The North Strabane Township Planning Commission met in regular session on Monday, February 19, 2018, 2018 at 5:30 PM at the Municipal Building located at 1929 Route 519, Canonsburg, PA 15317

Attending This Session:
Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairman
Diane Balogh, Vice-Chair
Michael Kelly, Secretary
Barry Crumrine, Commission Member
Kandi Jablonski, Commission Member

Absent:

Also Attending This Session:
Gary Sweat, Township Solicitor
Joe Sites, Township Engineer
Margaret Householder, Planning Coordinator
Colleen Mellor, Stenographer

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Christine Oelschlager of 129 Greenwood Dr., Canonsburg. She questioned if there was ever a second access figured out for Greenwood Village? As far as she understood the access into Canonsburg Borough has never been cleared with the Borough. The approval was based on the second access. Joe Sites stated that is correct. She also questioned why it has been so long since the Judge approved this in July of 2016. Gary stated a decision was issued. This is a PRD and a PRD has its own time limit built in. PRD's are a special zoning with its own set of rules. The tentative approval to consider this as a conditional use is what the judge approved. That does not mean they can go and start building. They still need grading permits, building permits. The developer has 1 year after final approval to start developing. Christine again stressed the secondary access.

Pete Castriota of 254 Greenwood Dr., Canonsburg, stated regarding Greenwood Village, when they start logging, the road is not built for all that equipment, Greenwood Drive and Weavertown Road. There is a bank in front of the condos that is causing a problem. When they start logging Pete wants to know who is going to take care of these roads and the bank. You cannot even get out of Greenwood Drive right now. If you are building back there with one way out it is not going to work. Pete stated when the plan was built behind them they moved trees and we had to pay for the ones that fell over into our property, which was not fair. We are getting in the same situation with Greenwood Drive. Someone needs to take a look at this. This needs studied very thoroughly. Heavy equipment and the traffic is bad enough. Jeffrey asked Joe Sites if there is a bond that needs to be posted. Joe responded generally you do post a bond for developments or some other kind of maintenance agreement. We are still in the process of getting the developers agreement addressed for Greenwood Village. It is not final at this time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Michael Kelly to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2018 meeting.

January 15, 2018

ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES - 0 NO

OLD BUSINESS: WALNUT GROVE-CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL FOR A CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION

Walnut Grove- Conditional use approval for a conservation subdivision, consisting of 31 single family dwellings on a 23.1-acre parcel in the R-2 Zoning District. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated:

February 6, 2018

North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317

Re: Conditional Use and Preliminary Site Plan – Conservation Subdivision Walnut Grove – Thomas Road – R-2 Zoning District

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the conditional use application for conservation subdivision development in the R-2 Zoning District per §701(B) 1(c), §1300(A &B), §1301, §1302, and §1303(18) of the Township Zoning Ordinance. The proposed development is on 23.1 acres and proposes 31 dwelling units. The following are comment relative to the application submitted by Victor Wetzel and Associated dated November 1, 2017 revised December 22, 2017 and revised January 31, 2018:

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, [1] 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.

This requirement has been met.

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

 This requirement has been met.
- (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.

 This requirement has been met.
- (d) The application fee required by § 1908 of this chapter. This requirement has been met.
- 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.

 Application is pending review and a recommendation from the
 - Application is pending review and a recommendation from the Township 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. The applicant has granted extensions for the submission. A Public hearing is to be scheduled by the Board of Supervisors.
- 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 casein-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.
- 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.

Pending

- 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 party opposing the application to appeal the decision to a court of competent jurisdiction.
- 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.
- 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.

§ 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 the following general standards and criteria:

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. The applicant has responded that as a single-family subdivision, the proposed homes will not endanger the public health, safety and welfare,

nor deteriorate the environment, as the plan will be constructed to Township standards. This standard is being met.

- B. The use shall comply with the performance standards of § 1401 of this chapter. The applicant has responded that the proposed single-family homes will comply with Section 1401 as noted below. This standard is being met.
- 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. The applicant has addressed each of these parts with responses in their respective sections which are forthcoming in the review.
- 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. The applicant has responded that "The streets will be designed to the Township's roadway standards. With only 31 homes, there will not be congestion and impacts on local streets." This meets the requirement.
- E. Outdoor lighting, if proposed, shall be designed with cutoff luminaires that direct and cut off the light at a cutoff angle of 60° or less. (See illustration in Appendix B.) Spillover illumination shall not exceed 0.2 foot-candle at the property line. The applicant has responded "Outdoor lighting will be limited to the entrance, cul-de-sac and the post lamps at the homes; therefore, there will be no light spillover." This meets the requirement.
- 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. The applicant has responded that "Sidewalks will be designed to ADA standards with ADA ramps". This meets the requirement.

§1303 – Standard 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.

§1303(18) – Conservation Subdivision

1. §1303(18) A requires that the permitted uses shall be limited to single –family detached dwellings. The plan as submitted meets this requirement with 31 single family dwellings.

- 2. §1303(18) B requires that the minimum site required shall be 10 acres. The proposed site consists of a gross area of 23.1 acres and meets the requirement.
- 3. §1303(17) C requires that public sewage and public water services shall be provided to all dwelling units within the development. The proposed development plans on providing public sewage and public water to all dwelling units within the development. Providing public sewage and water for the development shall be a condition of approval. Public sewage and public water will be established through the existing public road right of ways for the respective infrastructure.
- 4. §1303(18) D requires that before determining the maximum number of lots to be permitted on a given tract, the total acreage of the tract (excluding existing rights-of-way) proposed for a conservation subdivision shall be reduced by 15% to accommodate potential new rights-of-way. The proposed development consists of 23.1 acres before the 15% reduction which nets 19.6 acres. This requirement is being met.
- 5. §1303(18) E requires that in the A-2 District, the maximum dwelling unit density shall be one unit per acre. The number of dwelling units authorized in the conservation subdivision shall be equivalent to the net site area determined by Subsection 16D above, expressed in acres, multiplied by the density factor of one. Any portion of an acre shall be rounded to the nearest acre. This is not applicable for this development since it is located in the R-2 zoning district.
- 6. §1303(18) F requires that in the R-2 District, the maximum dwelling unit density shall be two units per acre. The number of dwelling units authorized in the conservation subdivision shall be multiplied by the density factor of two. Any portion of an acre shall be rounded to the nearest acre. The number of dwelling units shall be 19.6 acres' times 2 units per acres for total of 39 lots. The proposed development is only for 31 single family homes which is less than the maximum density and meets the requirement.
- 7. §1303(18) G requires that in the A-2 District, the minimum lot area required for a single-family detached dwelling may be reduced, provided that it shall not be less than 21,780 square feet. This is not applicable for this development since it is located in the R-2 zoning district.
- 8. §1303(18) H requires that in the R-2 District, the minimum lot area required for a single-family detached dwelling may be reduced, provided that it shall not be less than 10,890 square feet. All of the proposed lots exceed the minimum lot area of 10,890 square feet.
- 9. §1303(18) I requires that in the A-2 District, the minimum lot width required for a single-family detached dwelling may be reduced, provided that it shall not

be less than 90 feet. This is not applicable for this development since it is located in the R-2 zoning district.

- 10. §1303(18) J requires in the R-2 District, the minimum lot width required for a single-family detached dwelling may be reduced, provided that it shall not be less than 60 feet. **The minimum lot width is 65' and meets the requirement.**
- 11. §1303(18) K requires in a conservation subdivision, the front yard setback required for a single-family detached dwelling may be reduced, provided that it shall not be less than 25 feet; and the rear yard setback may be reduced, provided that it shall not be less than 20 feet. **The proposed development meets this requirement.**
- 12. §1303(18) L requires in a conservation subdivision, side yard setbacks required for a single-family detached dwelling may be reduced, provided that each side yard shall not be less than 10 feet. **The proposed development meets this requirement.**
- 13. §1303(18) M states that the maximum permitted lot coverage for each individual lot in the conservation subdivision shall be 25%. The proposed development meets this requirement.
- 14. §1303(18) N states that no lot proposed for a conservation subdivision shall front on a Township street or State road existing prior to the approval of the requested conservation subdivision. All proposed streets located in the conservation subdivision and intended by the developer to be taken over by the Township shall meet the construction specifications of the Township subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. The proposed development meets this requirement.
- 15. §1303(18) O requires that the development shall be so designed that privacy is preserved, views are protected and groups of dwellings are arranged to preserve the open space atmosphere intended under the conservation subdivision. All lots are positioned and located such that they are within the open spaces that rings the perimeter of the property. This requirement is being met.
- 16. §1303(18) P requires a buffer area of open space shall be located at the perimeter of the development where the lots are closest to adjoining property owners. The amount, density and types of planting in the buffer area shall be based upon physiographic features, feasibility of using native species, proximity to existing dwellings, compatibility of adjacent uses and natural views. Where adjacent property has been developed in such a manner that privacy from the conservation subdivision is desirable, the landscaped buffer area adjacent thereto shall be of sufficient density and contain sufficient evergreen material to effectively screen the portions of the development from which privacy is desired. This requirement is being met with the existing

perimeter vegetation buffer and supplemented where it needs to have a greater density. This requirement is being met.

- 17. §1303 (18) Q requires that Open space shall be provided in an amount equal to the difference between the minimum lot area for single-family dwellings otherwise required in the zoning district and the lot size proposed in the conservation subdivision. In no case shall the open space be less than 20% of the total area of the development site. The balance of the land not contained in the lots shall be contiguous and easily accessible to the lots in the conservation subdivision and shall be of such condition, size and shape as to be usable for recreation, park or open space areas or to serve to protect an environmentally sensitive area. This requirement is being met.
- 18. §1303(18) R requires that safe and easy access to recreation, park and open space areas shall be provided by adjoining road frontage, easements or paths. Access ways to recreation, park and open space areas shall be sufficiently wide so that maintenance equipment shall have reasonable and convenient access to such area. All lots have access to the open space through the adjacent frontage or through the street.
- 19. §1303(18) S requires recreation, park and open space land shall be owned and managed in one of the two following ways:
 - (1) Shall be held in common ownership by the owners of the lots within the development and shall be protected by legal arrangements satisfactory to the Township sufficient to assure its maintenance and preservation.
 - (a) In this regard, covenants or other legal arrangements shall:
 - [1] Obligate purchasers to participate in a homeowners' association and to support maintenance of the open space areas by paying to the association assessments sufficient for such maintenance and subjecting their properties to a lien for enforcement of the respective assessments. The developers is in agreement with this requirement.
 - [2] Obligate such an association to maintain the recreation, park and open space areas and private streets and utilities. The developers is in agreement with this requirement.
 - [3] Provide that the Township, as well as other purchasers in the development, can enforce the covenants in the event of failure of compliance. The developers is in agreement with this requirement.
 - [4] Provide for agreement that, if the Township is required to perform any work pursuant to the item above, such purchasers would pay the cost thereof, and the same shall be a lien upon

their properties until such cost has been paid; provided that the developer shall be responsible for the formation of the homeowners' association of which the developer, or if the developer is not the owner of the development, then such owner, shall be a member until all of the lots of record are sold; provide assurance that such covenants will be evidenced by recording in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of a perpetual maintenance of facilities as prescribed hereinabove and identifying the tract and each lot therein. The declaration shall be included in the deed or other instrument of conveyance of each lot of record and shall be made binding on all purchasers, provided that such declaration may, as to subsequent conveyances other than the initial conveyance of each lot of record, be incorporated by reference in the instrument of conveyance. The developers is in agreement with this requirement.

- [5] Guarantee that any association formed to own and maintain common open space will not be dissolved without the consent of the Board of Supervisors and any other specifications deemed necessary by the Board of Supervisors. The developers is in agreement with this requirement.
- [6] Guarantee that the recreation, park and/or open space areas shall not be further subdivided or further developed. Improvements may be made to said areas for the purposes for which they were originally proposed upon approval of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The developers is in agreement with this requirement.
- (b) All such covenants set forth herein shall be submitted for preliminary review with the preliminary plan and conditional use application and shall be reviewed and approved by the Board of Supervisors prior to the granting of final approval for the conservation subdivision. The developers is in agreement with this requirement.
- (2) Shall be dedicated to the Township for public usage upon final plan approval. This provision shall not, in any manner, obligate the Township to accept the open space or any part thereof. Open space will not be dedicated to the Township but to the HOA for maintenance and responsibility.
- 20. §1303(18) T requires that preliminary plans for a conservation subdivision shall be accompanied by information providing calculations of net site area and dwelling unit density and describing how the lots, frontage and setbacks differ from the otherwise applicable requirements of the zoning district in which the conservation subdivision is proposed. The preliminary plan submitted with the

conditional use application shall contain all the information required by the Township subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for a preliminary plat. **This requirement has been met.**

21. §1303(18) U requires a proposed development of fifty (50) units or more shall have two (2) direct vehicular access ways to an arterial or collector street, as defined by this chapter. This requirement is not applicable for this development since there are 31 lots proposed.

§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.

- 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. The applicant has stated that the proposed plan will have fire hydrants as recommended by the Fire Chief thereby providing the fire protection needed by the fire department. A condition of approval shall be that the Fire Chief shall make the final determination as to the location of the hydrant installation.
- B. Electrical disturbance. No activity shall cause electrical disturbance adversely affecting radio or other equipment in the vicinity. The applicant has stated that the plan of homes will not cause a disturbance to radio or other equipment.
- C. Noise. No operation or activity shall cause or create noise in excess of the sound levels prescribed below:
 - 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. The applicant has stated that the development will not generate noise levels in excess of 60 dBA for more than four hours during a 24 hour period.
 - 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. Not Applicable.
 - 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. Not Applicable

- 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. **Not applicable.**
- 5. The following uses or activities shall be exempted from the noise regulations:
 - (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 emergencyrelated activities or uses.
 - (c) Noises emanating from public or private recreational uses between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m.

The developer accepts these exemptions.

- 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. **Duly noted by the applicant.**
- D. Vibrations. Vibrations detectable without instruments on neighboring property in any zoning district shall be prohibited. The applicant has stated that the development will not generate any detectable vibrations.
- 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. The applicant has stated that the development will not generate any obnoxious odors.
- 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 Ring Lemann 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. The applicant has stated that the development will not emit any of the aforementioned from the development.
- G. Lighting and Glare.

- 1. The purpose of these provisions is to:
 - (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:
 - (a) Light Zone 1 Agricultural and Residential Zones.
 - (i) There shall be a maximum illumination value shall be one-tenth (0.10) horizontal and vertical foot-candles at all lot lines when measured three (3) feet above the ground surface.
 - (ii) The maximum on-site illumination value shall be three (3) foot-candles and the average on-site illumination value shall be less than or equal to one (1) foot-candle 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.
 - (i) There shall be a maximum illumination value of two-tenths (0.20) horizontal and vertical foot-candles at all lot lines when measured three (3) feet above the ground surface.
 - (ii) The maximum on-site illumination value shall be five (5.0) foot-candles and the average on-site illumination value shall be less than or equal to one and one-half (1.5) foot-candles when measured three (3) feet above the ground surface.
 - (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.
 - (iv) Lighting associated with any canopy constructed on the lot shall be installed as internal illumination of the canopy only.
- 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.
- 6. Installations producing disabling glare shall not be permitted within the Township.
- 7. Glare shall not exceed a rating of 3 on the DeBoer Scale

The applicant has stated that other than the customary residential lighting for each single family home, there will be street lighting proposed for all intersections and end of cul-de-sacs. A condition of the approval shall be that all lights shall be the responsibility of the HOA.

- 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. The applicant has stated that 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. The applicant is making application for an NPDES Permit which must be obtained prior to a grading permit being issued.
- I. Water pollution. Water quality shall be subject to the standards established by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP). The applicant states that impervious area runoff will be collected and conveyed to a stormwater detention basin where both quality and quantity will be controlled prior to discharging at a rate that won't exceed pre-construction rates.
- 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 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.

K. Continuing enforcement.

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.

§1402 - Buffer Areas and Landscaping

The conservation subdivision does not have specific Buffer Area standards. The plan proposes an extensive buffering around the perimeter using the existing vegetation. This requirement is being met.

§1403 – Special Yard Requirements

The proposed plan complies with these requirements.

§1404 - Permitted Projects into Required Yard

The proposed plan complies with these requirements.

§1405 – Height Exceptions

No exceptions are necessary.

§1406 – Drive Through Facilities

Not Applicable

§1407 - Temporary Construction Trailers, Model Homes, or Sales Offices

The applicant agrees to comply with the requirements for duration of the project.

§1408 – Agricultural and Related Activities

Not- Applicable for development

§1409 – Storage

Not- Applicable for development

§1410 – Forestry

Not-Applicable for development

§1411 – No-Impact Home Based Business

Not- Applicable for Development

§1412 – Keeping of Chickens

No lots meet the minimum two (2) acre requirement.

§1413 – Oil and Gas Pipelines and Temporary Water Pipelines

Not-Applicable for Development

§1414 – Re-Entry Drilling

Not-Applicable for Development

§1415 Traffic Control Site

Not-Applicable for Development

§1416 Rooftop and Ground Mounted Solar Systems

Rooftop Units would be integrated to the building. Ground Mounted systems must be on a minimum 2-acre lot in which no lots meet the acreage requirement.

§1417 Medical Marijuana Dispensary Buffer Distance

Not- Applicable for Development

§1500. Off Street Parking and Loading -Applicability.

- A. Off-street parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the specifications in this Part in any district whenever any new use is established or any existing use is changed or enlarged.
- B. All parking areas established prior to the effective date of this chapter that are not in conformance with all provisions of this Part shall be allowed to continue as previously laid out. Any change or alteration to these existing nonconforming parking areas shall require that the portions to be altered be upgraded in accordance with all provisions of this Part.
- C. Any change in use or in floor area of an existing building that would require a greater number of off-street parking spaces than the previous use or floor area did shall provide additional off-street parking for the new use in accordance with this Part. If the number of additional required parking spaces results in more than a 25% increase in the total number of parking spaces currently provided on the lot or requires the addition of at least five more spaces, whichever is greater, then all existing parking is also required to meet or exceed all provisions of this Part, including surfacing.

§1501 – Off Street Parking Design

Not applicable for Residential Development

§1502 – Off Street Parking Requirements

Each home will have a minimum of 2 garage parking spaces per home.

§1503 – Off Street Loading

Not-Applicable for development

§1600 – Signs

§1601 – Types and Classes

The development proposes a residential plan identification sign per §1601(B)4 at the entrance to the development

§1604 – Signs Authorized in Residential Zoning Districts

The development proposes a residential plan identification sign that will not exceed the maximum of 24 square feet per §1604(A). The sign is proposed to be in the open space and be owned by the Homeowners Association

Stormwater Management

A stormwater management review was completed in which responses were provided in a letter under separate cover dated December 20, 2017. A response letter from the stormwater management designer, AWK Consulting Engineers, Inc. dated December 22, 2017 acknowledges receipt of our comments and has indicated that all items will be addressed prior to final plan submission.

General

Prior to Final Site Plan approval, the following items must be addressed:

- 1. A complete subdivision and site plan meeting the design standards and requirements of the Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance must be submitted for review and approval. This shall include profiles for the road, all storm and sanitary sewers, Township Standard Details, etc.
- 2. A note must be added to the plan that a PennDOT HOP Permit will be required for access to Thomas Road.
- 3. A condition of the approval should be that the perimeter buffer of the property must remain in place and be the responsibility of the HOA to maintain in perpetuity.
- 4. Signage must be added to the final plan which establishes the parking at the Mailbox Cluster Units is not to exceed 15 minutes.
- 5. The Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval.
- 6. The applicant demonstrates all necessary permits from the DEP for the proposed discharge to the stream must be provided.
- 7. A cost estimate of the improvements must be provided for review and approval.
- 8. 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. Language must be included in the developer's agreement that a maintenance bond for the

landscaping per §1402(K) equivalent to 15% of the total cost of landscaping for a period of 18 months must be posted with the Township.

- 9. 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.
- 10. The plans must be submitted to the Municipal Authority for review and comment.
- 11. The plans must be submitted to the North Strabane Township Fire Chief for review and comment.
- 12. Prior to any construction on the site, a pre-construction meeting with the Engineer, Public Works Director, and the Developer must be held.
- 13. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.

Based on the information that has been provided, the application is in order for consideration for conditional use for the conservation subdivision subject to the aforementioned conditions been placed on the approval.

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

If you have any questions, please contact me.

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

Steven Victor of Victor Wetzel Associates on behalf of Waterdam L.P., gave an overview of the proposed conservation subdivision located along Thomas Road in an R-2 zoning district consisting of 23 acres. The stormwater management will be located across the road. It is a 3-acre parcel located in A-1. We are proposing 31 single family dwellings. A traffic study was completed by Wooster Associates along the frontage on Thomas Road. They determined the safe sight distance location for access to Walnut Grove. Steven stated the cul-de-sac is just under 1200 feet in length. Steven addressed the stormwater plan. The sanitary sewer system was located on the plan and will be gravity by sewer all the way back to the pump station located at Springdale Road.

Steven showed the board there will be street trees. The standards in the conservation subdivision require 20% open space we have 53%. The perimeter buffering will be provided where there is not existing natural vegetation.

Steven continued we are requesting conditional use and preliminary site plan approval. We will be back again later for construction plans. All engineering items have been addressed. Jeffrey inquired about the site distance. Steven stated Wooster would have done this to PennDOT standards. It was designed as an intersection. Jeffrey inquired if they plan on dedicating this as a township road. Steven replied yes. Jeffrey inquired how do they plan to cross the road. Will it be bored? Steven responded yes. Kandi questioned if any type of guiderail will be placed along the road to protect from the storm pond. Seven stated that is a good point. If the members believe it would be important to have a guiderail in that portion of the road that would not be a problem. Mike questioned the length of the cul-de-sac. Steven stated 1200 feet. Mike also inquired were there initially going to be 2 access points to this development? Steven stated it was not for this development but it was discussed when they were trying to rezone the other side of Thomas Road. That property is owned by the same individual and they had requested a rezoning to go from A-1 to A-2 to do a conservation subdivision. That request was denied. There is not the necessity for a second access because without the rezoning they are under the 50 lot threshold. Steven stated he pointed all of that out because they will be coming back probably within 6 months or sooner with a plan for that piece of property and it will be well under 50 lots.

MOTION TO APPROVE WALNUT GROVE-CONDITIONAL USE FOR A CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Kandi Jablonski to approve Conditional Use for Walnut Grove. Steven stated the application is for conditional use and preliminary subdivision plan. Barry only recommended approval for conditional use. The reason it is logical to do is that the application for conditional use states you must submit a plan that has all the preliminary plan information with it to show that you can comply with the conditions of a conditional use. Discussions with the staff concluded it is appropriate that it be a joint application. The motion was amended by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Kandi Jablonski to approve Conditional Use and preliminary subdivision plan for Walnut Grove. Gary stated to add the recommended condition that the developer install a guiderail along Thomas Road. Jeffrey added the developer look at the PennDOT criteria for guiderail installation in the area of the stormwater retention. Steven stated if it drops off with a certain steepness PennDOT will require it. The motion was amended again by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Kandi Jablonski.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 1 NO – D. Balogh

GREENWOOD VILLAGE – FINAL PRD APPROVAL Greenwood Village – final PRD approval consisting of 233 units on 62.4 acres, and phase 1 approval, consisting of 51 units on 15.8 acres in an R-3 zoning district. The Court of Common Pleas granted conditional use and tentative master plan approval on 7-7-2016. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated:

July 24, 2017 Reissued February 6, 2018 North Strabane Township 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317

Att: Frank Siffrinn

Re: Final Approval Submission – Greenwood Village - PRD

Dear Frank;

We are in receipt of a submission from the developer of Greenwood Village that has been submitted for Final PRD and Phase 1 approval for the development. The court ruled on the preliminary approval and granted "Conditional Use and Tentative Master Plan Approval". As a result of this court granted approval, the applicant should be making application to obtain Final PRD approval from the Township before any Phase 1 approval is considered through the Township Subdivision and Land Development Process. The applicant should provide clarification as to the approval that they are seeking.

In accordance with §1207 – Application for Final Approval, the procedures for final approval are identified and the Zoning Officer is the determine if the application is 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 included the Applicants transmittal of submission to the Washington County Planning Commission.

§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 February 2017:

- 1. §1207.6(a) 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 the be provided. It is our understanding that the fees were paid, but no performance bond was provided. The designer has indicated in their June 19, 2017 letter that the performance bond will be provided separately based on the cost estimate of improvements.
- 2. §1207.6(b) sates that accurately dimensioned locations for all proposed buildings, structures, parking areas and common open space. *This requirement has been met.*
- 3. §1207.6 (c) 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. This requirement has been met.
- 4. §1207.6(d) states that Building elevation drawings for all principal structures, other than single-family dwellings. *This requirement has been met*
- 5. §1207.6 (e) 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. *This requirement has been met.*
- 6. §1207.6 (f) 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. *This requirement has been met.*
- 7. §1207.6(g) 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. The response from the designer indicates that this will be addressed under separate cover.
- 8. §1207.6 (h) states that an engineering report including the following data shall be provided, whenever applicable
 - 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.

This requirement has been met.

- 9. §1207.6(i) states a grading plan prepared in compliance with the requirements of the Township Grading Ordinance.
 - This requirement has been met.
- 10. §1207.6(j) states that Evidence that the applicant has submitted plans to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval. Evidence of submission has been provided and the designer has indicated that the plans are currently under review. WCCD approval will be forwarded to the Township upon receipt.
- 11. §1207.6(k) 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:
 - 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.

This requirement has been met.

12. §1207.6(m) states that a Performance bond and development agreement as required by the Township subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

The Applicant has provided a tabulation showing the Opinion of Probable Cost for the Improvements for Phase 1.

Stormwater Management Plan

All comments of our prior reviews have been addressed.

Site Plan

All of the comments of our prior reviews have been addressed.

Based on the aforementioned submission and information, the plan is in order for consideration for approval.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

The Gateway Engineers, Inc.

Joseph H. Sites, P.E.

Township Engineer

Terry Bove spoke on behalf of Greenwood Village L.P. (the owner). It is a planned residential development and consists of a 62-acre parcel located on Victoria and Greenwood Drive which connects with Weavertown Road in North Strabane Township. The parcel also connects with Crawford Avenue aka 1st Avenue in the Borough of Canonsburg. Terry stated the PRD site is undeveloped and is located in the R-3 zoning district. The property is wooded. Greenwood Village will have a total of 233 duplex, triplex and townhouse units and will be developed in 5 phases. Recreation facilities there will be a clubhouse and a pool. There will be 2 means of access through Crawford Avenue in Canonsburg Borough. The common open space plan shows 65%.

Phase 1 gross area will be 15.8-acres of the 62-acres and 51 dwelling units. There will be a homeowner's association that will maintain the PRD open space. It will take care of the clubhouse, the pool and the parking areas. Each unit will have a 2 car garage as well as a 2 car driveway. In addition, there will be 40 off street parking spaces and there will be 24-hour off-street parking located at the clubhouse. That is a per unit parking ratio of 4.27.

Jeffrey questioned when will the clubhouse be ready. Terry stated it will be constructed before phase 1 is finished.

Kandi questioned the logging that needs to be done. Who will be doing that? Terry responded the owner, Greenwood Village L.P. is the general contractor. Any firm that is engaged to move earth or to put in storm or sanitary falls under the Greenwood

Village L.P. The sub-contractor that is engaged by Greenwood Village is contracted by Greenwood Village L.P.

Jeffrey asked where does Phase 1 tie into. From what existing road? Terry replied Greenwood Drive and Victoria Drive. Currently they dead-end. Kandi asked Joe what bond amount was set and how much in mileage of township roads are being used. What is the bond set according to standard? Joe replied the bond requirement is \$12,500 per mile. We are still in the process of getting the developers' agreement and maintenance to the roads. Joe and Gary had discussed it. With the amount of the bond that would be posted if using the PennDOT standards, it would be somewhere around \$6,000. We would need something more than \$6,000.

Barry asked if the street from the borough would be ready to use right away for logging or anything. Joe stated he thinks it is going to have to stay in North Strabane Township. They do have rights to Crawford in Canonsburg. That is a detail that the developer needs to work out with Canonsburg Borough. Terry stated for the record in the past there were 2 houses on the property that accessed Crawford Avenue, which is in Canonsburg Borough. It has never been the position of the Borough of Canonsburg that they are going to deny access to Crawford. They are interested in how we can help them with their roads and widening their roads. It is just not legal to cut off roads.

Kandi questioned if Terry had stated earlier that the Phase I access point would be Crawford Road. Terry stated he did not state that. The access in the first phase is Greenwood. Kandi questioned when does Crawford come in to play? Terry replied that is in a future phase. Kandi questioned Terry did say 2 access points. Terry was talking about the PRD, which will have 2 access points. Joe stated it looks like on the master plan that Crawford would be a Phase III connection. Kandi questioned how many dwellings in the first 3 phases if Terry replied Phase I was 51, Phase II was 41, and Phase III was 53. Joe questioned these are all townhouse units. Terry stated yes and no. They will look like townhouse units but because of the PRD requirements some will be built as 2's so they would be considered duplexes and some will be built as 3 so they would be considered triplexes.

Jeffrey asked Gary if the members can grant final PRD approval if the developer does not have permission to connect the road. Diane stated make it contingent upon. Gary stated that becomes a legal issue and he has gone back and forth with the developer's attorney that if it is public and it has been represented to us that Crawford is a public road, they do not need permission. Down the road that may become an issue and a fight between the developer and Canonsburg Borough, if we are looking for written permission, but their attorney took the position that it is a public road and they do not need permission. Gary tends to agree and it meets all the requirements of being a public road.

Gary questioned if the filing fee was submitted. Margaret stated yes, last Thursday February 15th. Gary stated to Terry he knows he has a partner but one of the concerns he keeps hearing over and over from residents, township engineer, and township manager concerns the conditions of Greenwood Drive, which is deplorable. Is the developer willing to do any upgrades and stabilization of the road, so it is safe for passage for all vehicles? Terry stated it would be their intention to film that road and have the picture of the existing condition before they start. He thinks the township would want the same thing. Terry stated he will discuss that with the principal. Gary

stated to work with the township engineer. Make sure that road is safe and it may require some upgrade or stabilization before you begin. Also take a serious look at potential bank and sliding areas. Initially a retaining wall may be required to stabilize that entire area. Terry stated as far as this evening and the Planning Commission he can state unequivocally that they will not create an unsafe condition. They will look to work with the Township Engineer on the Greenwood end and discuss and examine any suggestions that are forth coming.

Gary asked Joe about article 1200, which talks about tentative approval and then there is a whole section on final approval. That section lists all of the different items that the developer must submit as part of the final application approval. It goes on to say if there is any substantial or significant change between the tentative plan and the final plan that an additional public hearing is required. However, if there is not a significant difference between the tentative and the final it then would just be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors for final approval. Gary asked Joe in his review of these plans if he noted any significant or substantial difference. Joe stated there was no significant or substantial difference between the master plan and the Phase I plan which was approved by the court as deemed approval.

Margaret noted we do not yet have the planning module exemption approval. We just submitted that. It is in the works and has been submitted.

Gary added the Developers Agreement has been finalized.

Diane stated she thinks one of the questions the board has is what happens with Crawford Road in Canonsburg. How do we deal with that? Can we require an alternate arrangement if Crawford is not going to be usable as an access road? Kandi stated Crawford is not usable in the first three phases. They are going to push 150 dwellings out of that one road. Kandi expressed concern with that point. Gary asked Joe what if Canonsburg shuts down that road. Is it feasible to put a second access road anywhere on this plan? Joe stated it would be better to ask Terry. Terry stated they have approached other property owners to have a third access. Those discussions have not been concluded and have been on going and they will continue to be on going. He suggested if the board is looking for some way to make a recommendation on this plan, maybe it is something like there is no Phase III until the connection is made to Crawford. Something along that line, and to act on the plan and address the Crawford connection. Jeffrey stated aren't 2 access points required regardless of the phases. Doesn't the PRD section require it? Joe stated he believes it does. Terry stated then we are back to Crawford Avenue. It is a public road and it is their position as a public road it will be used as a second public access. Jeffrey asked Gary if a PRD requires 2 access points can we make it a condition that we can approve Phase I contingent on the secondary access be constructed as part of Phase I. Gary thinks other PRD's have done it in phases without two access points at the beginning. Gary wants the board to know we have in the past approved these types of developments in phases when both access points were not available. Kandi would be curious to see what the density and the dwellings are in each phase.

Joan Kness of 110 Victoria Drive, Canonsburg stated it seems there is a lot of "ifs" and not for an access road in and out. She stated just doing simple math if this new phase is 233 units, Victoria Court is 88 and there are 20 homes plus an additional 51 on the end of Victoria Drive. It comes up to 392. If it is a 2 car garage that number could double and that is everybody going on Greenwood Drive on to Weavertown

Road which is a mess as it is now. She cannot see 400 more cars going out of that road way. She hopes they give some consideration to that. She expressed Crawford Drive is an if. Canonsburg rejected it last time. She does not know how they can vote on that. Terry stated there was a traffic study. Gary asked what was the result of that study. Terry stated it was based on 2 access roads including Crawford. Jeffrey stated regardless of whether it is based on Crawford or not, there is an obvious problem with people getting in and out of that road. There is a substantial delay for people exiting from Greenwood onto Weavertown. Jeffrey stated in his professional opinion there is a need for an auxiliary turning lane to get cars out of the way on Weavertown as an existing condition. You are going to be adding traffic to an already poor condition. Jeffrey would like to know the results of the study as well.

Joe commented there was not enough right of way to construct a turning lane. Joe stated PennDOT wants to know what is going on but then when it comes to trying to get them on board to do something for an offsite improvement they kind of turn the other cheek. We had that with Magnolia Ridge when we tried to get them to do something where Lindley comes out to Route 19 and they said since it was an offsite improvement they could not force the developer to do anything.

A resident asked Terry if he had stated he was going to use Kidder Lane later in a phase. Terry commented he did not understand Kidder Road. The discussion was Crawford Road.

Pete Castriota asked the members if any of them traveled Weavertown Road during the day. He has been there for 25 years. If there was a problem for a fire truck or ambulance, you would never get up Weavertown Road between 3:00 and 5:00 P.M. Whoever took the survey must have done the survey at 3:00 A.M. If they did not do their job down at Canonsburg, you could not even get through there. They blocked the state road going into McDonald's so that you cannot even cross over. This is not going to work there. You cannot have one exit. Canonsburg does not want it because they have a school there. They come up over that hill doing 30 to 35 MPH. You are lucky you do not get hit. Now there is going to be an additional 233 units there with one exit. It is not going to work.

Diane stated she does not think anyone wants to have a development there with one access point. She stated they all understand that whole area is a traffic nightmare. The issue is we are willing to see 2 access roads. Diane feels that Terry's position is that Canonsburg does not have a legal right to deny them access. Terry agreed. Pete replied if they start logging that property do you know what will happen them.

He worked construction. They will run the log trucks through their plan like you would not believe. If he does not get the exit what do you do? That is the problem Pete has right now. He is not sure of this exit.

Diane asked Gary what are the legal ramifications of that? You are stating that we have not required other developers to install a second access road in any particular phase in a development. What if he gets to Phase III and he does not have access to Crawford? What are the implications to the Township?

Gary responded maybe the other phased developments did not have the potential congestion and traffic flow that we are hearing on this one. Joe replied Summerbrook was one of the PRD's that was developed with 2 access points. It had Gala Drive coming up off of Galley Road and the connection to Poplar Street. Again you do not have the density at Summerbrook like you have here.

Gary stated the possible solution if the board is willing to recommend approval of the final plan, that it be conditioned upon that both access points being installed at Phase I. If the developer disagrees that becomes an issue that we may have to either discuss, negotiate or go to court. Gary feels there is a strong safety issue to justify requiring that both access roads be installed regardless of the phase of development. Christine Oelschlager, resident, commented with this plan, should it be going to a main artery? That is why this was denied the first time around, if she is correct. It should be going to Route 19, not these little back roads. If you have ever been on Crawford, those roads are small. They cannot handle what is being discussed here. Jeffrey replied unfortunately this is a landlocked piece of property that has access from existing roadways and those are the roads that are providing access. Christine stated so it does not matter? To put this big of a plan. You are talking over 600 cars. Most of us do have 2 cars, it is a safety issue. Cannot this just go back to being just homes like the last plan, instead of putting 233 townhomes. She has young kids and a dog and she is concerned about the traffic and she wants them to be safe. Jeffrey stated he appreciates her position. He apologized, but the members need to move on from this. It has been dragged out. He understands the residents' position. He stated they are a planning commission. They are a recommending body. Whatever they do goes in front of the Supervisors, who have the ultimate decision. He believes it is in their right, because of the safety issues, to ask for the second connection to be constructed immediately upon Phase I commencement, and that the infrastructure be connected to connect the 2 access points. However, as Joe Sites has indicated, this plan meets the ordinance. We as a board do not have a right to deny this plan. We have a right to move it on with the members' recommendations. Jeffrey stated he is a professional traffic engineer and he understands the residents' concerns. We just need to move on from this issue.

MOTION TO APPROVE GREENWOOD VILLAGE FINAL PRD AND PHASE I, WITH CONDITION THE DEVELOPER PROVIDE 2 ACCESS POINTS DURING 1ST PHASE A motion was made by Diane Balogh and seconded by Michael Kelly to approve Greenwood Village Final PRD and Phase I in an R-3 District contingent upon the developers providing for 2 access roads during the first phase of development.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 3 YES – 2 NO- K. Jablonski & B. Crumrine

NEW BUSINESS:
BRIDGEVIEW
TOWNHOUSES
PRELIMINARY AND
FINAL APPROVAL OF
AMENDED PLAN NO. 5
– LOT 101

Bridgeview Townhouses – preliminary and final approval of amended plan NO. 5 – Lot 101, Units A-H located on Chesnic Drive in the C-1 Zoning District. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: February 6, 2018

North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South

Canonsburg, PA 15317

Re: Amended Plan No. 5– Lot 101 – Units A-H Bridgeview Townhouses – Chesnic Drive

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the amended subdivision application for preliminary and final approval to subdivide 1.041 acres to create the eight (8) lots for the Townhouses located on Lot 101 - Units A-H in the C-1 zoning district as prepared by HMT and Associates dated January 16, 2018.

The plan represents the as-built condition of the townhouses and the plan is in order for consideration by the planning commission.

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

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

THE GATEWAY ENGINEERS, INC.

Joseph H. Sites, P.E.

Township Engineer

MOTION TO APPROVE BRIDGEVIEW TOWNHOUSES PRELIMINARY AND FINAL OF AMENDED PLAN NO. 5 – LOT 101 A motion was made by Diane Balogh and seconded by Barry Crumrine to approve Bridgeview townhomes preliminary and final amended plan NO. 5 lot 101.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO

EMPORIO RESTAURANT AT THE STREET – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL Emporio Restaurant at the Street – Preliminary and final site plan approval of a 5,023 square foot restaurant located at The Street at The Meadows in a C-2 district. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: February 16, 2018

North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317

Re: Emporio Restaurant at the Street at the Meadows Preliminary and Final Land Development Plan

Members of the Commission:

All of the comments of our letter of February 6, 2018 have been addressed, and the plan is in order for consideration for approval.

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

Present were John Fredrick of R.A. Smith C.E. and Survey Consultant for the applicants, The Street at Meadows, L.P. and Jody Schurman of Lab 8 Designs, who is the architect for the Emporio Restaurant. John provided highlights of the land development plan of lot #3. The development would be a 5000 sq. ft. restaurant with outdoor dining. John stated 78 parking places are required. They are providing 80 and on the top left northern most perimeter there are 11 landbanked parking spaces in the event that the parking spaces would be needed in the future. The parking provided meets ordinance requirements. This will take the total restaurant development to 9,600 sq. ft., still within the limit that was originally proposed.

Jeffrey asked if John's calculations were correct. Are we really going to 9,600 total square feet? He feels it would be tight between Primanti Bros and Buford's. Joe responded that is correct. We went through it and even checked the traffic. There is still some excess that can be used on the parcel to the east. When this development was originally looked at there was discussion with Horizon Properties about the need for a traffic signal at Racetrack Road and Quail Acres Lane. Nothing is triggered yet to do that. Jeffrey asked if did show signalized on the master plan. Joe replied yes. Margaret stated the planning module exemption was approved with The Street several years ago.

Parking was discussed. Joe stated he insisted there was extra parking for the patio even though it may be just seasonal.

MOTION TO APPROVE EMPORIO RESTURANT PRELIMINARY & FINAL SITE PLAN

A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Michael Kelly to approve preliminary and final site plan for Emporio Restaurant at the Street.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO

INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES

Informational Purposes-Proposal for Property located on Morganza Road, Zoned I-1.

Joe stated both he and Margaret met with Joe Fello of GAI Consultants to discuss the property on Morganza and Curry Avenue. They suggested the property owner make application to have the zoning changed to C-1.

Joe Fello presented to the members that back in 2015 they appeared before the board in hopes of building a hotel. Since then there is less of the need for a hotel in the area. The owner is still interested in developing this site; however potential tenants or occupants that they are in discussions with are more commercial in nature, less than industrial. Across the street is zoned C-1. Adjacent to the parcel along Morganza Road the zoning is I-1; however, the tenants they are in discussion with are more commercial in nature. With the impending adoption of the new zoning ordinance, Joe asked the planning commission if they would consider changing the zoning on the subject parcel to C-1. It would be consistent with the zoning across the street. It would be consistent with the occupants along Morganza that are adjacent to this parcel and it would be consistent with the tenants/occupants they are in discussion with. It would assist with marketing those tenants to this site.

Jeffrey asked Margaret what is the zoning of the Super 8. It is zoned I-1. Jeffrey questioned is a hotel a permitted us in I-1. She replied yes. Joe Fellow responded and in C-1. Barry questioned how many acres with this parcel. Joe stated he believes 8.7 acres.

Jeffrey questioned if they have a tenant interested or is his map just a conceptual drawing for that site? Joe replied it is both. This is a tenant that describes itself as a specialty geriatric hospital. That is sort of what lead to the discussions. Per the definition in the ordinance they may more closely fit the definition of a nursing home or assisted living. That would be the next hurdle once they know if they are definitely interested. The challenge of a hospital is that the ordinance requires ten acres, whereas this user would be more interested in a smaller 2-acre site. Based on the services that they offer it more closely matches the ordinance definition of nursing home or assisted living. It is the size of the parcel, size of building and size of the parking that would be optimal for them. If we move forward with this concept plan it would leave approximately a 4.8-acre lot and two 2-acre lots. This is just a concept. Tonight is the request to adjust the zoning for this parcel to make it C-1 to make it consistent to the zoning across the street and the uses.

Gary questioned if this was divided by the creek. Joe replied it was subdivided with the 2015 submission. Not exactly on the creek but along the creek.

Joe Sites' recommendation was that everything between Curry and up to R.H. Office Products between Morganza and the creek be rezoned to C-1 and Pennsylvania Transfer and everything on other side of the creek stay I-1. It is consistent.

Diane stated in her opinion she is not inclined to change the zoning on something that may or may not happen. When you have a commitment is that not the time to come in with a zoning change. Gary stated that would be a condition of the sales agreement, "I'll buy the property if it can be rezoned". Diane replied if we go from an I-1 to a C-1 and they do not build the nursing home, what does that open us up to? What can you build in an C-1 that you cannot build in an I-1? Joe stated changing from a I-1 to a C-1 gave more them opportunities to develop as a commercial property. Right now as an I-1 zoning district they are limited as to what they can do from a commercial standpoint. It opens it up and cleans it up. Morganza Road is probably more conducive to being commercially developed than an industrial development.

Diane responded that still leads here back to her question what can go in there. Gary stated it is a long list if Diane wanted to look at the zoning book with the permitted uses.

Gary stated this is informational purposes tonight. They will need to file an application. Joe Fello asked the planning commission if they would consider adding

application. Joe Fello asked the planning commission if they would consider adding the assisted living/nursing home use to the I-1 zoning district if they are not willing to change the zoning, because the I-1 is less restrictive. If the I-1 included that medical use, we could keep the I-1 and potentially not need to rezone the site.

Kandi stated there is a process that needs to be followed for that decision to be made. Gary stated he thinks it is better for Joe Fello to pick what they want, rather than have the township checking on options and alternatives. Gary stated submit a request for rezoning to C-1 and let's see what the township does with it.

Jeffrey commented to Joe Sites about extending the C-1 up to R.H. Office Products. Joe stated the zoning is still pending and it gives us the ability to change the zoning and clean some things up.

Gary asked if this something we should have Carolyn comment on. She has been the quarterback for the entire rezoning process. This may be something that the planning consultant should look at and make a recommendation, even before they make their application.

ADJOURNMENT:

There was no other business to discuss. Diane Balogh made a motion and Barry Crumrine seconded to adjourn the meeting at 6:47 PM.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 5 YES – 0 NO

Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairperson

Michael Kelly, Secretary