

	<p>The North Strabane Township Planning Commission met in regular session on Monday, May 21, 2018, at 5:30 PM at the Municipal Building located at 1929 Route 519, Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p><u>Attending This Session:</u> Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairman Diane Balogh, Vice-Chair Kandi Jablonski, Commission Member Barry Crumrine, Commission Member</p> <p><u>Absent:</u> Michael Kelly, Secretary</p> <p><u>Also Attending This Session:</u> Gary Sweat, Township Solicitor Joe Sites, Township Engineer Margaret Householder, Planning Coordinator Andrew Walz, Township Manager Colleen Mellor, Stenographer</p>
<p><u>PUBLIC COMMENTS:</u></p> <p><u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</u> April 16, 2018</p> <p><u>OLD BUSINESS:</u> WALNUT GROVE – REVISIONS TO SUBDIVISION PLAN FOR PROPOSED CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION LOCATED ON THOMAS ROAD IN AN R-2 DISTRICT.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Diane Balogh to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2018 meeting.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>Walnut Grove – Revisions to subdivision plan for proposed conservation subdivision located on Thomas Road in an R-2 district. This plan was recommended for approval at the February 19, 2018 meeting of the Planning Commission. Joe Sites addressed the revisions, resulting from the second public hearing for this use. There were comments made to the applicant regarding location of the stormwater retention basin which was located on the other side of Thomas Road at the intersection of Ross Road. Several of neighboring property owners indicated there are wetlands and there was difficulty getting permits from DEP for their own development. There were also concerns from the adjacent property owner on the same side of Thomas Road as the proposed Walnut Grove Development expressing their concerns about the encroachment and so forth. The revised plan will be presented tomorrow for the continuation of the hearing showing 29 lots and brings the stormwater retention over to the same side as the development. One concern was the Homeowners Association would be responsible for the retention basin that was on the other side of the road. If there was a flooding event that stormwater retention may require extensive repairs and clean up. The HOA may not have sufficient funding to remediate. They have reduced the number of lots and they have addressed many of the questions and comments that have been given by the public and the Board of Supervisors.</p>

<p>MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDED WALNUT GROVE.</p> <p><u>NEW BUSINESS:</u> ANDREW MANGANAS – REQUEST FOR REZONE OF 53 LINDEN ROAD- WITHDRAWN</p> <p>TIMOTHY RODGERS – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL CONSOLIDATION PLAN APPROVAL</p>	<p>Jeffrey asked if the developer acquired the property they had originally planned for the retention basin. Joe will confirm either way. Jeffrey asked if there was a comment from the Board with regards to a buffer between the northern property lines behind lots 103, 104, and 105. There was some discussion on the pending ordinance amendments in regards to the buffer area. Gary commented the pending ordinance change on the buffer was after this was in process and would not apply to this. Joe responded that is a good question and we will have to discuss it.</p> <p>Diane commented on the water issues as a result of the flooding along Ross Road. It is the same location, correct? Joe replied the basin will be on the other side of Thomas Road. Gary stated one of the ideas was they can have two retention basins. Joe stated there are two basins proposed on the site.</p> <p>Gary stated they had addressed the issues that concerned the board.</p> <p>Jeffrey questioned if a motion was required on this item. Gary stated this is an amended conservation subdivision which differs from what was initially approved.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Kandi Jablonski to approve the amended conservation subdivision for Walnut Grove.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 3 YES –1 NO (D. Balogh)</u></p> <p>Andrew Manganas – Request for rezone of 53 Linden Road, consisting of 11 acres, from current R-2 zoning to proposed C-1 zoning for warehousing and storage has been withdrawn. A letter was submitted by Andrew Manganas and received on May 3, 2018 with a request to withdraw rezone application.</p> <p>Gary stated for the record the Planning Coordinator received a letter dated May 3, 2018 from Andrew Manganas with a request the rezone application be withdrawn.</p> <p>Timothy Rodgers – Preliminary and final consolidation plan approval for a two lot consolidation located on Thomas Road in an R-2 zoning district. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: May 17, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Timothy Rodgers Preliminary and Final Consolidation Plan -Thomas Road</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We have received and reviewed preliminary and final application for the consolidation of three (3) lots totaling 2.502 acres in the R-2 zoning district. The following are comments relative to the plan as prepared by Mounts Engineering dated April 3, 2018</p>
---	--

and revised plan dated stamped May 16, 2018 in response to our comments of May 9, 2018:

1. The plan as submitted indicates that there are three (3) lots to be consolidated, but the application that was submitted says that it is a two (2) lot subdivision. This must be clarified and corrected by the applicant.

This item has been addressed with the revised plan submitted. Only two lots are being consolidated.

2. The plan shows Nancy Lane intersecting Thomas Road. The Township GIS map does not indicate the presence of an existing right of way or a paper street. This must be checked and corrected accordingly on the plan.

This item has been addressed with the revised plan submitted with the removal of the Nancy Lane paper street that did not exist.

3. Upon a review of the Township GIS map it shows different primary structures on the property. The correct structures must be shown on the plan with building ties in two directions even if they are proposed to be demolished.

This item has been addressed with the revised plan submitted.

4. A site location map must be added to the plan.

This item has been addressed with the revised plan submitted.

5. The name and address of the property owner must be indicated on the plan.

This item has been addressed with the revised plan submitted.

6. The plan shows a sewer line which is assumed to be sanitary near the southern property line. The easement for the sanitary sewer must be shown on the plan.

This item has been addressed with the revised plan submitted. The plan now shows a sanitary sewer easement.

7. Thomas Road is a State Road and a note must be added to the plan that a PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit will be required for access.

This item has been addressed. The existing driveway will be use for the new home to be constructed.

8. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Township Planning Coordinator.

<p>MOTION TO APPROVE TIMOTHY RODGERS – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL CONSOLIDATION PLAN.</p>	<p>This item has been addressed and the applicant is aware that they must make application for a sewer tap and obtain it prior to getting a building permit. The applicant has not committed to a time frame for construction.</p> <p>All of the comments of our letter of May 9, 2018 have been addressed and the plan is in order for consideration for approval.</p> <p>The plans have been reviewed for conformance to Township Ordinance standards only. The review is based on information prepared by others and assumes this information is correct and valid as submitted.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please contact me.</p> <p>Sincerely, THE GATEWAY ENGINEERS, INC. Joseph H. Sites, P.E. MBA Township Engineer</p> <p>Joe provided the Planning Commission members a brief description of the Rodgers consolidation plan.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Kandi Jablonski to approve the Timothy Rodgers preliminary and final consolidation plan located on Thomas Road in an R-2 district.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
<p>CASCO USA – 5,500 SQ. FT. OFFICE AND WAREHOUSE ADDITION MEADOWLANDS BOULEVARD - I-1 ZONING DISTRICT</p>	<p>CASCO USA – Preliminary and final approval for a 5,500 SQ. FT. office and warehouse addition to the existing building, located at 370 Meadowlands Boulevard in an I-1 zoning district. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: May 9, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Building Expansion – Casco USA - Meadowlands Boulevard</p> <p>Members of the Commission: We have received and reviewed the application for preliminary and final approval for the site plan for a 5,500 S.F. mixed-use office and warehouse building expansion in the I-1 Zoning District on 4.0 acres as prepared by Young and Associates, Consulting</p>

	<p>Engineers, revised May 1, 2018. This is a permitted use in the zoning district per §1101(A). The following are comments relative to the plan:</p> <p>Site Plan</p> <p>1. The Site Plan needs to be signed and sealed by the preparer. The plan has been signed but not sealed.</p> <p>2. The proposed use of the building expansion needs to be identified, including the breakdown for the type of use for both the proposed and existing buildings. This is necessary to identify building capacity. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>3. We question the number of parking spaces shown on the plan. The existing conditions plan shows 26 total parking spaces. Per the calculation shown on sheet C-5, 18 additional parking spaces are required to be added, but the proposed site plan shows 37 total parking spaces. Addressing Item 1 will determine the required total number of parking spaces. The revised submission has addressed this comment and shows the updated calculation which results in a reduction in the number of parking spaces. The required amount of parking has been addressed.</p> <p>4. The parking spaces and travel aisle width should be dimensioned on the site plan to meet the Township standard parking requirements. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>5. One off-street loading berth is required per section 1503 of the Zoning Ordinance. A designated loading berth shall be added to the site plan. If loading berths exist, the loading area shall be shown and dimensioned on the site plan to meet the Township Standard of 60' x 14', if not, it must be added to the site plan. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>6. The clauses on sheet C-4A are not required as part of the land development and grading plans. They must be removed. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>7. We question if the proposed orientation of the dumpster pad will be able to be serviced by a garbage truck. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>8. There are two (2) differing typical dumpster pad details shown on sheet D-1. Which detail is to be used for construction? The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>9. We recommend installing a concrete apron/approach slab for the proposed dumpster pad. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>10. A standard detail for the screening of the dumpster pad must be provided, per Section 1409.B of the Zoning Ordinance. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p>
--	--

	<p>11. If the parking areas are to be used during night hours, a lighting and photometric plan shall be provided.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment with the addition of building mounted lighting being provided.</p> <p>Stormwater Management</p> <p>1. The PCSM report shall be signed and sealed by the preparer.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>2. Does the headwall along Meadowlands Boulevard need to be modified to accept the flow from the increase in impervious area on site?</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>3. Is the headwall along Meadowlands Boulevard supposed to drain into the modified drainage basin?</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>4. Per Section 512-9, catch basins shall meet the minimum PennDOT Standard. All catch basins shall be 2'x4' concrete in order to minimize the potential for maintenance issues in paved areas.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>5. Per Section 512-4-B, provide storm sewer calculations that demonstrate adequate capacity for the 25-year storm. The proposed storm sewer system has numerous segments that are 0.5% slope with inlets that are less than 4-feet deep. It will be necessary to demonstrate that the catch basins do not surcharge.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>6. Per Section 512-4-B, provide apron calculations for Headwall 2. Also provide capacity calculations for the existing storm sewer bypass to which this headwall discharges.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>7. The plan proposes to modify the existing basin by deepening it. However, the existing riser is not proposed to be modified. The report assumes 0.5 inches/hour of exfiltration from the basin, with no supporting study to verify this assumption. Per Section 512-5-A, all detention areas shall be designed to drain completely. It is suggested to provide a 4" PVC drain line that connects to the inlet below the</p>
--	--

	<p>emergency spillway, with a 4" Ball Valve below the emergency spillway, to allow for the basin to be completely dewatered in emergency conditions.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>8. Per Section 512-4-C, provide emergency spillway calculations for the 100-year storm emergency condition, with the principal outflow structure inoperable (i.e. all flow through the emergency spillway).</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>9. Per Section 512-4-A, include hydrographs for all storm events required to be analyzed by the Ordinance. Include a summary table indicating the predevelopment and post-development peak discharge, along with the water surface elevation in the basin, for each required storm event.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>10. Include the principal outflow structure and emergency spillway on Section B-B of Sheet C-4E.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>General</p> <p>1. An NPDES permit will be required for the site. The Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval.</p> <p>The revised submission included a letter from the Washington County Conservation District approving the proposed Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan.</p> <p>2. As per §304.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, the developer must execute a Developers Agreement with the Township prior to being granted final approval by the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.</p> <p>3. We will be completing a review of the cost estimate and provide a recommendation for bonding.</p> <p>The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.</p> <p>4. A copy of the plans should be submitted to the Public Works Director, Building Inspector/Zoning Offices and Fire Chief for review and comment prior to final approval.</p>
--	---

The Applicant has indicated that copies of the plans have been submitted to all entities mentioned above.

5. The plans must be submitted to the Municipal Authority for review and comment.

The Applicant has indicated that copies of the plans have been submitted to the Municipal Authority for review.

6. Prior to any construction on the site, a pre-construction meeting with the Engineer, Public Works Director, and the Developer must be held.

The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.

7. The resubmission must be provided as a full set without individually folded sheets.

The revised submission has addressed this comment.

8. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.

The Applicant has reviewed the need for a planning module with the Planning Coordinator on April 30 and May 1, 2018 and the Planning Coordinator determined a planning module is not required for the proposed project.

All of the comments have been addressed and the plan is in order for consideration for approval by the planning commission.

The plans have been reviewed for conformance to Township Ordinance standards only. The review is based on information prepared by others and assumes this information is correct and valid as submitted.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,
THE GATEWAY ENGINEERS, INC.
Joseph H. Sites, P.E., MBA
Township Engineer

Josh James P.E. of Young and Associates gave the Planning Commission members a brief description of the plans. The existing office/warehouse building is roughly 8,800 sq. ft. The addition will be 5,500 sq. ft. They will move 8-10 employees from the existing building. They will then be relocated in the new addition office space and use remainder as warehouse.

<p>MOTION TO APPROVE CASCO USA – 5,500 SQ. FT. OFFICE AND WAREHOUSE ADDITION</p>	<p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Diane Balogh to approve CASCO USA – 5,500 SQ. FT. office and warehouse addition, located at 370 Meadowlands Boulevard in an I-1 zoning district.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
<p>GUARDIAN STORAGE – PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN - SELF STORAGE, INTERIOR BUILDING AT GALLEY ROAD.</p>	<p>Guardian Storage – Preliminary site plan approval for a 110,000 square foot self-storage, interior building at Galley Road. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: May 17, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Land Development Application - Preliminary Site Plan Guardian Storage Building - Galley Road and Route 19</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We have received and reviewed the application for preliminary site plan approval for a 110,000 SF building in the C-1 Zoning District on 2.34 acres as prepared by The Gateway Engineers, Inc., dated May 2018. This is a permitted use in the zoning district per §901(C). The following are the comments from our letter of May 10, 2018 that are being addressed per the revised plans dated May 15, 2018”</p> <p>Site Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Per Section 302.10.C.2 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the existing conditions plan must show the boundary of the property including bearings and distances of each line enclosing the property. <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Per Section 302.10.C.5 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the existing conditions plan must show existing streets or roads abutting the property or within fifty (50) feet of it, indicating name, surfacing, right-of-way width and pavement or cart way width. <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Per Section 302.10.C.6 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the existing conditions plan must show existing easements, if any, indicating

	<p>width, bearings, distances, use and lessee. If no easements exist, a note shall be added to the plan.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>4. Per Section 302.10.C.7 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the existing conditions plan must show existing public sewer, gas, and water lines in the property or within fifty (50) feet of it, indicating line size, manholes, invert and top-of-manhole elevations, valves, fire hydrants and other appurtenances.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>5. Per Section 302.10.C.8 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the existing conditions plan must show existing streams and watercourses in the property or within fifty (50) feet of it, together with culverts and storm drain lines indicating line size, direction of flow, location of culverts and storm inlets. The existing stream shall be labeled on the plan with the direction of flow.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>6. Per Section 302.10.E.3 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the proposed plan must show the proposed location of sewer, water, and all other utility lines, including any major facilities related thereto on or near the site and connection to existing systems.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>7. Per Section 302.10.F.2 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the proposed plan must show the bearings and distances of all property lines and area in square feet of the property.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>8. Per Section 302.10.F.4 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the proposed plan must include the approximate location, in or adjacent to the property, of sanitary sewers, storm sewers, water lines, gas lines, and electric lines, with direction of sewer flow, line sizes and location of stormwater inlets, sewer manholes, and hydrants.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>9. Per Section 302.10.H.6 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, a registered engineer's estimate of costs of installation of required improvements in the proposed plan must be provided.</p>
--	---

	<p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>10. The plan must be signed by the preparer.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>11. The Applicant shall provide a breakdown of the use of the proposed building to verify that the proposed parking space calculation is correct.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>12. The Applicant shall add the aisle widths of the parking area and cart way around the building to the plan.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>13. Per Section 1503.B of the Zoning Ordinance, 3 loading berths are required for the total Gross Floor area of the proposed building. Do the two areas labeled inside the building as loading areas function as loading berths?</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission. The two areas labeled inside the building will be functioning as loading berths.</p> <p>14. The proposed sidewalk by the two ADA Handicap parking stalls shows concrete curb will be installed. Will there be an ADA Handicap compliant ramp in this section of sidewalk?</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission. The sidewalk will be level with the pavement.</p> <p>15. Will there be additional sidewalk from the 7 parking spaces to the entrance, or will pedestrians have to walk through the parking area to get to the front door?</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission. The customers will have to walk through the parking lot to get to the front door.</p> <p>Stormwater Management</p> <p>1. Ensure that all applicable permit regulations are adhered to with the design for both State and County Agencies for discharge to a High-Quality Watershed. Provide any written correspondence from these agencies when it is received.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>2. Adjust all times of concentration in the report to be a minimum of 5 minutes.</p>
--	---

	<p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>3. Revise Appendices H, I, J and K in the report to match the table of contents.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>4. Page 1 of the report narrative states that the allowable release rate is 100%. Please revise to 70% as indicated by the remainder of the report.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>5. The rim elevation indicated on page 4 of the report narrative does not match the elevation indicated on Sheet C301.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>6. On the plan sheets, there appears to be a large headwall at elevation 940, immediately to the north of the proposed tank system. Label this structure and ensure that the proposed tank system will not interfere with any piping associated with it.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission for the preliminary submission. For final submission, verify that existing storm sewers shown between the proposed tank and Inlet 10 and between Inlet 4 and Inlet 5 will not interfere with the proposed sewers, or that upstream flow is properly diverted. If the location of the upstream end of the existing sewers is not known, label on the final plans that the Contractor shall verify the existing storm sewer location and abandon during construction.</p> <p>7. The plan sheets show the parallel 72” pipes disconnected from the riser structure. However, on Sheet 702, the piping is shown connected directly into the riser structure. It is suggested to provide a manifold that terminates in a reducer, and to use a standard sized manhole for structure OS-1.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>8. Note on the plans and section that the top of structure OS-1 shall be installed flush with the final paving course.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>9. On Sheet 702, revise elevations for top of stone and top of weir on details 3 & 4.</p> <p>This has been addressed with the revised submission.</p> <p>General <i>Prior to Final Approval the following items must be addressed:</i></p>
--	--

	<p>1. An NPDES permit will be required for the site. The Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval.</p> <p>The applicant has indicated that they are in the process of making application.</p> <p>2. As per §304.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, the developer must execute a Developers Agreement with the Township prior to being granted final approval by the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>The applicant has indicated that they will execute a developer’s agreement with the Township.</p> <p>3. A copy of the plans should be submitted to the Public Works Director, Building Inspector/Zoning Offices and Fire Chief for review and comment prior to final approval.</p> <p>Copies of the plan have been submitted to the Public Works Director, Building Inspector/Zoning Office and the Fire Chief for review and comment.</p> <p>4. The plans must be submitted to the Municipal Authority for review and comment.</p> <p>The applicant has indicated that they are in the process of making the submission.</p> <p>5. Prior to any construction on the site, a pre-construction meeting with the Engineer, Public Works Director, and the Developer must be held.</p> <p>The applicant has indicated that they will comply.</p> <p>6. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.</p> <p>The applicant has indicated that they are in the process of making application.</p> <p>All of the comments from our May 10, 2018 letter have been addressed. Procedurally the Special Exception for the use must be obtained from the Zoning Hearing Board before site plan approval can be granted.</p> <p>The plans have been reviewed for conformance to Township Ordinance standards only. The review is based on information prepared by others and assumes this information is correct and valid as submitted.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please contact me.</p> <p>Sincerely, THE GATEWAY ENGINEERS, INC. Joseph H. Sites, P.E. MBA Township Engineer</p>
--	---

<p>MOTION TO TABLE GUARDIAN STORAGE – PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL PENDING ZHB HEARING 6/6/18</p> <p>PENDING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>William Krahe, Grand View Development Company for Guardian Storage, presented the proposed Guardian Self Storage building. William stated there are 2 parcels and they will be using the 6-acre parcel with the intent to demolish the existing building and construct a new 4 story building. Access will be from Route 19 and Galley Road. William described the layout of the building including the office which is approximately 1500 sq. ft., typically two stories, well-appointed with a lot of marble and high end lighting. It has a high retail appeal when a customer walks in. The customer parking includes two handicapped parking locations. There will be three loading areas and two additional loading areas cut out in first floor. William stated typically there are two elevators inside the building located fairly close to these loading areas. William addressed the location of the stormwater retention tank. There are 16 locations in Pittsburgh and another 5 in Colorado.</p> <p>Gary asked William if they own this property. William stated it is under agreement and he has written authorization from the current owner to present this planned development application. A copy of the authorization letter was submitted with the sales agreement. Gary asked if the title will be Guardian Storage Development North Strabane, LLC. William stated that is correct. Diane questioned if there will be 24-hour access. William responded it typically does not but the office hours are 7 days a week. It does come with high security video cameras and high quality gated access.</p> <p>There was discussion on the access points. The Route 19 access was permitted and the Galley Road access has a utility pole in the middle of the entrance. William stated there will be plenty of opportunity to clean it up.</p> <p>Gary asked if all 3 parcels are being purchased. William stated there are only 2 that they want to purchase. It would be to the intersection of Route 19. He was told by the owners it was consolidated. On the Alta survey it somehow appears as three.</p> <p>Joe stated the self-storage is a use by exception as per the pending ordinance. They have an application in to the Zoning Hearing Board for the special exception per the requirements that are outlined here in the ordinance.</p> <p>Gary questioned procedurally should we hold this in advance of the Zoning Hearing Board. Gary asked if it was scheduled. Margaret stated it is scheduled for June 6, 2018. Gary asked William if he agreed to table it pending the Zoning Hearing Board approval and William agreed.</p> <p>Kandi asked William if they will be cleaning up the pull off area where vehicles are unloaded and the debris there. He stated it will be maintained and secured.</p> <p>A motion was made by Diane Balogh and seconded by Barry Crumrine to table Guardian Storage – Preliminary site plan by agreement with the developer’s representative.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>Pending ordinance amendments – revision of buffer zone requirements in conservation subdivisions and regulations for off-site vehicle inventory storage. Andrew Walz, Township Manager spoke with authorization from the Board of Supervisors to move forward with making these changes to the pending zoning</p>
---	---

<p>MOTION TO APPROVE ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS WITH REVISIONS</p> <p><u>ADJOURNMENT:</u></p>	<p>ordinance. There was discussion for the need to create some type of definition for off-site vehicle storage. This is where car dealerships store their vehicles off-site. It would limit that activity to C-1 and C-2 where automobile sales are currently permitted. There was discussion earlier this evening on creating a standard buffer area with a conservation subdivision. Presently the pending ordinance states it is at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors. In the future that could change from time to time. Presently the buffering requirements in the pending ordinance state the maximum is a 35' buffer, the middle is a 25' buffer and the minimum is a 15' buffer. We did ask for a recommendation from our consultant who came back with a 25' buffer. She also recommended certain types of planting requirements and types of vegetation per conversation with our consultant.</p> <p>Joe stated we do not have a list of plant types for the Township. We will have to come up with a list.</p> <p>Joe had brought up fencing for auto storage. Andy stated that was discussed and this is not a standalone place, such as a furniture store that may want to share parking space. It would not be required.</p> <p>Andy commented the goal is to have these be the last two changes to the pending ordinance and try to have that wrapped up by June as Margie's going away present. Margie questioned how will we handle the list of plant types? Do we need to have that language by June? We are going to make that an appendix? Joe stated what we currently have in the buffers is a mixture of pine trees and deciduous trees. Andy stated we can have it state refer to that.</p> <p>Kandi questioned Andy regarding the language. The 4 inches, should that be taken at a measurement at the circumference perhaps 2 ft. from the base. She has had this happen before.</p> <p>Andy stated yes that is a good recommendation. Kandi replied she will provide that language.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Diane Balogh to approve with the ordinance amendments with revisions to the language due to typographical error to read (40) linear feet of perimeter. Also to clarify where the measurement is taken and remove species of plants.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u> There was no other business to discuss.</p> <p>Diane Balogh made a motion and seconded by Barry Crumrine to adjourn the meeting at 6:15 PM.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <hr/> <p>Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairperson</p> <hr/> <p>Diane Balogh, Vice-Chair</p>
---	--

