

NORTH STRABANE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES April 16, 2018

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>The North Strabane Township Planning Commission met in regular session on Monday, April 16, 2018, at 5:30 PM at the Municipal Building located at 1929 Route 519, Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p><u>Attending This Session:</u> Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairman Diane Balogh, Vice-Chair Kandi Jablonski, Commission Member Barry Crumrine, Commission Member</p> <p><u>Absent:</u> Michael Kelly, Secretary Margaret Householder, Planning Coordinator</p> <p><u>Also Attending This Session:</u> Andrew Sweat, Township Solicitor Joe Sites, Township Engineer Andrew Walz, Township Manager Colleen Mellor, Stenographer</p> |
| <p><u>PUBLIC COMMENTS:</u></p> <p><u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</u> March 19, 2018</p> <p><u>OLD BUSINESS:</u></p> <p><u>NEW BUSINESS:</u> WATERDAM CHURCH – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL FOR A TWO STORY, 4,473 SQ. FT. ADDITION</p> | <p>None.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Diane Balogh to approve the minutes of the March 19, 2018 meeting.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p>Waterdam Church – Preliminary and final approval for a two story, 4,473 sq. ft. addition to existing building for a social hall, located at 208 Galley Road in an R-3 zoning district. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: April 13, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Preliminary and Final Application - Site Plan for Building Expansion Waterdam Church Building Addition - Galley Road</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> |

We have received and reviewed the application for preliminary and final site plan approval for a 4,573 SF building addition in the R-3 Zoning District on 3.83 acres as prepared by Stahl Sheaffer Engineering LLC, dated March 23, 2018 and revised April 11, 2018. This is a permitted use in the zoning district per §1101 (A).

All of the comments of our letter of April 3, 2018 have been addressed 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

Robyn Froehlich, of Stahl Sheaffer Engineering, Project Manager and Civil Engineer, provided a brief overview. Robyn stated it will be a two story multi-level addition, approximately 4500 sq. ft. building foot print, so twice that for the 2 levels.

Jeffrey questioned the total square footage. Robyn replied total 8800 for the total. Robyn described the new uses of the space.

Robyn commented there will be a fair amount of substantial grading involved because the site is located on a pretty steep bank.

Robyn stated the existing parking is adequate both for existing and proposed uses. The stormwater will be managed at lower end of site with an underground rock sump. Stormwater from all of the roof, driveway and sidewalks will be collected through inlets or roof drain collection systems right into the sump, collected, and slowly discharged into Little Chartiers Creek.

The utility improvements will entail new gas service, waterline and sanitary lateral that will be in the back of the fellowship hall. The grinder pump will be replaced and then pump up to gravity manhole on the public system.

Jeffrey questioned Joe regarding the parking requirements. Joe replied they have provided a letter that states both facilities will not be used at the same time. They will not be used concurrently. Joe had questioned that at the original meeting with them. Eric Bilski of the Waterdam Church mentioned some of the uses, including the upper level, which is classrooms. One room may be used on Wednesday for a youth group. The fellowship hall will be used for church events. Events may be a meal on a Saturday or following services on Sunday.

Eric stated the church owns property across Galley Road. Youth group is currently there and will be relocated in the new building. This would be a big improvement, to have the kids on the church grounds rather than across the street. Diane asked if the social hall will be rented out for any purpose such as bingo or baby showers? Eric replied it will not be rented to non-members but members would be able to use it at no

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>MOTION TO APPROVE WATERDAM CHURCH – PRELIMINARY AND FINAL</p> <p>CASCO USA – 5,500 SQ. FT. OFFICE AND WAREHOUSE ADDITION MEADOWLANDS BOULEVARD - I-1 ZONING DISTRICT</p> | <p>cost. There has not been discussion regarding it being rented out to non-members. Diane asked Joe who will be monitoring the parking. Joe responded it would be self-policing. The church provided a letter stating it would not be using them concurrently.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Kandi Jablonski to approve Waterdam Church – Preliminary and final for a two story, 4,473 sq. ft. addition to the existing building for a social hall.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 3 YES –1 NO (D. Balogh)</u></p> <p>Casco USA – 5,500 SQ. FT. office and warehouse addition to existing building, located at 370 Meadowlands Boulevard in an I-1 zoning district. This item has been tabled at the request of the applicant. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: April 2, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Re: Building Expansion - Casco USA Meadowlands Boulevard</p> <p>Members of the Commission:</p> <p>We have received and reviewed the application for preliminary and final approval for the site plan for a 5,500 S.F. mixed-use office and warehouse building expansion in the 1-1 Zoning District on 4.0 acres as prepared by Young and Associates, Consulting Engineers, dated March 9, 2018. This is a permitted use in the zoning district per §110 1 (A). The following are comments relative to the plan:</p> <p>Site Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed use of the building expansion needs to be identified, including the breakdown for the type of use for both the proposed and existing buildings. This is necessary to identify building capacity. 2. We question the number of parking spaces shown on the plan. The existing conditions plan shows 26 total parking spaces. Per the calculation shown on sheet C-5, 18 additional parking spaces are required to be added, but the proposed site plan shows 37 total parking spaces. Addressing Item 1 will determine the required total number of parking spaces. 3. The parking spaces and travel aisle width should be dimensioned on the site plan to meet the Township standard parking requirements. |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. One off-street loading berth is required per section 1503 of the Zoning Ordinance. A designated loading berth shall be added to the site plan. If loading berths exist, the loading area shall be shown and dimensioned on the site plan to meet the Township Standard of 60' x 14', if not, it must be added to the site plan. 5. The clauses on sheet C-4A are not required as part of the land development and grading plans. They must be removed. 6. We question if the proposed orientation of the dumpster pad will be able to be serviced by a garbage truck. 7. There are two (2) differing typical dumpster pad details shown on sheet D-1. Which detail is to be used for construction? 8. We recommend installing a concrete apron/approach slab for the proposed dumpster pad. 9. A standard detail for the screening of the dumpster pad must be provided, per Section 1409.B of the Zoning Ordinance. 10. If the parking areas are to be used during night hours, a lighting and photometric plan shall be provided. <p>Stormwater Management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PCSM report shall be signed and sealed by the preparer. 2. Does the headwall along Meadowlands Boulevard need to be modified to accept the flow from the increase in impervious area on site? 3. Is the headwall along Meadowlands Boulevard supposed to drain into the modified drainage basin? 4. Per Section 512-9, catch basins shall meet the minimum PennDOT Standard. All catch basins shall be 2'x4' concrete in order to minimize the potential for maintenance issues in paved areas. 5. Per Section 512-4-B, provide storm sewer calculations that demonstrate adequate capacity for the 25-year storm. The proposed storm sewer system has numerous segments that are 0.5% slope with inlets that are less than 4-feet deep. It will be necessary to demonstrate that the catch basins do not surcharge. 6. Per Section 512-4-B, provide apron calculations for Headwall 2. Also provide capacity calculations for the existing storm sewer bypass to which this |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>headwall discharges.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The plan proposes to modify the existing basin by deepening it. However, the existing riser is not proposed to be modified. The report assumes 0.5 inches/hour of exfiltration from the basin, with no supporting study to verify this assumption. Per Section 512-5-A, all detention areas shall be designed to drain completely. It is suggested to provide a 4" PVC drain line that connects to the inlet below the emergency spillway, with a 4" Ball Valve below the emergency spillway, to allow for the basin to be completely dewatered in emergency conditions. 8. Per Section 512-4-C, provide emergency spillway calculations for the 100-year storm emergency condition, with the principal outflow structure inoperable (i.e. all flow through the emergency spillway). 9. Per Section 512-4-A, include hydrographs for all storm events required to be analyzed by the Ordinance. Include a summary table indicating the predevelopment and post development peak discharge, along with the water surface elevation in the basin, for each required storm event. 10. Include the principal outflow structure and emergency spillway on Section B-B of Sheet C-4E. <p>General</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. We will be completing a review of the cost estimate and provide a recommendation for bonding. 4. A copy of the plans should be submitted to the Public Works Director, Building Inspector/Zoning Offices and Fire Chief for review and comment prior to final approval. |
|--|--|

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>REZONE OF 53 LINDEN ROAD</p> | <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Members of the Commission,</p> <p>We are in receipt of and have reviewed the submission for the rezoning of 11 acres in the R-2 zoning district to C-1 located at 53 Linden Road as submitted by the applicant, Andrew Manganas. The applicant states that the land was previously used for farming. The applicant states that he is looking to clean the land and store/warehouse materials/supplies on the property. There we be no operation of sales and little if any additional traffic. §2003 outlines the application criteria and the requirements that must be met for a rezone application to be considered. The following is our review of the submission per §2003:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. §2003(A) 1 requires that a Conceptual Site Development Plan must be provided. None has been provided. 2. §2003(A) 2 requires that a topographic survey must be provided. None has been provided. 3. §2003(AO 3 requires that a Site conditions report must be provided. None has been provided. 4. §2003(A) 4. Requires the Estimated infrastructure (sanitary sewer and potable water) demands (gallons per day) be provided. The applicant has stated in the cover letter that they do not anticipate any changes in the potable water, electric, or sanitary sewer usage. No information has been provided to support this statement. 5. §2003(A) 5 requires Off-street parking projections (number of parking spaces) available on site. The applicant in their cover letter states that there will not be any change in parking on the property after the warehousing is established. Generally, establishment of a warehouse would require parking to be provided per the zoning ordinance which would increase the number of parking spaces on site. 6. §2003(A) 6 requires a summary of anticipated impacts on adjoining lots including but not limited to noise, vibration, night-time lighting, service area locations and visibility, hours of operation. No information has been provided. |
|-------------------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>7. §2003(A) 7 requires existing zoning of surrounding parcels and closest adjacency of zoning district identical to request. No information has been provided.</p> <p>8. §2003(A)8 requires classifications of existing roadways/streets adjacent to and within 300' of the perimeter of the proposed site. No information has been provided.</p> <p>9. §2003(A) requires the calculation of average daily trips and peak hour trips proposed to be generated by development on the lot as presented on a proposed Sketch Plan as enabled by the PA Municipalities Planning Code. The most current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual shall be used as part of said calculation. No information has been provided.</p> <p>10. 2003(A)10 requires calculation of average daily trips and peak hour trips proposed to be generated based upon proposed Conceptual Site Development Plan. No information has been provided.</p> <p>11. 2003(A) 11 requires the percentage of proposed dwelling units and any associated limitations that are specific to a particular segment of potential residential demographics/socio-economics. N/A since this is a request for a zoning change from R-2 to C-1.</p> <p>12. §2003(A) 12 requires depending upon the location of lot access, infrastructure service/demands and impacts identified on adjoining lots, the Township may require a landowner and/or developer to prepare other potential related studies such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Traffic related studies b. Fiscal impact analysis c. Density comparison to base zoning d. Geotechnical/stormwater analysis <p>Nothing was provided based on the submission but would be appropriate to be submitted with the Conceptual Site plan for development of the property.</p> <p>B. The Township will evaluate the proposed development of the proposed zoning in relationship to the potential development in the existing zoning. The Township Planning Commission and Township Board of Supervisors reserve the right to require additional information as part of the review and approval processes in order to evaluate the applicability of the rezoning.</p> <p>Based on our review of the information that has been provided, the application is incomplete since there are outstanding items that will need to be provided as identified above to satisfy the requirements of §2003 of the Township Zoning Ordinance. Once the outstanding items are provided, a review for completeness will be performed and a determination made if the submission</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>is ready to be presented to the Township Planning Commission for consideration and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>In order for this application to be considered by the North Strabane Township Planning Commission at their April 16, 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 April 11, 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.</p> <p>The plans have been reviewed for conformance to Township Ordinance standards only. The review is based on information prepared by others and assumes this information is correct and valid as submitted.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please contact me.</p> <p>Sincerely, THE GATEWAY ENGINEERS, INC. Joseph H. Sites, P.E. MBA Township Engineer</p> |
| <p>MOTION TO TABLE REQUEST FOR REZONE OF 53 LINDEN ROAD</p> | <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Diane Balogh to table new business item 6 C Manganas 53 Linden Road.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p> |
| <p>AMY & WILLIAM PRICE – REQUEST FOR REZONE OF VACANT PARCEL LOCATED ON WASHINGTON ROAD.</p> | <p>Amy Price and William Price – Request for rezone of a vacant 5.512-acre parcel located on Washington Road. The front portion is zoned C-1 and the back is zoned R-3. This request is to rezone the back portion of the property to C-1, for a proposed new car dealership. The following letter was submitted by Gateway Engineers dated: April 4, 2018</p> <p>North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission 1929 Route 519 South Canonsburg, PA 15317</p> <p>Members of the Commission,</p> <p>We are in receipt of and have reviewed the submission for the rezoning of a portion of 5.512 acres that is currently R-3 to C-1 located between Route 19 and McClelland Road as submitted by the applicant, Amy and William Price. The applicant indicates in their</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>application that a portion of the property is not zoned commercial and the entire property is needed for the proposed use a car dealership. The applicant indicates that the rezoned will be used for parking. 2003 outlines the application criteria and the requirements that must be met for a rezone application to be considered. The following is our review of the submission per §2003:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. §2003(A) 1 requires that a Conceptual Site Development Plan must be provided. This has been provided. 2. §2003(A) 2 requires that a topographic survey must be provided. This has been provided. 3. §2003(AO 3 requires that a Site conditions report must be provided. None has been provided. 4. §2003(A) 4. Requires the Estimated infrastructure (sanitary sewer and potable water) demands (gallons per day) be provided. No information has been provided to support this statement. 5. §2003(A) 5 requires Off-street parking projections (number of parking spaces) available on site. The site plan shows parking spaces for the proposed use. If a site plan is submitted in the future, parking will need to be distinguished as customer, service, and vehicle storage. 6. §2003(A) 6 requires a summary of anticipated impacts on adjoining lots including but not limited to noise, vibration, night-time lighting, service area locations and visibility, hours of operation. No information has been provided. 7. §2003(A) 7 requires existing zoning of surrounding parcels and closest adjacency of zoning district identical to request. A zoning map showing the surrounding zoning has been provided. 8. §2003(A)8 requires classifications of existing roadways/streets adjacent to and within 300' of the perimeter of the proposed site. No information has been provided. 2003(A) requires the calculation of average daily trips and peak hour trips proposed to be generated by development on the lot as presented on a proposed Sketch Plan as enabled by the PA Municipalities Planning Code. The most current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual shall be used as part of said calculation. No information has been provided. 9. 2003(A)10 requires calculation of average daily trips and peak hour trips |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>proposed to be generated based upon proposed Conceptual Site Development Plan. No information has been provided.</p> <p>10. 2003(A) 11 requires the percentage of proposed dwelling units and any associated limitations that are specific to a particular segment of potential residential demographics/socio-economics. N/A since this is a request for a zoning change from R-2 to C-1.</p> <p>11. §2003(A)12 requires depending upon the location of lot access, infrastructure service/demands and impacts identified on adjoining lots, the Township may require a landowner and/or developer to prepare other potential related studies such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Traffic related studies b. Fiscal impact analysis c. Density comparison to base zoning d. Geotechnical/stormwater analysis <p>Nothing was provided based on the submission but would be appropriate to be submitted with the Conceptual Site plan for development of the property.</p> <p>B. The Township will evaluate the proposed development of the proposed zoning in relationship to the potential development in the existing zoning. The Township Planning Commission and Township Board of Supervisors reserve the right to require additional information as part of the review and approval processes in order to evaluate the applicability of the rezoning</p> <p>Based on our review of the information that has been provided, the application is incomplete since there are outstanding items that will need to be provided as identified above to satisfy the requirements of §2003 of the Township Zoning Ordinance. Once the outstanding items are provided, a review for completeness will be performed and a determination made if the submission is ready to be presented to the Township Planning Commission for consideration and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>In order for this application to be considered by the North Strabane Township Planning Commission at their April 16, 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 April 11, 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.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please contact me.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>MOTION TO APPROVE THE PRICE REZONE LOCATED ON WASHINGTON ROAD.</p> <p>ASA REMOVAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</p> | <p>Sincerely, THE GATEWAY ENGINEERS, INC. Joseph H. Sites, P.E. MBA Township Engineer</p> <p>David Hvizdos, Attorney for the Prices, was present. David stated the letter went to Amy and she did not open it. David asked for consideration and leeway on this application. The letter from Gateway was reviewed. A great portion of the engineer’s report has already been done. Once the rezoning is approved, if it goes to supervisors, it will be back in front of the Planning Commission for another look. Since this project is time sensitive they would like to get this moving along. Every condition will be satisfied prior to meeting with the supervisors. If you could give the approval at this point for it to go the supervisors, they would guarantee all the items in the engineer’s letter will be presented to them in the time that they have to consider the actual rezone. David gave some points to the property. He feels a car dealership is the best use for this property.</p> <p>Diane questioned what was the history with the township and the letter was addressed to one applicant and not both? Jeffrey questioned as well stating they are co-applicants. Are we required to send out two separate letters? The solicitor stated 2 separate letters are not required. Joe Sites stated he mailed the letter to the name and address that was on the application.</p> <p>Joe asked David when he indicated that they will address the comments in the letter prior to the meeting with the supervisors. What is the time line? Will it be in advance or the day of the hearing. Joe replied it would be nice to have it 7 days prior to a scheduled hearing or sooner. It will be enough time for advertising prior to hearing. A traffic study was discussed. Will there be enough time to get that completed?</p> <p>Mr. Price stated access will only be off Route 19 south, right turn in and out only. Jeffrey asked what car dealership it is. Mr. Price responded Lexus.</p> <p>Joe Sites asked who owns the trailer park. Mr. Price replied Roger Dolanch. Joe said it would be nice if Roger could jump on this and sell to them as well. There is too much work needed and there are water issues as well. This property is the perfect footprint for them.</p> <p>Kandi asked if this is tied to any other dealership. Mr. Price replied Rohrich.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Kandi Jablonski to approve item 6D. Price rezoning.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 3 YES – 1 NO- (J. DePaolis)</u></p> <p>Acknowledgment of removal of several parcels from the Agricultural Security Area at the request of Team Rahal. Parcels are located on Washington Road and were previously owned by Vasbro. They no longer qualify for inclusion in the ASA. Andy Walz gave a brief update on these parcels. Solicitor Andrew Sweat asked if it is the</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>MOTION TO ACKNOWLEDGE ASA REMOVAL AND SOLICITOR TO DRAFT RESOLUTION.</p> <p><u>ADJOURNMENT:</u></p> | <p>Township determination or the landowner request? Andy stated it is landowner request. Andrew responded he assumes it has been more than 7 years. We have to enact a resolution which must be accompanied by a removal form and be recorded pursuant to section 1381.22 which relates to The Ag Security Act. Township Manager, Andy Walz requested Andrew Sweat to prepare a resolution.</p> <p>A motion was made by Barry Crumrine and seconded by Diane Balogh to acknowledge the ASA removal request and approve the solicitor to draft a resolution and process paperwork.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <p>There was no other business to discuss.</p> <p>Barry Crumrine made a motion and Diane Balogh seconded to adjourn the meeting at 6:05 PM.</p> <p><u>ROLL CALL OF VOTES: 4 YES – 0 NO</u></p> <hr/> <p>Jeffrey DePaolis, Chairperson</p> <hr/> <p>Diane Balogh, Vice-Chair</p> |
|--|--|