

MINUTES OF TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Monday, November 9, 2015

Pine Community Center

This session of the Township of Pine Planning Commission was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Michael Hansen, Chair.

Members in attendance were: Michael Hansen, Chair; Joel Dennison, Vice-Chair; Steve Olshavsky; John Lombardo; and Renee Evans. Also present were Larry Kurpakus, Director of Code Administration and Land Development; and Robert Firek, Lennon, Smith, Souleret Engineering, Inc. (LSSE).

There were approximately 30 visitors present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Hansen explained that the Planning Commission is a recommending body and all approvals must be received from the Board of Supervisors.

MINUTES

The minutes of the October 12, 2015 Planning Commission meeting were not approved because two Planning Commission members were not present at tonight's meeting. The minutes will be approved at the December 14, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

SUNSET RIDGE PRD

Mr. Kurpakus reported that Riviera Land Partners, L.P. is proposing a 47 lot Planned Residential Development (PRD) on a 54.5 acre parcel located along Pearce Mill Road. Access to the development will be from a single township road connection to Pearce Mill Road. A pedestrian trail connection is proposed to link to the existing pedestrian trail to Pinecrest Estates. The plan proposes ½ acre minimum single family detached building lots, stormwater management, landscaping and pedestrian improvements. The planning commission tabled the application at the October meeting to allow the applicant to address outstanding engineering comments. The application includes four modification requests and one waiver request. There are minor outstanding items noted on the LSSE review letter dated November 4, 2015. The applicant, Marty Gillespie of Riviera Land Partners, L.P, replied that their engineer has addressed the issues noted in the LSSE review letter.

Mr. Hansen commented on moving the stormwater detention basin and the right-of-way on the northern part of the property. Mr. Gillespie replied that there will be trail connection at the lower cul-de-sac, and the right-of-way to the detention pond is for pond access only.

Mr. Dennison asked if the developer had any comment concerning the EAC's recommendation. Mr. Gillespie replied that the EAC's suggestions are fine.

Due to the layout of the trees of significance, Mr. Dennison identified the EAC's recommendation for adding a 25' conservation easement on the back of the lots; this will give relief to the number of trees that are to be replaced. Mr. Kurpakus replied that it can be addressed on the recording plan, particularly cut and fill areas.

Mr. Hansen asked if the LSSE letter posed any challenges. Mr. Kurpakus replied that the developer's engineer has acknowledged their comments.

Motion was made by Mr. Dennison and seconded by Mrs. Evans to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve a waiver of section 48-16 to allow 2:1 slopes as shown on the submitted drawings to limit disturbance to existing woodlands with condition that additional mitigation trees to be planted on the slope per the woodland replacement requirements of the Code. The aye vote on the motion was unanimous. Motion carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Mr. Dennison and seconded by Mr. Olshavsky to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant tentative approval of the Sunset Ridge P.R.D. drawings CS, C061, C501-C514, C520, L101 and L601 dated September 2015 and revised 10/29/15 and prepared by Gateway Engineers and C101, C111, C121, C131-C135, C601-C605, C701 and 4 Recording Plan drawings dated September 2015 and prepared by Gateway Engineers with applicable modifications as summarized in the project narrative with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the LSSE Review letter dated 11/4/15
2. Compliance with the HRG Review letter dated 4/23/15
3. Compliance with the EAC recommendation dated 9/16/15 including the recording of a 25' conservation easement on the rear of the building lots and an increase of the diameter of the street trees from 2.5" to 3.5"
4. Compliance with the Parks and Recreation recommendation dated 7/14/15 with exception that a 25' pedestrian easement is provided along Pearce Mill Road with additional grading for future trail construction in lieu of construction of the required sidewalk.
5. Grading easements to be provided on lots 204 and 206 to provide for future street construction to the undeveloped parcel to the south
6. Proposed trail construction to be a minimum of 8' wide asphalt with detail to be provided on the recording plan
7. Lot #204 to be revised to include the required bufferyard to the property to the south.
8. Developer to construct sidewalk along Birch Lane fronting common open space "C" and lot 137

The aye vote on the motion was unanimous. Motion carried.

FOREST VIEW PLAZA LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. Kurpakus reported that TEC Construction is proposing a 32,100 square foot general office building located along Swinderman Road in the C-2 Zoning District. Office buildings are a permitted use in the C-2 Zoning district. The project includes surface and structured parking, landscaping and stormwater management. The plan submitted shows pedestrian improvements to connect to the Tanglewood open space. No review by Parks and Recreation or the EAC was completed since the plan is less than 10 acres in area. There are minor outstanding items noted on the LSSE review letter dated 10/27/15. The township engineer's traffic review is pending.

The applicant engineer, Sara Moore of Moore Design Associates, introduced the applicant, Kurt Schweiger of TEC Construction and the architect, Rick Avon of Avon Graf Architects, LLC.

TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 9, 2015
Page 3

Ms. Moore stated that she has received and responded to LSSE's review, but did not have time to update the drawings. They are proposing a 32,000 square foot building. Swinderman Road's topography slopes downhill to a wetland and a pond that is on TEC Construction's and a neighbor's properties; grading will be done along Swinderman Road. Parking will be limited to the front and side, a garage in the rear of the building will contain parking. The site plan includes an exterior patio and terrace space to overlook the wetlands; a 50' setback from the wetlands; 2 raingardens; the sanitary sewer easement will cross the wetlands; and a mulch walk will connect Tanglewood. Mr. Avon added they are using an existing easement, and Ms. Moore added that a sanitary sewer extension will be available for the applicant and other adjacent property owners.

Kurt Reuter, 160 Swinderman Road, stated Swanson Lane is a private drive and privately maintained. He asked where construction vehicles will be parked, and if private lane or no trespassing signs could be posted. He also asked if Swanson Lane would have sidewalks and street lights. Mr. Kurpakus replied that standard improvements would be required if the land was further developed, the only exception would be improvements made by the township. Mr. Reuter stated that residents on Route 910 had received extensive lighting and sidewalk improvements. Mr. Firek replied that the township has been working on "missing link" projects, adding sidewalks and streetlights. The township could in the future tie missing pieces together.

Mr. Hansen stated that he did not realize Mr. Reuter's property is a private residence, and asked if there is a buffer between his property and the proposed development. Mr. Kurpakus replied that there will be a 10' buffer to Swanson Lane and Mr. Reuter's property is located across Swanson Lane.

Marijn Ford of 104 Tanglewood Drive stated that he is pleased that a sidewalk will connect Tanglewood to Kiddie Academy. Mr. Hansen replied that the applicant will need to work in conjunction with the Tanglewood Homeowners' Association if the trail on the Tanglewood open space is to be constructed.

Margaret Richardson, 158 Tanglewood Drive, stated that the proposed trail will run down the side of her yard, and she is concerned about the safety of opening her neighborhood up to outsiders. She is also concerned about a deep slope that runs into her backyard, and asked what will be done to alleviate stormwater runoff. She also questioned if the building's lighting will illuminate her backyard. Mr. Firek replied the applicant has met the requirements of stormwater management. Mr. Hansen added that the trail will need to be addressed by the Tanglewood Homeowners' Association.

Robert McKinney, 435 Swanson Lane, the second home behind Mr. Reuter's, stated that he shares the same concerns as the others. He added that he has a special interest in the barrier between the commercial area and the residential area. Although he is in the middle of a commercial area, the aesthetics should remain as close as possible to a residential area while allowing progress. Mr. McKinney also stated that he is concerned with the landscape fence. Colorado blue spruce is not a good choice since they die from the bottom, grow slowly, and need to be pruned. He asked if the existing deciduous trees will be taken down. Ms. Moore replied that they would be removed. Mr. McKinney replied that disturbing the trees would make them die eventually and they should be removed. Mr. McKinney asked if something else could be planted. He suggested planting eastern hemlock and to consider planting groupings. He stated that the groupings would be aesthetically pleasing and not designed to be a barrier. He added that having a barrier will not stop the building's lights from shining into his and his neighbor's houses.

TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 9, 2015
Page 4

Mr. Olshavsky asked if a 10' buffer with a tree line would be along Swanson Lane. Mr. Kurpakus replied the buffer would be between Swanson Lane and the parking lot. Mr. McKinney stated that the buffer would not be wide enough to accommodate the proposed trees. Mr. Olshavsky asked if the 10' buffer could be expanded. Ms. Moore replied that the amount of parking will be reduced and therefore the size of building will have to be reduced. She added that 6' spruce or arborvitae, not hemlock, could be planted. Mr. Dennison asked if the required parking calculations had been considered and if it is possible to have more landscaped islands in the parking lot. Ms. Moore replied that it is possible, but it will affect the amount of parking. Mr. Dennison asked who the tenants will be. Mr. Schweiger replied that it will have typical 9-5 office type tenants. Mr. Dennison stated that he has concerns about light infusion; he added that it should be minimal.

Mr. Dennison asked if the applicant has spoken with the Tanglewood Homeowners' Association about the mulch trail. Mr. Schweiger replied that the path will stop at the end of his property and he will talk to the homeowners' association later as it will be a cooperative effort.

Mr. Lombardo asked if TEC Construction owns the property right up to Swanson Lane. Ms. Moore replied that there is 5-8' of green space between the road and the border. Mr. Lombardo asked who owns Swanson Lane. Ms. Moore replied that Swanson Lane is a right-of-way and is owned by the residents of Swanson Lane. Mr. Lombardo asked if trees could be planted along the right-of-way. Mr. Schweiger replied that trees could be planted. Mr. Lombardo added that they will need to receive permission from the residents of Swanson Lane. Mr. Dennison and Mr. Lombardo suggested talking to everyone along Swanson Lane.

Mrs. Evans asked if the construction right-of-way could be moved. Ms. Moore replied that she has talked to the contractors and the construction entrance will be moved away from Swanson Lane.

Mrs. Evans asked about the building elevations not shown on the drawing and what the residents of Tanglewood will see. Mr. Avon replied that the look of the elevations shown on the drawing will continue to the side not shown and the back, although the elevation will be taller. Mrs. Evans asked if the back will continue straight across. Mr. Avon replied that the terraces will break up the elevations.

Mr. Hansen stated that the developers want to build on a commercially zoned area next to a residential area and they have met the conditions to build there. He added that the applicant needs to take building next to a residential area into consideration. Mr. Dennison stated that the applicant should speak with township staff concerning the waiver requests, and the tree minimum will stay at 2.5 inches.

Mr. Hansen stated that the light fixture originally approved by the township has been discontinued, but there is a replacement for it. He also asked if the lights could be put on a timer. Mr. Schweiger and Ms. Moore replied that it could be done. Mr. Dennison stated that the photometric plan will need to be revised to limit illumination to 0.5 foot candles. Mr. Avon and Ms. Moore replied that they will make the adjustments to reduce the illumination.

TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 9, 2015
Page 5

Mr. Hansen asked if there were any issues with LSSE's letter. Ms. Moore replied that there were no issues. Mr. Hansen added that they need to work with Tanglewood Homeowners' Association if they want a trail.

Mr. Dennison asked if there was response to HRG's traffic letter. Mr. Kurpakus replied that a response is pending from the applicant.

Mr. Lombardo stated that if Tanglewood Homeowners' Association does not want a trail it won't happen, although not having a formal trail will not stop people from cutting through. He added that he wanted to clarify that the residents of Tanglewood have not wanted trails in past. Mr. Dennison replied that there will be a foot trail whether it's built or not, and to try to work with Tanglewood Homeowners' Association to construct a mulch trail.

Motion was made by Mr. Dennison and seconded by Mr. Lombardo to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of section 48-18A to allow 2:1 slopes as shown on the submitted plan set to limit disturbance to the wetland buffer. The aye vote on the motion was unanimous.

Motion was made by Mr. Dennison and seconded by Mrs. Evans to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of section 78-49C to allow disturbance within 50' of a wetland for the construction of a mulch walking trail and install additional landscaping and utilities. The aye vote on the motion was unanimous.

Motion was made by Mr. Dennison and seconded by Mr. Olshavsky to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant preliminary and final approval of the Forest View Plaza land development plan drawings C001, C200, C201, C202, C300, C301, C302, C400, C600, C601, C602, C603, C604, C605, C700, C701, C702, L100 and L101 dated 10/9/15 and prepared by Moore Design Associates, drawing C100 dated 8/21/15 and prepared by Pedersen & Pedersen, drawings A1.00, A1.01 and A2.00 dated 10/9/15 and prepared by Avon Graf Architects and drawings ES-1.0 and ES-1.1 dated 10/7/15 and prepared by Iams Consulting with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the LSSE review letter dated October 27, 2015
2. Compliance with the HRG review letter dated November 16, 2015
3. Developer to provide written easement agreement from the Tanglewood Homeowners' Association prior to any encroachment or construction of the mulch trail on Tanglewood property
4. Revise the photometric plan to limit illumination to 0.5 foot candles along the Swanson Lane right of way per Township Code section 84-112
5. Submission of rear elevation of the building for staff review to insure Code approved materials and articulation
6. Construction entrance is to be shown on the plan
7. Enhance buffer planting along Swanson Lane and include landscape groupings

The aye vote on the motion was unanimous. Motion carried.

VILLAGE AT PINE PRD PHASE VI

Mr. Kurpakus reported that Gigliotti Holding, L.P. is proposing an amendment #1 to the Village at Pine Planned Residential Development (PRD) to include an additional 28.8 acre parcel to the east for the construction of 41 additional single family residential lots with two street extensions to be known as Phase 6. The project includes the extension of Eddie Lewis Drive to serve an additional 15 lots and the construction of a new township street to serve the remaining 26 lots. The project includes landscaping, stormwater management and pedestrian improvements. The submission has been reviewed for compliance with the tentative approval granted April 6, 1999 as well as Township Code requirements. The township engineer has reviewed the land development, the EAC submitted a report dated 11/8/15 and the township traffic engineer submitted a review dated 11/6/15. No additional review was required by the Parks and Recreation Committee. The application includes four modification requests.

The applicant engineer Don Trant of Trant Corporation stated that this is the first amendment to the Village at Pine PRD. It contains 28.5 acres, adjacent to Phases 5A and 5C, forty-one single family lots, 24 lots on the west with access to Village Club Drive, and 17 single family lots on the east with access from Eddie Lewis Drive, the existing loop will be reconfigured. The plan will have 11 acres of open space and a 7 acre lot will be donated to a conservancy by the developer. Several small wetlands and a large wetland are to be preserved. A traffic study analyzed the intersection at Route 910, and it was determined that no traffic signal or any other improvements are needed. Mr. Hansen stated that the township engineer did not have enough data for the traffic analysis. Mr. Trant replied that he did not receive HRG's response letter, and Mr. Kurpakus gave him a copy of it.

Mr. Trant stated that the EAC site walk was on Sunday morning and he received their report today. The EAC report listed 497 trees of significance and Trant reported 460. Mr. Trant stated that 37 trees will be added to the plan. He noted that the EAC calculated the number of trees differently than the method used in the original PRD. The original calculations should be used since this is an amendment, but they will comply with the EAC's number. Mr. Hansen asked Mr. Kurpakus how the EAC came up with their number. Mr. Kurpakus replied that the ordinance has changed since the original approval, and the end number is correct. Mr. Trant replied that they are agreeable to 497 trees as recommended by the EAC.

Diane Berger, 120 Kestler Drive, stated that her property is near the upper rim of Phase 3, and understood this would be densely populated plan when she purchased her property. She added that she was promised a 40' green space when she purchased her home, and there is a difference between a green space and an open space. Ms. Berger also stated that she was promised by the builder that it would remain open because the parcel was land locked. She added that the buffer should be maintained and the drop is very steep. Ms. Berger stated that homeowners will have trouble reselling their homes because there is no space between the homes. The greenspace should not include wetlands. Ms. Berger added that no playground has been built and the other amenities for Phase 2 have not been completed and this is not fair to the 500 residents.

TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 9, 2015
Page 7

Rajvi Patel, 122 Kestler Drive, stated that she agrees with Ms. Berger and was also told by the builder it was green space when she purchased her home. She added that the amenities like the playground and the soccer fields have not been completed. Mr. Hansen replied that he apologizes for not having answers, but he cannot control what the builder says.

Jodi Vasalani, 104 Kestler Drive, asked what type of trees will replace the trees that are to be taken down. He added that he is concerned about the quality of the trees. Mr. Trant replied that there is a bonding requirement of 1 year for trees. Mr. Kurpakus added that the developer is bonded and dead trees will be replaced.

Gregg Brown, 110 Hill Road, stated that his property is located east of the proposed plan and the houses on the east side will abut his property. He added that the property next to him is currently wooded. Mr. Hansen replied that 497 trees of significance have been identified and they will be replaced or the developer may pay a fee in lieu. Mr. Brown asked how close the homes will be to his property line, and if there will be a buffer. Mr. Trant replied the back of the lots will be 40' from Mr. Brown's property line, and the new homes will be a total of 80' from Mr. Brown's property. Many of the trees will remain, and trees will be planted on the slope. Mr. Brown asked what type of trees will be planted. Mr. Trant replied that it will be a combination of trees.

Mr. Brown stated that there are survey markers on his property and he is concerned that the surveys need to match before development starts. Mr. Trant replied that they are not required to set corners. Mr. Dennison advised Mr. Brown to have his surveyor contact the developer's surveyor.

Steve Leonard, 211 Pine Cone Court, stated that he attended the meetings for Phases 4 and 5 and thanked Mr. Kurpakus for following up on the plantings for Phase 5. Mr. Leonard stated that his generalized comment is that the residents of Oakhaven don't believe there are enough buffers; if the plan is approved as an amendment to an existing PRD the ratios for buffers will not be large enough. Mr. Leonard added that his specific comment on the plan is to remove the elbow shown on the plan as plantings will not grow well on the slope anyway.

Claire Schwarz, 121 Oakhaven Drive, stated that during Phase 5 the developer removed too many trees behind her house. She added that construction equipment will travel past the houses being built now, and the infrastructure should have been completed first. Ms. Schwarz stated that replacing 40" caliper trees with two small trees is not acceptable, and the township should be concerned about trees and the destruction of an oak forest. She added that since the infrastructure was not built first the land is landlocked, and the planning commission should say no to the development.

Kevin Lawler, 108 Kestler Drive stated that his main concern is the landscaping plan showing the addition of a new tree line. He uses part of the 40' buffer as his yard, and has planted grass and flowers. Mr. Lawler showed the planning commission members a picture of the trees that are to be removed. He stated that he believes that the planning commission is pushing to make it work as a development. He added that he has been lied to by the builder and that 3 of his 4 trees are dead and have not been replaced. He added that 20' high trees will never replace the 70' high trees that are there now. Mr. Lawler asked if all of the trees will be cut down. Mr. Trant replied that they would be.

TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 9, 2015
Page 8

Elaine Jewart, 111 Oakhaven Drive, stated that she was saddened to see the planning commission members' reactions to Mr. Lawler's comments. She added that she moved to the Township twenty years ago because it was green. She added that the town center is lovely, but the Township should require the developer to replace the trees with larger trees. She stated that the planning commission should not let the builder remove so many trees. She added that the planning commission needs to protect the community better. Mr. Hansen replied the developer is following Code and the planning commission can't make the developer do more. Mrs. Jewart replied the developer should be required to work with neighboring property owners. The planning commission is allowing the developer to devalue her home.

William Marshall, 119 Oakhaven Drive, stated that the phase was approved ending in a loop and asked if purchasing property caused the developer to change the plan. Mr. Hansen replied that the developer purchased the property and has submitted this plan to the planning commission. Mr. Marshall stated that the parcel is zoned R-2 and asked how it can be changed to TC-PRD. Mr. Dennison replied that it has been presented as an addition to an existing PRD. Mr. Marshall replied that the planning commission can choose to leave it as R-2 or change it to TC-PRD. Mr. Lombardo replied that it is not economically feasible for the developer to leave it as R-2, and that it is an amendment to a PRD. Mr. Kurpakus added that the parcel meets permitted use for TC-PRD, and the planning commission does not determine the zoning of a parcel, it is the applicant's option. The applicant has submitted the plan as an amendment of a TC-PRD. Mr. Marshall asked if controls are in place to monitor the planting of trees and the maintenance of a buffer. Mr. Hansen replied that the township staff will investigate if the developer is meeting the approved requirements.

Mr. Lawler stated that having a 40' buffer behind his house prohibited him from having a deck or morning room, and homes behind him will not have 40' buffer and will be able to put sheds behind him within 10' of his property. Mr. Kurpakus replied that the 40' buffer will remain. Mr. Lawler added that 35' of it will be torn up and replanted with ugly trees. Mr. Trant replied the 40' area will remain, it had been a buffer, but it will be graded. Mrs. Berger replied that the corner of a lot of an existing house lot is in grading area. Mr. Kurpakus replied that it has been addressed in the engineer's review.

Tom Jewart, 111 Oakhaven Drive, stated that the planning commission has no choice, but the builder and the developer do have a choice; they do not have to cram so many houses into the development, more setbacks could be provided, and they could leave the mature trees. He added they will not do it because they want to maximize every single dollar.

Mr. Brown stated that his last concern is a large parcel that appears untouched on the plan. Mr. Trant replied that the area shown in dark green will remain untouched. Mr. Brown asked if the area at the top of the development will be graded where grading lines are shown and small trees planted. Mr. Trant replied that it will be a new planting buffer. Mr. Brown asked if the only reason for grading is to make it easy to build, and if the natural buffer could be left along his property line. Mr. Trant replied they will take it into consideration. Mr. Brown stated that the deer will eat the newly planted small trees, and asked if the developer could leave as many mature trees as possible.

Mrs. Evans stated that the stream and wetlands are in the ravine, and asked if Pine Heights Drive could be moved east to allow for more space. Mr. Trant replied moving it would put it in a 50' buffer that they can't disturb.

TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 9, 2015
Page 9

Mr. Dennison stated that the planning commission had received many good comments and appreciates the residents' participation. He added the planning commission will do what they can to address the residents' concerns.

Mr. Trant stated that he wanted to make a clarification. There will be grading, but there will still be an 80-85' buffer between the houses, and the new houses will be the same type as what is already there, making it an equivalent or better plan.

Mr. Dennison stated that he agrees with the comments and concerns about the species and size of the replacement trees. He added that the idea of a PRD is to keep as much open space as possible and keep the lots small; and this property has challenges, a ravine and wetlands along the highway, and the developer is doing what he can. The developer is entitled to present his plan and the planning commission can't say no if he is meeting the requirements, the planning commission's job is to review the plan and make sure it meets Code. Mr. Olshavsky stated that he has the same concerns as Mr. Dennison, and he really doesn't like the plan.

Mr. Hansen stated that Mr. Lombardo brought up a great point about the length of the cul-de-sac, the cul-de-sac looks too long. He stated that his second concern is the amendment to the PRD. The property was just purchased and maybe it should be looked at as a stand-alone development. He asked Mr. Kurpakus what the setback would be. Mr. Kurpakus replied that Mr. Leonard is correct and the setback may be greater than proposed according to the bufferyard requirements in Code, but the plan has been reviewed for compliance with the Village at Pine tentative approval requirements. Mr. Hansen stated that it is unclear if the plan should be presented as a separate plan or an amendment to a PRD. He added that he suggests the plan should be tabled to discuss the issues. Mr. Dennison stated that he would like to ask staff for clarification about adding a parcel to an existing PRD. Mr. Kurpakus replied 84 Lumber is an example of adding a parcel to an existing PRD. Mr. Dennison replied that 84 Lumber is commercial, not residential. Mr. Trant stated that it is the same whether commercial or residential. Mr. Dennison replied adding the 84 Lumber parcel didn't impact residents. Mr. Dennison added that he would like to consult the township solicitor when amending a PRD and ask if the township is bound by the tentative approval or if a new decision can be made. Mr. Kurpakus replied that he will consult the solicitor.

Mr. Kurpakus stated that no notification will be sent for next month's meeting, but notification will be sent for Board of Supervisors' meeting. Mr. Dennison added the Board of Supervisors' meeting is the important meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Dennison and seconded by Mr. Lombardo to table the first amendment to the Village at Pine P.R.D. The aye vote on the motion was unanimous. Motion carried.

TOM ADAM WAREHOUSE SKETCH PLAN

Mr. Kurpakus reported that Tom Adam is proposing the construction of an 8,400 square foot warehouse building and associated parking and delivery areas to serve as a furniture storage and delivery warehouse at 11149 Babcock Boulevard. A warehouse is a conditional use in the C-2 Zoning District.

TOWNSHIP OF PINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 9, 2015
Page 10

The applicant engineer, Scott Shoup of Shoup Engineering, Inc., stated that the applicant, Tom Adam owns a Room Concepts furniture store on Route 19 and one in the South Hills. The parcel is 4.3 acres, has a floodplain, a tributary of Breakneck Creek and steep slopes. They are proposing an 8,400 square foot warehouse building and office; no sales will be made at this location. A warehouse is a conditional use in the C-2 zoning district. A metal building with color variation is being proposed. Mr. Shoup noted that a metal building for Sports and Courts was approved in the past. The proposed site will have 4-5 employees and be open from 8 am – 5 pm. Public sewer is available to the site, and well water will be used. Approximately 3 tractor trailers will enter per day. He added that the parcel probably has wetlands, and they may need a modification to encroach on the wetlands. Mr. Hansen replied a 50' buffer around wetlands is required and the planning commission does not grant waivers for building or parking, utilities are acceptable. Mr. Shoup added that stormwater management will be underground on higher ground because of the floodplain.

Mr. Olshavsky asked if trucks will be able to turn left. Mr. Shoup replied that they have used templates and have determined that trucks will be able to turn left. Mr. Dennison added that trucks will be able to pull in, back into the loading docks and exit. Mr. Shoup stated that 10,000 cubic yards of fill will need to be taken off site.

Mr. Dennison stated that he wants to see three sides of the building elevations and quality construction materials. Mr. Lombardo advised that the Sports and Courts building was approved 15 years ago.

Mr. Lombardo asked if the building will be built on a level pad. Mr. Shoup replied that it would. Mr. Lombardo asked if there will be adequate parking. Mr. Shoup replied that there will be adequate parking even with a greenway overlay and they have planned for expanded parking.

Mr. Lombardo stated that he is glad someone is doing something with the property; it will have a positive effect on the neighboring properties. Mr. Lombardo asked how far the building will be from Babcock Boulevard. Mr. Shoup replied 50'. Mr. Lombardo stated that he is concerned that there may not be enough room for fire trucks.

Mrs. Evans asked if the trailer trucks would be parked overnight. Mr. Shoup replied that there will be a 100' setback to meet the conditional use requirement. The setback is intended for maneuvering and parking of trailer trucks, it will also allow trailer trucks to be parked overnight since there will be a 100' buffer between the trucks and the three neighboring residences. Mr. Shoup indicated the trucks would not be stored on-site.

Mrs. Evans asked if the main entrance for employees is on the parking side of the building. Mr. Shoup replied that it would be. Mrs. Evans added that handicap accessibility and the building's façade at the employee entrance will need to be addressed.

Mr. Hansen stated that the planning commission will look at the conditional use and building material samples. Mr. Kurpakus added that sight distance will be reviewed for trucks, and a scoping meeting will be held with PennDOT and township staff.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Mr. Lombardo and seconded by Mr. Dennison to adjourn the meeting. The aye vote on the motion was unanimous. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.