

**BOROUGH OF GREEN TREE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
DECEMBER 13, 2017**

CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Green Tree Planning Commission met on Wednesday, December 13, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in the Sycamore Room of the Green Tree Municipal Center, 10 West Manilla Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15220.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rebecca Chembars, Chairman
Cheryl Bakin
James Turocy
Robert McWilliams

Also Present:

Harry Faulk, Assistant Borough Manager
Louis A. Casadei, P.E., Borough Engineer

Absent:

Thomas Bean
Paul Kirsch
Ed O'Donnell

HEARING OF THE CITIZENS

There was no one present who wished to be heard.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Ms. Chembars had nothing to report at this time.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

November 15, 2017

Mr. Turocy made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Bakin, to approve the November 15, 2017 Planning Commission minutes as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

SP-01-17

Applicant, Pennsylvania American Water, requesting approval for the development of its Green Tree Operations Center at the existing warehouse at 500 Noblestown Road.

Mr. Turocy asked if perhaps the subdivision plan should be addressed first before the site plan approval for this project. Ms. Chembars asked if one of the applications was a condition of the other. Mr. Casadei did not think that would be the case since the site is already developed.

Mr. Joel Mitchell, Senior Project Manager from Pennsylvania American Water Company (PAWC) and Mr. Alberto Jarquin from Gateway Engineers were present to discuss the proposed plans for 500 Noblestown Road and had also attended the November 15, 2017 Advisory Discussion at the last Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Mitchell said that PAWC has purchased the building at 500 Noblestown Road to use as an operations center for the Pittsburgh district of Pennsylvania American Water. The building will be used as warehouse and office space with some interior and exterior renovations. Mr. Jarquin said renovations include a mill and overlay of the existing parking areas. There are no plans to increase

any of the parking areas, add more parking, or more impervious area. Two new garage doors will be added to one side of the building. In order to do that, a 30-foot wide driveway that will be graded slightly higher than the existing grade to meet the garage doors. This renovation required the addition of more impervious area in this part of the property, but another section of parking spaces will be removed elsewhere to create more landscaped areas.

Mr. Jarquin said the lighting pole bases would remain where they are currently located, but new poles and new lighting fixtures will be installed. He said that upon review, Gateway Engineers has revised the lighting plan from the plan originally distributed, which was completed today. The revised plan shows the photometrics and the property line and is more detailed and complete than the other plan.

Mr. Jarquin pointed out a proposed shed on the property that is about 25-feet tall. The shed will be located on the part of the property located in Scott Township, which has a height limit of 14-feet for sheds. However, last week Scott Township granted a variance for this shed. Additionally, Scott Township's Code Official told Mr. Jarquin that the township would provide a letter stating that the Scott Township Planning Commission would not require the applicant to present a site plan.

Mr. Jarquin said the building will have office use, warehouse use, and indoor storage, requiring 221 parking spaces. The property will have 223 parking spaces. Review of the drawings continued.

Mr. Casadei presented his engineering comments, dated December 8, 2017:

"The Gateway Engineers submitted a site plan for PAWC Green Tree Operations Facility that will occupy the existing Walgreen's facility at 500 Noblestown Road. They are proposing some minor modifications to the area adjacent to the north side of the building to facilitate a vehicle entrance to the building and an overall reconfiguration of the parking lot. The existing building will be used as a regional operation center. I have reviewed the plans and would like to submit the following comments for consideration to the Planning Commission:

Stormwater Management:

1. The Gateway Engineers provided a Stormwater Consistency Letter, which describes the existing and proposed site and how the existing stormwater runoff will be affected by the new construction. Basically there will be no impervious surface area added to the site after all of the reconfiguration work is completed. They indicated in their letter that the stormwater volume should not increase due to the proposed work, so no revisions to the stormwater detention system have been proposed. I concur with their evaluation as long as there is no net increase in impervious surface.

Parking:

1. Drawing A1 was included to illustrate the parking requirements for the new use of the building. They used Section 420-204(D) to calculate the required parking for office space and Section 420-204(E) to calculate the required parking for the warehouse portion of the building. There is 38,918 square feet of floor area that is to be used for indoor parking of utility vehicles. Section 420-204(O) of the Parking Ordinance is for uses not covered under the other sections of the Ordinance. They have shown this area to be laid out for indoor parking, and are including 67 parking spaces as the spaces required for this portion of the building. For the currently proposed use, this is in accordance with the Parking Ordinances. However, if the area used for indoor parking is ever changed to warehouse or office use, additional spaces will need to be provided to accommodate the changes in use."

Mr. Casadei said the applicant currently meets the parking requirements, but he wanted it noted that if the use of the facility should change to additional office space, additional parking would be needed and the plan would need to be reviewed again. Ms. Chembars said there was a note on the

plan indicating that Green Tree Borough would be notified if there were any changes in the use of the site. She felt that the note should indicate that the borough would be notified if there were any changes in the use of *the building* or the site. Mr. Casadei asked that the note be changed accordingly.

"Parking (continued):

2. Parking stall sizes and aisle widths should be dimensioned for both indoor and outdoor parking areas. It appears that the spaces as proposed do not meet the requirements outlined in Section 420-204 and Table I, which is attached to the Parking Ordinance. Parking spaces are to be a minimum of 19 feet long for head-in parking.

Site Plan (C100):

1. There are two (2) parallel parking spaces indicated along the driveway on the west side of the building, but only one space is shown. The second space should be shown at its correct location."

Mr. Casadei said an additional line is needed to indicate that there are two parallel parking spaces in this area and not one. The second space will fit; the plan just needs to indicate a line to create the two spaces.

- "2. Section 420-204 states that all parking spaces shall be 9 feet wide, and Table I attached to the Parking Ordinances indicates the minimum length for head-in parking is 19 feet. The spaces shown on the Site Plan do not meet the Ordinance Requirements for minimum size."

Mr. Casadei said that a couple of feet need to be added to the striping on the plan. The dimensions work, but they do not meet the ordinance requirements, but can easily be revised.

- "3. At the Planning Commission workshop meeting the applicants discussed access gates at all entrances to the site. All entrance access gates should be shown on the plans along with the method of securing the gates and allowances for Fire Department access."

Mr. Casadei said that the details that had been discussed at the December 13, 2017 workshop meeting regarding the need for emergency services to be able to access all gates need to be clearly detailed on the plan along with information on how emergency services will be able to utilize them in an emergency.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the gates would tie in with the fencing. He said that earlier discussions about fencing had indicated that a variance would be required and he was not in a position to bring a variance forward at this time. Therefore, he felt that the gates would not be proposed until it came through as a fencing variance. Mr. Casadei replied that a gate can be put on a site without a fence and the issue of emergency vehicle access is a planning issue. Mr. Mitchell said they would include the gate information on the plan and the gates would be card-accessed. Review of the plans and the details of the gate access equipment continued.

- "4. All retaining walls higher than 30 inches must have guards installed in accordance with the requirement set forth in the International Building Code."

Mr. Casadei said the proposed retaining wall on the property only show a guiderail at the top and the wall is approximately eight feet tall in some places. In this situation, a fence must be at least 34 inches high, whereas a guiderail is only 18 inches high. Any area over 30 inches tall on the retaining wall must have a fence.

"Details (C600):

1. Detail 9 has a number of reference details. The numbers used to reference other details are not correct. Please revise to make all reference numbers valid.
2. The correct model number for the sign indicating fines for handicap parking violations is sign number R7-8f.

Lighting Plan (C700):

1. The photometrics seem to show that the lighting near the residential district is bright. The lighting on other parts of the parking area don't go above 1.3 footcandles when the lighting in the lot near Hanover Place exceeds 2.7 footcandles. There is only 0.5 footcandles required for security lighting. The applicant should try to tone down the brightness near the residences.
2. What are the expected hours for the site lighting to be illuminated? It would be appropriate for lighting not required for security to be turned off when the facility is closed for business.
3. The lighting intensity values should extend to all of the property lines surrounding the site. If the intensity diminishes prior to meeting the property lines, the values should be shown to a minimum value of 0.0. This is required so that the applicant can demonstrate that the site lighting does not splash over onto adjoining properties."

Mr. Casadei said that he would have to review the revised lighting plan to see if his comments still applied. He said that for some reason the lighting nearer the residential district was brighter than the lighting in the remote parking areas. He suggested that additional consideration should be given to the lighting nearer to the residential district, but he would have to review the revised plan.

Mr. Faulk presented his zoning review of the plan, stating that the proposed use of the business offices and enclosed warehousing of non-flammable and non-explosive materials and goods are permitted in the zoned commercial district where the property is located. The principal lot, 66-C-30, where the structure is located is 298,412 square feet and exceeds the minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet. The structure comprises 23% of the property. The front and rear yards exceed the required 15-foot minimum and the side yard exceeds the required 10-foot minimum.

Mrs. Bakin asked if the lights in the parking lot would always be on. Mr. Mitchell said that PAWC facilities typically provide dusk until dawn lighting. Some of the operations planned for the Green Tree facility will be 24-hour operations with people working overnight. The proposed lighting that will be used in the parking area will have motion detectors that will allow the light intensity to be reduced if there is no motion for a period of time. Additionally, if an employee swipes his badge upon entry it will trigger the lights to a higher intensity. Mr. Casadei asked to see the revised lighting plan and review of the plan continued.

During the review of the plan, Mr. Mitchell noted that during the purchasing process, while conducting deed research, PAWC realized that there were approximately seven parcels that comprised the property. As a result, PAWC decided that they wanted to consolidate these parcels into one lot. Ms. Chambers asked if lots in different zoning districts could be consolidated. Mr. Casadei said the Zoning Officer had stated that such a consolidation could be done with the zoning districts defined by metes and bounds instead of lots. Mr. Casadei said it was likely that the borough was considering rezoning the area to make it residential as part of the revised zoning ordinance process. Mrs. Bakin said that none of the zoning districts lines were changed during Planning Commission's zoning review process.

Review of the lots to be consolidated continued. Mr. Casadei said that even if the lots were consolidated, the district boundaries would not change. Ms. Chembars said the consolidation plan would show these lots being consolidated into one single lot while the consolidated property would be in two different zoning districts. While she did not have a problem with defining the property with metes and bounds, she was concerned whether lots in different zoning districts could be consolidated into one lot. Mr. Mitchell said that specific setbacks and requirements for each zoning district would apply to the areas in the lot. Discussion continued regarding the details of this issue.

Mr. Mitchell said that if it was a problem consolidating all the lots into one lot because of the zoning issue they might consider forgetting about the consolidation. Ms. Chembars said that the borough is in the process of revising its zoning ordinances and possibly doing some redistricting. She hoped the borough would take this situation into consideration during its zoning review. Mr. Mitchell said it might be better to wait until the zoning is completed before addressing the consolidation issue. Mrs. Bakin said it appeared to be spot zoning and felt that the area would need to be rezoned before it could be consolidated. Review of the locations and zoning of the various lots continued.

Mr. Casadei read the following from borough ordinances:

"Where uncertainty exists with respect to the boundaries of the various districts, as shown on the Zone Map, the following rules shall apply . . . Where the district boundaries are not shown to be streets and where the property has been or may hereafter be divided into blocks and lots, the district boundaries shall be construed to be lot lines. Where the designation on the Zone Map indicates a district boundary approximately upon a lot line, such lot line shall be construed to be the boundary. In undivided property, the district boundary lines on the Zone Map shall be determined by use of the scale of the map."

Ms. Chembars felt that this ordinance applied more to a piece of property that has not yet been subdivided.

Mr. Casadei suggested that the Borough Solicitor could review this issue. Mrs. Bakin said that the site plan could be reviewed for approval without the consolidation/subdivision issue. Mr. Casadei suggested that the subdivision could be tabled pending an opinion by the Borough Solicitor and Zoning Officer regarding the consolidation of lots in two different zoning districts. Planning Commission agreed, and decided to continue with the review of the site plan.

Mr. McWilliams asked if the building would be sprinkled. Mr. Mitchell replied that the building is currently sprinkled and it will be maintained as a fully sprinkled building. When asked, Mr. Mitchell said there are currently several existing hydrants available for the building. Mrs. Bakin asked if there was a need to identify the locations of the hydrants on the plan and if the sprinkler system and fire hydrants need to be tested. Mr. Casadei said the sprinkler system would be tested and there are currently ordinances that require private fire hydrants to be tested once a year. Mr. Casadei felt that the location of the hydrants should be shown on the plan, which would help the borough locate the hydrants on its GIS mapping. Mr. Jarquin said the hydrants would be added to the site plan. Discussion continued regarding the water pressure and the sprinkler system in the building.

Ms. Chembars said Planning Commission would consider approval of the site plan contingent upon meeting all of the comments from the Borough Engineer and the Assistant Borough Manager, adding the fire hydrant locations on the plan, and pending submission of the variance approval from

Scott Township along with the letter from Scott Township stating that they do not wish to review and approve the site plan.

Motion:

Ms. Chembars made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Bakin, to approve SP-01-17, applicant, Pennsylvania American Water, for the development of its Green Tree Operations Center at the existing warehouse at 500 Noblestown Road, contingent upon the following:

- 1. Addressing the comments from the Borough Engineer's and the Assistant Borough Manager's review letters.**
- 2. Adding the locations of the fire hydrants to the plan.**
- 3. Submitting the following documents from Scott Township:**
 - (a) Variance approval for the proposed shed.**
 - (b) Letter stating that Scott Township does not wish to review the site plan.**

Motion carried unanimously.

SD-02-17

Applicant, Pennsylvania American Water, requesting recommendation to Council for the consolidation of lots that they own into one lot at 500 Noblestown Road.

Ms. Chembars said that there was discussion earlier in the meeting regarding this proposed consolidation. She recommended that this item be tabled pending further information from the Borough Solicitor regarding this consolidation across zoning districts. Planning Commission agreed.

Mr. Casadei confirmed that the Planning Commission would be awaiting clarification from the Borough Solicitor to provide an opinion on the proposed subdivision. He said that would require a meeting to be held in January to review the Solicitor's opinion. Planning Commission would then have to make a ruling regarding the subdivision plan unless the applicant would choose to withdraw the application. Discussion continued regarding the subdivision plan.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Mrs. Bakin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Turocy, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

Rebecca Chembars, Chair

Ed O'Donnell, Secretary