

NORTH STRABANE TOWNSHIP PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION PAGE 1
****MINUTES** April 18, 2011**

The North Strabane Township Planning and Zoning Commission met in regular session on Monday, April 18, 2011 at 6:30 P.M. at the Municipal Building, located at 1929 Route 519, Canonsburg, PA.

Attending this session

Norma Wintermyer, Chairperson
Jon Erdner, Vice Chairperson
Linda Romito, Secretary
Katharine Stayduhar, Member

Absent from this session

Bill Franczyk, Member

Also attending this session

Jim Jeffries, Solicitor
Paulette Moyar, Planning Coordinator
Margaret Householder, Stenographer

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES OF
MARCH 21, 2011**

Motion by Erdner, seconded by Stayduhar to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 21, 2011.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES – 3 YES, 1 ABSTENTION (Romito, as she was not present at that meeting).

OLD BUSINESS

There is no old business this evening.

NEW BUSINESS
**WEAVERTOWN
WOODLANDS**

This is for preliminary and final review of a subdivision which consolidates the main parcel of Weavertown Woodlands and 0.4725 acres that was purchased from an adjoining property owner, located along Route 19, in an R-3 district.

The following review letter was received from Gateway Engineers, dated April 14, 2011:

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the application for the consolidation of 0.4725 acres with 31.1787 acres in the R-3 zoning district, which was previously R-2, with the development being completed as a PRD as prepared by J. Ripple and Associates revised dated April 5, 2011.

All of the comments of our letter of April 5, 2011 have been addressed and the plan is in order for consideration by the Planning Commission.

April 18, 2011

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,
Joseph H. Sites, P.E.

Matt Cramer, Heartland Homes, is present for this item. He stated this is a small rectangular piece which we acquired. A 5-unit townhouse building will be constructed on it.

Moyar commented this was left out of the original plan. There is an existing right of way, a paper street. Heartland Homes is acquiring this piece and will consolidate it with the existing condominium association. This is not fee simple. Heartland will have to come back for a revision to the master plan.

MOTION FOR
WEAVERTOWN
WOODLANDS

Motion by Stayduhar, seconded by Romito to approve Weavertown Woodlands preliminary and final review for a consolidation.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES – 4 YES 0 NO.

CONCORD GREEN
PHASE 3C AND
LOT 331 IN PHASE
3B

This is for preliminary and final review of Phase 3C consisting of 10 single family lots and revised lot 331 in Phase 3B.

The following review letter was received from Gateway Engineers, dated April 14, 2011:

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the preliminary and final subdivision application for lot 331 in Phase 3B, to shift the line, and the recording of lots 313-315 and 324-330 in Phase 3C of the Concord Green PRD in the R-3 zoning district, as prepared by Sawyer Engineering dated April 12, 2011.

All of the comments of our letter of April 6, 2011 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,
Joseph H. Sites, P.E.

Mr. and Mrs. McCloskey are present this evening for this item.

Moyar explained Lot 331 was in Phase 3B. Lot 330 is in Phase 3C. Lot 330 needed to give six feet to Lot 331 to accommodate the home to be built on Lot 331. 3C has not been recorded yet. This action revises Lot 331 and records 10 lots in 3C.

MOTION FOR
APPROVAL OF
CONCORD GREN

Motion by Erdner, seconded by Romito to approve Phase 3C and revised lot 331 in Phase 3B of Concord Green.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES – 4 YES 0 NO.

CONCORD GREEN
REVISED
PHASING PLAN

This is for preliminary and final review of a proposed change to the phasing plans of phases 1-East and 2. This revision to the phase designation will place all multi-family dwelling in Phase 1-East. The single family lots and the garden apartment parcel will remain in Phase 2.

The following review was received from Gateway Engineers, dated April 15, 2011:

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the preliminary and final subdivision application for combining the townhouse and open space parcels of Phase 1 with townhouse parcels of Phase 2 into a single phase as prepared by Sawyer Engineering dated April 13, 2011. The purpose of this recharacterization is to have a unified homeowners association for the townhouses.

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,
Joseph H. Sites, P.E.

Mr. and Mrs. McCloskey are present for this item

Moyar explained this affects only Phase 1 and Phase 2 existing parcels. This is to separate townhouse units from single family dwellings. All townhouse units will be in Phase 1-East. The phasing lines have been corrected to reflect that re-grouping.

MOTION TO
APPROVE
CONCORED
GREEN PHASING
PLAN

Motion by Stayduhar, seconded by Erdner to recommend approval, as written on the agenda.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES – 4 YES 0 NO.

CONCORD GREEN
GARDEN
APARTMENT
PARCEL

This is for preliminary and final approval of a subdivision plan to create a common parking area outside of the Township right of way for five cars to be used for visitor parking.

The following review letter was received from Gateway engineers, dated April 15, 2011:

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the preliminary and final subdivision application for Concord Green Plan No. 4 – Revised Garden Apartment Parcel in Phase 2 of the Concord Green PRD, as prepared by Sawyer Engineering dated April 14, 2011. The purpose of this revised subdivision is to dedicate an easement along Woodlawn Drive outside of the roadway right of way to establish five (5) common parking spaces to be used by the residents.

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,
Joseph H. Sites, P.E.

Mr. and Mrs. William McCloskey are present for this item.

Moyar explained the townhouse owners wish to have some guest parking at the top of Woodlawn Drive, because all the current parking is at the bottom. This is going to be parallel parking, parallel to Woodlawn Drive, a total of five (5) stalls. This will be subdivided and transferred to the homeowner's association. This will be for visitors' parking only, and not

to be used for storage by residents. This will be totally out of the right of way.

Mrs. McCloskey commented there should have been some additional parking behind the townhouse buildings; however, Heartland Homes increased the size of the units. Some parking was lost.

MOTION FOR
APPROVAL OF
GARDEN
APARTMENT
PARCEL

Motion by Romito, seconded by Stayduhar to recommend approval, per the agenda; specifically a subdivision plan to create a common parking area.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES – 4 YES 0 NO.

SUMMERBROOK
PHASE 3, 4, AND 5

This is for preliminary subdivision and site plan review, which consists of 58 single family lots on 33.076 acres off Poplar Street in an R-3 district.

The following review letter was received from Gateway Engineers, dated April 15, 2011:

Members of the Commission:

We have received and reviewed the preliminary site plan application for the development of 58 single family lots on 33.076 acres in the R-3 zoning district as prepared by PVE Sheffler revised, dated April 12, 2011. The development was previously approved as part of the Planned Residential Development (PRD) as per Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance.

The submission is in order for consideration for preliminary subdivision and site plan approval.

The following are comments that need to be addressed prior to being considered for final approval relative to the plan.

Master Plan

1. Section 1202.2 requires that the site proposed for a Planned Residential Development shall be under single ownership and control. Since the development was started, it is our understanding that there may be more than one developer/property owner involved with the site. If that is the case, a written explanation between the developers should be provided and identify who is assuming responsibility for items related to the Planned Residential Development, specifically, but not limited to S1202.4 and the completion of the improvements that have

already been started but not accepted by the Township. The designer, in his letter of April 12, 2011, has indicated that the applicant will provide a written narrative to the Township under separate cover.

Subdivision Plan

1. The plan must be signed and sealed by the preparer.
2. The required buffer and open area should be indicated on the subdivision plan as such and be designated as a “conservation district” in which vegetation cannot be disturbed, cleared and/or developed. This information must also be included in the deeds of the lots as they are sold to the individual property owners.
3. The overall layout plan includes property that is between the rear of the existing townhouses on Gala Drive and rear of the existing homes on Poplar Drive. If this is intended to be open space for the development, it should be designated and subdivided as such with the development.
4. The subdivision for Phase 2 of Summerbrook was included with the submission. The new application is Oakbrooke-Muse Partners, LP and the developer shown on the subdivision is Summerbrook LLC. What is the current status of Summerbrook LLC and is it in any way associated with Oakbrook-Muse Partners, LP? The designer has indicated in their April 12, 2011 response letter that the developer will provide a written response under separate cover.
5. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.

Site Plan

1. A landscaping plan must be provided for the buffer area for the development in accordance with S.1202.9(a) and (c) and S.1402.2 (a) and (c).
2. Profiles for the storm sewers must be provided.

Storm Water Management

Prior to final approval, a revised storm water management report must be submitted reflecting the design of the current phases as proposed prior to final approval.

General

1. An NPDES permit for the site will be required to be amended.
2. The Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan must be submitted to the Washington County Conservation District for review and approval.
3. As per S.304.3 of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance, the developer must execute a developer's agreement with the Township prior to being granted final approval by the Board of Supervisors.
4. Prior to any construction on the site, a pre-construction meeting with the Engineer, public works director, developer, builder and building inspector must be held.
5. The location of the proposed fire hydrants must be reviewed and approved by the Fire Chief.
6. The plans must be submitted to the Municipal Authority for review and approval.
7. The requirement for a planning module must be reviewed by the Planning Coordinator.

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,
Joseph H. Sites, P.E.

Jim Venture, PBE Schleffer, is present this evening, representing Oakbrooke-Muse Partners, along with Woody Welsch developer. Venture gave the following information:

This is the extension of Poplar and Fuji, and created parcels known as GR2 and AR2. The item before you tonight is for GR2. That parcel originally proposed 52 lots, and 55 proposed units and measures about 33 acres in size. We must create a minimum of three alternate products, so we had to include a duplex unit. The lots range for 80' to 90'. We went from 3 duplex lots to 1 duplex, for a total of 58 lots, with 59 units.

The lots range from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ acre. We will be at about 30% of the maximum density permitted.

The bulk of the infrastructure, including grading, was completed in Phase 1. Storm water facilities are in place and utilities are available, with exception of sanitary sewer. We are working with the Municipal Authority. The perimeter buffer A is going to be contained within an open space, 50 foot wide. That is a separate lot.

We did respond to Gateway's letter and have been able to adequately address most, if not all, of its comments.

Stayduhar questioned the duplex unit, asking if it will be the only one. Venture answered it will, and will be on a corner lot. There will be a single family home on each side of it. There could potentially be duplexes in the next phase. Stayduhar would like to see it incorporated with something else.

Moyar stated the most current response letter from Gateway is dated today and one of the comments has to do with the question of single ownership and control. The applicant's response is that the requirement for single ownership only applies to the initial application and not subsequent phases of the PRD.

Furthermore, the applicant states that the developer for this phase, Oakbrook-Muse Partners, shall not be responsible for any of the work performed or required to be performed in phases 1 or 2 or any other obligation previously promised by Summerbrook LLC to North Strabane Township or any other governmental body.

Moyar continued she is concerned, because we have so many developers involved, things that were promised and not delivered, as well as a homeowner's association. Who will be responsible for what?

Venture responded he tried to spell out the responsibilities as he perceives them in the response letter. Jeffries asked why he doesn't want to put this in writing.

Woody Welsh commented he can only be responsible for what he and Dan Caste are purchasing. Responsibility of roads and so on in prior phases should fall back onto Summerbrook LLC.

Moyar questioned why this is being called phases 3, 4 and 5. Welsh answered it probably makes more sense to call it phase 3A, 3B, and 3C. The work will be divided into sub-phases, if you will.

Moyar answered that this is really a master plan within a master plan.

She continued she feels we need to have in writing from the developer(s) exactly what each will be responsible for.

Venture commented the developer's agreement will address the responsibility. The response is no, not necessarily. Moyar stated there are many issues that come up that may not be within the developer's agreement. There are complaints about builders putting mud into storm sewer systems, which are installed by the developer, just as an example.

Venture stated there are issues which are occurring right now, whether or not this phase 3 ever is developed. The problem is that there has not been one person in charge of the Summerbrook plan. There have been several different individuals making decisions, which has led to this situation.

Moyar asked who owns the residual. Welsch stated he believes Ted Taylor owns the remainder of the lots in phase 2, and Summerbrook owns the remainder of the property.

Wintermyer commented this needs to be legally worked out, and a legal document created and signed by the developer(s).

Venture stated there will be one homeowner's association.

After further discussion, Moyar pointed out this is only for preliminary approval. We can discuss this further before final approval is requested.

Venture suggested we have legal counsel for the developer discuss this with our solicitor. Welsch reiterated Oakbrook-Muse Partners will take full responsibility for all the items they are required to take responsibility for.

Neil Kelly asked about a white square shown on the plan. Ventore stated that is not part of this development. It is not a buildable lot. There is an easement for access for maintenance. All the open space we propose is physically linked to the right of way.

MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY
SUBDIVISION
APPROVAL FOR
SUMMERROOK
PHASE 3

Motion by Stayduhar, seconded by Wintermyer, to recommend preliminary subdivision approval, pending the legal representatives for Oakbrook-Muse Partners meeting with our solicitor to hammer out an agreement, stating what will be covered by each different entity, and all other requirements for final site plan approval, as per the Gateway Engineers review letter dated April 15, 2011.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES – 4 YES 0 NO.

MOTION FOR
ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Stayduhar, seconded by Erdner to adjourn the meeting, all business being concluded.

ROLL CALL OF VOTES – 4 YES 0 NO. The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 P.M.

Norma Wintermyer, Chairperson

Linda Romito, Secretary