

	<p>The North Strabane Township Planning Commission met in regular session on Monday, June 18, 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 Michael Kelly, Secretary Kandi Jablonski, Commission Member Barry Crumrine, Commission Member</p> <p><u>Also Attending This Session:</u> Gary Sweat, Township Solicitor Joe Sites, Township Engineer Margaret Householder, Planning Coordinator Colleen Mellor, Stenographer</p>
<p><u>PUBLIC COMMENTS:</u></p> <p><u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</u> May 21, 2018</p> <p><u>OLD BUSINESS:</u> WALNUT GROVE – FINAL SUBDIVISION & SITE PLAN FOR PROPOSED CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION-TABLED.</p> <p>MOTION TO TABLE WALNUT GROVE</p> <p>GUARDIAN STORAGE-PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN-</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Diane Balogh to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2018 meeting.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO – 1 ABSTAIN (M. Kelly)</u></p> <p>Walnut Grove – final subdivision and site plan approval of the conservation subdivision consisting of 29 single family dwellings on a 23.1-acre parcel located on Thomas Road in an R-2 Zoning district has been tabled. Conditional use approval was granted on May 22, 2018. Gary suggested the motion reference that it was tabled with a letter dated June 14, 2018 from Victor Wetzel & Associates. Jeffrey made reference to the letter from Victor Wetzel & Associates dated June 14th granting a 30-day extension in order to present the final plans at the July 16, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p>A motion was made by Kandi Jablonski and seconded by Barry Crumrine to table the Walnut Grove final subdivision site plan referencing letter to the Township dated June 14, 2018 from Victor Wetzel & Associates.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>Guardian Storage – Preliminary and final site plan approval for a 110,000 square foot self-storage, interior facility at Galley Road and Washington Road. A special exception was granted for the facility and a variance granted on construction materials by the Zoning Hearing Board on June 6, 2018.</p>

<p>SELF-STORAGE AT GALLEY ROAD</p>	<p>William Krahe, Grand View Development Company for Guardian Storage, gave more details since the last meeting in May. William stated one of the significant revisions to the elevations was the inclusion of metal siding. It is 50% on part of the elevation. The Zoning Ordinance had that being required to be block or stucco. The Zoning Hearing Board met on June 6, 2018 and did approve the metal siding and Nichiha siding. Kandi asked William if the ramp will not be level with Galley Road. He replied no, it does look a little deceiving. He stated the driveway is a little tighter and the slope is steeper.</p> <p>Barry questioned what size truck can go through that door way. William replied typically it is 10 to 12 ft. wide and typically 20 ft. deep. The height is 10 ft. These units are really strong commercial suppliers. There is a high occupancy of business operators with these driveway units.</p> <p>The loading area is covered and inside the building is in close proximity to the exterior doors. There is an elevator.</p> <p>Barry asked if any units are humidified or conditioned. William replied 50% are conditioned. Typically, the non-conditioned space is the upper floors. On the drive up units they will all be conditioned.</p> <p>Jeffrey asked Joe Sites for his letter of review on this. Joe stated last month the application was tabled, so his preliminary letter issued from last month still holds true. There was one item that was outstanding with the stormwater management which they have resolved. Joe will follow up with a letter</p> <p>Jeffrey asked about the highway occupancy permit for the driveway to Galley Road. William stated they have engaged with Wooster & Associates to begin that engineering process.</p> <p>Joe asked is there going to be any requirement of the Township to enter into an HOP for the stormwater connections. William stated he did not believe so. There will be below grade tanks that will discharge into the stream.</p> <p>Joe expressed concern the Township has been a good neighbor and enters into these stormwater agreements but then gets the citation on a site because of a contractor's carelessness.</p> <p>William assured this is all private and it is a private system. It will be under their control.</p>
<p>MOTION TO APPROVE GUARDIAN SELF STORAGE ON GALLEY ROAD CONTINGENT ON HOP.</p>	<p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Michael Kelly for preliminary and final site plan approval for Guardian Self Storage, contingent upon an HOP onto Galley Road.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
<p><u>NEW BUSINESS:</u> ANDREW MANGANAS – CONDITIONAL USE BUSINESS LOCATED AT 333</p>	<p>Andrew Manganas – Conditional Use for comparable use not specifically listed, proposed to be a used car sales facility at the existing contracting business located at 333 Morganza Road in an I-1 zoning district. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: June 14, 2018</p>

<p>MORGANZA ROAD IN AN I-1 ZONING DISTRICT.</p>	<p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Conditional Use Application – Used Car Sales and Service 333 Morganza Road</p> <p>Members of the Commission;</p> <p>We are in receipt of a Conditional Use Application for a Used Car Sales and Service in the I-1 Zoning District located at 333 Morganza Road. Used Car Sales and Service in the I-1 Zoning District is not a permitted use. The applicant has made the submission per §1101(B)1f- Comparable Uses Not Specifically Listed and §1101(C)1(e). Per the ordinance and the I-1 requirements, the comparable use is Truck and Heavy Equipment rental, sales and services which is a special exception per §1303(56). In addition, the requirements of §1302 General Standards, must be met. The following are comments relative to the submission prepared by the applicant Andreas Manganas received by the Township date stamped May 21, 2018:</p> <p>§ 1302. General Standards.</p> <p>In addition to the specific standards and criteria listed for each use in § 1303 below, all applications for conditional uses and uses by special exception listed in each zoning district shall demonstrate compliance with all of the following general standards and criteria:</p> <p>A. The use shall not endanger the public health, safety or welfare nor deteriorate the environment, as a result of being located on the property where it is proposed.</p> <p>The applicant has stated in their undated letter, which is attached, that the used does not endanger the public or environment in any way at this location. Documentation supporting this statement should be provided.</p> <p>B. The use shall comply with the performance standards of § 1401 of this chapter.</p> <p>The applicant has stated in their undated letter, which is attached, that the use complies with all performance standards of §1401 of the ordinance. §1401 is quite extensive and specific regarding the standards. Each of the requirements of §1401 should be addressed in detail by the applicant with a written response before the application can be considered.</p> <p>C. The use shall comply with all applicable requirements of Part 14 providing supplementary regulations, Part 15 governing parking and loading, Part 16 governing signs, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter.</p> <p>The applicant has stated in their undated letter, which is attached, that the use shall comply with all applicable requirements of Part 14 providing</p>
---	--

	<p>supplementary regulations, Part 15 governing parking and loading and Part 16 governing signs, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter. Information addressing Parts 14, 15, and 16 must be provided before the application can be considered. It should be noted that parking per Part 15 must meet the combined requirements of Vehicle Sales and Service Stations/vehicle repair garages must be met. In addition, the site lighting requirements of §1501(L) must be met.</p> <p>D. Ingress, egress and traffic circulation on the property shall be designed to ensure safety and access by emergency vehicles and to minimize congestion and the impact on local streets.</p> <p>The applicant has stated in their undated letter, which is attached, that Ingres, Egress, and Traffic Circulation on the property is designed to ensure safety and access by any emergency vehicles. It minimizes congestion and impact on local streets. The plan as submitted is insufficient to verify the requirement.</p> <p>E. Outdoor lighting, if proposed, shall be designed with cutoff luminaires that direct and cut off the light at a cutoff angle of 60° or less. (See illustration in Appendix B.) Spillover illumination shall not exceed 0.2 foot-candle at the property line.</p> <p>The applicant has stated in their undated letter, which is attached, that the current lighting will meet the standard limitations. The light cut off is less than 60 degrees at 45 degrees. The submission of the site lighting photometrics shows foot candles in excess of the requirements of §1501(L) being met at the property lines.</p> <p>F. For all uses that are subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the applicant shall certify that all applicable ADA requirements have been met in the design.</p> <p>The applicant has stated in their undated letter, which is attached, that any requirements for the ADA will be in place. The plan as submitted does not show any parking spaces or site improvements which meet ADA requirements. All parking must meet the Township requirements.</p> <p>Applying the comparable use of §1303(56) Truck and heavy equipment rental, sales and service, the following conditions would need to be met:</p> <p>A. The minimum site required shall be five acres.</p> <p>The site does not meet this requirement. The acreage submitted for the site is 1.4 acres</p> <p>B. The site shall have frontage on and direct vehicular access to an arterial or</p>
--	---

collector street, as defined by this chapter.

Morganza Road is an Arterial Street which serves large volumes of high-speed and long-distance traffic.

- C. No part of any truck or heavy equipment or accessories displayed outdoors shall be less than 35 feet from any A or R District nor less than 20 feet from any other property line. No vehicle or equipment shall be parked on adjacent property or in any public street right-of-way.

The information submitted is not to scale and a determination as to meeting this requirement can be met.

- D. No vehicle shall be displayed or offered for sale that does not have all of the mechanical and body components necessary for its safe and lawful operation.

The applicant has not addressed this item.

- E. A permanent structure for office administration, sales, rental and/or servicing shall be provided.

The applicant has stated in the submission that the existing building will be used for office administration, sales, and servicing. The applicant has stated that the types of products, materials, and equipment such as, but not limited to used automobiles for sale, an automobile lift, various vehicles being installed, and vehicle washing, and detailing will be occurring on the site.

- F. All property lines adjoining an A or R District shall be screened by Buffer Area A, as defined by § 1402, Subsection 1, of this chapter.

The property is in the I-1 zoning district.

The information that has been submitted is general in nature and does not address the specific items of the Township Zoning Ordinance. A site plan and specific technical information should be provided with written responses to support the application for the conditional use application to be considered.

The submission has 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

<p>MOTION TO APPROVE ANDREW MANGANAS – CONDITIONAL USE</p>	<p>Andreas Manganas addressed the members. He stated his father had a contracting business that was located previously on this lot. Andreas is in the process of liquidation the equipment. He would like to have a used car/servicing station. The demographics have changed a lot over the past 30 years. He has submitted a letter to Joe Sites dated June 18, 2018 addressing Joe’s comments in his June 14th letter. Andreas stated he has started to move the equipment to his other facility on Neville Island. There are approximately 6 pieces of larger equipment that will, until they are gone, to remain on the back side of the building. There is a fence and trees that separate from the neighboring property.</p> <p>Jeffrey stated the property is located on Morganza which is a state owned highway and Andreas will need a permit to access the highway. Jeffrey stated since the use is changing it is required from PennDOT.</p> <p>Joe Sites stated he did get to review what Andreas had submitted and Joe feels he has addressed quite a few of the items that Joe had identified. Joe thinks he can work with Mr. Manganas and work out any of the details that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Gary stated he thinks the approval may be recommended based upon the applicant’s compliance with the conditional use provisions of the ordinance and the Township engineer with review of the comment letter.</p> <p>Margaret asked Mr. Manganas how big the site is. He replied approximately 1.4 acres. Margaret stated when you look at the requirements for truck and heavy equipment rental, which Joe had to go to, it states a minimum of 5 acres. Would a waiver need to be granted? He is selling cars not trucks. Andreas stated there are two uses that are comparable. One of them is the truck by special exception which is the 5-acre minimum. The other is the mobile homes sales and service which is a permitted use without special exception that does not require 5-acres. The truck sales and service was something in Joe’s response letter was relating it to. But the mobile home does not require that much space. Obviously it is different in size. Margaret asked what he planned to sell there. Andreas replied automobiles and very light trucks and cars. Gary asked where are used car lots permitted in the zoning ordinance. Margaret responded C-1. Andreas stated .5 with public sewage and 1 acre with no public sewage. Gary stated he thinks that would be the standard.</p> <p>Jeffrey stated once the hearing it set it will be back in front of the Planning Commission.</p> <p>Gary asked what is the comparable section? Are we saying Truck & Heavy Equipment? Joe stated Truck & Heavy equipment in that zoning district and Andreas replied also the Mobile Home sales. Diane asked if the mobile home one seemed relevant? Gary stated that is the comparable use section that we are recommending as far as special exception. That is Zoning Hearing Board. Joe agreed.</p> <p>Joe stated maybe it is a matter of asking for a waiver on the acreage. Gary stated we can give waivers under conditional use, and agreed he preferred that.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Michael Kelly to approve Andrew Manganas – Conditional Use - Special exception for conditional use will be per the truck sales and services, with the waiver being requested on the acreage. The standards for review will be as if it were - Truck and heavy equipment with rental sales and service and contingent on Mr. Manganas and Mr. Sites working out everything prior to the hearing.</p>
--	--

<p>WITH WAIVER ON ACREAGE-333 MORGANZA RD.</p>	<p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
<p>WATERDAM FARMS PHASE 4A – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL TO CREATE PARCELS A AND B ON LOT 408 ON GREYSTONE DRIVE</p>	<p>Waterdam Farms Phase 4A – preliminary and final approval to create parcels A and B on lot 408 on Greystone Drive in an R-3 zoning district. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: June 13, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Third Amended Plan to Waterdam Farms Phase 4A – Lot 408 Greystone Drive</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We have received and reviewed the amended subdivision application for preliminary and final approval to subdivide 0.4958 acres to create Parcels A & B on Lot 408 for the as-builts on Greystone Drive in the A-1 zoning district as prepared by HMT and Associates, dated May 4, 2018.</p> <p>The plan is in order for consideration by the planning commission.</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>A motion was made by Diane Balogh and seconded by Barry Crumrine to approve preliminary and final for parcels A & B on lot 408 Greystone Drive.</p>
<p>MOTION TO APPROVE WATERDAM FARMS LOT 408- GREYSTONE DR.</p>	<p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p>

<p>OAK GROVE – PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR A 23 LOT SUBDIVISION</p>	<p>Oak Grove – preliminary subdivision and site plan approval for a 23 lot subdivision located on Thomas Road in an A-1 district. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: June 15, 2018 North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Application and Preliminary Subdivision and Site Plan Oak Grove Subdivision -Thomas Road</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We have received and reviewed the application for preliminary subdivision and site plan approval for development of 23 single family lots in the A-1 Zoning District on 32.8 acres as prepared by Victor Wetzel Associates, dated March 2018, revised June 13, 2018. This is a permitted use in the zoning district per §1101(A). The following are comments relative to the plan addressing the comments of our letter of June 6, 2018</p> <p>Subdivision Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A subdivision plan for recording with appropriate clauses must be provided. The Applicant has acknowledged this note and has indicated that the plan for recording will be submitted with the appropriate clauses at the time of Final Plans. The subdivision plan is in order for preliminary approval. 2. Per Section 302.10.C.8 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, existing watercourses are shown on the existing conditions plan, however size, direction, and conveyance structures shall be added to the plan. The revised submission has addressed this comment and is shown on the existing conditions plan. 3. Per Section 302.10.E.2 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, a proposed street plan including right-of-way width, pavement width, pedestrian circulation, and connection to existing public roads must be provided. The revised submission has addressed this comment. 4. Per Section 302.10.E.9 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant shall add a note indicating that the off-street parking requirements will be met by the individual homes driveways to the plan. The revised submission has addressed this comment. 5. Per Section 302.10.H.1 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide feasibility of sanitary sewage disposal, in terms of
--	--

	<p>connection to the existing public system based on the remaining line and plant capacity.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a copy of a sanitary sewer availability letter dated May 29, 2018 from the North Strabane Municipal Sewer Authority engineer Nichols and Slagle stating that capacity is available if upgrades are made to the Waterdam Pump Station. The designer, Victor Wetzel, has provided a copy of a letter addressed to Nichols and Slagle dated June 13, 2018 requesting a cost estimate for the upgrade and states that the developer is accepting financial responsibility for all upgrades. This item has been addressed.</p> <p>6. Per Section 302.10.H.2 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide the feasibility of storm drainage in terms of impact upon adjacent properties and proposals to control soil erosion and stream pollution during and after construction.</p> <p>Additional comments can be found under the storm water management section of this letter.</p> <p>7. Per Section 302.10.H.3 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide feasibility of the water supply plan in terms of available capacity in the public system.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment. PAWCO in their letter of April 26, 2018 has indicated availability.</p> <p>8. Per Section 302.10.H.4 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide feasibility of solutions to problems related to soil, mineral, or water conditions underlying the property.</p> <p>Additional comments can be found under the geotechnical report section of this letter.</p> <p>9. Per Section 302.10.H.6 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide a registered engineer's estimate of costs of installation of required improvements in the proposed plan.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p>10. Per Section 302.10.I.1, 2, 3, & 4 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide Letters of Availability for all utilities from all utility companies that will provide service to the development.</p>
--	---

	<p>The Applicant has provided letters of availability for water, gas, electric, and sanitary sewer. This requirement has been completely fulfilled.</p> <p>11. Per Section 302.10.I.7 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide a street lighting plan for the development.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>12. Per Section 302.10.J of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide a Grading Plan, Storm Water Management Plan, and Erosion and Sedimentation Control plan at the same scale as the Final Plat.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>13. Per Section 302.10.K of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the Applicant must provide profiles and cross sections of the proposed streets of the development.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>14. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the planning coordinator.</p> <p>The planning module has not been submitted to date.</p> <p>Site Plan</p> <p>1. The Applicant shall add rear yard setback lines to the plan.</p> <p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>2. The Applicant shall add side yard setback lines to the plan. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>3. The Applicant shall add sizes, lengths, slopes, and materials of the proposed sanitary and storm sewers to the site plan. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>4. The Applicant shall provide profiles and associated details for the proposed sanitary and storm sewer conveyance plans. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>5. The Applicant shall adjust the proposed storm sewer plan and profiles such that all storm sewers have a slope greater than 2%. All pipes must have a minimum slope of 2% so that they are self-cleaning. This revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>6. The Applicant shall add private sanitary and storm sewer laterals to the conceptual sanitary and storm sewers plan to verify that all lots will be serviced by the public sewers. It should be noted that none of the sewers have grades and elevations to verify practicality of construction.</p>
--	--

	<p>The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>7. We question how all roof drains will be connected to the storm sewer system. No roof drains shall discharge to the streets or drain freely over a slope. The Applicant has removed the drywells as requested but has not indicated how roof drains will be collected. All roof drains shall be piped into the proposed storm sewer system. It should be noted that no storm drainage will be allowed to discharge onto adjacent properties. The June 13, 2018 submission shows the laterals, but it does not have a complete storm sewer system in place that is piped to collect the roof drains. We have spoken with the designer and they will be addressing this for the final submission.</p> <p>8. The Applicant shall provide typical pavement details, in accordance with Township standards, for all roads to be dedicated to the Township. The revised submission has addressed this comment.</p> <p>9. We recommend that a locked chain be installed on the pond access road to keep vehicles out when it is not being accessed for maintenance.</p> <p>The revised submission includes a gate on the site plan and a detail of the proposed gate to address this comment.</p> <p>10. The Applicant shall look at relocating the mail box cluster so that it is not located on private property. A note must be added to the plan that the mail box cluster will be maintained by the Homeowners Association. The revised submission includes a note indicating that the mail box cluster is located within the street right-of-way, as well as a note indicating that the cluster will be maintained by the Homeowners Association.</p> <p>11. The Applicant shall add all pertinent typical details shall be provided that meet Township Standards.</p> <p>The Applicant shall include all pertinent details in accordance with Township Standards. The Applicant shall revise the backfill detail on SHEET 7 such that the bedding around 12” around the pipe shall be #57 limestone, and all remaining backfill under paved surfaces shall be compacted 2A limestone. The Applicant shall also use plastic coated rebar steps, not a ladder to access the storm manholes and inlets. Additionally, the rock construction entrance is labeled for the Walnut Grove Development and shall be revised so that it is for the Oak Grove Development. The June 13, 2018 submission has addressed the aforementioned.</p> <p>12. The names of the streets must be reviewed with the planning coordinator to confirm that there are streets with the same names in the county to prevent problems with the county 911 system.</p> <p>The names of the streets must have reviewed with the planning coordinator to confirm they do not prevent problems with the county 911 system. This has been addressed.</p>
--	--

	<p>Stormwater Management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Per Ordinance 22-302-10-C-8, indicate direction of stream flow and label stream name on plans. The comment has been addressed. 2. The Applicant must include drainage area maps for the pre- and post-development runoff conditions. The comment has been addressed. 3. The report indicates a uniform 1.5 inches/hour of exfiltration from BMP's utilized throughout the site. This results in 'discarded' volume that is removed from the routing calculations. The Applicant must provide infiltration testing in the locations and proposed depth of excavation for each BMP making this assumption, or else it must be assumed that there is no exfiltration from the BMPs. The stormwater management basin shows a 1.5 inch/hour exfiltration in the routing calculations. The report summary in Section 4.2.3 states that this is a conservative assumption based on infiltration test results. The assumption is acceptable assuming that the results can be verified. A copy of the results could not be located in the report. Please provide a copy or indicate where in the report the results are located. The June 13, 2018 submission included the requested information which is acceptable. 4. There are several dry wells shown on compacted benches. The report indicates that these are meant to infiltrate. This could create maintenance issues and should be reevaluated. The comment has been addressed. The sumps/drywells that were previously shown have been eliminated from the plans. 5. The Applicant shall ensure that the discharge points for the basin adjacent to the Ross Road/Thomas Road intersection (being the spillway and riprap apron) are directed to the stream within the subject property, so that no off-site discharge occurs onto road rights-of-way. The comment has not been addressed. The discharge from the basin is situated such that it will drain out of the property toward Ross Road. It is suggested that the discharge from the basin be shifted north to a point where the tributary to Little Chartiers Creek is contained within the development property. The June 13, 2018 submission has addressed this comment.
--	---

6. Due to the potential increase in storage volume that may be required as a result of the exfiltration assumption and possible changes to site layout, it is not possible to determine the adequacy of the preliminary design from the submitted information.

The comment has been addressed, assuming that the infiltration assumption can be verified. This was addressed with the June 13, 2018 submission.

7. The endwall on the common property line of lots 22 & 23 shall be adjusted to direct flow to the channel. Our preference would be for the channel to be eliminated and a storm sewer constructed to eliminate future issues.

The endwall has been repositioned to direct flow to the channel.

Geotechnical Report

1. The Geotechnical report will be reviewed, and comments will be provided under separate cover.

General

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.

The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.

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.

The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.

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.

The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.

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

The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.

5. 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.

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

The Applicant has acknowledged this comment.

Based on the aforementioned, the subdivision and site plan are in order for preliminary approval only at this time.

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

Steven Victor from Victor Wetzel and Associates presented the application for a conventional subdivision. Steven proceeded to go over the site plan and topography. He stated the majority of the site is either open meadow or scrub growth. The sanitary sewers will be extended from Walnut Grove to provide access to Oak Grove. The configuration will follow the contours around to provide gravity sewers. One portion, lot #6 will not achieve gravity sewer but will have a singular grinder pump on it. Steven addressed the initial consideration for the access point as per the traffic study. There was a problem with the size of the culvert, which would not be possible that close to Thomas Road. The safe spot would be approximately 150 feet from Springdale Road.

Steven showed the members the location of the storm detention facility. Steven stated there is a significant amount of grading. They will have to come in with the roadway and keep it relatively flat because of the intersection and the grade. The grade is rising steeper than the roadway.

With all of the developments that are going on today the Post Office requires the use of centralized mailboxes units (CBU's). That will be taken into consideration. The CBU will be located on the side yard of lot 23. There will be a 2 stall pull off area on the entering side and 3 stall exiting side to access the CBU. Steven stated this is a preliminary plan, there are no special hearings, and is not a conditional use. Hopefully it will go on to the Supervisors. We are anticipating a spring of 2019 construction.

Jeffrey inquired about the traffic study. Steven replied it was completed some months ago and was performed by Wooster & Associates. Jeffrey questioned if the developer plans to dedicate the road to the Municipality? Steven responded absolutely.

<p>MOTION TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN FOR OAK GROVE</p>	<p>With the frontage that is owned they have the ability to take out the trees because of the grading, also because of the storm and sanitary sewers. Jeffrey asked for clear sight range.</p> <p>Darrin Niemeyer of 730 Waterdam Road questioned the traffic study. He asked if they have given anything about the volume of traffic on Waterdam Road. With the increased neighborhood has anything been done to address the traffic. Steven responded this adds, 23 cars. Darrin stated they have added 15 neighborhoods in the back part of Venetia also so every neighborhood is adding 23 cars. Jeffrey replied he understood but without an impact fee ordinance we cannot assess these guys for 23 trips.</p> <p>A motion was made by Kandi Jablonski and seconded by Barry Crumrine to approve preliminary subdivision and site plan for Oak Grove on Thomas Road.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
<p>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO GRADING ORDINANCE REGULATING MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE SLOPE AND REQUIREMENT TO CONNECT ALL ROOF DRAINS TO STORM SEWER.</p>	<p>Review of proposed amendment to grading ordinance regulating maximum permissible slope and requirement to connect all roof drains to storm sewer.</p> <p>Joe Sites stated there was a meeting regarding this since there have been some concerns about slides and other things occurring in the Township. We determined that the maximum slope that would be permitted would be a 3 to 1 slope without an engineer study or inspection. If they want to go to a 2 to 1 or steeper they would need a Geotechnical engineer present while the grading is occurring and report accompanying it. It is not an unreasonable and is pretty much standard. The roof drains are one contributor to the slides that have occurred. They flow freely over the slopes causing them to be saturated. We should require roof drains to connect into the storm sewer out in the street or in the back yards of these properties. Kandi questioned if the number of slides have been predominately because of the roof runoff or has it been for various reasons such as the grading of vacant land. Joe replied it is a variety of reasons. Some could be roof drains. In some cases, the water gets to the sanitary sewer trenches of the main lines and travels through them like an underdrain. Joe has asked the Municipal Authority to put a piece of underdrain pipe at the manholes to bleed off that water. Joe thinks that water is building up in that trench and creating pressure leading to some of the slides. There has also been a significant amount of rainfall from February through March which was uncommon for that time of year. You have freezing and thawing and the ground was capturing the water and freezing but not given an opportunity to thaw out completely. Joe stated it is many factors. You cannot just pin it down to one. Kandi questioned the grade 3 to 1 max. Is there any documentation that supports why 3 to 1 and not 4 to 1. Joe responded 4 to 1 makes the whole lot somewhat undevelopable. So a 3 to 1 seems to be more applicable or more palatable than a 2 to 1 with a geotechnical investigation.</p> <p>Joe stated another thing that comes up is when they are grading out these lots to build the homes and digging out these foundations is to certify that the soil that is being dug</p>

<p>MOTION TO TABLE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO GRADING ORDINANCE REGULATING MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE</p>	<p>out of the foundation is getting hauled away from these lots. There have been instances where the soil has been tailgated on the lot and not properly compacted. Jeffrey asked if this was summarized with his letter. Joe replied correct. Kandi questioned if the developers are using the retention ponds. Kandi stated in her development, Linden Vue, the retention pond is dry after a heavy rain. Joe stated you can still have a landslide with a 3 to 1 slope. A lot is a case by case basis. As to the water at the Linden Vue basin he stated he could not comment due to pending litigation. Diane asked Gary his thoughts and he agreed with Joe’s summary. Barry asked what are we at currently. Joe responded it is currently 2 to 1 and if you want to go to 1 ½ to 1 you have to have a geotechnical investigation and inspection certifying. Joe stated that this would only take effect for any future application, not any that are currently in process or in review such as Oak Grove and Walnut Grove. Diane questioned does the commission need to make a motion on this today? She feels there is more discussion that is needed on this matter. Barry stated from a realtor’s perspective, he is selling a couple homes on Stonegate and his clients did not make an offer because the backyard is steep. Joe replied those are 2 to 1. Both Margaret and Joe asked what they are looking for. Diane stated she feels there is not enough information one way or another. Margaret asked if they wanted more illustrations of different slopes. Diane replied that would be helpful and she questioned what is the impact on the residents and the developers. Margaret asked if Diane wanted a developer to come. Diane replied no we do not make ordinances for developers we make them for the Township. Kandi responded it would be difficult to make a motion not knowing what the proposed language is. Right now it is only what has been discussed. Gary stated this tightens up our grading ordinance. If we do not take any action, applications that come in can come under the 1 ½ with Geotech which is what you want to try to stop. Joe stated this information was all in his memo. Jeffrey stated he feel 4 to 1 is asking way too much. Kandi stated this is a really big decision. Joe discussed a scenario such as Ryan Homes in which they have a standard as to how deep they want a pad to be to put their particular product on. What that will do is take that 3 to 1 slope and push it away. It may create smaller lots or less lots. Gary stated what Joe is looking for is 2 to 1 with Geotech. They can get it now and that is where the danger is.</p> <p>A motion was made by Diane Balogh and seconded by Barry Crumrine to table the review of the proposed amendment to the Grading Ordinance regulating maximum permissible slope and requirements to connect all roof drains to storm sewer, referencing Joe Sites letter dated 6/12/18.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES –1 NO (J. DePaolis)</u></p>
---	---

<p>SLOPE AND REQUIREMENT TO CONNECT ALL ROOF DRAINS TO STORM SEWER.</p>	
<p>SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE REQUIRING ALL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS OF FIFTY (50) UNITS OR MORE TO HAVE TWO (2) VEHICULAR ACCESS POINTS</p>	<p>Review of subdivision and land development ordinance requiring all residential developments of fifty (50) units or more to have two (2) vehicular access points.</p> <p>Joe was asked if this is PennDOT roads or Township roads. Joe stated this does not focus on PennDOT requirements. There was some question as to why 50 units. Margaret stated 2 access points were chosen because there was already an amendment to the conservation subdivision with 50 or more units require 2 access points. This is to keep it consistent.</p> <p>Gary stated this really came front and center with the Weavertown Road development. Jeffrey questioned what if the plan only fronted on one roadway. Basically it would be a U shape. Michael Kelly replied if it only accesses one road it is a safety issue. Access for emergency response and exit/entrance access for residents is the concern.</p>
<p>MOTION TO PASS RECOMMENDATION FOR 2 ACCESS POINTS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS 50 UNITS OR MORE.</p>	<p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Michael Kelly to pass a recommendation of approval of the modification in the ordinance requiring all residential developments of fifty (50) units or more to have two (2) vehicular access points.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 1 NO (K. Jablonski)</u></p>
<p>OTHER BUSINESS:</p>	<p>There was no other business to discuss.</p>
<p><u>ADJOURNMENT:</u></p>	<p>Diane Balogh made a motion and seconded by Barry Crumrine to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 PM.</p>
<p></p>	<p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
<p></p>	<p>_____ Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairperson</p>
<p></p>	<p>_____ Michael Kelly, Secretary</p>