4 acres of pretty dense woods so they anticipate finding a significant number of trees there. He said they would survey those and show the exact locations on the plan.

Mr. Kreutzman asked if those were trees that they would not be planting in the main lot or if those would be trees that would not be planted in the buffer area.

Mr. Schmidt said those would be the surplus trees that they actually received a variance to not use them on the site, but to put them offsite somewhere.

Mr. Meeske said they did not get any relief for any buffer trees.

Mr. McDermott said if it does become acceptable to the Township to have the existing trees be counted for required trees, he said that can be noted as a condition of approval. He said it could be made part of the actual plan document.

Mr. Schmidt said that would be the reason for surveying them so they could be documented.

Ms. Ludwig said she didn't believe the ordinance specifically states that it does or does not allow that approach. She said it is one of those gray areas and it makes logical sense to do that in her opinion if there are existing trees. She said they aren't cutting those trees down or disturbing that area so why couldn't they be counted, why would they have to plant a bunch of new trees. She said it just makes sense.

Mr. Cosnek said a lot of times a developer comes in and clear cuts everything and then comes back and puts in small trees to get the number of required trees.

Ms. Ludwig said exactly, and they deserve the credit for not doing that.

Mr. Cosnek said older trees are better than new growth.

Ms. Ludwig said if it was the bufferyard and they were trying to take trees from the buffer, it would be a different story. She said there is only so much that can be landscaped on that site realistically.

Mr. Schmidt said at some point, it would crowd out.

Mr. Cosnek said one of the things they had talked about with the applicant was the possibility that they might need to put in additional parking in the future. He asked how this would factor into it?

Mr. Meeske said that would be a requirement that they would have to fulfill in some fashion if that happened. He said they could clear a third of that back acreage and plant those trees, but why plant something 4' tall when they already have something 50' tall.

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

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments:

1. This is an application for preliminary and final residential land development filed by Lancaster Land LP/ Clover Group involving the construction of a three-story, garden apartment building for seniors ages 55 and over on 10.19 acres of land located at 7430 Steubenville Pike in a B-2 General Business Zoning District (Allegheny County Lot and Block # 496-A-1).
2. Lancaster Land, LP/ Clover Group is proposing to construct a 3-story garden style apartment building consisting of 126 individual units on the site of the former Hankey Farms ballfields.
3. 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 at least one 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.
4. 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.

5. The applicant applied for and was granted the following six variances from the Township's Zoning Hearing Board on Thursday, April 23, 2015. A copy of the ZHB's decision letter is enclosed. The applicant should add the list of variances granted, in a table, to the overall site plan for the project as well as on the landscape and parking plans as appropriate.

- **Off-Street Parking Variance** – The applicant must provide a parking ratio of 1.2 spaces per dwelling unit.
- **Units per Apartment Building** – The proposed garden apartments for seniors can have a maximum total of 126 units.
- **One Tree Per Dwelling Unit** – As per the landscape plan dated April 22, 2015, a total of 53 trees will be planted on site instead of the required 126 trees to satisfy this requirement.
- **Surface Parking Area Interior Landscape Islands** – The applicant can provide the proposed end cap islands as shown on the landscape plan dated April 22, 2015.
- **Shade Trees in Surface Parking Areas** – The applicant can install plantings as outlined in the April 22, 2015 landscape plan.

NOTE: The balance of plantings that should have been provided on-site must be coordinated for another location in the Township and the applicant agreed to plant other trees at specific sites identified in the Township to help meet these requirements.

6. The Conditional Use for the Garden Apartments was approved, with conditions, by the Township Board of Supervisors at the April 28, 2015 Board meeting. A copy of the written decision is enclosed.

7. 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.

8. In regard to the required bufferyards, an additional 10 foot bufferyard should be added along the Bashioum property, as that is a residential lot. Mr. Bashioum's property is zoned B-2 General Business. However, the use is a legal, non-conforming single-family residence. In regard to the bufferyard requirements, Table 27-5 in the Zoning Ordinance outlines these requirements. The language in that table is centered around zoning districts and not specific uses within a district. Thus, since the Bashioum's property is a residential lot in a B-2 zone, Bufferyard B would be required. This is how we have always interpreted that section of the ordinance. Since the homes along Palomino are in a residential zone, Bufferyard A is required on that side. The additional 10 foot buffer should be added along the Bashioum property per the conditional use criteria for garden apartments, which states:

“Bufferyards between a garden apartment development and any other adjacent residential lot shall be increased by 10 feet in addition to the Township's required bufferyard width. Landscaping, within this additional width, shall be provided according to spacing, quantity and type of plants specified by the Township Planning Commission.”

9. Per concerns raised at previous meetings, the applicant has added another form of ingress and egress through an emergency only access drive. This is still pending approval by PennDOT as Steubenville Pike is a state roadway.

10. There are still several outstanding items to be addressed, including items related to stormwater management, the preparation and submittal of a Phase One Environmental Study, the completion of the Buildable Area Analysis table, and the resolution of the above summarized bufferyard issue.
11. Pending items include the review and approval of the E&S plans from the Allegheny County Conservation District, the review and approval of the sewage planning facilities module by PA DEP, and the co-application between the applicant and the Township for the HOP permit from PennDOT.
12. Per the applicant's request, the Township Solicitor and Community Development Director will begin to work with them on the required drafting of the Developer's Agreement and Stormwater Maintenance Agreement.
13. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer per LSSE's letter dated May 12, 2015.
14. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.

At this time, Ms. Ludwig said the application is incomplete due to the list of items that still need to be addressed, submitted, and/or clarified. As such, she recommended that the Planning Commission reject the application as administratively incomplete. The applicant can resubmit no later than Tuesday, June 2nd for June's Planning Commission meeting to be held on Tuesday, June 16th at 7:30pm.

Ms. Ludwig said she believed the access drive had been addressed in terms of adding that second drive even if it would be an emergency only access point. She said that was the primary concern in the event of a fire or something and everybody had to get out and that would serve that purpose. She said it still needs to be approved by PennDOT and that would go in with their HOP application in which the Township has to be a co-applicant as a new requirement from what she understood.

Mr. Wingrove said they would be a co-applicant for stormwater and the HOP, but the driveway cuts would actually be applied for independently.

Ms. Ludwig said in regards to the bufferyards along the Hankey Farms side, they originally thought they might need to get a variance or some sort of conditional use deviation, but instead they are able to do the required bufferyard along that side. In relation to Mr. Bashioum's property, it is her understanding through correspondence with him via e-mail, his main concerns were protecting his buffer and protecting the apartments. She said it is open to interpretation in a sense and the Township has always interpreted that bufferyard table to be more the zoning district and not the use. He was questioning why the Palomino side was one buffer and he was a different buffer and it has been explained to him. She said the Conditional Use criteria states that if it is a residential lot abutting the garden apartments, then it would get that additional 10' buffer. She said it doesn't necessarily say something would have to be planted in there, but they at least have that additional area and that is what the applicant is working with Bashioum to address. She said hopefully, there will be some more resolution on that by next month's meeting

through giving Mr. Bashioum that additional 5' so the applicant won't have to alter where that access drive would be located.

Mr. Meeske said they would end up with an agreement with Mr. Bashioum and the survey and lot lines would be established, but they won't actually make that transfer of property until they close on the purchase of the property from the Catholic Institute of Pittsburgh. He said it would be a simultaneous close and transfer to Mr. Bashioum at the same time. He said they would be able to present the Board with the agreement.

Ms. Ludwig said the Planning Commission and the Township would also need to see the lot line relocation plan and it would need to be approved through this process.

Mr. Meeske said he didn't realize that and would need to speed up a little bit.

Ms. Ludwig said they could submit the lot line relocation plan when they re-submit the land development plan. She said as for the Phase One Environmental Study, the applicant said it was being finalized and they should have it shortly. There are some stormwater issues that still need to be addressed and then there are some standard pending items such as waiting for approval from the conservation district on the NPDES, agreements and that type of thing.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Land Development application documentation, dated April 22, 2015, as received by our office April 30, 2015. The plan proposes construction of a 3-story senior housing development including associated parking and stormwater facilities. The property is located along at 7430 Steubenville Pike, and is Zoned B-2 – General Business.

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), Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22) and Stormwater Management Ordinance (Chapter 19):

Zoning

1. The Ordinance defines permitted and conditional uses by Zoning District. (Section 205.2.). **Status: Garden apartments are a conditional use in the B-2 district. The applicant has submitted a Conditional Use application. Pending.**
2. The Ordinance requires at least one deciduous tree be planted for each dwelling unit. (Section 207.1.D.). **Status: The plan proposes 53 trees, where 128 are required. A Variance has been requested to reduce the required plantings to 53. A notation of granted Variances should be added to the plan.**
3. The Ordinance requires parking areas with more than 20 spaces have at least 20% of the interior parking area landscaped with planting including one tree for each 10 spaces. (Section 207.2.B.). **Status: A tabulation of proposed landscaped area has not been provided nor has a tabulation of the required trees have not been provided.**

4. The Ordinance requires one landscape island be provided for each 10 parking spaces and that there be no more than 10 spaces provided in an unbroken row without provision of interior landscape islands, (Section 207.2.B.(2).(b) and 207.2.B.(2).(c).) **Status: The required landscape islands have not been provided. The applicant has requested a Variance for relief from this Ordinance requirement. A notation of granted Variances should be added to the plan.**
5. The Ordinance requires 20% of the area occupied by parking spaces be shaded. (Section 207.2.B.(2).(h).) **Status: The applicant has requested a Variance for relief from this Ordinance requirement. A notation of granted Variances should be added to the plan.**
6. The Ordinance requires the number of parking spaces be determined based on use. (Section 302.D.) **Status: The Ordinance requires 2.5 spaces per dwelling unit for garden apartments. 320 spaces are required for the proposed 128 dwelling units. 155 spaces are provided. The applicant has requested a Variance to provide only 155 spaces. A notation of granted Variances should be added to the plan.**
7. 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.D.) **Status: Provide documentation that the HOP has been issued for the proposed driveway entrance. Additionally, provide documentation than an HOP has been issued for the proposed utility work in the PennDOT right-of-way.**
8. The Ordinance requires adequate sight distance be provided for each driveway. (Section 306.4.) **Status: Indicate the required and provided sight distance at the connection of the new driveway to Steubenville Pike.**
9. The Ordinance requires a buildable area analysis be provided. (Section 503.1.) **Status: Not provided.**
10. The Ordinance requires Bufferyard C along all primary roadways. All landscaping with the primary roadway bufferyard should comply with the landscape palettes defined in Table 27-10 of the Ordinance. (Section 609.3.B.) **Status: The proposed bufferyard plantings do not match the required Landscape Palette A presented in the Ordinance.**
11. The Ordinance requires the maximum number of units per building not exceed 24. (Section 703.B.(5).) **Status: The plan proposes a 128 unit building. The applicant has requested a Variance for relief from this Ordinance requirement. A notation of granted Variances should be added to the plan.**
12. The Ordinance requires bufferyards between a garden apartment development and any other adjacent residential lot be increased by 10 feet in addition to the Township's required bufferyard width with landscaping as specified by the Planning Commission. (Section 703.B.(10).) **Status: The additional 10' width buffer has not been included on the plan along the Bashioum property.**

13. The Ordinance requires bufferyards between garden apartment parking areas and existing single family lots contain one and one-half times the required number of plants and a mound, a minimum of 3.5 feet in height at its peak for screening off-street parking areas. (Section 703.B.(12).(a).(1) and 703.B.(12).(a).(2).) **Status: Not provided along the Bashoum property.**

Final Major Subdivision

1. The Ordinance requires a Completion Bond for the proposed improvements. (Sections 208.) **Status: 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.**
2. The Ordinance requires the Developer execute a Development Agreement. (Section 209.) **Status: The Developer should contact the Township to initiate the preparation of the Development Agreement.**
3. The Ordinance requires a phase one environmental assessment. (Section 307.) **Status: Not provided.**
4. The Ordinance requires preliminary building elevation drawings be provided. (Section 309.) **Status: Not provided.**
5. The Ordinance requires an infrastructure demand statement be provided. (Section 314.) **Status: Not provided.**
6. The Ordinance requires that construction plans conform to the Township Minimum Construction Standards. (Section 316.A.) **Status: The details provided in the plan set are taken from a previous version of the Township Standard Details. The Township details used should be revised to match those shown in the current Minimum Construction Standards and Details adopted February 2013.**
7. The Ordinance requires the erosion and sedimentation control plan be filed with the Allegheny County Conservation District. (Section 318.) **Status: 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.**
8. The Ordinance requires that each lot be served by public sanitary sewers approved by the PADEP (Section 402.). **Status: Provide documentation that a sewage facilities planning module has been approved for the site.**
9. The Ordinance requires sidewalks be provided for all major land developments. (Section 404.2.B.). **Status: Sidewalks have not been provided along Steubenville Pike.**

Grading

1. The Ordinance requires submission of a grading permit application. (Section 103.1.). **Status: Not provided.**
2. The Ordinance requires a plan showing a base line with locations of cross section at 50-foot intervals. (Section 103.2.D.(2).(g).). **Status: Cross sections have not been provided.**

Stormwater Management Ordinance

1. The Ordinance requires review by the Department of Transportation in cases where stormwater management facilities front on an existing State highway. (Sections 301.2.D.) **Status: The plan proposes connection to the existing storm sewer system within the S.R. 3066 right-of-way. PennDOT will require the Township to be the co-applicant for the HOP permit. An agreement must be executed between the Developer and the Township for submission of the HOP application. An escrow will be required as part of the agreement. Once the agreement is executed, a complete HOP application package should be provided to the Township for submission to PennDOT.**
2. The Ordinance requires all calculations, assumptions and criteria used in the design of the storm sewer system, including hydraulic and energy gradelines for the storm sewers. (Sections 403.C.(1).) **Status: Calculations have not been provided for the proposed storm sewers. Additionally, the plan proposes connection to the existing storm sewer system along Steubenville Pike. Provide calculations documenting that the downstream system has capacity to convey the added flow from the pond.**
3. The Ordinance requires plans and profiles of all storm sewers be provided. (Section 403.C.(2).) **Status: Profiles of the proposed storm sewers have not been provided. Include a scale profile of the bioretention area including the manhole outlet structure. Include on the profile the hydraulic grade line and provide supporting calculations.**
4. The Ordinance requires the maximum rate of runoff is no greater after development than prior to development activities and also requires control of post-construction stormwater impacts and compliance with state water quality requirements through BMPs including replication of pre-construction stormwater infiltration conditions. (Sections 502.A.(1). and 804.C.) **Status: The bioretention area and infiltration basin make use of the same capacity to address both rate controls and volume controls. If the area below the bottom orifice in each facility is to be used to address the 2-year volume increase and does not dewater within 24 hours, it should not be used in the routing calculations for rate control. Provide dewatering calculations using field measured infiltration rates for each BMP if this capacity is to be used to address both peak rate control and volume reduction.**
5. The Ordinance requires the 1-, 2-, 5-, 10-, 25- 50- and 100-year design storm frequencies be used for analysis of runoff. (Sections 502.B.(1).) **Status: 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.**

6. The Ordinance requires a fence, at least 4' in height be provided for detention facilities with a water depth greater than 2 feet. (Sections 601.D.(4).) **Status: A fence has not been shown on the plan.**
7. The Ordinance requires geotechnical report be provided for the construction of all stormwater facilities. (Sections 601.H.) **Status: A certification sealed by a registered professional engineer should be provided addressing the stability of the proposed detention pond embankment. Additionally, infiltration test results must be provide to confirm the infiltration rates used in the report calculation.**
8. The Ordinance requires the discharge of stormwater be to a well-defined drainage course. (Sections 801.G) **Status: The plan proposes discharge of the emergency spillway to the S.R. 3066 right-of-way.**
9. The Ordinance requires a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement be signed and recorded. (Section 803.3.A.) **Status: A copy of the signed and recorded Stormwater Maintenance Agreement has not been provided. The applicant should contact the Township Solicitor regarding the agreement.**
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.) **Status: Not provided.**
11. The Ordinance requires provision of a copy a recorded Post Construction Stormwater Management Plan record drawing. (Sections 805.) **Status: The applicant should note the requirement for provision of a recorded PCSM record drawing prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.**

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, 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 (Chapter 19). Additional comments may be made and we reserve the right to comment further pending submission of revised plans.

Mr. Wingrove said he thought a lot of the outstanding items were standard and could be worked out during their meeting with the applicant next week so they could resubmit for June. He asked if they intended to rework the front of the plan to put sidewalks on site or were they looking to pay the fee in lieu of sidewalks.

Mr. Meeske said they were in the process of figuring that out. He said his preference would be to put them in; but given the grade changes in one area, he wasn't sure if it would be possible to

come up with an effective solution. He said if that would turn out to be prohibitive, they would opt to pay the fee in lieu of sidewalks.

Mr. Schmidt said he did take a look at that this afternoon and part of the problem is the steep bank that comes all the way to the road. He said it would be a situation of installing a sidewalk way above the property and then it would drop way down.

Mr. Meeske said it sounds like they are heading towards the opt out.

Ms. Ludwig said that was part of the reason for creating the fee in lieu so when they wanted to create a sidewalk in that area in the future, the Township would have the funds to do it.

Mr. Cosnek said it would have been nice being next to Hankey Farms for people that are still able to walk to be able to have that sidewalk to walk along there.

Mr. Cosnek asked if there were any further comments or questions. Hearing none, he asked the board for a motion on the application.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO REJECT THE APPLICATION AS ADMINISTRATIVELY INCOMPLETE.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

Ms. Ludwig advised the applicant that she would be on vacation the week of the next Planning Commission meeting but they would receive her review letters well in advance.

2. Application 2015-09 – Elmer Morra Subdivision Plan – Application for preliminary and final minor subdivision involving a lot line relocation on 0.765 acres of land located at 1136 Hoffman Drive in the R-R Rural Residential Zoning District (Allegheny County Lot and Block # 494-N-2 and 492-N-3).

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

No representative was present.

Mr. Cosnek asked if the Board could move forward on this without an applicant.

Ms. Ludwig said yes, this is a simple enough application that the Board could move forward.

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

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments:

1. This is an application for preliminary and final minor subdivision involving a lot line relocation on 0.765 acres of land located at 1136 Hoffman Drive in an R-R Rural Residential Zoning District (Allegheny County Lot and Block #s 494-N-2 and 492-N-3).
2. Several **existing non-conformances** have been noted on the plan, including the following:
 - The minimum lot area of the proposed lot is only 33,314 square feet as opposed to the required 80,000 square feet,
 - The minimum lot width of the proposed lot is 145.2 feet as opposed to the required minimum lot width of 200 feet,
 - The existing one-story trailer encroaches upon the 20 foot required minimum side yard setback, and
 - The existing frame shed encroaches upon both the required rear (10 feet) and side (also 10 feet) accessory building setbacks requirements.
3. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer per LSSE's review letter dated May 8, 2015.
4. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.
5. 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.
6. In addition, the County's SALDO requires that all signatures be made in *permanent navy blue ink or felt tipped pen*.
7. To date, we have not received any comments back from the Planning Division of the Allegheny County Department of Economic Development.
8. 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, the applicant will be billed for any remaining fees owed and asked to replenish the escrow account.

At this time, Ms. Ludwig said the application was complete, the Planning Commission should make a motion to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve the Morra Subdivision Plan.

Ms. Ludwig said Mr. Morra owns both of the properties. She said he wanted to do the lot line relocation so he could build a garage or some type of accessory structure and wasn't going to be able to build it without a variance and opted to do this instead. She said there are just a couple of existing non-conformances that need to be noted on the plan and that is really it.

Mr. Cosnek said he noticed in Mr. Wingrove's letter that there was a frame barn or shed in the rear of the property that isn't marked on the drawing. He asked if that needed to be identified.

Ms. Ludwig asked if he was talking about the existing frame shed.

Mr. Cosnek said it is on the north end of the property, the frame shed.

Mr. Kyle asked if that was the one encroaching on the side.

Mr. Cosnek said he has the trailer and the shed on the east side noted, but there is one on the north side also.

Mr. Wingrove said the review letter noted that the frame shed to the east of the property and the shed to the north of the property are both existing non-conformances. He said there was no need for a variance because they are not making the non-conformance worse.

Mr. Cosnek said they just weren't identified on the drawing then.

Mr. Wingrove said correct, there is no leader to this one here – the shed on the north side.

Mr. McDermott said that is on the opposite side of the property, correct.

Ms. Ludwig said they just need to add the arrow and label the other frame shed in the rear as non-conforming. She said she could make Dale Wachter who prepared the plans aware of that.

Mr. Cosnek asked if it was okay with showing the owner on the bottom as identifying those two parcels. He asked if those comments are picked up by the county when they review.

Mr. Wingrove said if it was something that would be an issue with it getting recorded, yes. He said how they have it presented satisfies the Township ordinance. He said if it doesn't satisfy the county recording requirements, it would be noted when the county reviews the plan.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Subdivision Plan Application documentation, dated April, 2015, prepared by Wachter-Willis Consulting, LP, as received by our office April 30, 2015. The plan proposes the consolidation of two lots (Lot and Block # 492-N-2 and 492-N-3). The properties are located with frontage along Hoffman Drive, and are Zoned R-R – Rural Residential Zoning District.

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 requires a minimum lot area of 80,000 square feet. (Section 205.3.A.)
Status: The proposed lot only provides 33,314 square feet. This is an existing non-conformance and is noted on the plan.

2. The Ordinance requires a minimum lot width of 200 feet. (Section 205.3.A.) **Status: The proposed lot provides a minimum lot width of 145.2 feet. This is an existing non-conformance and is noted on the plan.**
3. The Ordinance requires a minimum side yard building setback line of 20 feet. (Section 205.3.A.) **Status: The existing one-story trailer is within the minimum side yard setback. This is an existing non-conformance and is noted on the plan.**
4. The Ordinance requires a minimum side yard building setback line of 10 feet for accessory buildings. (Section 205.3.A.) **Status: The existing frame shed is within the minimum side yard setback. This is an existing non-conformance and is noted on the plan.**
5. The Ordinance requires a minimum rear yard building setback line of 10 feet for accessory buildings. (Section 205.3.A.) **Status: The existing frame shed is within the minimum rear yard setback. This is an existing non-conformance and is noted on the plan.**

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, conforms to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 27), and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22) with the resolution of the above noted items.

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

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE ELMER MORRA SUBDIVISION PLAN FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MINOR SUBDIVISION INVOLVING A LOT LINE RELOCATION AT 1136 HOFFMAN DRIVE CONTINGENT ON ANY OUTSTANDING COMMENTS OR THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER BEING ADDRESSED.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

3. **Application 2015-07 – Argenta Plan No. 3 First Revision** – Application for preliminary and final minor subdivision involving a lot line relocation on 37.39 acres of land located at 400 North Branch Road in the Town Center Zoning District (Allegheny County Lot and Block # 688-R-2 and 687-B-5).

Mr. Cosnek asked a representative to approach the Board.

Ms. Ludwig said Township Manager Bob Grimm could not attend tonight so she would be presenting this one.

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

Ms. Ludwig made the following comments:

1. This is an application for preliminary and final minor subdivision involving a lot line relocation on 37.39 acres of land located at 400 North Branch Road in the Town Center Zoning District (Allegheny County Lot and Block # 688-R-2 and 687-B-5).
2. This lot line relocation involves the transfer of the Argenta baseball fields property from the Argenta Family to the Township. The Township had previously leased the fields from the Argenta Family. However, the Argenta Family did not want to continue the lease so the Township is purchasing the fields from them. The fields will be included as part of the overall Township Municipal Complex property.
3. Refer to any comments from the Township Engineer per LSSE's review letter dated May 18, 2015.
4. Refer to any comments from the Township Solicitor.
5. 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.
6. In addition, the County's SALDO requires that all signatures be made in *permanent navy blue ink or felt tipped pen*.
7. To date, we have not received any comments back from the Planning Division of the Allegheny County Department of Economic Development.

At this time, Ms. Ludwig said the application is complete and there are no pending issues to address. The Planning Commission should make a motion to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve the Argenta Plan No. 3 First Revision minor subdivision application.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Subdivision Plan Application, dated May 2015, prepared by Lennon, Smith, Souleret Engineering, Inc. The plan proposes the subdivision of an existing property into two lots. The properties are located with frontage along North Branch Road and Donaldson Road. The properties are Zoned TC – Town Center District.

It is our understanding that the North Fayette Township Board of Supervisors has acknowledged that Lennon, Smith, Souleret Engineering, Inc. has prepared both the Subdivision Plan and this review 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):

Subdivision and Land Development

1. The Ordinance requires the seal of the registered landscape architect, engineer or surveyor who prepared the plat and the registered surveyor who completed the survey shown on the plan. (Section 302.C., 315.M.) **Status: The plans have not been sealed.**

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, will conform to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 27), and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 22) with the resolution of the above noted items.

Mr. Wingrove said the area is staked out if anyone wants to take a look at it on their way out this evening.

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

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE ARGENTA PLAN NO. 3 FIRST REVISION FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MINOR SUBDIVISION INVOLVING A LOT LINE RELOCATION AT 400 NORTH BRANCH ROAD.

ROLL CALL:	CHUCK KYLE	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES

4. **Application 2015-08 – Pointe West Stormwater Ponds Plan of Lots** – Application for preliminary and final minor subdivision involving the subdivision of one lot into two lots on the corner of Gateway Drive and North Road in an R-3 Medium Density Residential Zoning District (Allegheny County Lot and Block # 585-R-150).

Ms. Ludwig said she received an e-mail from Township Manager Bob Grimm that stated: “Please take this correspondence as the Township’s request to withdraw the Pointe West Subdivision plan because of questions that need resolved between the developers and the Township. We will resubmit the application once these questions have been resolved.”

No action by the Board was required.

COMMENTS:

Mr. Cosnek asked if there were any comments or questions about anything.

Ms. Ludwig said she wanted to introduce Patrick Conners, the Township's summer intern for the Community Development Department. She said he would be helping with a bunch of different projects including the re-writing of the Zoning Ordinance. She said he has been with the Township for about four weeks now and will be here for a total of 12 weeks.

Ms. Ludwig said she also wanted to mention that she received four applications for next month's meeting. Since she will be on vacation the week of the June meeting, she said Mr. Grimm will attend in her place.

ADJOURNMENT:

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:02 P.M. MOTION CARRIED.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Cherico
Planning Commission Recording Secretary