

APPROVED

**MUNICIPALITY OF MT. LEBANON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

DATE: Tuesday, May 24, 2016

TIME: 7 p.m.

PLACE: Mt. Lebanon Municipality – Commission Chambers

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Pittman, Suzanne Seiber, Bill Pope, Jim Cannon

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Municipal Planner Ian McMeans, Municipal Engineer Dan Deiseroth, Municipal Manager Keith McGill

Agenda Items

Minutes of the April 26, 2016, Planning Board meeting. Mr. Cannon moved and Mr. Pope seconded to approve the April 26, 2016, Planning Board minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Business

- a. Request for a recommendation for final approval for the Shady Grove Consolidation Plan. RDC Design Build, Inc. has equitable interest in a property located on an unopened section of Pennsylvania Boulevard. The developer is requesting approval to consolidate four parcels currently identified as lot and block 192-C-23, 192-C-24, 192-C-30 and 192-C-32 in the Avondale Plan of Lots.

Mr. Deiseroth entered into the record a letter from Gateway Engineers dated May 19, 2016.

John Koenig, 433 Ashland Avenue, asked when the process started.

Mr. McGill, explained the process and what had occurred.

Ms. Seiber moved and Mr. Canon seconded to recommend final approval for the Shady Grove consolidation plan. The motion carried unanimously.

- b. Request for preliminary approval of a land development plan. RDC Design Build, Inc. has equitable interest in a property located on an unopened section of Pennsylvania Boulevard. The developer is requesting preliminary approval of a land development plan to construct a 30-unit multi-family building with parking and associated infrastructure. As part of the project Pennsylvania Boulevard from its intersection with Poplar Avenue will be brought up to municipal standards by the developer and dedicated for acceptance by the municipality.

John Deklewa, RDC Design Build, gave a presentation regarding the background and design for the property. He said originally this property was approved in 2007-2008 for a

12-unit townhome subdivision development. The road design and the stormwater management was approved at that time. He is proposing one building with 30 parking spaces inside the building, one for each unit, and an additional 16 parking spaces on the right side of the plan. They met with staff at the end of 2015 to present ideas, then came to the Planning Board officially in February 2016. They have received engineering comments from Gateway and have responded to those comments. They have added more trees than previously submitted. He said they believe this project meets the zoning requirements and the intent of the comprehensive plan of the municipality. They have built the same building in Murrsville, Cranberry, Upper St. Clair, and soon in Robinson Township.

Mr. Deiseroth said some issues discussed at the last planning board meeting included the impact of the development on the neighborhood, and the view from Ashland Avenue.

Mr. Deiseroth asked if they had prepared a sight line drawing.

Mr. Deklewa presented a rear elevation rendering to the board.

Mr. Deiseroth explained where Ashland is in relation to this project and what the possible view would be. He also explained that the site would require retaining walls; one would be approximately 12 feet and the second approximately four feet. This will provide a transition down from Long Way. One concern was regarding the type of trees that would be planted. He indicated Long Way would not be affected. The site development will occur from the retaining wall towards Pennsylvania Boulevard. The developer will try to maintain as much of the current vegetation as they can on Long Way.

Mr. Deiseroth read into the record a letter from Gateway Engineers dated May 19, 2016, for preliminary approval. He asked Mr. Deklewa to describe what additional landscaping or adjustments were made to the plantings.

Mr. Deklewa explained what types of plantings they have added to the plan.

Citizen Comments

Karen Earley, 322 Pennsylvania Boulevard, asked about the maturity of the trees that would be planted.

Mr. Deklewa explained that the pine trees would be six to eight feet in height. The caliper of the deciduous trees would be approximately 2½ inches, or approximately eight feet tall.

Ms. Earley also asked about the lighting from the parking lot.

Al Winkler, JR Gales & Associates, said they have not yet completed the plans for the lighting, but they will have zero foot candles onto other properties. There will not be any overflow lighting to adjacent properties. He said lights from car headlights would hit the wall below the property line.

Mr. Deiseroth clarified that there is approximately 50 feet from the Earley's home to the parking lot and there is a 14-foot grade down to the parking lot.

DJ Mosshart, 349 Ashland Avenue, asked for clarification regarding the status of the approval for this project. He voiced concern with several items: 1) the construction and long-term life of the retaining walls; 2) the possibility of using two different contractors constructing the walls; 3) the water collection and conveyance system and what is proposed by the developer; 4) the view from the residences above the proposed development once the trees have been cut; 5) if there will be mechanical units placed on the roof.

Mr. Deklewa said the use of two separate retaining walls is because of the prior retaining wall that was approved along the cul-de-sac. A small retaining wall needs to be built on the low side adjacent to the LRT tracks. He did not want to change the design or specifications because it was already reviewed and vetted by the Port Authority's engineers eight years ago, as well as the municipal public works department. The retaining walls that they will construct will be designed by an engineer, approved by an engineer, and inspected by an engineer.

Mr. Pittman asked if there was a difference between the functionality of the two walls.

Mr. Deklewa said there are different components to how the walls are constructed; they are designed and specified for a specific purpose. The lock-and-load wall will be used around the cul-de-sac; versalock will be used behind the development, and will be tiered.

Mr. Deiseroth said there has been discussion between Gateway and with the current engineer. He described what would be required for building the wall.

Mr. Deklewa said there would not be any air conditioning condensers on the roof, but there will be a limited number of vent stacks that will be painted the same color as the roof. These stacks should protrude from the roof by about eight inches.

Jerry Turk, 344 Ashland Avenue, asked about the height of the retaining walls and asked about the effect of the development on Long Way.

Mr. Deklewa said Long Way is a public right-of-way and they will not be blocking it. The two retaining walls will be about four feet and ten feet. The top of the wall will be approximately eight feet from Long Way.

Dan Earley, 322 Pennsylvania Boulevard, suggested the developer use pine trees over maples, because they would grow faster. He asked about the time frame for construction, and if this would inhibit his ability to reach his home.

Mr. Deklewa said the construction period lasts about 10 months. He assured Mr. Earley he would always have access to his home.

Ms Sieber asked if they had an estimated start date.

Mr. Deklewa said they can move quickly once they have received approval from the Commission. They hope to start within 30 days of that approval.

Mr. McGill gave an overview of what the process for getting an approval entails.

Mr. Pope asked about the process for the waivers and modifications.

Mr. McGill explained about the modification from the previous proposed development with regard to the cul-de-sac and if an emergency vehicle could have adequate access. The fire department vetted the proposed design and found it to be adequate. The planning board is a recommending body, so they would make recommendations to the commission regarding any waivers and modifications requested by the developer.

Jay Nestor, 335 Pennsylvania Boulevard, is concerned with confusion regarding the name of Pennsylvania Boulevard, and asked if there could be signage to help clear up that confusion. He also asked about the effects of lights from cars, as they exit the building, on properties across from the development.

Mr. Deklewa indicated the lighting from the development is not allowed to leave the property. They are responsible for providing a photo metric plan that shows the submitted foot-candles.

Mr. Deiseroth said they will examine that issue with lights across the tracks from the development.

Mr. Nestor asked if there would possibly more development further down the road, once the road is brought to municipal standards.

Mr. Deiseroth indicated anyone that owns property in that area could make a proposal for development once the street is completed.

Mr. Nestor voiced concerns regarding access to the trails in that area. He said there are problems with people loitering in that area late at night.

John Koenig, 433 Ashland, is concerned with the preliminary approval process. He is not sure this project is a good fit for this particular property. He wants to make sure the project is done right and is good for the neighborhood.

Mr. Mosshart, 349 Ashland, said he thinks the previous resident was outside the 200-foot notification radius. He said he has had full access to all of the plans and has been notified of the process.

Mr. McMeans said after the developer submit their application and drawings they are available in the municipal offices for residents to view.

Mr. McGill further explained the process and what is considered public information.

Mr. Nester asked what type of units are being proposed.

Mr. Deklewa said they are rentals at approximately \$1,300 per month.

Ms Seiber asked the developer to provide a better quality cross-section so the board would have a better understanding of what the residences will see from the properties on the high side.

Ms. Seiber moved and Mr. Canon seconded to grant preliminary approval for the Shady Grove land development plan conditioned on the engineer's review comments in a letter dated May 19, 2016, providing a method to shield the lights from the homes across the tracks from the development, providing a cross section of the site, comments from the planning board and the commission granting any requested waivers or modifications. Motion carried unanimously.

New Business

- a. Proposed Retail Building 1701 Cochran Road Land Development Plan – a request for a recommendation for final approval for a land development plan to reuse an existing two-story brick building and construct a new two-story commercial building on property located at 1701 Cochran Road.

Craig Cozza, Cozza Enterprises, said they have addressed all of the comments from the last meeting, as well as what was requested in the letter from Gateway Engineers.

Mr. Deiseroth asked that the letter from Gateway Engineers, dated May 19, 2016, be accepted into the record. He asked the developer to explain what changes they made to the driveway.

Randy Bowers, engineer for the developer, said this is a significant change per Gateway's traffic engineer. They moved the proposed curb cut ten feet from the property line along Cochran Road, which is now shown on the plans.

Mr. Deiseroth clarified that the distance between the driveways is approximately 75 feet, and is a "right-in/right-out" only driveway. He also had asked the developer to add additional landscaping to the residential side of the development to provide further screening.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

John Lisowski, 774 Colony Circle, is concerned with the screening for his property. He is concerned that there are not enough trees, and that the trees that are currently there are dead.

Mr. Deiseroth encouraged the developer to add more foliage on the hillside to shield their property better.

Mr. Pope asked about the site lighting, if there would be one transformer or any exterior meters.

Mr. Cozza indicated the utilities won't change on the existing building. And they will provide screening for the new building.

Mr. Pope asked about the location for the HVAC condensing units.

Mr. Cozza said they would be sitting on the ground behind the building and would be screened.

Mr. McMeans asked about the internal traffic flow and expressed concern with cross-over traffic.

Mr. Bowers said this intersection could create an area of conflict.

Mr. McMeans asked about the trash removal.

Mr. Cozza said the flow will be one way for the trash collector.

Mr. Lisowski voiced concern regarding turning left out of the site.

Mr. Pope moved and Mr. Canon seconded to recommend final approval of the Proposed Retail Building, 1701 Cochran Road Land Development Plan conditioned on the municipal engineer's review letter dated May 19, 2016, the traffic engineer's review letter dated February 11, 2016, modifications of landscaping plan along southeastern property line, other issues identified by the board, and approval of any requested waivers by the Mt. Lebanon Commission, and the municipal engineer's approval of the site lighting plan. The motion carried unanimously.

Next Meeting – The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Mt. Lebanon Planning Board is **Tuesday, June 28, 2016**, at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.