

**NORTH FAYETTE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2014
7:30 P.M.**

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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
Laura Ludwig, Community Development Director
Cheryl Cherico, Recording Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Kevin Brett, P.E., Township Engineer

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tyler Hall, Pointe West, L.P.
Joe Young, Wind Ridge Engineering
Dan Hall, Pointe West, L.P.
Randy Alwine, 212 Dupont Drive, McDonald

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

A motion was made by Mr. Bill Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. Fred Lutz, to approve the minutes from the July 15, 2014, meeting. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. Application 2014-16 -Pointe West Plan Phase No. 14** – Application for final subdivision and land development for Phase 14 of the Pointe West Plan along Hill Place Drive that proposes the creation of 31 residential lots and an open space parcel on 7.4 acres of land zoned R-3 Medium Density Residential.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

Mr. Dan Hall approached the Board.

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

Ms. Ludwig said she didn't have written comments since last week was her first week back from leave so she would defer to Mr. Wingrove for most items. She said they had a conference call with Mr. Young, the applicant's engineer, today to attempt to address comments in the Township Engineer's most recent review dated August 13, 2014, which the Board should have a copy. She said some items were addressed electronically today and they brought hard copies with them tonight for the Township Engineer. She said they did supply the Buildable Area Analysis which is Zoning Item No. 1 on the first page. She said the E & S from the Conservation District is still pending and the Board has approved projects with that item outstanding in the past. She said it wouldn't move forward to the Board of Supervisors until we would get that back from the Conservation District. She said a few other outstanding items include the Developer's Agreement and the Completion Bond, but those have also been contingent items in the past. She said the applicant is asking for three waivers: The Phase 1 Environmental Assessment in Section 301 of SALDO, the vertical curve length in Section 504.3.c in SALDO, and the cul-de sac length in Section 504.4.b. She said they did provide the Infrastructure Demand Statement and Lennon Smith Souleret Engineering will need to review the calculations on that as well as on the Buildable Area Analysis. She said there were some stormwater items that were worked out for the most part and should be shown on the plans. She said the one item she did want to comment on that is stormwater related is the fence around the detention facility. She said she believed they were originally going to try to get a waiver from installing that fence. She said that is not only a development sort of issue, but a public safety issue as well, especially in the residential developments. She said it is a newer requirement to fence those ponds in and it is a simple chain link fence. It was not required in previous phases, but it is a requirement now.

Mr. Fitzgerald said they didn't grant the last waiver request for that when Ms. Ludwig was on leave.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

We have completed our review of the above referenced Final Major Subdivision Plan, dated June 2014, last revised August 7, 2014 and Residential Land Development Plan dated July 2014, prepared by Wind Ridge Engineering Co., as received by our office July 23, 2014. The subdivision plan proposes the creation of 31 single-family residential lots, and an Open Space parcel in Phase 14. The properties are located along Hill Place Drive, and are Zoned R-3 – Medium Density Residential District.

Previous comments can be found in our letter dated August 4, 2014.

The following listing presents unresolved/non-compliant items identified during our review for conformance 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 Buildable Area Analysis be performed by the Developer. (Section 503.1.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status:** **The Ordinance requires a Buildable Area Analysis be submitted. This Ordinance was also in effect at the time of Preliminary Approval for Phases 13 and 14.**
2. The Ordinance does not allow erosion. (Section 909.) **Previous Comment:** *Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed, deemed adequate by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD), and that the revision to the existing NPDES Permit has been issued for Phase 14 have not been provided.* **Status:** **Pending.**

Final Major Subdivision

1. The Ordinance requires a Completion Bond for the proposed improvements. (Sections 208.) **Previous Comment:** *An itemized quantity takeoff and unit price cost estimate has not been provided for review. The cost estimate will aid in the determination of the required Completion Bond amount.* **Status:** **The applicant's consultant has indicated that an itemized cost estimate will be provided. Pending.**
2. The Ordinance requires the Developer execute a Development Agreement. (Section 209.) **Previous Comment:** *The Developer must contact the Solicitor to initiate the preparation of the Development Agreement.* **Status:** **Pending.**
3. The Ordinance requires a phase one environmental assessment. (Section 307.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status:** **No change. The applicant may request a waiver of this Ordinance requirement.**
4. The ordinance requires an infrastructure demand statement be provided. (Section 314.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided.* **Status:** **No change. An infrastructure demand statement is required by Ordinance.**
5. The Ordinance requires the erosion and sedimentation control plan be filed with the Allegheny County Conservation District. (Section 318.) **Previous Comment:** *Documentation that the Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been reviewed, deemed adequate by the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD), and that the revision to the existing NPDES Permit has been issued have not been provided.* **Status:** **Pending.**
6. The Ordinance requires that each lot be served by public sanitary sewers approved by the PADEP (Section 402.). **Previous Comment:** *Revise the plan to provide a direct lateral*

connection to the sanitary sewer main at each lot. The lateral connection to the sewer main is not located on the subject lot for Lot 1414 or 1417. **Status: No change.**

7. The Ordinance requires roadway vertical curves have a minimum length of 250 feet. (Section 504.3.C.) **Previous Comment:** *The plan proposes a vertical curve of 100 feet.* **Status: The applicant's consultant has indicated that a 250 foot vertical curve may create ponding issues. The applicant should provide a written waiver request.**
8. The Ordinance requires cul-de-sacs be no greater than 600 feet in length. (Section 504.4.B.) **Previous Comment:** *The plan proposes a cul-de-sac greater than 600 feet in length.* **Status: The applicant's consultant has indicated the cul-de-sac length has been previously approved. The applicant should provide a written waiver request.**
9. The Ordinance requires all permanent cul-de-sacs be designed with a snow removal easement 50' in width and 10' in depth. (Section 504.4.H.) **Previous Comment:** *A snow removal easement has not been provided. A note must be included on the plan indicating that this easement shall be maintained as open space and no improvements or obstructions shall be permitted.* **Status: No change. The applicant's consultant has indicated that this was not required for the Phase 13 cul-de-sac, however, the current SALDO, adopted by the Township following the approval of Phase 13, requires this easement be provided.**
10. The Ordinance requires all stormwater roof drains be discharged to an on-lot detention sump or other PADEP approved BMP. (Section 511.E.(1).) **Previous Comment:** *Roof drain collectors have been shown to convey runoff to the stormwater management facility; however a connection has not been shown for Lot 1414 or 1419.* **Status: Revise the plan to eliminate the connection for Lot 1419 through the roadway cartway. Provide a roof drain collector to service the lot directly.**

Stormwater Management

1. The Ordinance requires all calculations and criteria for the design of stormwater management facilities be provided. (Section 402.C.(13).) **Previous Comment:** *Provide calculations confirming the existing 24" storm sewer beyond Manhole1122 is adequately sized to convey the anticipated flow from Stormwater Management Facility 14-1 and the overland flow tributary to existing HW 11-1. Additionally, revise the plan to provide a direct connection from Storm Line 1 (the proposed stormwater management facility outfall) to the existing storm sewer system.* **Status: The calculations provided indicate a flow of 14.68 cfs entering the existing headwall. Provide calculations identifying the basis of this value. Also, the plan must be revised to provide a direct connection from Storm Line 1 to the existing storm sewer system.**
2. The Ordinance requires the project specifications relative to the proposed stormwater management controls be provided. (Section 402.C.(13).) **Previous Comment:** *Provide a detail for the outlet structure of the proposed stormwater management facility and clarification of the proposed operation of the structure. If the facility is to dewater through*

infiltration, provide calculations showing the dewatering time of the facility, based on field measured infiltration test results. Status: Revise the plan to eliminate the underdrain valve.

3. The Ordinance requires that all detention facilities with water depths greater than 2 feet be fenced. (Section 601.2.D.(4).) **Previous Comment:** *A fence has not been provided of Stormwater Management Facility 14-1. Status: No change. The plan proposes a water depth greater than 2 feet. Therefore the facility must be fenced.*
4. The Ordinance requires the discharge of stormwater runoff be directed to a well-defined drainage course. (Section 601.11.F.) **Previous Comment:** *Discharge from the emergency spillway appears to be directed toward Lots 1122 and 1123, and will not be collected by HW 11-1 as indicated in the drainage report. Revise the plan accordingly to eliminate the conveyance of runoff toward these adjacent properties. Status: A diversion channel has been shown on the plan to collect runoff above Lots 1123 and 1124. Provide a detail and calculations for this channel confirming the anticipated flow from the emergency spillway can be collected and conveyed by this channel.*
5. 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. Status: Pending.*
6. The Ordinance requires payment to the Stormwater Facility Maintenance Fund for privately owned and maintained facilities. (Section 803.4.1.a, and 902.3.) **Previous Comment:** *Not provided. Status: Pending.*
7. The Ordinance requires a geotechnical report for the construction of all stormwater management facilities. (Section 601.1.A.) **Previous Comment:** *A geotechnical report has not been provided for the proposed facility. Status: The applicant's consultant has indicated that a geotechnical report is being prepared.*

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

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

Mr. Wingrove said the engineer's review comments (above) were compiled before the conference call today with Mr. Young, so he wanted to touch on the ones that Ms. Ludwig didn't

mention. He said Item No. 6 from the review letter is in regards to the layout of the sanitary sewer system. He said there were a couple of spots that the lateral either crossed a neighbor's property or underneath the road, and the Engineer's office sees that as a long term maintenance issue if someone's lateral is not on their own property. He said it was discussed during the conference call and the applicant did revise the plan to reroute the sanitary sewer around the cul-de-sac to eliminate that issue. As Ms. Ludwig mentioned, the applicant requested a waiver for the vertical curve requirement. He said the Engineer's office would support that waiver. He said they took a look at it from a site distance perspective and the curve is not impairing site distance. He said they looked at the K number of the curve and it fits. He said the applicant's consultant brought up the fact they were concerned about a ponding issue if they flattened out too much. He said they would support the Planning Commission recommending that waiver. Also with the cul-de-sac length as Ms. Ludwig mentioned, it was previously discussed and approved with the preliminary approval for Phase 14.

Jumping to Item 9, Mr. Wingrove said the applicant has revised the plan to include the snow removal easement. He said this is one of the new items that changed in the newest edition of SALDO. It wasn't included in previous submittals but it was included in the most recent set of drawings. He said Item No. 10 is similar to the sanitary sewer item that was discussed earlier. He said the roof drain collector was crossing over another lot and has been revised that so the connection would be on the same lot. The engineer's office had requested some calculations on the existing headwall and everything it leads to in Item No. 1 of Stormwater Management comments and they have provided those. He said they also requested a revised plan to provide a direct connection from the pond to where the headwall is located. Previously, they had it emptying into the stream, not really a stream but a defined channel a little bit upstream. He said it looks okay but in the design phase sometimes everything is going ideal and then it can bypass the headwall and cause ponding and flooding issues for others downstream including residence of Phase 11. He said they discussed that as well and have revised the plan to provide direct connection and have added a manhole to tie in the pipe directly.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if these items he mentioned have been submitted.

Mr. Wingrove said yes.

Mr. Owens asked when they were submitted.

Mr. Wingrove said they were submitted this afternoon. He said they only had time for a brief review and didn't have time to review the calculations.

Mr. Fitzgerald said his concern was that the Township hasn't been given enough time to thoroughly review numerous items that are being discussed. Of the six items or so that were touched on, he said Mr. Wingrove only had since mid-day to look at it and was only recommending approval for one of them. He said he didn't believe there has been adequate time to review these changes.

Mr. Owens said he agreed and that the Planning Commission was given a letter dated Aug. 4 and Aug. 13, 2014, and now here at the meeting on Aug. 19, these items are being discussed in the final hour.

Mr. Wingrove said that was correct.

Mr. Owens said this isn't the first time this has happened, but he felt very uncomfortable about making a decision when there was so much that hadn't been thoroughly reviewed.

Mr. Wingrove said he didn't disagree and everything that he had mentioned this evening certainly needed a thorough review. As he was going through the latest review letter, he said he wanted to provide the Board with the most up to date information as possible. He said the information he provided this evening was based on a quick review from the time he entered the building tonight and in no way represented a comprehensive review. He said he did feel it was appropriate to update the Board on what he had seen up to this point so everything was on the table.

Ms. Ludwig said she wanted to mention that there are two dates on the letters. One review letter went out Aug. 4 and the applicant resubmitted. A second review letter went out Friday, Aug. 15. She said the first page of the letter states Aug. 13 but subsequent pages denote Aug. 15.

Mr. Dan Hall said the 15th was just last week. He said they got the list of items and responded to all of them and agreed to the one item about the fence. He said they weren't being arbitrary with any of the things and tried to answer so they would be acceptable to the Township engineer. He said he believed so far, they have been acceptable.

Mr. Wingrove said as a kind of overview review and based on some of the conversations with the applicant, yes he would agree with that statement. He said the calculations need to be reviewed, but those shouldn't take long.

Mr. Fitzgerald said essentially everyone assumes that when they get done with it, the pipeline is wide open and it should go right through. He said it does take time to review these things. He said he understands that the applicant wants to push their project forward, but . . .

Mr. Hall said that wasn't what he was trying to say. He said he was merely stating that they got the information and responded immediately and in a positive manner.

Mr. Fitzgerald said they weren't saying anything was negative, he said they are just trying to make sure their team gets an opportunity to review things thoroughly before making any recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Owens asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board.

Ms. Ludwig said they also want to be careful to make sure all of the stormwater items are addressed because Oakdale is down stream and this and other projects in the area are under a

microscope because of regional issues in regards to stormwater runoff and stormwater management. She said it is important that these items are reviewed thoroughly so no development projects in North Fayette Township are going to cause any issues in terms of flooding in other areas.

Mr. Owens said the Board isn't here to try to slow anybody's project down, but it seems there are a lot of pending issues here. He suggested the Board consider the application as administratively incomplete at this time.

Mr. McDermott said yes, to table it and come back next month would be the appropriate course of action.

Mr. Alwine said he is a resident in Phase 11, Lot 1119, and he just wanted to make sure water issues are addressed. He said some of the residents of Phase 11 have already had water issues and there are concerns about plans to build a hill up over the hill that already exists behind their back yards. He said the residents want to ensure that it would be properly engineered and that if any problems would arise that those issues would be addressed by the people that are building that hill. He said he had spoken to Mr. Wingrove about this. He said the other item that he would like to address has to do with trees and asked if as many trees as possible would remain in the open space areas. He said with the new hillside being built, there is also concern about how many trees are going to be removed in that area. He said this was something he had mentioned when Phase 13 was being discussed.

Mr. Wingrove said in regard to the tree cover, he had spoken to Mr. Hall about this and he believed their intention was not to remove any trees that didn't have to be removed.

Mr. Hall said their interest is to keep the trees because the open space is something that separates the community. He said there will have to be some tree removal to detain the water. Through development, they have to control the water and trees will have to be removed for the construction of the detention pond. He said that area is open space now, but there may have to be a few trees that would have to come out.

Mr. Young said they also have a landscaping plan that has been prepared to replace a lot of the plantings as far as buffering goes. He said it is a pretty flat area so it was designed with mostly 4 to 1 slopes with very little grading.

Mr. Hall said they are interested in having as much of a buffer zone as possible.

Mr. Alwine said for him with not knowing much about the topography that is being requested, he said he believes there is a 25 foot hill that is being built up.

Mr. Young said no, it is only about a 4 foot high embankment at the highest point.

Mr. Wingrove said he believed Mr. Alwine was talking about the open space between where he is at in Phase 11 and the very top of the hill of Phase 14, the existing hillside.

Mr. Young said that might be 25 feet, but the basin itself isn't anything close to that height.

Mr. Alwine said he guessed he wasn't clear on that, but the way he interpreted the drawing was that the apex of the hill that he has in his backyard would be the base, and go up from there another 25 feet.

Mr. Young said no, not at all.

Mr. Alwine said okay.

Mr. Young said they have done a lot to try to minimize grading on this.

Mr. Owens said at this time, the Board should consider tabling action on this application until next meeting pending further information being provided.

Mr. McDermott said as of the last review letter, the application was technical administratively incomplete. He said the applicant would end up in the same place, but it actually may be more appropriate to consider a motion to consider the application as administratively incomplete and have the applicant come back next month.

Mr. Owens asked for a motion on the application.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. BILL FITZGERALD, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED, TO REJECT THE APPLICATION AS ADMINISTRATIVELY INCOMPLETE.

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

Mr. Hall asked when the next meeting would be held.

Mr. Owens said it would be the third Tuesday of next month.

Mr. McDermott said this doesn't delay the applicant. He said the only difference is that the 90 day clock for the Township doesn't start until there is a completed application. He said they would end up the same place at the same time.

Ms. Ludwig said if everything would be complete for next month's meeting, it could go to the Board of Supervisors' meeting the following week providing they had heard from the Conservation District by then, too.

2. **Rory Hanczar Sewage Facilities Planning Module** - Application for approval of Mr. Rory Hanczar's sewer planning module which involves a sewer extension project to service a new single family home on 113 Sturgeon Street in an R-1 Low Density Zoning District.

Mr. Owens asked a representative to approach the Board.

No representative was present.

Ms. Ludwig said she didn't know much about this one because it was discussed while she was on leave. She asked to defer to Mr. Wingrove.

Mr. Wingrove made the following comments:

Mr. Wingrove said Mr. Hanczar is building a new single family home on Sturgeon Street. As part of the project, he needs to extend the sanitary sewer to service his house. Due to the DEP's regulations even though it is only one house, he has to go through the planning module process. He said just as the Board reviewed one with Pointe West a couple months ago even though it was on a larger scale, this is the same planning module and applies across the board for their big development as it does to his one house. He said Mr. Hanczar is seeking the Planning Commission's recommendation for approval to amend the sewage planning document to include his home.

Mr. Owens said this is basically just a formality.

Mr. Wingrove said it is part of DEP's regulations that the local planning agency makes sure that zoning wise it fits. He said he is building a single family home in a residential zoning district so it fits.

Mr. McDermott said the DEP sends out a standard resolution that is part of the application with a line for Planning Commission and a line for the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Ludwig said there is a checklist to follow.

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

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, SECONDED BY Mr. DAVE COSNEK, AND CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR THE RORY HANCZAR SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE.

ROLL CALL:	BILL FITZGERALD	YES
	DAVE COSNEK	YES
	FRED LUTZ	YES

**CHUCK KYLE
BOB OWENS**

**YES
YES**

COMMENTS:

Mr. Owens asked if anybody had any questions or comments about anything.

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHUCK KYLE, SECONDED BY Mr. FRED LUTZ, AND CARRIED, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:12 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Cherico
Planning Commission Recording Secretary