

**TOWNSHIP OF NORTH HUNTINGDON, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
PUBLIC HEARING, THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2016, 6:30 P.M.
11279 Center Highway, North Huntingdon, PA 15642
Presiding Officer – Tony Martino, President, Board of Commissioners**

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Martino called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL

| | | |
|-----------------------|---------|------------------|
| Commissioner Herold | Present | Also Present: |
| Commissioner Haigis | Present | John M. Shepherd |
| Commissioner Bertani | Present | Solicitor Dice |
| Commissioner Gray | Present | Andrew Blenko |
| Commissioner Faccenda | Present | |
| Commissioner Kucera | Present | |
| Commissioner Martino | Present | |

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Solicitor Dice states the purpose of the Public Hearing is to consider public input with respect to the Conditional Use Application, CU-1-2016 for the proposed Huntingdon Marketplace retail shopping center. The subject property is identified as Tax Parcel Number 54-12-00-0-043. The property is located on Mills Drive opposite the Walmart store. The current owner of the property is Colony Realty Associates, LP.

This hearing is a continuation of the April 14, 2016 Public Hearing concerning this matter.

This meeting is being recorded by both video and audio recording.

Mr. Don Tarosky - Colony Realty Associates ó 8954 Hill Drive, North Huntingdon ó states they have submitted developer's presentation at the last meeting, so there is nothing further to report.

Mr. Blenko states this was reviewed by the Planning Commission on Monday evening where there were a handful of residents from Lincoln Hills. He summarizes the issues of concern are landscaping, screening and the look of the rear of the building. There is an updated version of the concept plan from the architects in which they are proposing to provide some features on the back of the building. Mr. Blenko suggested two colors of split-face block and do stripes or panels with an alternate color.

Mr. Tarosky explains that effis or stucko material will be used on the back of the building.

June 9, 2016

Mr. Blenko asks how weather resistance is it?

Mr. Tarosky states it weathers very nice.

Mr. Blenko states the other thought is to use evergreen trees at the back edge of the parking lot. What was shown on the drawings was a single row of trees with another tree in between. He states that another resident was concerned about the dumpster enclosures. What was proposed was cedar planking and his concern that is weathers poorly and in five years would look awful.

(Mark) states the detail has been changed to specify a masonry type of enclosure, split-face block.

Mr. Blenko states they look very nice and weathers well which is key. Mr. Blenko states his preference is to get all the loose ends wrapped and have final approval at the July meeting with the sewage planning Resolution as well because he can't record the plan or issue any building permits until the sewage is approved.

Manager Shepherd asks what is needed for the sewage planning.

Mr. Blenko states a planning module along with approval from NHTMA and WWMA and then goes to DEP.

Don Tarosky Jr. states they have done conditionals on that, correct.

Mr. Blenko states that according to an email from Kevin Fisher stating they met on March 21, 2016 and was told a planning module was needed and has not seen anything since.

Don Tarosky Jr. states that until leasing is completed cannot project water flows anyway.

Mr. Blenko states they need something to even subdivide the property. He states Kevin Fisher says it was discussed that they would do one DEP EDU for each of the out parcels then come back in later with another planning module once they know who the tenant would be.

Manager Shepherd a Resolution would be needed for that.

Solicitor Dice clarifies that if they grant Conditional Use approval, do they have to come back again?

Manager Shepherd states they will need the Resolution approved for the planning module.

Solicitor Dice states he thought the Conditional Use approval was a condition preceding to getting the planning module with DEP. He is unsure DEP will grant a planning module without the Conditional Use approval.

June 9, 2016

Mr. Blenko states he doesn't know if they would ask that. He feels they would ask if the plan is consistent with the planning codes and ordinances.

Solicitor Dice asks if everyone agrees that they cannot do anything without the planning module approval.

Mr. Blenko and Mr. Tarosky agree.

Solicitor Dice states he feels they can approve the Conditional Use application next week and then the planning module will follow via formal Resolution.

Mr. Blenko states there are three things to approve: the planning module, the Conditional Use, and then the actual site plan and subdivision which was just received this afternoon. He states there is a time extension until next Thursday for the site plan and subdivision. Are they willing to grant a month extension if they can do the conditional use in the meantime.

Don Tarosky Jr. asks why they need another month. That is unnecessary.

Mr. Blenko states he is not willing to recommend approval on drawings he has not reviewed.

Don Tarosky Jr. states not much has changed since he looked at them before.

Commissioner Kucera states there was question on scrubbing some curbs and some radiusø

Don Tarosky Jr. states that was all taken care of.

Mr. Blenko states he disagrees and that he learned today that there is a whole new configuration to the second entrance.

Manager Shepherd states to keep in mind from a Conditional Use standpoint, the Board is going to render a formal decision with approval without conditions, approval with conditions or denial. Did the Planning Commission recommend approval with some conditions?

Mr. Blenko states the Planning Commission recommended approval with resolution of any outstanding issues.

Manager Shepherd asks if they had any conditions on top of that. Did they have specific recommendations on screening or possible patio and outside music?

Mr. Blenko states there will be conditions but his concern is the list will not be complete before next Wednesdayøs meeting.

Amy Johnson ó 8583 Delaware Avenue ó states she is one of the residents that will be impacted. She states she attended the April 9th Planning Commission meeting and there was discussion

June 9, 2016

about the number of parking spots, whether or not there was going to be a fence, what type of a fence. She wants to know what the resolution was to those questions.

Mr. Blenko states he does not believe the developer is proposing a fence.

Don Tarosky Jr states they feel a fence with the elevations won't accomplish much in terms of screening. They are proposing non deciduous trees as a better option. The maintenance aspect is a concern as well.

Solicitor Dice asks if Mr. Tarosky knows what the difference in elevation would be from the side of Ms. Johnson's property.

Mr. Blenko states the elevation is variable. It's probably twenty to twenty five feet at the western end of the development and at the eastern is much, much less at six to eight feet.

Ms. Johnson states her concern if they just have trees, will it block the parking. In the original proposal, there were far less parking spots. She is also concerned about unquestionable behavior in the back parking lot.

Mr. Tarosky states he feels the berm will shield the headlights. The height of the berm is two feet.

Ms. Johnson states she is not opposed to the shopping center, she just want to ensure the division between commercial and residential.

Solicitor Dice recommends the developer meet with Ms. Johnson to discuss.

Mr. Blenko asks that in her back yard, is it even elevation?

Ms. Johnson states her back yard sits down below and does not see Wal Mart unless she is on her second floor.

Commissioner Herold asks how tall are the pine trees.

Mr. Tarosky states they will be six foot when planted.

Commissioner Kucera states at the first meeting, some of the residents were opposed to the chain link fence. A member of the Planning Commission recommended bumping up the dirt in the back to add additional couple feet and adding vegetation trees and landscaping. He feels the trees being offset, should catch some of the garbage and shouldn't have a problem with lighting.

Mr. Blenko states one of things discussed at the Planning Commission was the zoning ordinance

June 9, 2016

has a performance based standard for lighting and what it states is that light will not bleed over from commercial into residential. Once the project is built, he will be in the yards looking to see if the light can be seen and if so, then shades, blenders, screens or whatever is needed to keep the light on their site. A lighting plan has been submitted.

Mr. Blenko suggests to make a condition of approval that the applicant agrees that lighting will not spill over and if it does, it will be changed and resolved.

Commissioner Kucera states that at Norwin Towne Square, there is a hill there which keeps the garbage out.

Solicitor Dice asks if anyone else is going to testify. With that, the record is closed.

Mr. Blenko adds that under the strictest provision of the zoning ordinance, the landscape buffer is to be at the property line. The problem is the property line is at the toe of the slope, landscape buffer doesn't do anything but waste money and doesn't screen the building. In lieu of putting it at the bottom, to put it at the top.

Commissioner Haigis states what the developer is proposing will look better than the current state with the vegetation.

Solicitor Dice states the testimony is closed and will move forward with the project.

Commissioner Gray asks that the plan is for this to be on the agenda for next week for approval or denial? The extension is not granted, so there will be a whole list of conditions?

Manager Shepherd states he too is unclear. The question is whether or not they can bring the recommended approval with conditions to the Board.

Commissioner Gray states he does not like getting things at the last minute for approval that affects so many people. If by chance, the Board feels overwhelmed by all the conditions and deny the plan, where does that put the developer and do they need to reapply.

Mr. Blenko states they would have to agree to a tabling and grant a time extension.

Solicitor Dice states the only two options are to appeal or reapply.

Manager Shepherd states the Mr. Blenko is close to recommending approval with conditions.

Mr. Blenko states there is a list of six comments based on a quick review and will be more, but he has to get back to their consultant for answers. It seems unrealistic to have a list of final conditions ready for Wednesday's meeting.

June 9, 2016

Commissioner Gray clarifies that at next week's meeting the Board could ask for another extension.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Gray

Motion to conclude the Public Hearing.
(7:08 P.M.)

Second: Commissioner Haigis

Motion Carried 7 0 0 0

- Public Hearing Minutes of June 9, 2016 were approved by the Board of Commissioners on _____.

Tony Martino, President

John M. Shepherd, Township Secretary
/jjm