

**NORTH FAYETTE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING  
TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2014  
7:30 P.M.**

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

**ROLL CALL:**

Bob Owens, Chairman  
Bill Fitzgerald, Vice Chairman  
David Cosnek, Board Member  
Fred Lutz, Board Member  
Charles Kyle, Board Member  
Tom McDermott, Township Solicitor  
Shawn Wingrove, EIT  
Cheryl Cherico, Recording Secretary

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Kevin Brett, P.E., Township Engineer  
Laura Ludwig, Community Development Director

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Joel Hamilton  
George Baran, Mackin Engineering Company  
Elaine Storm, Mosaic Anglican Church  
John Frydrych, Tractor Supply  
Kevin Smith, Mosaic Anglican Church

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

A Motion was made by Mr. Bill Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. Dave Cosnek, to approve the minutes from the May 20, 2014, meeting. Motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **Application 2014-08 – Hamilton Consolidation Plan** – Application for a Preliminary and Final Minor Subdivision/Consolidation of 1.3362 acres of land on two existing lots located at 209 Logan Road in an R-2 Suburban Residential Zoning District.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

Mr. Hamilton approached the Board. He said he received the letter from the Township Engineer and there was only one minor change to make on the mylar. He said he believed J.R. Gales was going to resubmit the plan with the correction.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Wingrove.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Subdivision Plan Application, dated April 8, 2014 prepared by J.R. Gales and Associates, Inc., as received by our office May 23, 2014. The plan proposes the consolidation of two existing lots into one 1.3362 acre lot. The properties are located at 209 Logan Road, and are Zoned R-2 – Suburban Residential.

The following listing presents items identified during our initial review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (No. 360), and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (No. 418):

Subdivision

1. The Ordinance requires signature clauses for the Township Board of Supervisors. (Section 315.M.(6).) **Status: The signature clause and seal blank are labeled “Board of Commissioners.” Please revise the plan to read “Board of Supervisors.”**

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 (No. 360), and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (No. 418) with resolution of the above noted item.

Mr. Wingrove said the plan is simply consolidating two lots into one lot. He said the outstanding comment is pretty minor in nature and the Board could recommend approval contingent on his review comments being addressed.

Mr. Owens asked if anyone had any questions or comments.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there are any dwellings on either of these properties.

Mr. Hamilton said they are building a new house that would be contained on the larger of the two parcels and there is nothing on the smaller lot.

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

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF**

**SUPERVISORS FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MINOR SUBDIVISION/CONSOLIDATION OF THE HAMILTON CONSOLIDATION PLAN CONTINGENT ON THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER'S REVIEW COMMENTS DATED JUNE 3, 2014, BEING ADDRESSED.**

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

2. **Application 2014-10 – 3000 Park Lane Parking Addition** – Application for Preliminary and Final Non-Residential Land Development on 12.123 acres of land located at 3000 Park Lane Drive in a B-2 General Business Zoning District.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

Mr. Baron approached the Board. He said they were asking for approval to construct 48 parking spots on a previously developed site to meet tenant requirements.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Wingrove.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Land Development application documentation, dated May 20, 2014, last revised June 12, 2014, prepared by Mackin Engineering Company, as received by our office June 13, 2014. The Land Development application proposes construction a parking lot expansion to add 87 spaces to the existing lot at 3000 Park Lane Drive. The property is located along West Steuben Street, and is presently Zoned B-2 – General Business.

Previous comments may be found in our letter dated June 3, 2014. The items in *italics* are previous comments, which have not been resolved as of the date of this letter.

The following listing presents unresolved/non-compliant items identified during our review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (No. 360), Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (No. 418), and Stormwater Management Ordinance (No. 355):

Zoning

1. The Ordinance requires a buildable area analysis. (Section 503.1) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status: The applicant's consultant has indicated that a buildable area analysis is not applicable; however, the Ordinance requires completion of the analysis for all land development applications.**
2. The Ordinance requires that no erosion may occur. (Section 908.) **Previous Comment:** *Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has not been provided.* **Status: Pending.**

## Land Development

1. The Ordinance requires the posting of a Completion Security. (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: Pending.**
2. The Ordinance requires a Development Agreement. (Section 209.) **Previous Comment:** *The Developer should contact the Township Solicitor to initiate the preparation of the Development Agreement.* **Status: Pending.**
3. The Ordinance requires a Geotechnical Report (Section 304.) **Status:** *Not provided.* **Status: The applicant's consultant has indicated that the site is located previously graded site. The applicant should submit a written waiver request.**
4. The Ordinance requires a Phase One Environmental Site Assessment. (Section 307.) **Status:** *Not provided.* **Status: The applicant's consultant has indicated that the site is located previously graded site. The applicant should submit a written waiver request.**
5. The Ordinance requires a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan be provided. (Section 318.) **Previous Comment:** *Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has not been provided.* **Status: Pending.**
6. The Ordinance requires all storm sewers have a minimum grade of 1% and a minimum diameter of 15 inches. (Section 511.1.A.) **Previous Comment:** *The plan does not identify pipe sizes or grades.* **Status: The plan proposes 12" diameter storm sewers. The applicant should submit a written waiver request.**

## Stormwater Management

1. The Ordinance requires a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan be provided. (Section 701.) **Previous Comment:** *A Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan Narrative has not been provided. Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has not been provided.* **Status: Pending.**
2. The Ordinance requires a Stormwater Maintenance Agreement be signed and recorded. (Section 803.3.A.) **Previous Comment:** *A copy of the signed and recorded Stormwater Maintenance Agreement has not been provided.* **Status: Pending.**
3. The Ordinance requires payment to the Stormwater Facility Maintenance Fund for privately owned and maintained facilities. (Sections 803.4.1.a., and 902.3.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status: Pending.**

The plans have been reviewed for conformance to the Township Ordinance standards only. The review is based on surveys and drawings prepared by others and assume this information is correct

and valid as submitted. Independent confirmation of adequacy or applicability of surveys, design data or procedures has not been provided.

The application, as submitted, will conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (No. 360), Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (No. 226), and Stormwater Management Ordinance (No. 355) with resolution of the above noted items.

Mr. Wingrove said the revised submittal addressed the majority of the comments, but there are still some pending items with the developer's agreement, storm water management agreement, security and other typical items. He said the applicant also submitted a waiver request for three waivers on behalf of his client. He said one is for the Geotechnical Report because the site is already graded and he would recommend the Planning Commission consider approving that waiver request.

Mr. Wingrove said the applicant has also requested a waiver for the Phase One Environmental Site Assessment. He said for the same reason as the Geotechnical Report, this is an existing site that has already been graded and they would just be adding some more parking so he would recommend the Board consider approving that waiver request.

Mr. Wingrove said the final waiver request is to reduce the diameter of the storm sewer pipe from 15" to 12". He said there have been similar circumstances in some other developments recently and he would recommend the Board consider approving that waiver request.

Mr. Wingrove said the outstanding items are minor and it would be his recommendation to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors contingent on all outstanding items in the Township Engineer's review letter dated June 16, 2014, being addressed.

Mr. Owens asked when the applicant made the requests for the waivers.

Mr. Baron said it was after they had received the first review letter from the Township Engineer.

Mr. Owens asked the Township Solicitor if he had any issues with the waivers or application.

Mr. McDermott said they are mainly engineering issues and he would rely on the engineer's recommendation for those.

Mr. Kyle asked if they needed to make two separate motions.

Mr. McDermott said that has been the normal practice, to address the waivers and the application separately.

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

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE WAIVER REQUESTS FOR A GEOTECHNICAL REPORT, PHASE ONE ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT AND TO REDUCE THE STORM SEWER PIPE SIZE FROM 15" TO 12".**

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

Mr. Owens asked for a motion on the application.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR 3000 PARK LANE ADDITION CONTINGENT UPON ALL OUTSTANDING COMMENTS FROM THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER’S REVIEW LETTER DATED JUNE 16, 2014, BEING ADDRESSED.**

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

- 3. Application 2014-11CU – Mosaic Anglican Church Conditional Use – Application for a Conditional Use for a Place of Worship at 160 Imperial Plaza Drive in a B-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District.**

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

Ms. Storm approached the Board and said she is the pastor of the church. Ms. Storm submitted responses to the Board to address comments from the Township Engineer’s review letter.

Mr. Owens asked if the Township Engineer had received this previously.

Mr. Wingrove said he had received it late this afternoon and had not had an opportunity to review it before leaving the office.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Wingrove.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Conditional Use application, dated May 16, 2014, as received by our office May 23, 2014. The Conditional Use application proposes a place of worship. The property is located along at 160 Imperial Plaza Drive, and is Zoned B-1 – Neighborhood Commercial District.

The following listing presents items identified during our initial review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (No. 360):

## Zoning

1. The Ordinance requires a traffic impact study. (Section 703.NN.(3).). **Status: The Trip Generation and Parking Analysis letter, prepared by David E. Wooster and Associates, Inc. indicates an assumption was made regarding the parking usage of the other Imperial Plaza tenants. Provide confirmation that this assumption is correct and adjacent businesses do not have a demand for parking in conflict with the church service schedule.**

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. 360).

Mr. Wingrove said the application is for a Condition Use to have a place of worship at the Imperial Plaza shopping center. He said the Township Engineer's concern was regarding the traffic and parking requirements. He said the applicant submitted a parking analysis prepared by Wooster Engineers indicating that there was sufficient parking under the assumption that at their peak time, Sunday morning, the remaining establishments in the complex would not be in conflict. He said he believed the letter addressed the concerns and the Township Engineer would recommend approval of the Conditional Use if the Planning Commission so desired and recommend that a hearing be set.

Mr. Owens said he believed the only business that might be in conflict would be the gym in the corner.

Mr. Wingrove said he believed that business was no longer in that plaza. He said the only business listed on the report as being open on Sunday morning was Sun Club Tanning. He said the report indicates that there would be sufficient parking for both.

Mr. Kyle said if any of the other businesses elected to be open during that time, would there be sufficient parking.

Mr. Wingrove said they didn't address that in their report, but they did state in the original report that any expansion within the church that would require more parking could be addressed at a later date. He said that would also be the case if existing conditions with the other tenants would change.

Ms. Storm said the maximum number of seats that they could have would be 170. She said that would add up to approximately 50 parking spots. She said there are 101 parking spots at the location.

Ms. Owens said if the other businesses applied for applications previously, they would have given their hours of operation at that time.

Mr. McDermott said parking capacity isn't necessarily based on hours of operation. He said it would be generically based on peak employee times, square footage of business, number of people using it, etc. He said different uses would follow the chart differently.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if there would be other activities there on other week nights such as a youth group.

Ms. Storm said currently, no. She said their average attendance on a Sunday is 50. As the congregation grows, they are hoping to have a youth group at some point in time. Even in the event that they could have a youth group, most of the kids don't drive yet so parents would be dropping them off. She said other activities might happen during lent, but those would be evening based after 7:00 p.m. She said the building can only hold so many people. As the church would grow, she said they would start to look for property somewhere in the North Fayette area. She said the hope is that they would eventually outgrow the current retail space.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked how many current parking spots are there.

Ms. Storm said she believed there were currently 101 spaces and they would only be using 50 spaces at the most. She said that figure is based on one parking space per every three parishioners since most are families with children that can't drive. She said there are 170 chairs and typically a church doesn't have 100 percent attendance.

Mr. Fitzgerald said if it is based on three people per car, the total would be closer to 60 vehicles which is taking up the vast majority of what is there. He said he understands that the goal is to grow. His concerns, however, is that at some point in the future when they do grow, that it could become a problem for the other tenants.

Ms. Storm said the church started three years ago in her living room with the people who attended with her tonight. She said they have grown to 50 people that come on average in the last three years. She said she would like to tell them that church growth is quick and fast, but typically it's not. She said the current lease would be for three years and the hope would be to look for a property at the end of the second year and hopefully be able to start building.

Mr. Owens said the plans have basically been reviewed by the Township Engineer for conformance to the township ordinance standards only, but that is at this time. If there is a growth or youth group in the evenings, would there be a conflict. He said he isn't against having a church there, but they have to take these things into consideration.

Ms. Storm said she understands that.

Mr. Owens asked Mr. McDermott for his input.

Mr. McDermott said it seems like the Board has several concerns. One is what if another tenant makes changes that would affect Sunday morning. The other is what if the church starts doing things on weekday evenings. He said they could take a look at the other occupancies and see what the total parking requirements are in the plaza.

Mr. Cosnek said that would have been done when the development was first initiated, correct.

Mr. McDermott said that was correct. He said that should have been part of Wooster's original analysis.

Mr. Cosnek asked how the new uses compare with the original parking requirements.

Mr. McDermott said he wasn't talking about the prior use of the space they are going to occupy. He said he was talking about the total plaza. He asked how many other businesses are located there.

Ms. Storm said currently there is a pediatrician's office, a spot that is vacant where a chiropractor had been located, the church would occupy two spots, a tanning salon, Curves, a nail salon and a hair salon.

The Board said they didn't believe Curves was located there anymore.

Mr. Owens said it would be fine under current conditions, but he asked if there would be a way for them to come back before the Board if there was an expansion in the church.

Mr. Cosnek said they would have to have a public hearing for this now and if they expanded to another building, they would have to come back.

Mr. Fitzgerald said right now, they would be taking up 50 percent of the parking spaces. With growth, they could be taking up 80 percent of the parking spaces. He said if it goes to a public hearing and the people that are tenants there now have an issue, then they would show up. He asked how they could make it contingent upon them not exceeding a certain percentage of the parking.

Mr. McDermott said it seems like the Board is comfortable with the Sunday morning scenario. He said they could impose some kind of limit on a Wednesday night if they added a youth group when the other tenants may be at peak parking usage to limit it to a smaller capacity.

Mr. Lutz said the Planning Commission can only make a recommendation, but it would ultimately be up to the Board of Supervisors to grant the conditional use or place any parking requirements on it.

Mr. McDermott said that is correct, but the Board could certainly recommend that the Board of Supervisors limit occupancy during peak hours if that is a concern. Frankly, he said the Planning Commission could recommend conditions be placed on the plaza for future occupancies.

Mr. Kyle said he didn't get the feeling that the church would be infringing on anybody. He said it would be future tenants that would be affected and they would have to take a look at the parking situation to see if they could be open on a Sunday morning.

Mr. McDermott said the person that needs to have notice is the owner, the landlord of the plaza. If the Planning Commission would recommend that the Township grant conditional use and the church would be taking up all of the spaces on Sunday morning, the property owner needs to know that they could not lease space to someone else that would have a heavy Sunday morning load.

Mr. Kyle said he was comfortable with that. He asked if the existing tenants would have to buy into this, would they need consent from the existing tenants.

Mr. McDermott said the Planning Commission could recommend that. He said he wasn't sure that the existing tenants would need to express consent.

Mr. Fitzgerald added, or that they would have the right to. He said if the landlord is willing to lease to the church then onus is on him to deal with his angry tenants.

Mr. McDermott said that is actually a very good point. The fact that the Board may allow this does not trump for example if a pizza shop was next door to this and they started to serve Sunday brunch and all of the sudden they can't get their people in there because all the parking is taken up by the Sunday service.

Mr. Cosnek said what is going to happen is that people are going to start parking off the property which creates another issue.

Mr. McDermott said what happens is that the pizza shop owner can call the owner and say they had no right to tell somebody else to fill up the whole parking lot. He said if there is only 100 spaces, the landlord shouldn't be renting to someone that needs all of it. He said that is their responsibility. Whether the Planning Commission or the Township grants permission for this to be done, there are landlord/tenant laws.

Mr. Owens asked if they could make a motion to recommend approval based on current conditions.

Mr. McDermott said there are a couple of things the board could do. He said the Planning Commission could take action on recommending the public hearing be set and defer recommending action for or against the approval. If the Planning Commission doesn't wish to defer a recommendation, the Board could recommend that it not be approved, recommend that it be approved or recommend that it be approved with some conditions. He said they could recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors so long as the Township is satisfied that the parking conflicts are adequately dealt with.

Mr. Cosnek asked when the building was first constructed, if it had to meet parking requirements based on square footage of the building, not how many store fronts were there.

Mr. McDermott said no, in a plaza situation the occupancy is not a static thing. If it is a plaza with 10 retail spots and you put a butcher, a baker and a candlestick maker in there with the required parking calculations for each and all of the parking spaces are used up, no more occupancies can occur.

Mr. Cosnek said if he builds a spec building for retail and they don't know specifically what would be going in there yet, doesn't there have to be a certain number of spaces provided for the square footage of that building.

Mr. McDermott said not all parking requirements are based solely on square footage. He said an office building would be based on square footage. A building with retail spaces where each one of the spaces have uses and types of uses that can change and require different parking totals, the

owner could fill up the parking lot and not fill up all of the tenant space if they let in a big heavy user. He said for the landlord to be willing to take in a tenant that requires 50 dedicated parking spaces, he is also limiting the types of uses that could go in the vacant spaces.

Mr. Cosnek said so what Mr. McDermott is saying is that parking in the Planning Commission's discussion has no bearing and is not an issue.

Mr. McDermott said no, he was saying just the opposite.

Mr. Cosnek asked who was to determine that. He asked if it was part of the review or it was up to the building owner.

Mr. McDermott said the Township would determine whether the parking requirements are met.

Mr. Kyle said the Township believes they are met, correct.

Mr. Wingrove said from their engineer's report, yes.

The Board unanimously said at this time.

Mr. Owens said exactly, at this time and that was his whole point for why he started on this parking discussion.

Mr. McDermott asked Mr. Wingrove if this was a business that had these parking requirements every day, would it meet the parking requirements.

Mr. Wingrove said it may or may not. He said they didn't provide the parking requirements for each individual other tenant. He said they only provide for the Sunday morning spot when they would be open. He said maybe the solution would be for them to provide a revised letter addressing the need for each individual tenant right now with their maximum need for parking. He said this wouldn't address the future if any of the tenants would change or if their needs would change.

Mr. Owens asked if when he says they, if he means Wooster Engineering.

Mr. Wingrove said yes, the applicant and their engineer.

Mr. Owens asked if there was any urgency to opening the church at this location.

Ms. Storm said they cannot use the current space that they are using in October. She said from conversations with Ms. Ludwig, they would not be able to move any sooner than August 12 if they would receive approval or as late as August 26. She said they can continue where they are until October.

Mr. Owens asked the Board if they would like to make a request for additional information on the parking requirements of the adjoining business in the plaza in order to make a more informed response to the application.

Mr. McDermott said if that is the consensus of the Board then the appropriate procedural thing to do would be to do a motion to table a recommendation. He said they could still go ahead and make a motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors set a public hearing. In the meantime, the applicant could gather the information to bring back for the Planning Commission's July meeting.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked specifically what they are asking the applicant to bring back next month.

Mr. Owens said based on what Mr. Wingrove mentioned, the engineer could prepare information on parking for the other tenants.

Ms. Storm said for clarification, does the Board want their engineer to do a study of peak business hours of all of the tenants in the plaza.

The Board said that made the most sense.

Mr. Smith asked if they wanted a traffic/parking study done that shows the church at 100 percent capacity and all of the other businesses at their peak capacity to see if there would be adequate parking 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Mr. Cosnek said it wouldn't have to be 24/7 just maximum capacity for all at the same time.

Mr. McDermott asked if they were looking for the parking load of all of the businesses in the plaza.

Mr. Owens said yes.

Mr. McDermott said the Board wants to know the technical requirements and the actual in practice what is happening there.

Ms. Storm asked if by technical he meant they would need to contact each business owner to get the parking for each business or if the engineer would need to sit in the parking lot and watch the daily traffic flow for each business.

Mr. McDermott said by technical he meant on paper what is required for each of the individual businesses.

Mr. Owens asked if he would be able to come to the Township building to get that information.

Mr. McDermott said yes.

Mr. Cosnek said he was trying to simplify by asking what was the original parking for the plaza and how many of those businesses aren't there anymore, to determine the difference between what was originally proposed in that square foot space and what would be coming in there now.

Mr. McDermott said that's not how you do the analysis.

Mr. Cosnek said he knows that . . .

Mr. Fitzgerald said that wouldn't have any impact on what it could be in the future. He suggested they recommend a cap at 150 people. He said he personally didn't think the Sunday use issue was a big problem. How it impacts people throughout the week is another story, but they don't even have a youth group at this point. He said he didn't see a problem with moving it forward to a public hearing and let the church's engineer come up with the figures to present at the public hearing.

Mr. Kyle said it appears they have met all of the requirements of the Township to do this. He said he agreed with Mr. Fitzgerald and that he was comfortable with the Sunday morning usage and that there would be no current impact and possibly no future impact. He said he didn't know what the Planning Commission would get out of it other than what they already have because they can't project the future as to what is going to move in or out and what hours they would possibly have. He said he was back to approving it with the understanding that the applicant could be limited on what they are doing by the landlord depending upon who he rents to in the other spaces. He asked if the Board agreed.

Mr. McDermott said he thought a lot of the conversation was not keying on Sunday morning. He asked if the applicant was only requesting this activity on Sunday morning or have this extent of occupancy on Sunday morning.

Ms. Storm said there would be three people on site during business hours throughout the week. As far as worship services, that would be Sunday mornings. She said once a year, there would be a Good Friday service and that would be at 7 p.m. She asked if they would need to come back and ask for permission for that a later date.

Mr. Owens said this is back to where it all started and they are asking for approval for Sunday morning. He said he believed they should approve that if the rest of the Board agrees. He said they could come back for anything additional to that at a later time.

Ms. Storm asked if they should submit a calendar.

Mr. Cosnek said if the ordinance doesn't call for more parking spaces, he was okay with approving it.

The Board agreed.

Mr. McDermott said they could recommend approval for Sunday services and other holidays and they would need to show that they could meet the parking spaces for other activity during other hours. He suggested they collect the information to show that Sunday morning is not an issue and that youth groups with attendance of up to 50 on a Wednesday night could also be accommodated.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he thought they were trying to get too defined with this and that government needed to take a step back. He suggested they recommend approval and let the other tenants complain to the landlord if the church starts taking up too much parking.

Mr. Owens 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. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR CONDITIONAL USE FOR A PLACE OF WORSHIP AT 160 IMPERIAL PLAZA DRIVE FOR MOSAIC ANGLICAN CHURCH.**

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

Mr. Owens 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 SCHEDULE A CONDITIONAL USE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MOSAIC ANGLICAN CHURCH.**

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

4. **Application 2014-12 – Tractor Supply Company** – Application for Preliminary and Final Non-Residential Land Development on 8.471 acres of land located along West Steuben Street in a B-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

Mr. Frydrych on behalf of 3 Point Properties North Fayette, LLC approached the Board. He said he wanted to speak in general on all three applications to give a summary before breaking it down individually. Basically, the property consists of two parcels, one that is 1 acre and one that is approximately 7.5 acres. He said they have requested lot consolidation to create one developable parcel of 8.47 acres located off Route 22. He said there is also a pending re-zoning of the property that was initiated by the Township a month or two ago to change the current zoning from B-1 to a proposed B-2 zoning. He said they submitted the applications under the proposed B-2 zoning pending approval of the zoning change. He said the permitted use under B-2 allows for the retail space of a store up to 20,000 square feet. The site plan itself after considering the lot consolidation is to construct a 19,097 square foot tractor supply store within the Township that also accommodates a 15,000 square foot outdoor display area located on the back where the side would be facing Route 22. The proposed store would be located on West Steuben Street just above the Shop n Save Plaza to the east and Nappies Food and Distribution Center to the west. He said the site itself has a single family home located near the entry here (he pointed to a site plan drawing) and on the west corner here. He said access would be on the eastern most edge to accommodate turning movements and site distance as it relates to the intersection of West Steuben Street and Steubenville Pike.

Mr. Cosnek asked if he could point out the driveway for Advanced Auto on the site plan and asked if it would be directly across from that entrance.

Mr. Frydrych said the entrance would be down a little farther from Advanced Auto. As for development, he said the building would cover 5 percent of the lot and there would be a considerable amount of green space. He said there would be no planned development beyond the outdoor display area and that would be in excess of 375 feet to the right of way of Route 22. He said there is a plan to preserve the existing wood lines to the east and west. He said they have requested three waivers for storm conveyance piping of less than 1 percent, the fence requirement along the detention basin located on the side between Nappies, and the dimension of the drive isles. He said the tractor supply traffic is typically larger vehicles that require a wider drive. He said patrons are usually 15 to 25 miles out from the store because Tractor Supply is a destination point for small scale farmers and homeowners that like outdoor merchandise. Fencing along the outdoor display would be chain link with rolling gates. He said there are a number of variances that have been requested that will be presented to the Zoning Hearing Board next week including landscaping and curbed islands. He said there are 70 planned parking spaces although 90 are required. He said Tractor Supply typically likes to get 62 to 70 spaces. He said there is not a huge demand for parking at Tractor Supply stores. He said they have been successful at all of the store locations that they have worked on to get the parking requirements reduced. He said this site is planned for 70 spaces, four of which are ADA accessible. Three of those spaces would be larger for pull through vehicles where a truck with a trailer hitched to it could park without taking up additional stalls and then also navigate through the outdoor display area to pick up merchandise, load their trailers and trucks, and circulate through to leave the property.

Mr. Cosnek asked what the required number of spaces was.

Mr. Frydrych said it was 90. He said as they evaluated the number of bufferyard issues, they believe they can make their case for the preservation of existing wood lines which is a considerable depth of 40 to 60 feet on both sides. He said they are also seeking waivers in regards to the dense requirement of Bufferyard B and Bufferyard C along West Steuben Street. He said they intend to add hedge rows along West Steuben and clear out the existing brush to add site distance. Stormwater would go through the site to a detention basin. He said they have worked very closely with Township staff and have had several meetings spanning over several months prior to submitting applications and have been very appreciative to the fact that they were very willing to work with us to have solid applications and presentations to present to the Planning Commission, Zoning Hearing Board and ultimately to the Board of Supervisors. He said they have also requested conditional use for a pole sign on the property. He said they are actually proposing two pole signs, one at the entrance and one at the back side along Route 22. He said they feel the pole sign is applicable to the area because there are four observable pole signs within the quadrant of commercial development at McDonalds, Advanced Auto, Circle K and First Commonwealth Bank. He said the request for the pole sign along Route 22 is because any eastbound traffic would not be able to see the building because of topographic conditions. He said the fall from Route 22 to the building pad would be in excess of 30 feet. He said the plan would include a 200 percent landscape area around the signs. He said there is one issue with regard to the size of the sign that they would resolve through discussion with the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked how many feet of fence would it be around the detention pond. He said with the dollar value of the whole project, how much more could it be to add a fence. He asked if it was because they consider it an eyesore.

Mr. Frydrych said it is hit or miss in different jurisdictions, some require it and others don't. He said Tractor Supply would rather not have it because in most cases it is not a pool of standing water because it dissipates quickly.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if they have ever let someone not put a fence around the detention pond.

Mr. Wingrove said he spoke to Mr. Brett several times today and he recommended that the Board not grant that waiver. He said the ordinance is pretty clear that any pond facility that holds two feet or more of water has to have a fence. In this case, he said Mr. Frydrych is correct that it dissipates quickly but there are scenarios where the pond could have up to 4 ½ feet of water which does meet the ordinance requirement. He said as a point of reference, the pond in front of the Township is a similar depth as well as two at the community center and they all have fences. He said all of the new ponds have fences.

Mr. Frydrych said they could accept that.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he didn't think it would be a big deal, but doesn't want to set precedence. He said he was glad Tractor Supply was back. He said they were here a few years back, but never came in with applications.

Mr. Frydrych said the area has been on Tractor Supply's radar for years and the developer has been in and out of the Township for six or seven years trying to get the store here. He said this was one of two or three sites that they have looked at over the last six years.

Mr. Owens said he is tired of driving over an hour to get there.

Mr. Frydrych said they are moving forward now and this is a commitment.

Mr. Lutz said he believed it would do very well here.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Wingrove.

Mr. Owens asked for comments from the engineer's office.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Land Development application documentation, dated May 19, 2014, prepared by SE3, as received by our office May 23, 2014. The Land Development application proposes construction of a 19,097 square foot Tractor Supply retail store with associated parking and stormwater management facilities. The property is located along West Steuben Street, and is presently Zoned B-1 – Neighborhood Commercial. A rezoning request has been submitted for the subject parcel to rezone to B-2 General Business with a Planned Non-Residential Development (PNRD) Overlay.

The following listing presents items identified during our initial review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (No. 360), Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (No. 418), and Stormwater Management Ordinance (No. 355):

### Zoning

1. The Ordinance identifies Retail Store (greater than 20,000 sf) as a permitted use in the B-2 district. (Section 205.2.B.(3).) **Status: The property is currently zoned B-1, however, the rezoning process to change the Zoning District to B-2 has been initiated. Comments contained in this review letter will pertain to the proposed B-2 zoning. Should the property remain zoned as B-1, LSSE reserves the right to revise this review accordingly.**
2. The Ordinance requires a 30' front building setback, 20' side building setback where not adjoining residential districts and a 50' rear building setback in the B-2 Zoning District. (Section 204.3.A.) **Status: The site plan identifies proposed zoning as B-1 and includes building setbacks for this District. As noted in Item 1, above, a zoning change to B-2 is required for the proposed use, and the rezoning process has been initiated. Revise the plan to identify the proposed Zoning District as B-2. Also, please revise building setbacks accordingly.**
3. The Ordinance requires a maximum building height of 80 feet in the B-2 Zoning District. (Section 204.3.A.) **Status: The proposed building height has not been shown on the plan.**
4. The Ordinance requires clear sight distance be maintained. (Section 205.6.B.(4).) **Status: Identify the required and available sight distances on the Site Plan.**
5. The Ordinance requires Bufferyard B where adjoining any B District. (Section 201.3. and 205.3.B.) **Status: Bufferyard B has been labeled on the plan, however, the limit of the required 25-foot width bufferyard has not been shown. Proposed bufferyard plantings have not been shown on the Landscaping Plan.**
6. The Ordinance requires a 100-foot bufferyard from the right-of-way of Route 22/30. (Section 206.3.E.) **Status: The location of this bufferyard has not been identified on the plan. The proposed pole sign encroaches into this bufferyard.**
7. The Ordinance requires 20% of the interior parking area be landscaped. (Section 207.2.B.) **Status: Not provided.**
8. The Ordinance requires one internal landscape island for every 10 parking spaces. Landscape islands shall be a minimum of 10' wide with a minimum area of 160 square feet. (Section 207.2.B.(2).(b).) **Status: Not provided.**
9. The Ordinance requires a maximum of 10 parking spaces in an unbroken row. (Section 207.2.B.(2).(c).) **Status: The plan proposes rows of greater than 10 parking spaces.**

10. The Ordinance requires 20% of the area occupied by parking spaces be shaded. (Section 207.2.B.(2).(h).) **Status: A tabulation of shaded area has not provided. It does not appear as though this requirement has been met.**
11. The Ordinance requires outdoor storage areas be screened by a 100 percent opaque security fence at least 6 feet in height. (Section 211.1.) **Status: Opaque screening has not been provided for the outdoor storage areas.**
12. The Ordinance requires parking be provided as determined by use. (Section 302.D.) **Status: A tabulation of required and proposed parking has not been provided.**
13. The Ordinance requires loading berths, at least 65 feet in length by 12 feet wide, as determined by use. (Sections 302.D. and 311) **Status: The location of loading berths has not been identified on the plan.**
14. The Ordinance requires two-lane access drives be a maximum of 26 feet in width. (Section 306.1.) **Status: The plan proposes 28' wide access drives.**
15. The Ordinance requires parking lot lighting be installed to provide an average minimum of 2-footcandle during typical hours of operation. (Section 309.) **Status: A photometric plan with spot illumination levels has not been provided.**
16. The Ordinance requires a Buildable Area Analysis be provided. (Section 503.1) **Status: Not provided.**
17. The Ordinance requires that no erosion may occur. (Section 908.) **Status: Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has not been provided. Provide documentation that the NPDES Permit has been issued.**
18. The Ordinance requires pole signs have a maximum height of 25 feet and allows one pole sign per lot. (Section 1007.1.A.) **Status: The plan proposes two pole signs 30' in height. The applicant should also note a separate Sign Permit Application must be filed with the Township for the construction of any sign.**

#### Land Development

1. The Ordinance requires the posting of a Completion Security. (Section 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 bond amount.**
2. The Ordinance requires a Development Agreement. (Section 209.) **Status: The Developer should contact the Township Solicitor to initiate the preparation of the Development Agreement.**
3. The Ordinance requires certification and seal of the engineer or surveyor who prepared the plan. (Sections 302.C and 308.P). **Status: The plans have not been sealed.**

4. The Ordinance requires building lines be shown on the plan. (Section 302.J.) **Status: Building lines have been shown for the B-1 Zoning District, but should be shown for the B-2 District. Refer to Zoning Comment No. 2, above.**
5. The Ordinance requires zoning classification of the area to be developed be shown on the plan. (Section 302.K.) **Status: The plan identifies the B-1 Zoning District as both existing and proposed zoning. The proposed zoning should be identified as B-2.**
6. The Ordinance requires areas subject to periodic flooding, as identified on the current Flood Insurance Rate Maps be identified. (Section 302.T.) **Status: Not provided. If the proposed plan does not lie within the FEMA designated floodplain, a note should be added to the plan indicating such.**
7. The Ordinance requires a Phase One Environmental Site Assessment. (Section 307.) **Status: Not provided.**
8. The Ordinance requires preliminary building floor plans be provided. (Section 308.D.) **Status: Not provided.**
9. The Ordinance requires the location and specifications for lighting of parking areas and walkways. (Section 308.H.) **Status: A photometric plan with spot illumination levels has not been provided.**
10. The Ordinance requires building elevation drawings be provided. (Section 309.) **Status: Not provided.**
11. The Ordinance requires a traffic impact study be provided for any land development which will generate 100 or more peak hour trips. (Section 312.) **Status: Not provided. If the proposed development proposed fewer than 100 peak hour trips, provide a sealed statement indicating such, including a calculation of the proposed peak hour trips.**
12. The Ordinance requires an infrastructure demand statement be provided. (Section 314.) **Status: Not provided.**
13. The Ordinance requires a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan be provided. (Section 318.) **Status: Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has not been provided. Provide documentation that the NPDES Permit has been issued.**
14. The Ordinance requires the development be served by public water. (Section 402.) **Status: A water service availability letter has not been provided.**
15. The Ordinance requires the development be served by public sanitary sewers. (Section 402) **Status: The Developer's consultant has indicated that the proposed use will generate less than 800 gallons per day and is thus does not require completion of a Planning Module. Provide sealed calculations indicating the anticipated sewage flows. Because the plan proposes a mainline extension, a sewage planning exemption mailer should be submitted.**

16. The Ordinance requires sidewalks be provided along all street frontages of all land developments. (Section 404.2.) **Status: Sidewalks have not been provided along West Steuben Street.**
17. The Ordinance requires the site grading to comply with the Township Grading Ordinance. (Section 503.1.) **Status: The following comments are made after a review per the Township Grading Ordinance:**
  - A. The Ordinance requires a grading permit application be filed. (Section 103.1.) **Status: Not provided.**
  - B. The Ordinance requires a plan showing a base line with locations of cross sections at 50-foot intervals be provided. (Section 103.2.D.(2).(g).) **Status: Not provided.**
  - C. The Ordinance requires a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan be provided. (Section 103.2.D.(2).(j).) **Status: Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has not been provided. Provide documentation that the NPDES Permit has been issued.**
18. The Ordinance requires all storm sewers have a minimum grade of 1%. (Section 511.1.A.) **Status: The plan proposes storm sewers with a grade of less than 1%.**
19. The Ordinance requires all sanitary sewers have a minimum diameter of 8 inches. (Section 512.2.A.) **Status: The plan proposes a 6 inch diameter sanitary sewer. The proposed sewer constitutes a mainline sewer extension which must be dedicated to the Township. This extension must connect to the existing line at a manhole. A wye connection as shown on the plan is not permitted. Additionally, proposed Sanitary Manhole San (1) should be located within the roadway right of way.**
20. The Ordinance requires the Township inspect all street crossing for proposed waterlines. (Section 513.2.C.) **Status: The plan proposes and open cut of West Steuben Street for the proposed water service. The applicant should note a Road Opening Permit will be required for this work.**

#### Stormwater Management

1. The Ordinance requires all calculations used in the design of the storm sewer system and detention facilities. (Section 402.C.(1).) **Status: The report identifies Pipe Reach 1 (STM (2) to STM (3)) as an 18" diameter storm sewer and Pipe Reach 2 (STM (3) to STM (4)) as a 24" diameter storm sewer, however the plan identifies both as 15" diameter. Please revise the report or plan accordingly.**
2. The Ordinance requires the design hydrographs. (Section 402.C.(5).) **Status: The report includes complete hydrograph and routing data for only one storm for each the pre- and post-development conditions and a summary sheet only for all other design storms. Provide complete hydrograph and routing data for all storms.**

3. The Ordinance requires the all detention facilities be equipped with a spillway to safely pass the 100-year design storm without damaging the facilities. (Section 601.2.B.) **Status: The narrative indicates that the emergency spillway has been design to pass the unattenuated 100-year design storm with 1 foot of freeboard. Please provide calculations for the emergency spillway confirming that 1 foot of freeboard exists. Also, the report does not consider this scenario in the routing calculations. Provide confirmation that the storm sewers identified in the report as Existing Modified Pond, Reach 1 and Reach 2 have capacity to convey the 100-year design storm from the emergency spillway in addition to all other areas tributary to STM (1).**
4. The Ordinance requires the all detention facilities with water depths greater than 2 feet be fenced. (Section 601.2.D.(4).) **Status: A fence has not been provided.**
5. The Ordinance requires a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan be provided. (Section 701.) **Status: A Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan Narrative has not been provided. Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) has not been provided.**
6. 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.**
7. 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.**

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 (No. 360), Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (No. 226), and Stormwater Management Ordinance (No. 355). Additional comments may be made and we reserve the right to comment further pending submission of revised plans.

Mr. Wingrove said he did receive a revised application earlier in the day, but could not process a revised letter in time for the meeting. He said the revised application addresses the vast majority of the comments. He said the outstanding issues in the zoning section are all for the most part pending the outcome of the Zoning Hearing Board's decision next week. Other than that, he said most of the items were clerical that needed to be added to the plan. He said the bond security, etc. are items that they are addressing with Mr. McDermott. There are still some items with stormwater management but despite the amount of comments in the letter, he said the Township Engineer recommended that they could be addressed through contingent approval if the Planning Commission so desired. He said the Township Engineer's office would also recommend denial of the fence waiver and approval of the storm sewer pipe waiver.

Mr. Owens asked if all of this could be addressed in one motion.

Mr. McDermott suggested that each be addressed separately.

Mr. Owens said before he called for a motion he wanted to make a comment. He said he spoke to Mr. Grimm earlier in the day and understands that the outstanding items were addressed kind of late. Although he didn't understand all of the particulars, he wanted to note for the record that the Planning Commission and Township want to make sure things get done, but also want to be accommodating.

Mr. Frydrych said it has been a great working relationship with the Township.

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

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DENY THE WAIVER REQUEST TO NOT INSTALL A FENCE AROUND THE DETENTION POND.**

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

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVIORS FOR THE STORM SEWER PIPE OF LESS THAN 1 PERCENT.**

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

Mr. Owens asked for a motion on the application.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL NON RESIDENTIAL LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR TRACTOR SUPPLY CONTINGENT UPON ALL OUTSTANDING ITEMS IN THE TOWNSHIP ENGINEER'S REVIEW LETTER BEING SATISFIED AND THAT THE ENTIRE APPROVAL PROCESS HINGES ON THE ZONING CHANGE BEING APPROVED.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
-------------------	------------------------	------------

<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>FRED LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

5. **Application 2014-13– Page Consolidation Plan** – Application for a Preliminary and Final Minor Subdivision/Consolidation of 8.471 acres of land on two existing lots located along West Steuben Street in a B-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Wingrove.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Subdivision application documentation, dated May 19, 2014, last revised June 17, 2014, prepared by R.A. Smith National, as received by our office June 17, 2014, via email. The subdivision plan application proposes the consolidation of two existing lots into one 8.510 acre lot. The property is located along West Steuben Street, and is presently Zoned B-1 – Neighborhood Commercial. A rezoning request has been submitted for the subject parcel to rezone to B-2 General Business with a Planned Non-Residential Development (PNRD) Overlay. Comments contained in this review letter will pertain to the proposed B-2 zoning. Should the property remain zoned as B-1, LSSE reserves the right to revise this review accordingly.

Previous comments may be found in our letter dated June 3, 2014.

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, conforms to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (No. 360), and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (No. 418).

Mr. Owens asked if there were any comments or questions. Hearing none, he asked the Board for a motion.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MINOR SUBDIVISION/CONSOLIATION OF THE PAGE CONSOLIDATION PLAN.**

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

6. **Application 2014-14CU – 3PP North Fayette, LLC Conditional Use**– Application for a Conditional Use for a Pylon Sign at 125 West Steuben Street in a B-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District.

The Board reviewed the comments of Mr. Wingrove.

We have completed our review of the above referenced Conditional Use application, dated May 15, 2014, as received by our office May 23, 2014. The Conditional Use application proposes two pole signs. The property is located along West Steuben Street, and is currently Zoned B-1 – Neighborhood Commercial District. The rezoning process has been initiated to rezone the property B-2 General Business District

The following listing presents items identified during our initial review that do not conform to the Township of North Fayette’s Zoning Ordinance (No. 360):

Zoning

1. The Ordinance requires a written statement showing compliance with the applicable express standards of Part 7 of the Township Zoning Ordinance. (Section 701.D.(1).(b).). **Status: Not provided.**
2. The Ordinance requires a map showing and identifying all lots within 200 feet of the lot for which the conditional use is requested and a list of the names and addresses of the owners of these lots. (Section 701.D.(1).(c).). **Status: Not provided.**
3. The Ordinance requires the applicant to demonstrate that no other identification sign is practical for the site and that the natural conditions of the site prohibit all other signage as an effective means of identification. (Section 703.OO.(1) and 703.OO.(2).). **Status: Not provided.**
4. The Ordinance requires landscaping be planted at the base of each pole sign that is equivalent to 200 percent of the sign face. (Section 703.OO.(3).). **Status: A landscaping plan has not been provided.**
5. The Ordinance prohibits backlighting of pole signs. (Section 703.OO.(4).). **Status: A detail of the sign has not been provided.**
6. The Ordinance allows one pole sign per lot. (Section 1007.1.A.) **Status: The application proposes two poles signs. A request for a variance has been submitted for review by the Zoning Hearing Board. Pending.**

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

The application, as submitted, does not conform to the Township of North Fayette's Zoning Ordinance (No. 360). Additional comments may be made and we reserve the right to comment further pending submission of revised plans.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if the two signs would be the same size.

Mr. Frydrych said yes, they would be two like signs.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked how large the signs would be.

Mr. Frydrych said each would be 18' x 6' for a total of 108 square feet on the sign face. He said that would be pretty much in line with the sign Advanced Auto has up now. He said the other signs in that quadrant are smaller.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked how many feet off the ground the signs would be.

Mr. Frydrych said 30'.

Mr. Owens asked if the two signs would be at the same level.

Mr. Frydrych said both would be at the same maximum height of 30'. He said if they would be looking at two different sizes of signs, obviously they would want the larger to be at Route 22.

Mr. Kyle asked where the entrance sign would be located.

Mr. Frydrych said it would be on the east side of the entrance.

Mr. Kyle asked if the Planning Commission had ever granted two pole signs in the past.

Mr. Fitzgerald said the pole signs located there now were up before the Zoning Ordinance was changed. He said by the highway, it makes sense. He said he would rather see a ground sign by the entrance.

Mr. Kyle said he is kind of in favor of the highway sign, but doesn't see the need for a 30' pole sign at the entrance.

Mr. McDermott said there has been an attempt to phase out pole signs as they are taken down.

Mr. Owens said he doesn't see a problem with both pole signs.

Mr. Kyle said he doesn't agree and would probably vote no.

Mr. Cosnek said it is amongst the other pole sign so he didn't see a problem with it.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he understands where Mr. Kyle is coming from and out by the highway makes sense. He said ultimately the Board of Supervisors would decide and they are the ones that approved the ordinance to begin with.

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

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR A PYLON SIGN FOR TRACTOR SUPPLY ON WEST STEUBEN STREET.**

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

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SET A CONDITIONAL USE PUBLIC HEARING FOR A PYLON SIGN FOR TRACTOR SUPPLY ON WEST STEUBEN STREET.**

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

- 7. **Sewage Facilities Planning Module - Pointe West Plan of Lots Phases 8, 12B, 14 and 15 –**  
Application for approval of a sewage planning module associated with the construction of Phases 8, 12B 14 and 15 of the Pointe West Plan of Lots.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

No representative approached the Board.

The Board reviewed the comments or Mr. Wingrove.

Mr. Wingrove said there were no outstanding issues with the Township Engineer and he recommended approval.

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

**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 POINTE WEST PLAN OF LOTS PHASES 8, 12B, 14 & 15 SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE.**

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	<b>BILL FITZGERALD</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>DAVE COSNEK</b>	<b>YES</b>

<b>FREDM LUTZ</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>CHUCK KYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>BOB OWENS</b>	<b>YES</b>

**COMMENTS:**

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

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:59 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Cherico  
Planning Commission Recording Secretary