

	<p>The North Strabane Township Planning Commission met in regular session on Monday, October 15, 2018, 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 Barry Crumrine, Commission Member Kandi Jablonski, Commission Member</p> <p><u>Also Attending This Session:</u> Gary Sweat, Township Solicitor Joe Sites, Township Engineer Margaret Householder, Planning Coordinator Anthony Ascioffa, Planning Coordinator Colleen Mellor, Stenographer</p>
<p><u>PUBLIC COMMENTS:</u></p>	<p>Maria Sampaio owner of 206 Alexander Avenue she stated her property is for sale and she is trying to sell her property to a company that has a dance studio for little girls. This item is listed on agenda as item 5A. She has questions regarding the papers that were received. Maria expressed she really needs it to be approved. Jeffrey responded that Maria's original approval back in 2006 indicated that any change in use would require a conditional use hearing approval. She replied she understands that. She had talked to Mr. Kelly regarding that. She said she received paperwork in the email that she was unsure of. Her agent Bruce Fife of Century 21 Frontier stated it is a small lot with a building that probably cover 80% of the lot. Putting some sort of pond on the property or underneath the property or a parking lot. It is becoming cost prohibited for the buyer in order to do that kind of work. Jeffrey again stated a change in use would require you to bring the property up to current standards. Joe Sites stated in reviewing this there is a change in use which is significant. You are going from a photography studio which has very low traffic to a dance studio that is going to have a lot more traffic. There is also the mention of increase of number of parking spaces, which is a requirement. Since the change of use and an increase in the number of parking spaces this will require some stormwater management. There will be some impact on the neighborhood. Maria stated it is not as high volume as you think it is. It is only being sold for \$240,000.00. She understands it is a large property it is 6300 sq. ft. It was previously a bowling alley and before that it was a dance hall for wedding receptions. Life its self has changed not everybody used to have a car. The problem becomes I have a beautiful, well maintained, and renovated property but by requiring some of the things the township is requiring. She stated it is basically making her property unsellable. Nobody is going to invest between 30-40 thousand dollars into that when they are paying 240 for a property. She is trying to find to work with this to make this work for</p>

<p><u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</u> September 17, 2018</p>	<p>her and the buyer. She is not talking about a bar or some crazy gun business. She does not see the difference between clicking a camera and a little girl moving her arms. Jeffrey stated he is a traffic engineer by profession and with that additional traffic the building will need additional parking. The run off from that additional parking will need taken care of.</p> <p>Jeffrey commented if there is \$30,000.00 worth of work to go in it then maybe you are selling the property too high. Maybe the value of the property is not \$240,000.00. It is not a matter of working with you it is a matter of Maria understanding that there are certain rules when a property exchange hands. There was an approval given 12 years ago that pretty much laid that out. When this changes hands you are going to have to make sure you go through the whole process again. That process includes bringing the property up to the current standards.</p> <p>Maria questioned there is no variance or anything that can be done to facilitate some of these issues we are having. This is not a Walmart it is just two small businesses. Jeffrey asked Joe for input.</p> <p>Joe stated these are conditions of approval that have to be satisfied for the type of use. Our ordinance is quite specific as to what you need to meet in order to have these types of business. Joe stated he has to look out for the township so that compliance occurs with these requirements. This is what we have in place.</p> <p>Maria asked Joe as an example if that property was to become a warehouse and there was no traffic would this not be an issue then? If the buyer was a different type of buyer.</p> <p>Joe stated he would have to look at the ordinance. Strabane is a unique situation where you have a combination of residences and businesses all in the same place. Yes, it may have been a dance hall and a bowling alley years ago. Most everybody at that time did not have cars and they walked there. If you are going to have 7-8 girls in a class two times a day. You are looking at 16 cars to drop off their children. When you had your photography studio you had maybe one or two people there at one time during that time frame.</p> <p>Maria stated that is not true. She runs events where she has over 20 people there. She stated she has never had a complaint from any neighbors.</p> <p>Gary Sweat stated there is absolutely no way to waive the conditional use requirement. That requires a hearing in front of the Board of Supervisors. It is clear when Maria was giving this approval back in 2006 the record indicated any change in use requires a conditional use hearing. This board does not decide that. This board can make recommendations it goes up to the Board of Supervisors. A full hearing will be scheduled. The buyer does have the ability or right to request certain waivers. Gary is not saying they will get it. It depends on how critical it is to public health and safety. We are beating a dead horse here because you have to go through a hearing. That cannot be waived by this board.</p> <p>Maria and Bruce thanked the board.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Michael Kelly to approve the minutes of the September 17, 2018 meeting.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
---	---

<p><u>OLD BUSINESS:</u></p>	<p>Jeffrey stated the only item with the September 17, 2018 minutes is the portion that states the Sheetz location stated Franklin and it should read Franklin Park.</p> <p>None</p>
<p><u>NEW BUSINESS:</u> CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST DANCE STUDIO AT 206 ALEXANDER AVENUE-TABLE</p> <p>MOTION TO TABLE DANCE STUDIO-206 ALEXANDER AVE.</p>	<p>Conditional Use request dance studio at 206 Alexander Avenue has been tabled at the request of the applicant. The request dated October 9, 2018 was submitted by Danielle Black for Grace Christian Dance Company.</p> <p>Gary asked for the applicant to be named. Margaret stated the applicant is Grace Christian Company.</p> <p>Gary asked who they requested tabling. Margaret stated via email dated October 9th.</p> <p>A motion was made by Michael Kelly and seconded by Barry Crumrine to accept the tabling of 206 Alexander Avenue.</p>
<p>GREENWOOD VILLAGE – APPLICATION FOR FINAL SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN REVIEW OF PHASES 2 AND 3A, CONSISTING OF 41 TOWNHOUSES IN PHASE 2 AND 26 TOWNHOUSES IN PHASE 3A. REQUEST TO TABLE.</p>	<p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>Greenwood Village – Application for final subdivision and site plan review of phases 2 and 3A, consisting of 41 townhouses in phase 2 and 26 townhouses in phase 3A, located on Greenwood Drive in an R-3 zoning district. Greenwood Village LP submitted a letter dated October 15, 2018 to table item.</p> <p>The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: October 12, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Greenwood Village – PRD Phase 2 and 3A – Final Subdivision and Site Plan</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We are in receipt of the Final subdivision and site plan for Phases 2 and 3A for Greenwood Village in the R-3 zoning district. The following are comments relative to the subdivision dated August 29, 2018, site plan dated July 2018, and Stormwater Management Report dated June 2018 all revised October 10, 2018 as prepared by Lennon Smith, Souleret Engineering, Inc.</p> <p>In accordance with §1207 – Application for Final Approval, the procedures for final approval are identified and the Zoning Officer is to determine if the application is</p>

	<p>complete in accordance with §1207.1 and provide written notice. Within section §1207.1 it states, “The applicant shall submit the application to the Washington County Planning Commission for review and comment subject to the payment of the required fee”. The submission that was provided to the Township did include correspondence from the Washington County Planning Commission that reflects an approval of the plans but does not indicate if this approval covers phases 2 & 3A.</p> <p>§1207.6 states that the application for Final Approval shall comply with all applicable ordinance provisions and minimums for the Development Plan. The following notes are based on the submission of plans dated July 2018:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. §1207.F (1) states that All data required by the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for a final plan, including application filing, application review, inspection fees and performance bond are to be provided. <p>It is our understanding that the fees were paid, but no performance bond was provided. This is a requirement of final approval. A recommendation for approval will not be made without a performance bond.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. §1207.F (2) states that accurately dimensioned locations for all proposed buildings, structures, parking areas and common open space. <p>A plan has been submitted that shows proposed buildings and dimensions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. §1207.F (3) states that the number of families to be housed in each residential building or structure and the intended use of each nonresidential building or structure. <p>The Applicant has added to the plan that the townhouses will be single family homes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. §1207.F (4) states that Building elevation drawings for all principal structures, other than single-family dwellings. <p>No information has been provided. The Applicant has stated that the elevation drawings will be provided under separate cover but has not yet submitted elevation drawings for review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. §1207.F (5) states that a lighting plan, showing the location, height and type of any exterior lighting fixtures proposed, and a photometric plan, showing the distribution of lighting on the site and at the site boundaries. <p>Locations of the proposed carriage lamps have been added to the landscape plan, but a photometric plan has not been provided. The Applicant has stated that the photometric plan will be provided under separate cover but has not yet submitted a photometric plan for review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. §1207.F (6) A Landscaping Plan, as defined by this Ordinance, including the location and types of plant materials, sidewalks, trails and recreation facilities authorized by this Ordinance. <p>This requirement has been met.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. §1207.F (7) states that Supplementary data, including any covenants, grants of easements or other restrictions to be imposed on the use of the land, building and structures and the organization proposed to own, maintain and operate the common open space facilities.
--	---

	<p>No information has been provided. The Applicant has stated that this information will be provided under separate cover but has not yet submitted covenants for review.</p> <p>8. §1207.F (8) states that an engineering report including the following data shall be provided, whenever applicable</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Profiles, cross-sections and specifications for proposed public and private streets. b. Profiles and other explanatory data concerning installation of water distribution systems, storm sewers and sanitary sewers. c. Feasibility of sanitary sewerage systems in terms of capacity to serve the proposed development. <p>This requirement has been met.</p> <p>9. §1207.F (9) states a grading plan prepared in compliance with the requirements of the Township Grading Ordinance.</p> <p>This requirement has been met.</p> <p>10. §1207.F (10) states that Evidence that the applicant has submitted plans to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an approval letter from the Washington County Conservation District. The Applicant has also stated that the approval letter covers the entire development.</p> <p>11. §1207.F (11) states that an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan that shall specifically indicate all erosion and sedimentation control measures to be utilized on the site be provided. The Erosion and sedimentation Control Plan shall be designed to prevent accelerated erosion and sedimentation. The Plan shall include, but not limited to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The topographic features of the site b. The types, depth, slope and extent of the soils by area c. The proposed alterations to the site d. The amount of runoff from the site area and the upstream watershed e. The staging of earthmoving activities f. Temporary control measures and facilities during earthmoving g. Permanent control measures and facilities for long-term protection h. A maintenance program for the control facilities, including disposal of materials removed from the control facilities or site area. <p>This requirement has been met.</p> <p>12. §1207.F (12) states a storm water management plan prepared in compliance with the requirements of the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance.</p> <p>Stormwater Management comments are addressed later in this letter.</p> <p>13. §1207.F (13) states that a Performance bond and development agreement as required by the Township subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.</p>
--	---

	<p>None has been provided. This is a requirement of final approval. A recommendation for approval will not be made without a performance bond.</p> <p><u>Subdivision Plan</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposed subdivision plan shall be revised so that Phase 3B is not included. The area and bulk regulation requirements table should only show the Phase 2 and 3A information. <p>The Applicant has revised the subdivision plan to remove Phase 3B but has not adjusted the bulk regulation requirements table to reflect these changes. The bulk regulations table shall break out the number dwelling units in Phase 2 and Phase 3A. The current table includes the total number of dwelling units in Phase 3, including Phase 3B.</p> <p><u>Site Plan</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A Legend shall be added to all sheets of the plan so that the proposed development can be reviewed accurately. <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant shall revise the plan to show individual connections of the roof leaders to the proposed storm sewer. The current plan shows the 8” storm sewer line to collect the runoff water from the residences but does not show the individual connections to this sewer line. <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant shall revise the plans so that they show the top and invert elevation, pipe size, pipe material, and pipe grade of the storm sewer on the plan view. <p>This item has not been addressed. The plans shall include the pipe size, material, and pipe grade on the storm sewers on the plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant shall review the storm sewer profiles to verify the slopes they provided, as we question the accuracy of the pipe slope. <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant shall adjust the location of CB 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 46, and 47 so that they do not conflict with the location of proposed driveways. <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant shall adjust the turnaround area at the end of club house parking lot so that the turnaround area is 25’ wide by 13’ deep. This must meet the requirements of Part 15.
--	---

	<p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p>7. The site plans state that ADA curb ramp facilities are to be installed in the sidewalk at all intersections, but there are no details for these ADA curb ramps.</p> <p>This item has not been addressed. The locations of the proposed ADA ramps have not been included on the site plan, and the appropriate details have not been included for the proposed ADA ramps.</p> <p>8. We question if houses above elevation 1220’ will require booster pumps for their water lines and if these pumps will provide sufficient fire protection.</p> <p>The Applicant has stated that the concern is being addressed with Pennsylvania American Water. If required, booster pumps will be provided within units that may not have adequate pressures.</p> <p>9. The plan as submitted indicates Curtis Court with a 40’ right of way which is not the required 50’ right of way width for a public road. We are assuming Curtis Court as shown is proposed to be a private lane. §402.2 (L) 1 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance only permits a private lane when only two (2) lots have no other access to a public street. §402.2(L)2 states ... “Any further subdivision of a lot or parcel into three (3) or more lots with frontage on a private lane shall mandate construction of a public street in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance for constructing a public street. Curtis Court shall be constructed as a public road and have a cul-de-sac at the terminus.</p> <p>The Applicant has stated that Curtis Court was approved as a private road as part of the preliminary PRD and that all roads will be built in accordance with the approved preliminary PRD. This was part of the court order related to the approval.</p> <p><u>Stormwater Management</u></p> <p>1. Consideration should be given to installing diversion channels at the top of slope above Lots 203A-205E and 312A-314E in order to minimize the potential for damage to the slope.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p>2. The details for all PCSM BMPs proposed in Phases 2 & 3A that are shown on the PCSM sheets bound in the PCSM report must be included in the Construction Drawings.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p>
--	--

	<p>3. Provide a base cross section view that shows the location of the proposed anti-seep collars and all pertinent information necessary to construct the basin bottom, embankment, riser, emergency spillway, and outfall structure.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p>1. An NPDES permit will be required for the site and the erosion and sedimentation plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval. The grading permit will not be issued until the NPDES permit is approved.</p> <p>This item has been addressed. The NPDES permit submitted for the master plan approval covers the work under Phase 2 and Phase 3A.</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 stated that a Developers Agreement will be submitted separately but has not yet been submitted for review.</p> <p>3. The plans must be submitted to the Municipal Authority for review and comment.</p> <p>The Applicant has stated they are working with the Municipal Authority Engineer to finalize the sanitary sewer plans.</p> <p>4. 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 acknowledged this comment.</p> <p>5. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.</p> <p>The Applicant has stated that a copy of the approved planning module will be forwarded upon receipt.</p> <p>Based on the aforementioned outstanding item, the plan is in order for consideration for preliminary approval at this time. Once the outstanding items are addressed, consideration for final approval will be entertained.</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,</p>
--	--

<p>MOTION TO TABLE GREENWOOD VILLAGE- SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN REVIEW</p>	<p>The Gateway Engineers, Inc. Joseph H. Sites, P.E. Township Engineer</p> <p>Jeffrey referenced a letter dated October 15, 2018 from Greenwood Village LP requesting a 31-day extension for formal review for final approval-subdivision and site plan.</p> <p>A motion was made by Diane Balogh and seconded by Kandi Jablonski to table Greenwood Village – application for final subdivision and site plan review of phases 2 and 3A, at the request of Greenwood Village LP.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p>
<p>MYERS WELL SERVICE – PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE YARD LOCATED AT 36 INDUSTRY DRIVE IN AN I-1 ZONING DISTRICT.</p>	<p>Myers Well Service – Preliminary site plan approval for equipment storage yard located at 36 Industry Drive in an I-1 zoning district. a special exception was granted on September 5, 2018 for the equipment storage yard. After further consideration, an application for conditional use approval must be obtained for a truck staging area for the oil and gas industry. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: October 4, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Myers Well Service – Gravel Parking Area – Equipment Storage Yard Industry Drive</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We have received and reviewed the site plan for an equipment storage yard to be used in conjunction with the exiting Myers Well Service property of 3.57 acres in the I-1 zoning district. An equipment storage yard is a special exception per §1303(22). The Zoning Hearing Board granted Special Exception for the equipment storage yard at the September 5, 2018 meeting. All special exception applications are to comply with §1301 related to the Procedure for Approval, §1302 General Standards, and the standards for specific uses of §1303(22) for an equipment storage yard. In addition, since the business is a related operation to Oil and Gas Development, compliance with Conditional Use approval per §1301(E) must occur. The following are comments relative to the submission by R.F. Mitall and Associates dated June 25, 2018:</p> <p>Special Exception and Conditional Use</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant must review and provide a written response to §1301, §1302, and §1303 and related sections of the zoning ordinance that are referenced. 2. §1303(22) identifies that special exception requirements for an equipment storage yard. §1303(22) A requires a minimum site of five acres. There is conflicting information regarding the testimony that was provided at the Zoning Hearing Board Meeting on September 5, 2018. It was presented that the equipment storage yard is 12 acres. The plan does not show any area for the proposed storage yard or adjacent property. The lease that was provided indicates that the area for the equipment storage yard is 2 acres. 3. §1303(22) B requires that the site shall have frontage on and direct vehicular access to an arterial or collector street, as defined by this chapter. There is no direct connection of the equipment storage yard to a public road. Access is through a driveway of the 3.57-acre parcel which is the main operations center of Myers Well Service. 4. §1303(22) C requires all areas used for storage and movement of equipment shall be improved with a dust-free, all-weather surface. Any areas not paved with hard surface shall have a dust control plan that is submitted to the Township Engineer for review and approval. A dust plan has been submitted which has been reviewed and is in order. 5. §1303(22) D requires a Buffer Area B, as defined by § 1402, Subsection 1, of this chapter, shall be provided along all property lines adjoining an R Zoning District. This requirement is not applicable since the entire property is surrounded by I zoned property. 6. §1303(22) E states that no repair of vehicles or equipment shall be permitted outside a completely enclosed structure. The applicant in their testimony at the Zoning Hearing Board Meeting stated that no maintenance would be occurring on the property. 7. §1303(22) F states that all operations shall comply with the performance standards of § 1401 of this chapter. The applicant must provide a written response to each of the performance standards of §1401. 8. §1303(22) G states that engines shall not be started or kept running before 6:30 a.m. or after 8:00 p.m. if the site is located within 500 feet of an existing dwelling. The applicant in their testimony at the Zoning Hearing Board meeting did not provide a clear response to this question per the transcript. 9. §1303(22) H states that all lighting shall be shielded and reflected away from streets and any adjoining residential properties. The testimony at the Zoning Hearing Board meeting said that there would be lighting on the site, but there is not a photometric plan as the submission states on the index sheet of the submission indicates is included. This must be provided.
--	---

	<p>10. §1303(22) I requires a stormwater management plan to control runoff of surface water shall be submitted for review and approval by the Township Engineer. See comments below related to the stormwater management plan.</p> <p>Site Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan must be signed by the preparer. 2. The limits of the lease are for the equipment storage yard must be indicated on the plan including the acreage of the area. 3. The lease agreement states that it is for a five (5) year period. If the lease is not extended, will the owner of the property where the equipment storage yard be assuming the maintenance of the equipment storage yard? <p>Stormwater Management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The report must be signed and sealed by the preparer. 2. The methodology of the report refers to and underground detention tank, but none is indicated on the site plan. 3. The stormwater detention and infiltration makes reference to “The proposed multi-family and single family lots will drain to a proposed stormwater detention pond...” and “The commercial and recreational areas will drain to an underground detention system containing ...”. None of the aforementioned are located on the site. The report must be revised accordingly. 4. The discharge of STM EW- 3 and STM EW-4 must be hard pipe connected to an existing storm sewer pipe and not be discharged overland which has the possibility of draining to the Township Road leading to a Township maintenance issue. 5. Additional comments relative to the stormwater management report may be forthcoming once the aforementioned comments are addressed. <p>General</p> <p>Prior to Final Site Plan approval, the following items will need to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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.
--	---

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.
4. The plans must be submitted to the Municipal Authority for review and comment.
5. The plans must be submitted to the North Strabane Township Fire Chief for review and comment.
6. Prior to any construction on the site, a pre-construction meeting with the Engineer, Public Works Director, and the Developer must be held.
7. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.

In order for this application to be considered by the North Strabane Township Planning Commission at their October 15, 2018 meeting, one copy of the revised plans with a written response letter that address the comments in this letter must be received by Gateway Engineers and 6 copies by North Strabane Township by 12:00 P.M. on October 10, 2018. If revised plans are not received by this deadline the plans will not be reviewed prior to the meeting. As part of the final submission, a power point document and PDF's of the plan must be submitted for use as an exhibit during the presentation at the planning commission meeting.

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

J.J. Richardson, Land Use Attorney, representing Myers Well Service. J.J. provided some background on Myers Well Service. J.J. stated he did have a preliminary conversation with Gary Sweat on Friday October 12th so he has a general idea of the questions that have been raised.

J. J. stated Myers approached the township several months ago with a proposed use for a lot that is adjacent to their current operation. That proposed use being the parking and only the parking of water trucks in connection with their business. The feedback that came back from the township after some consideration was this is an equipment storage yard and they will need to apply for a special exception and go before the Zoning Hearing Board. That occurred on September 25th and J.J. was not in attendance but his clients were there along with their engineer. They presented all information that

was required. That special exception was granted it was a standard one paragraph granting of the special exception letter received from the Zoning Hearing Board and the vote was unanimous. A few days ago a letter was received suggesting the use may be related to Oil & Gas development and after speaking to Mr. Sweat and reading this on the agenda. It appears there may be some questions as to whether this is going to be used as a truck staging area. This is not intended to be used as a truck staging area. There will be no loading to, from, or between trucks. This is a parking lot. This is in fact an equipment storage yard. The engineer and the principals from the company are here to answer any questions.

Lenny White of KU Resources addressed the members. He stated the testimony from the Zoning Hearing Board questioned the lot size. The parcel the equipment storage yard is going to be on is 12 acres and of that 12 the leased Myers will be using is 2 acres.

Gary stated an equipment storage yard requires 5 acres. Lenny replied yes the parcel is 12 acres.

Margaret stated the leased area is 2 acres.

Gary questioned how do we get to 5?

Lenny responded they assumed the 5 is if you are in a high density residential area with all buffers and any screenings to keep noise and traffic down. So the 5 acres in an industrial park where there are not any residences within close proximity to the sight. We do not need any of the buffers for anything like that.

Joe commented his interpretation of the 5 acres is it is 5 acres complete for the equipment storage yard. The one issue Joe has with this application is this storage yard is being established on the adjacent property that is not owned by Myers but is being leased. There are other equipment storage yards in the I-1 zoning district that meet the 5-acre requirement for equipment storage.

Joe stated show the 5 acres outlined and a leased lot. There is conflicting information. Joe feels there are inconsistencies there which he feels does not warrant the equipment storage yard being permitted.

JJ stated this is all industrial. The policy underlying the 5-acre requirement that is primarily intended to create a large enough space so that there can be separation from other uses that might be adversely effected by the equipment storage yard. He feels having a 2-acre storage yard rather than a 5-acre storage yard we are creating less impact.

Gary replied that is an argument you would have to make to the Zoning Hearing Board because you are basically asking for a variance from 5 to 2. Gary stated looking at the transcript, it was not asked at the Zoning Hearing Board to do that. It was granted on the representation that Myers Well Service had 12 acres.

JJ feels this is a situation where the policy underlying that requirement really does not make sense in this district. If there is a legal argument that the members would like for JJ to put in writing he stated, he can do that. Unfortunately, JJ stated he was not present at the Zoning Hearing Board. What is available is approximately 2.5 acres. JJ stated they have an approval letter and that is what they were moving forward with.

Gary stated the big issue is the members want to make sure this is not a truck staging area.

Lenny stated there will be no transferring materials between the trucks.

Gary asked are the trucks are used to aid or assist in fracking operations at well pads.

<p>FOUR STARS PIPE AND SUPPLY – PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR A 9,000 SQUARE FOOT FLEX BUILDING LOCATED ON ROUTE 519 IN AN I-1 DISTRICT. REQUEST TO TABLE</p>	<p>Matt Myers, CEO of Myers Well Service, replied they will not be loaded with water and the lot will be used as parking.</p> <p>Jason Myers, Vice President of Myers Well Service, read the North Strabane Township definition of truck staging area as: off street facility used for the transfer of loads to, from or between Oil and Gas Development or Traffic Control Site. That does not fall under this. It falls under the truck staging area where the trucks are being parked in between shifts. There will be no loading or transferring being performed during that time. It is simply switching out 6 A.M. and 6 P.M. two drivers are switching trucks. The trucks go back to the site where the fracking and unloading is occurring. The is strictly driver transfer only.</p> <p>Matt stated this is a parking area for Myers Well Service business. They are currently out of room.</p> <p>Gary asked Matt do they work for Range or EQT?</p> <p>Matt replied EQT.</p> <p>Jeffrey questioned Matt if they are looking to expand.</p> <p>Matt replied yes.</p> <p>Jeffrey expressed his concern. This application was filed with 12 acres and the board granted it. Now we are finding out the leased area is over 2 acres. The issue is our ordinance states 5 is needed. This is an issue for the Zoning Hearing Board to consider and exception to the 5-acre requirement.</p> <p>Gary was looking at the overview of lease, the term sheet. Gary stated he does not see the ability to extend it past the initial five years.</p> <p>JJ replied that is a term sheet. There is a more detailed lease being prepared. That is not the final lease.</p> <p>Gary stated the options are we can table this if they want to present a written legal argument or you can press the board to vote on the existing application based on what they see or they can voluntarily go back to the Zoning Hearing Board requesting a variance.</p> <p>The Meyers Well Service group stepped out for discussion.</p> <p>Four Stars Pipe and Supply – Preliminary site plan approval for a 9,000 square foot flex building on 10.16 acre parcel located on Route 519 in an I-1 district. previously an office and warehouse building was constructed on the lot. This creates a second principal use on the existing property. It is our recommendation that the property be subdivided or an application for conditional use for planned industrial park be filed. A letter dated October 15, 2018 was submitted by Harshman CE Group request to table.</p> <p>The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: October 12, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Preliminary Site Plan –Permitted Use – I-1 Zoning District Four Star Pipe and Supply Facility – Phase 2</p>
--	--

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the preliminary site plan application for the additional development of a 9,000 Square Foot Flex Building on the exiting 10.16 acres site in the I-1 zoning district. The property was previously reviewed and approved for an office and warehouse building for Four Star Pipe and Supply. The additional building will create two primary uses on a single lot. As this is a second similar principal use on the existing property, we recommend the applicant either subdivide the property and create two parcels on a private lane or apply for conditional use approval for a planned industrial park, in accordance with §1303(35). The following are comments relative to the submitted site plan as prepared by Harshman CE Group revised dated October 2018:

The resubmission response letter from the designer has indicated “Our client is considering the need to either subdivide the property or apply for conditional use approval for a planned industrial park. At this time, our client is still considering whether the proposed building will be used for his own business or leased out to another business”

Since there is uncertainty existing regarding this application, we would recommend that the applicant table the application until they can make a decision.

Site Plan

1. The Plan must be signed and sealed by the preparer.

This comment has been addressed.

2. §1102(k) states the maximum height of structures in the I-1 zoning district to be 3 stories, but no taller than 45 feet. The plan must indicate the height of the proposed building.

The October 10, 2018 response from the designer states, “As the building is still being designed, the exact height has not yet been determined. The building is anticipated to be 1 story and about the same size as the last building which is approximately 17ft., the plan currently indicates less than 45 feet. Again, a decision must be made as to the final height of the building.

3. §1503 indicates the criteria for loading berth design. Per this ordinance, a loading berth is required for the site. The plan must be revised to include a loading berth that is in accordance with this requirement.

This item has been addressed.

4. Fire lanes in accordance with the Township Fire Code shall be added to the plan and must be approved by the Fire Chief.

The applicant has indicated the fire lane on the plan, but there has not been any letter of approval provided by the Township Fire Chief.

	<p>5. Two different pavement structure cross sections are provided, one for the entrance driveway and one for the parking stalls. We recommend using one pavement structure cross section across all paved areas for ease of construction.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p>6. The Applicant shall revise the plan to include a detail of the proposed trench drain along the eastern side of the proposed building.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p>7. We question the location of the proposed rock construction entrance and wash rack as the driveway for at this location has already been paved. The Applicant shall move the rock construction entrance to the lot entrance of the proposed building location.</p> <p>The applicant has indicated that “Since the NPDES permit is still active, we are undergoing a minor modification/amendment with the DEP. They requested we modify the existing plans (from Phase One) to bring them into conformance with the current plan.</p> <p>A revised E&S Plan will need to be submitted with the modified NPDES permit to obtain a grading permit for Phase 2.</p> <p>8. The requirement for planning module must be reviewed by the planning coordinator.</p> <p>The designer has acknowledged that they will address the planning module.</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <p>1. On Sheet LD3, the catch basin 2A detail shows a 1” orifice at the bottom of the weir. It is suggested to provide a 4” PVC pipe that connects to the 36” pipe upstream of the weir with a valve on the outside of the tank that is capable of completely dewatering the tank for emergency and maintenance purposes. The valve could normally be opened ¼ to simulate the 1” orifice in the original design.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p>2. On Sheet SM2, a valve is shown connecting to the 4” underdrain for the permanent detention pond. It is suggested to show a rising stem to the top of the riser grate, which would allow it to be operated at the top of the riser.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p>6. An NPDES permit will be required for the site and the erosion and sedimentation plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval. The grading permit will not be issued until the NPDES permit is approved.</p>
--	---

The designer has stated in their response “The NPDES for the site was still open. WCC and DEP requested that the current permit be modified/amended rather than closed out and a new one opened. The review is accruing at the DEP Southwest rather than WCCD due to the high-quality nature of the watershed” This is an outstanding item.

- 7. 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 designer in their response acknowledges this requirement.

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

The designer has stated in their response “We have submitted to NSTMA and are currently working with Matt Marasco and Nichols and Slagle Engineering, Inc., regarding the sanitary design and connections”

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

The designer has acknowledged a pre-construction meeting being held before any work starts on the site.

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

The designer has acknowledged that they will address the planning module.

Based on the indecisive manner of the applicant as to how this site plan application is to be approached for development as either as two separate lots or an industrial park, I would recommend that the applicant table the application until such time that the outstanding items are addressed for compliance with the Township Subdivision and Land Development and Zoning Ordinances.

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.
 Township Engineer

<p>MOTION TO TABLE – FOUR STARS PIPE AND SUPPLY – PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR A 9,000 SQUARE FOOT FLEX BUILDING DISTRICT.</p> <p>LAUREL COMMUNITIES – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL FOR A TWO LOT SUBDIVISION LOCATED ON MCDOWELL LANE IN AN R-3 ZONING DISTRICT</p>	<p>A motion was made by Kandi Jablonski and seconded by Diane Balogh to table Four Stars Pipe and Supply –at the request of Harshman CE Group, LLC letter dated October 15, 2018.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>Laurel Communities – Preliminary and final subdivision approval for a two lot subdivision located on McDowell Lane in an R-3 zoning district. The purpose of this subdivision is to create two separate parcels for development as a non-family type 1 facility and a multifamily development.</p> <p>The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: October 12, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Scenic Valley –Land Development Conditional Use Applications for Non-Family Facility Type “1” and Multi-Family R-3 Zoning District – McDowell Lane, Valleyview Drive, and Meadowview Drive.</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We have received and reviewed the conditional use applications for permitted Non-Family Facility Type “1” and Multi-Family Housing on two separate parcels totaling 63.75 acres in the R-3 zoning district. A Non-Family Facility Type “1” is a conditional use per §801(B)1(c) and Multi-Family Dwellings are conditional use per §801(B)1(d). A conditional use is subject to §1301 related to the Procedure for Approval, §1302 General Standards, and the standards for specific uses of §1303. The conditional standard specific uses for Multi-Family Dwellings are to be in accordance with §1303(35) and a Non-Family Facility Type “1” is to be in accordance with §1303(39). The revised submission addresses the comments of our letter of October 4, 2018 was made on October 10, 2018 and stamped as received by the Township office. The following are comments relative to the submission prepared by Victor Wetzel Associates with a revised date of October 10, 2018:</p> <p>§ 1300. Applicability.</p> <p>The following procedures shall apply to all applicants for approval of a conditional use or use by special exception in all zoning districts.</p>
--	---

§ 1301. Procedure for Approval.

A. Approval of conditional uses. The Board of Supervisors shall hear and decide requests for conditional uses; however, the Board of Supervisors shall not approve a conditional use application unless and until:

1. A written application for conditional use approval is submitted to the Zoning Officer or his or her designated representative no less than 20 calendar days prior to the regular meeting of the Planning Commission. The applications shall indicate the section of this chapter under which conditional use approval is sought and shall state the grounds upon which it is requested. The application shall include the following:

(a) A preliminary land development plan, if required by the Township subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, or, if a land development plan is not required, a current property survey indicating all existing and proposed structures and all proposed construction, additions or alterations on the site in sufficient detail to determine the feasibility of the proposed development and compliance with all applicable requirements of this chapter.

All the requirements of §302.10 of the Subdivision and land development ordinance must be met in order for the application to be complete. This item has been met.

(b) A written statement showing compliance with the applicable express standards and criteria of this Part for the proposed use.

The applicant stated that the revised project narrative addresses the conditional use express standards, but no revised narrative was provided for review with the October 10, 2018 submission.

(c) A traffic impact study, as defined herein, for any use that, according to the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, will generate 75 or more additional trips during the adjacent street's peak hours.

A traffic impact study was included with the August 20, 2018 submission and comments were provided to be addressed.

(d) The application fee required by § 1908 of this chapter.

The application fee was submitted with the submission on August 20, 2018.

2. A written recommendation is received from the Township Planning Commission or 45 days have passed from the date of the Planning Commission meeting at which the application is first considered as complete and properly filed for approval.

A written recommendation is forth coming upon the application being submitted for action to be taken by the Planning Commission.

3. A public hearing is conducted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to public notice and said hearing is scheduled no more than 60 days following the date of submission of a complete and properly filed application, unless the applicant has agreed, in writing, to an extension of time.

A public hearing will need to be scheduled and held upon action taken by the Planning Commission.

4. Each subsequent hearing before the Board of Supervisors shall be held within 45 days of the prior hearing, unless otherwise agreed to by the applicant in writing or on the record. An applicant shall complete the presentation of his case-in-chief within 100 days of the first hearing. Upon the request of the applicant, the Board of Supervisors shall assure that the applicant receives at least seven hours of hearings within the 100 days, including the first hearing. Persons opposed to the application shall complete the presentation of their opposition to the application within 100 days of the first hearing held after the completion of the applicant's case-in-chief. And the applicant may, upon request, be granted additional hearings to complete his case-in-chief, provided that the persons opposed to the application are granted an equal number of additional hearings. Persons opposed to the application may, upon the written consent or consent on the record by the applicant and the Township, be granted additional hearings to complete their opposition to the application, provided that the applicant is granted an equal number of additional hearings for rebuttal.

The public hearing(s) will need to be scheduled.

5. The Board of Supervisors shall render a written decision within 45 days after the last public hearing. Where the application is contested or denied, the decision shall be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions based thereon. Conclusions based on any provision of this chapter or any other applicable rule or regulation shall contain a reference to the provision relied upon and the reasons why the conclusion is deemed appropriate in light of the facts found.

A decision will be required to be provided within the specified time.

6. Where the Board of Supervisors fails to render a decision within the required forty-five (45) days or fails to commence, conduct or complete the required hearing as specified in Subsections C and E, above, the decision shall be deemed to have been rendered in favor of the applicant, unless the applicant has agreed, in writing or on the record, to an extension of time. The Board of Supervisors shall give public notice, as defined herein, of said deemed approval within 10 days from the last day it could have met to render a decision. If the Board of Supervisors shall fail to provide such notice, the applicant may do so. Nothing in this subsection shall prejudice the right of any

	<p>party opposing the application to appeal the decision to a court of competent jurisdiction.</p> <p>7. In considering an application for conditional use approval, the Board of Supervisors may prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards in conformity with the spirit and intent of this Part. A violation of such conditions and safeguards, when made a part of the terms and conditions under which conditional use approval is granted, shall be deemed a violation of this chapter and shall be subject to the enforcement provisions of § 1901 of this chapter.</p> <p>B. Expiration of conditional use approval. Conditional use approval shall expire automatically, without written notice to the applicant, if no application for a grading permit, a building permit or an occupancy permit to undertake the construction or authorize the occupancy described in the application for conditional use approval is submitted within 12 months of said approval, unless the Board of Supervisors, in its sole discretion, extends conditional use approval upon written request of the applicant received prior to its expiration. The maximum extension permitted shall be one twelve-month extension.</p> <p>§ 1302. General Standards. 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>A written response was provided by the Applicant in the Engineer’s Report.</p> <p>B. The use shall comply with the performance standards of § 1401 of this chapter.</p> <p>§1401 Performance Standards: All permitted uses, conditional uses and uses by special exception in all districts shall comply with the requirements of this section. In order to determine whether a proposed use will conform to the requirements of this chapter, the Board of Supervisors or Zoning Hearing Board may require a qualified consultant to testify, whose cost for services shall be borne by the applicant.</p> <p>A. Fire protection. Fire prevention and fire-fighting equipment acceptable to the Board of Fire Underwriters shall be readily available when any activity involving the handling or storage of flammable or explosive materials is carried on.</p> <p>The applicant has responded that “The proposed development will have fire hydrants as recommended by the Fire Chief thereby providing the fire protection</p>
--	--

	<p>needed by the fire department.’ Fire hydrants have been added to the site plan, but no letter of approval from the Fire Chief has been provided for these locations. This requirement has not been met. The Applicant stated that a letter of availability has been requested from Pennsylvania American Water, and they are awaiting a response from the Fire Chief as to the locations of the fire hydrants.</p> <p>B. Electrical disturbance. No activity shall cause electrical disturbance adversely affecting radio or other equipment in the vicinity.</p> <p>The applicant has responded that “This plan of mixed housing will not cause a disturbance to radio or other equipment.”</p> <p>C. Noise. No operation or activity shall cause or create noise in excess of the sound levels prescribed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residential districts: at no point beyond the boundary of any lot within these districts shall the exterior noise level resulting from any use or activity located on such lot exceed a maximum of 60 dBA for more than four hours during a Twenty-four-hour equivalent period. <p>The applicant has responded “This mixed housing development will not generate noise levels in excess of 60 dBA for more than four hours during a 24-hour period.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Commercial districts: at no point on or beyond the boundary of any lot within these districts shall the exterior noise level resulting from any use or activity located on such lot exceed a maximum of 65 dBA for more than eight hours during a Twenty-four-hour equivalent period. <p>Not Applicable</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Industrial districts: at no point on or beyond the boundary of any lot within these districts shall the exterior noise level resulting from any use or activity located on such lot exceed a maximum of 75 dBA for more than eight hours during a Twenty-four-hour equivalent period. <p>Not Applicable</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Where two or more zoning districts in which different noise levels are prescribed share a common boundary, the most-restrictive noise level standards shall govern. <p>Not Applicable</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The following uses or activities shall be exempted from the noise regulations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Noise. emanating from construction or maintenance activities between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. (b) Noises caused by safety signals, warning devices and other emergency-related activities or uses. (c) Noises emanating from public or private recreational uses between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. 6. In addition to the above regulations, all uses and activities within the Township shall conform to all applicable County, State and Federal regulations. Whenever the regulations contained herein are at variance with any other lawfully adopted rules or requirements, the more-restrictive shall govern. <p>D. Vibrations. Vibrations detectable without instruments on neighboring property in any zoning district shall be prohibited.</p>
--	---

	<p>The applicant has responded “This mixed housing development will not generate detectable vibrations.”</p> <p>E. Odors. No use shall emit odorous gas or other odorous matter in such quantities as to be offensive at any point on or beyond the lot lines. The guide for determining such quantities shall be the 50% response level of Table I (Odor Thresholds in Air), Research on Chemical Odors: Part I — Odor Thresholds for 53 Commercial Chemicals, October, 1968, Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., Washington, D.C.</p> <p>The applicant has responded that “This mixed housing development will not generate obnoxious odors.”</p> <p>F. Smoke, ash, dust, fumes, vapors and gases. There shall be no emission at any point for longer than five minutes in any hour of visible gray or other color smoke, ash, dust, fumes, vapors or gases with a shade darker than No. 3 on the Standard Ringelmann Chart issued by the U.S. Bureau of Mines; nor shall there be any emission at any point from any source that can cause damage to health, to animals or vegetation or to other forms of property or which can cause excessive soiling at any point.</p> <p>The applicant has responded that “These emissions will not occur from the residential activities on this property” It should be noted that any burning of trees and vegetation as a result of the clearing of the property must first obtain a permit from the Township.</p> <p>G. Lighting and Glare.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The purpose of these provisions is to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Minimize light trespass from buildings, structures and lot improvements; (b) Reduce night-time light pollution that causes sky-glow; and (c) Reduce visibility impairing glare. 2. The Applicant shall submit a Photometrics Plan to measure the light impact of the exterior lighting improvements. The Photometrics Plan shall describe the maximum illumination values and average illumination value required herein as part of the submission. 3. Low voltage and light emitting diode (LED) lighting systems are encouraged. 4. Two (2) lighting zones and the applicable zoning district as well as the respective illumination levels for each zone are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Light Zone 1 – Agricultural and Residential Zones. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) There shall be a maximum illumination value shall be one-tenth (0.10) horizontal and vertical footcandles at all lot lines when measured three (3) feet above the ground surface. (ii) The maximum on-site illumination value shall be three (3) footcandles and the average on-site illumination value shall be less than or equal to one (1) footcandle when measured three (3) above the ground surface. (iii) No more than five (5) percent of the fixture’s lumens shall be emitted at a ninety (90) degree angle or greater from nadir. (iv) Lights on motion sensors shall not be triggered by movement or activity located off the property on which the light is located. (b) Light Zone 2 – Non-Residential Zones.
--	--

	<p>(i) There shall be a maximum illumination value of two-tenths (0.20) horizontal and vertical footcandles at all lot lines when measured three (3) feet above the ground surface.</p> <p>(ii) The maximum on-site illumination value shall be five (5.0) footcandles and the average on-site illumination value shall be less than or equal to one and one-half (1.5) footcandles when measured three (3) feet above the ground surface.</p> <p>(iii) No more than ten (10) percent of the fixture’s lumens shall be emitted at a ninety (90) degree angle or greater from nadir.</p> <p>(iv) Lighting associated with any canopy constructed on the lot shall be installed as internal illumination of the canopy only.</p> <p>5. All outdoor lighting shall be designed, installed, located and maintained so that nuisance glare onto adjacent lots or streets shall be minimized and all direct illumination kept within the boundaries of the lot.</p> <p>6. Installations producing disabling glare shall not be permitted within the Township.</p> <p>7. Glare shall not exceed a rating of 3 on the DeBoer Scale</p> <p>The applicant has responded “Other than the customary residential lighting for each townhouse, there will be street lighting proposed for all intersections and end of cul-de-sacs. Lighting for the Senior Housing’s driveway and parking lot will be shielded to avoid glare.” The Applicant has provided a lighting and photometric plan for both parcels. It should be noted that a light detail was provided on the plan and a separate, different hanging light detail was submitted. We question which one will be installed.</p> <p>H. Erosion. No runoff of water or erosion of land by wind or water shall be permitted onto adjacent properties. Measures satisfactory to the Township shall be installed to control runoff and/or erosion.</p> <p>The applicant has responded “An E&S Plan and Stormwater Report will control the construction practices, which will be used to control run-off quality and quantity to both Township and PaDEP standards. Extra care will be taken to protect Glencannon Lake.” The proposed E&S Plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval. The Applicant shall provide a letter stating that the E&S Plan has been submitted for review, and again once the E&S Plan has been approved.</p> <p>I. Water pollution. Water quality shall be subject to the standards established by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP).</p> <p>The applicant has responded “The quality of stormwater runoff and discharges will be protected by impervious area run-off will be collected and piped to a detention basin where both water quality and quantity will be controlled prior to discharging to a rate that won’t exceed current pre-construction rates. PaDEP requirements for infiltration of the 2-year storm will improve water quality.”</p> <p>J. Determination of compliance with performance standards. During the review of an application for zoning approval, the applicant may be required to submit data and evidence documenting that the proposed activity, facility or use will comply with the provisions of this section. In reviewing such documentation, the Township may seek the assistance of any public agency having jurisdiction or interest in the particular issues and the Township may seek advice from a qualified technical expert. All costs of the expert's review and report shall be</p>
--	--

	<p>paid by the applicant. A negative report by the technical expert and the applicant's refusal or inability to make alterations to ensure compliance with this section shall be a basis for denying approval of the application.</p> <p>K. Continuing enforcement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Zoning Officer shall investigate any purported violation of the performance standards and, subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors, may employ qualified technical experts to assist in the determination of a violation. Costs of the services of such experts shall be paid by the owner or operator of the facility or use accused of the violation if the facility or use is found to be in violation. If the facility or use is found to be in compliance with the performance standards when the Township initiated the enforcement, said costs shall be borne by the Township. If a complainant requests the enforcement by the Township and the facility or use is found to be in compliance with the performance standards, said costs shall be borne by the complainant. 2. If the facility or use is found to be in violation, the owner or operator shall be given written notice of the violation in accordance with § 1901 of this chapter and a reasonable length of time to correct the violation. Failure to correct the violation shall be subject to the penalty provisions of this chapter and shall result in the revocation of the occupancy permit for the facility or use. <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 provided a written response to each of these items.</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>Ingress, egress, and traffic circulation for the development will be from existing Township Roads. The development will fill in gaps in the existing Township road network to improve access.</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 footcandle at the property line.</p> <p>A photometric plan has been provided. A detail of a proposed light pole has been shown on the plan, but no information about the light fixture to be installed was provided. The Applicant has provided a detail on the photometric plan and cut sheets of the proposed light fixtures, but they are not the same. A detail for a hanging light has been submitted which differs from what is on the plan. We question which one will be installed.</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 revised the plan to include ADA Ramp locations and applicable details.</p> <p>§ 1303. Standards for Specific Uses. In addition to the general standards and criteria for all conditional uses and uses by special exception listed in § 1302 above, an application for any of the following uses that are listed in any zoning district as a conditional use or use by special exception shall comply with the applicable standards and criteria specified below for that use.</p> <p>Per §1303(36) Multifamily dwellings in the R-3 District, subject to:</p> <p>A. The maximum dwelling unit density shall be sixteen units per acre. This condition has been met.</p> <p>B. Where two or more buildings are proposed on one lot, the minimum distance between buildings shall be 20 feet. The layout of the buildings meets this condition.</p> <p>C. All property lines adjacent to a single-family use or zoning classification shall be screened by Buffer Area B, as defined by § 1402, Subsection <u>1</u>, of this chapter. The Applicant has revised the site plan to include a landscape plan showing the required buffer areas along the property lines. Where possible, the Applicant is planning to use the existing vegetation as a buffer. Buffer Area B shall be installed along the rear of the Deerfield Drive single family homes for the entire length of the property line. We question if sufficient existing vegetation can be used in this area as a buffer.</p> <p>D. All parking areas adjacent to a single-family use or zoning classification that are not screened by a buffer area shall be screened by a minimum six-foot-high compact evergreen hedge. It appears that one additional parking area is proposed behind Lot 210. Additional parking for the townhouses may be a condition placed on the plan by the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>E. All portions of the property not covered by buildings, driveways, parking, pools, shelters, gazebos or other paved areas shall be suitably landscaped with grass, ground cover and decorative shrubs or trees. A landscaping plan has been provided that meets this requirement.</p> <p>F. The design and orientation of the buildings on the property shall take into account compatibility with the visual impact on adjacent single-family residential properties. The building and the property shall be effectively landscaped to minimize such impacts on adjacent residential properties. This condition has been met.</p> <p>G. On lots containing more than 50 dwelling units, indoor or outdoor recreational facilities appropriate to the needs of the prospective residents shall be provided, subject to approval by the Township Supervisors.</p>
--	--

	<p>The Applicant has added a recreational trail to the plans but has not indicated what type of surface the trail will be made of. A detail must be provided. A grass trail is not acceptable.</p> <p>H. Off-street parking shall be 1.75 spaces per dwelling unit. This condition has been met with 2 parking spaces being provide for each dwelling unit.</p> <p>Per §1303(39) Non-Family Facility, Type 1 and/or 2, subject to:</p> <p>A. The minimum site required shall be five (5) acres.</p> <p>This condition has been met.</p> <p>B. The maximum dwelling unit density of a facility licensed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Health shall be 20 dwelling units per acre. The maximum dwelling unit density of a facility that is not licensed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Health shall be 12 dwelling units per acre. When any unit or sleeping arrangement (bed) in a facility does not meet the Township’s definition of dwelling unit, the density of beds shall not exceed the density herein prescribed for dwelling units in accordance of those facilities with and without licensing by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.</p> <p>This condition has been met.</p> <p>C. A facility shall include common leisure and/or recreational areas.</p> <p>The applicant indicates in the submission that there will be a Town Center, Terrace, Patio, and Garden. This requirement is being met as represented on the Landscaping plan. We question why it is not shown on the site plan.</p> <p>D. In addition, a facility may include one or more of the following supporting uses, subject to approval by the Township:</p> <p>(1) Postal station for use of the residents and staff only. The applicant has stated that this will be provided.</p> <p>(2) Banking facility for use of the residents and staff only. The applicant has stated that this will be provided.</p> <p>(3) Pharmacy and/or medical offices for use of the residents only. The applicant has stated that this will be provided.</p> <p>(4) Personal services for the use of the residents only, including beauty shop, barbershop, common laundry facilities and dry-cleaning valet. The applicant has stated that this will be provided.</p> <p>(5) Ice cream parlor and/or florist/gift shop for the use of residents and their invited guests only. The applicant has stated that this will be provided.</p> <p>(6) Elderly day-care center licensed by the Commonwealth. The applicant has stated that this will not be provided.</p>
--	---

	<p>(7) Taxi, van or similar transportation services for the residents. The applicant has stated that this will be provided.</p> <p>E. Buffer Areas, as defined by § 1402, Subsection 1, of this chapter, shall be provided along all property lines adjacent to property in an A-1, A-2, R-1-V, R-2 or R-3 District.</p> <p>Buffer A will be provided along the adjacent property lines. This requirement has been met.</p> <p>F. Parking shall be provided in accordance a minimum of 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit.</p> <p>This condition appears to have been met. The site plan includes a total of 94 parking stalls around the proposed building and 134 parking stalls in the parking garage. The Applicant shall note which parking stalls will be reserved for handicap parking in both the surface lot and the garage.</p> <p>Site Plan</p> <p>1. The existing conditions plan Sheet 1 indicates a total area of 29.99 acres for the entire site, but the preliminary subdivision and plan for development indicates two (2) 34.47-acre parcels. This does not equate. How is this possible?</p> <p>The Applicant has revised both the subdivision plan and preliminary site plan to indicate that Lot 100 has an area of 35.04 acres and Lot 200 has an area of 28.28 acres.</p> <p>2. A legend shall be added to every page in the plan set so the plan can be reviewed accurately.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised the plan set to include a legend on every page.</p> <p>3. The Applicant shall revise the plan set to include storm sewer profiles to verify there are no potential conflicts with other utilities.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised the plan set to include storm sewer profiles but shall correct the slopes of the following segments: Inlet-3/Inlet-4 and Inlet-11/Inlet-13.</p> <p>4. The Applicant shall revise the plan to add a pipe to collect roof drains from each lot, including storm sewer laterals. Roof drains will not be allowed to flow freely over a bank, or onto the street.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised the plan to include roof drains connected to the storm sewer for all proposed buildings.</p>
--	--

	<p>5. The Applicant shall review the location of all storm sewer inlets to confirm they will not interfere with any driveways in Lot 200.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed and revised the locations of all inlets, so they do not interfere with any driveways.</p> <p>6. The Applicant shall revise the site plan so that the cul-de-sac on Lot 200 is compliant with the requirements of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised the plan to remove the islands from the cul-de-sac but has not met the requirements of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The Applicant shall follow the requirements of section 402.2(D) of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.</p> <p>7. The Applicant shall revise the bituminous pavement detail. It currently has the road being built in the following order (starting at the subbase): Geotextile, 6” of 2A limestone, 1.5” of 9.5mm Wearing Course, 5” of 19mm Binder Course, and 1.5” of 9.5mm Wearing Course.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised the bituminous pavement detail.</p> <p>8. The Applicant shall add pipe trenching/backfill details to the plan set.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised the plan set to include trenching/backfill details, but they do not differentiate between being in the road ROW and outside the ROW. All backfill within the ROW must be 100% stone.</p> <p>9. The Applicant shall add all pertinent ADA ramp details required for the installation of these facilities.</p> <p>The Applicant has addressed this comment.</p> <p>10. The Applicant shall add the width of all road cart ways, driving aisles, and parking stalls to the site plan.</p> <p>The Applicant has addressed this comment.</p> <p>11. We recommend stabilizing the SWM pond access drives on both lots. Is the proposed construction detail for bituminous paving outside of the ROW going to be used for this, or is it to be used for the parking lot and driveways for Lot 100.</p> <p>The Applicant has indicated the pavement detail outside of the ROW is to be used for the parking lot and driveways for Lot 100.</p>
--	---

	<p>12. Consideration shall be given to installing diversion channels at the top of slope above SWM Pond #2 in order to minimize potential damage to the slope.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded that the area has been graded so that water flows away from the top of slope to inlets located in the rear lawn of the building. We do not see any defined grading that would indicate this to be true.</p> <p>13. Will there be any fencing proposed to be installed around the SWM Ponds? If so, any pertinent details related to the fencing shall be added to the site plan.</p> <p>The Applicant has indicated that there are no plans for fencing to be installed at this time.</p> <p>14. Who will be responsible for maintaining the proposed recreational trail shown on the cover sheet but nowhere else in the plans?</p> <p>The Applicant has indicated that the recreational trail will be maintained by the HOA and is shown on all sheets. The Applicant will have to abide by all covenants of the SALDO and Zoning Ordinance for creating a HOA.</p> <p>15. The Engineer’s report has a letter from Nichols and Slagle Engineers that states there is enough capacity for a proposed number of dwelling units that is less than what is on the current site plan. Is there still sufficient capacity in the sanitary sewer lines to accommodate the development?</p> <p>The Applicant has responded that there is enough capacity in the sanitary sewers but has not provided a revised letter from Nichols and Slagle Engineers verify that this is the case.</p> <p>16. A letter of utility availability from an electricity provider is still outstanding.</p> <p>The Applicant has indicated that a letter of availability has been requested. Once it is received, it will be forwarded to the Township.</p> <p>17. The provided cost estimate in the Engineer’s Report is incomplete. Please revise and resubmit a complete engineer’s estimate.</p> <p>The Applicant has revised the Engineer’s estimate.</p> <p>Storm Water Management</p> <p>Review comments will be sent under separate cover.</p> <p>Traffic Report <u>General Comments:</u></p>
--	--

	<p>1. Speed data was collected by the ATRs as well as by radar. Where were these two data points collected along McDowell Lane? Please provide speeds collected by radar study in the appendices.</p> <p>This information has been provided.</p> <p>2. The speeds indicated in the ATR data show an 85th percentile speed of 43 mph in both directions on McDowell Lane. Since this is in excess of 10 mph over the posted speed limit, these speeds should be utilized to determine the required sight distance. Utilizing this speed with the grades indicated in Section 10.0 of the TIS results in sight distance that is inadequate for most movements at the proposed site drives.</p> <p>This information has been provided.</p> <p>3. Regardless of comment #2, the sight distances presented in Section 10.0 of the TIS indicate vegetation clearing that will be required to achieve adequate sight distance. These sight triangles should be clearly indicated on the site plans and maintained to provide appropriate visibility. The “Stopping Sight Distance From Behind” at the western site driveway is indicating the clearing of vegetation to achieve 304 feet of visibility; however, the clearing that would be required is located on the opposing side of McDowell Lane from the subject property.</p> <p>Site triangles are not shown on the plan as required. Clearing to establish the required site triangles will be the responsibility of the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Synchro Network Comments:</u></p> <p>1. Each approach at the signalized McClelland Road and McDowell Road / DeMar Boulevard intersection is coded for “MIN” recall. The McDowell Road / DeMar Boulevard approaches should be coded as “None” per the permit plans. It should be noted that this adjustment is unlikely to change the results of the TIS.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p><u>Capacity Analyses Comments:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed development is anticipated to result in an increase of more than 10.0 seconds of overall intersection delay at the McClelland Road and McDowell Road / DeMar Boulevard intersection during the PM peak. This level of impact typically requires mitigation efforts to maintain the operational conditions of the pre-development condition.</p> <p>We question if the developer is pay an informal impact fee to the Township to be applied to improving the McClelland Road and McDowell Road/DeMar Boulevard Intersection.</p> <p><u>Queue Analyses Comments:</u></p> <p>1. The queues should be the manually calculated average from the SimTraffic simulations rather than the averages calculated by the software.</p> <p>This item has been addressed.</p> <p>Geotechnical Report</p> <p>We have reviewed the ACA Engineering, Inc., Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation report dated August 14, 2018, for proposed Scenic Valley development in North Strabane Township. The site is many acres in size and has significant grade change. It</p>
--	--

appears that the site grading will include 50-ft-high fill embankments and 40-ft-high cut slopes. The ten borings drilled to refusal on apparent bedrock are not adequate to properly develop specific grading, foundation, and subgrade preparation recommendations.

As part of the final report, slope stability analyses should be completed for the major cut slopes and fill embankments. Parameters utilized in the analyses should be based on representative laboratory testing and/or published documentation. Further, the additional borings should also provide information to formulate more specific structure foundation recommendations.

After the final report has been completed and we concur with the recommendations, the developer should confirm that ACA will provide full-time site inspections during the construction phase of the project to confirm that their recommendations are properly implemented. At the completion of the work they should provide a summary letter indicating the same.

General

11. An NPDES permit will be required for the site and the erosion and sedimentation plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval. The grading permit will not be issued until the NPDES permit is approved.
12. 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.
13. The plans must be submitted to the Municipal Authority for review and comment.
14. Prior to any construction on the site, a pre-construction meeting with the Engineer, Public Works Director, and the Developer must be held.
15. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.

Based on the aforementioned conditions and comments, there are item that remain to be address before a recommendation for approval can be considered.

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

	<p>Township Engineer</p> <p>Mike Wetzel with Victor Wetzel Associates addressed the members and he stated that Marty Gillespie from Laurel Communities and Bobby Jo Hadden from Presbyterian Senior Care. Mike proceeded to go over the preliminary land development plans for Scenic Valley. It is located off of McDowell Lane and it is approximately 68.4 acres. Access points will be two from McDowell Lane with secondary access off Valleyview Drive and Meadowview Drive. There will be a total of 4 access points. Under the conditional uses R-3 zoning district there is a series of uses that can be used. They will be using the non-family facility type 1 located on lot 100. This will be the Presbyterian Senior Care lot. The multifamily dwelling which will be used on lot 200. This is the reason for the 2 lot subdivision.</p> <p>After a lengthy presentation Mike asked if there were any questions. Kandi questioned if the associations will be one or separate.</p> <p>Mike stated the Presbyterian Senior Care will own all land and common land for the senior living. Under the multifamily area for lot 200, there will be a homeowner's association totally separate from Glencannon.</p> <p>Joe stated he had received an email from the fire department and they are concerned about the independent facility regarding access to the rear of the building. Joe suggested a grass paver.</p> <p>Mike stated that is a common task that they can provide access around the back building.</p> <p>Joe also stated the police presented a concern with the site distance. Chuck Wooster presented his observation of the site distance and the plan itself. Jeffrey commented ever since Andrew took over as Township Manager he has put a more conserved effort into maintaining that vegetation but, there is a lot of times people cannot see pulling out.</p> <p>Joe stated he is okay from the conditional use perspective.</p> <p>Karen Jacobs, 30 Francis Street, Eighty-Four stated when they put in Indian Ridge she thought they were going to make improvements at the light at McClelland and McDowell. The traffic backs up.</p> <p>Joe replied the township did make application to PennDOT district 12 regarding that. PennDOT denied the application to make the improvements. They asked the township to continue to collect money from the developers for future improvements. They want to do in conjunction with work related to the off ramp of interstate 79. Maybe we were a little premature in the application.</p> <p>Karen stated maybe we should try again.</p> <p>Jeffrey questioned who made application to District 12.</p> <p>Joe responded Mike Haberman made the submission to them and they denied it. It was going to be funded with developer money and some money from the township. It was to get the left turning lane onto McDowell Lane as you are come up toward Route 19 and they denied it.</p> <p>Diane questioned if we have a copy of that letter.</p> <p>Joe responded he can find it.</p> <p>Kandi questioned how long ago was that.</p> <p>Joe replied within the last 2 to 3 years.</p>
--	--

<p>MOTION TO APPROVE LAUREL COMMUNITIES – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SUBDIVISION FOR A TWO LOT SUBDIVISION.</p>	<p>Joe stated both he and Mike were puzzled. The township was willing to provide funding and they did not want to do it. There was discussion about the bridge. Joe talked about an informal impact fee that was addressed in his letter. Mike stated he will need to confirm the response.</p> <p>A motion was made by Michael Kelly and seconded by Barry Crumrine to approve Laurel Communities – Preliminary and final subdivision for a two lot subdivision located on McDowell Lane in an R-3 zoning district.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 1 NO (D. Balogh)</u></p>
<p>LAUREL COMMUNITIES – CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR A NON-FAMILY TYPE 1 FACILITY</p>	<p>Laurel Communities – Conditional use application for a non-family type 1 facility, consisting of 130 independent living units, 24 memory care units and 48 units of assisted living, located on a 34.47 acre parcel on McDowell Lane in an R-3 zoning district.</p>
<p>MOTION TO APPROVE LAUREL COMMUNITIES CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR A MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT.</p>	<p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Michael Kelly to approve Laurel Communities – conditional use application for a multifamily development located on McDowell Lane, Valleyview Drive and Meadowview Drive in an R-3 zoning district.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 1 NO (D. Balogh)</u></p>
<p>LAUREL COMMUNITIES – CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR A MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>Laurel Communities – Conditional use application for a multi-family development consisting of 52 townhouse units, located on a 34.47 acre parcel on McDowell Lane, Valleyview Drive and Meadowview Drive in an R-3 zoning district.</p>
<p>MOTION TO APPROVE LAUREL COMMUNITIES – CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR A MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>A motion was made by Michael Kelly and seconded by Barry Crumrine to approve Laurel Communities – conditional use application for a non-family type 1 facility located on McDowell Lane in an R-3 zoning district.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 1 NO (D. Balogh)</u></p>
<p>MYERS WELL SERVICE-</p>	<p>The Planning Commission went back to item # 5C- Myers Well Service. Matt again stated this will not be a staging area. Myers Well Service is directed by the customer</p>

<p>PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL</p>	<p>EQT where to stage their equipment. Myers is in the midst of growing their business. They have 65+ employees they need to hire to meet their contractual agreements. At Myers they strive to be the best with their safety records. With GPS in all the trucks to make sure all drivers go below the speed limit.</p> <p>J.J stated to clarify they are looking for a vote from the Planning Commission. It is their position it is not a truck staging area and should not be required to apply under the conditional use standard at all. The questions about acreage that may be a zoning question they can address in the appropriate manner.</p> <p>Jeffrey stated he understands and not speaking for the entire board, he does not question the truck staging area verses the equipment storage. As far as the Planning Commission has been told the information with regards to 2 acres. It is not up to this commission make up an interpretation. You do not have 5 acres.</p>
<p>MOTION TO DECLINE MYERS WELL SERVICE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE YARD</p>	<p>A motion was made by Diane Balogh and seconded by Michael Kelly to decline Myers Well Service – Preliminary site plan for a storage yard located on Industry Drive in an I-1 zoning district.</p>
<p>FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES</p>	<p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 3 YES – 1 NO (B. Crumrine) – 1 abstain (K. Jablonski)</u></p> <p>Forest View – Informational review of a conservation subdivision consisting of 46 single dwellings, located on Locust Street in an R-2 zoning district.</p> <p>Michael Wetzel of Victor Wetzel Associates along with Terry Bove and Leo McMurdy. This is an informational review of the conservation subdivision for Forest View. Mike stated he wanted to give the members an overview and to look at the plan so when they come back next month the members have a better understanding.</p> <p>The site is about 63 acres in size. The conservation subdivision plan will consist of a total of 47 lots. It will be done in 2 phases. Along Locust Street Phase I will consist of 28 lots. That will include 2 estate lots.</p> <p>Diane questioned is that one way in and out.</p> <p>Michael replied it will be a 2 lane road. Locust Street will be reconstructed to township standards.</p> <p>The requirements are met for less than two required access points.</p> <p>Phase II will consist of 19 lots.</p> <p>Joe stated on the 2 estate lots maybe there needs to be a covenant on there that they cannot be further subdivided.</p> <p>Michael replied that is fine.</p> <p>Margaret questioned lot 128, it fronts on existing Locust.</p> <p>Michael stated he showed the detail. It does not go up against the existing Locust Street.</p> <p>Joe replied you will create a buffer around the perimeter of that lot so it does not have frontage up against Locust Street. The land currently abuts Locust Street. The point of the ordinance is that the conservation subdivision cannot be developed with any property abutting any existing township road. Joe would suggest remove that lot from the conservation subdivision. Start the subdivision where the right of way for Locust Street begins.</p>

<p>OTHER BUSINESS:</p> <p><u>ADJOURNMENT:</u></p>	<p>Michael stated they looked at that. You cannot get a R-2 lot out of it. There is a 40-foot setback. Margaret questioned the recreation facilities. Michael responded it would be fee in lieu of.</p> <p>Lakeview Village - informational review of a multi-family development, consisting of 88 apartment units and 41 rental townhouses located on a 9.12-acre parcel on McDowell Lane in an R-3 zoning district. Marty Gillespie with Laurel Communities, provided an overview of the proposed development. More information will come on the planning commission November agenda for the formal process. Marty stated they will be asking for conditional use. This will be a higher end, more luxury rental apartment community. It will be garden apartments and townhome style. Marty feels there is opportunity in this area to do a nice upscale rental community. There was plans to do this in Peters but that was taken away. The location here is fantastic spot. You can walk to shopping and restaurants and the access to 19 and 79 is good. The plan is to bring a little bit of urbanism to the suburbs. There will be two- 3 story buildings and will step back and have two- 4 story building. There will be a clubhouse will feature a great room, exercise room, and meeting space. The leasing agent will work out of there. There will be a pool, dog park, and walking trail. The back will border with townhomes. There will be not variances. Marty and Terry Bove met with Little Lake Theater they discussed the fact they do not have sewers. One thing they want to do is provide them access to the pump station. The traffic study and geotech have been completed. Kandi stated she liked the idea. Jeffrey expressed concern with the parking along the boulevard close to McDowell Lane. Marty replied they are over parked and before November they will get with the Fire Chief to address any safety concerns.</p> <p>None</p> <p>There was no other business to discuss.</p> <p>Diane Balogh made a motion and Kandi Jablonski seconded to adjourn the meeting at 7:24 PM.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>_____ Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairperson</p> <p>_____ Michael Kelly, Secretary</p>
---	--