

**MUNICIPALITY OF MT. LEBANON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MEETING HELD VIRTUALLY**

DATE: Tuesday, January 19, 2021

TIME: 7 p.m.

PLACE: Mt. Lebanon Municipality – Commission Chambers

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Andrew George, Dennis Pittman, Clint Rounsfull, David Hornicak, Suzanne Seiber (chair)

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

AUDIENCE PRESENT: Commissioner Steve Silverman, Matthew Moses (Historic Preservation Board Liaison)

Meeting Procedures and Outline – The Pennsylvania Office of Open Records has advised that to ensure continued compliance with the Sunshine Act, the procedures for online meetings should be stated at the beginning of the meeting. There is one applicant appearing before the board tonight. I will read the agenda item and then the applicant will have the opportunity to make remarks. After that, the Planning Board will provide their comments and feedback followed by members of the public. Finally, we will play and read any public comments related to the application that were received prior to the meeting. Any public comments received not relating to the application before the board will be read at the end of the meeting. The applicant has agreed to these procedures, including conducting the meeting virtually.

1. Meeting Minutes

- a. Approval of minutes from December 15, 2020, meeting. Mr. Pittman moved, and Mr. Hornicak seconded to approve the minutes of the December 15, 2020, Planning Board meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Old Business

- a. None

3. New Business

- a. Request for preliminary approval for a minor subdivision plan. Dr. Ali Melhem owns the neighboring properties located at 824 and 830 Osage Road with lot and block numbers 99-E-60 and 99-E-66. The plan moves the interior property line between the lots by 40.90 feet.

Dr. Ali Melhem thanked the board for reviewing his application. He said he has purchased the two properties and in order to build a pool the property line needs to be moved.

Mr. Pittman asked for clarification regarding if moving the property line would put the pool on the other property from where it currently is.

Dr. Melhem said that was correct.

Mr. Pittman asked Mr. Deiseroth about the setbacks.

Mr. Deiseroth said the swimming pool is an accessory structure and needs a five-foot setback, which they have, but it needs to be reflected on the plan.

Mr. Hornicak said asked about the easements for the sanitary sewer line, and if the pool might be too close.

Mr. Deiseroth said if the sanitary line were a public line then the pool would be too close, but it is a private lateral, and the responsibility lies with the property owner, and under the jurisdiction of the Allegheny County Health Department. He did talk with Tim Mahoney and confirmed there needs to be an easement on the sewer, and the deeds will need to be rewritten to reflect that Lot #1 would use the sewer, and Lot #2 would allow the sewer to cross over the property to the main.

Mr. George asked if Dr. Melhem lived in the house on 824 Osage. And if so, what are the plans for the other property.

Dr. Melhem said he plans to remodel the house that is there, so that when his parents come to visit for part of the year they can reside in that house.

Mr. Deiseroth read into the record a letter dated January 14, 2021, from Gateway Engineers.

Citizen Comments

There were no citizen comments.

Mr. Pittman moved, and Mr. Roundsfull seconded to grant preliminary approval to the Melhem Plan of Lots, moving the lot line by 40.90 feet between 830 Osage Road and 824 Osage Road, conditioned upon the applicant addressing the comments in the engineer's review letter dated January 14, 2021, and any additional comments from the planning board. The motion carried unanimously.

- b. Request for preliminary approval of a land development plan. Flash Point Partners, LLC owns the property at 62 Cedar Boulevard and is requesting approval of a land development plan to construct a Two-family Dwelling with associated grading, landscaping, and stormwater management. The property is zoned as R-4 Residential. Two-Family Dwellings are a Use by Right in the R-4 District.

Matt Cramer, Flash Point Partners, LLC, said they own the property 62 Cedar Boulevard, situated in an R-4 zoning district. The property currently has an older home on the property, which they are planning on razing and replacing with two townhomes. Each townhome will be 24 feet wide and 37 feet deep. The plan meets the specifications for an R-4 district and therefore does not need any variances or modifications. He does not have the elevations and floorplans for tonight's meeting.

Ms. Seiber said she has not seen any drawings showing what the townhomes will look like.

Mr. Cramer said they have changed the design of the townhomes, but do not have those revisions, yet. He said they would be front entry and front garages; the front entrance would be on the first level, but he does not have a finished elevation for tonight's meeting.

Ms. Seiber asked if the design would be similar to the townhomes recently constructed on Washington Road, called Uptown Place.

Mr. Cramer said they would be similar, but not quite as high-end.

Mr. George said there was no landscaping plan and asked if it would be provided for the next submission.

Mr. Cramer said there will be grass in the side yards, but there is not a lot of room for landscaping because of the slope of the property. He said he can have a landscaping plan ready by the next meeting.

Mr. Deiseroth read into the record a letter dated January 14, 2021, from Gateway Engineers.

Mr. George asked about the valve and what happens to the water that is in there.

Mr. Deiseroth said if there's no ground water, or need for a sump pump related to water at the facility, the tank could be used for storage during the winter months, and then it could discharge when conditions permit. The only other solution would be to extend the storm sewer by approximately 1,000 feet, which is not realistic.

Mr. George asked what happens when it **(the tank?)** fills up and the valve is shut.

Mr. Deiseroth said it operates in the overflow. He feels it is the best solution based on the limited space they have to work with.

Mr. Hornicak asked if Mr. Cramer had done any test pits on site.

Mr. Cramer said they have not done any test pits because the house is still there.

Mr. Hornicak gave some instructions and said he feels Mr. Deiseroth's solution is the best one. He is concerned about the tight fit with the tank, and that water may be sitting for long periods of time. This is something that will need to be watched to determine if there are other issues. He is also concerned about the walls in the back of the property and whether the properties above are adequately collecting their waters. This will also need to be watched.

Mr. Cramer said there is a small yard drain in the backyard, but they will have some small drains behind the wall to help mitigate the water drainage.

Mr. Hornicak asked if they would be making a wall out of versa-lock.

Mr. Cramer said they have not made that decision yet.

Mr. Hornicak asked if the steps up the side of the building would be concrete or wood.

Mr. Cramer said they would be concrete.

Mr. Hornicak asked about spot elevations and ramps by the driveway, and meeting ADA requirements.

Kim Gales, J.R. Gales & Assocs., said they have no problems addressing any of Gateway's comments, and will be conducting an infiltration test.

Mr. Deiseroth asked if the railings by the steps would be iron.

Mr. Cramer said they are planning on black vinyl railings.

Citizen Comments

There were no citizen comments.

Mr. George moved, and Mr. Hornicak seconded to table the Cedar Place Land Development Plan in order to give the developer the opportunity to address the comments in the engineer's review letter dated January 14, 2021, and any additional comments from the planning board. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Citizen Comments

There were no citizen comments.

5. Next Meeting — The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Mt. Lebanon Planning Board is **Tuesday, February 16, 2021**, at 7:00 p.m.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.