

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**  
**FEBRUARY 16, 2006**  
*Revised 3/8/06*

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Upper St. Clair, duly advertised and posted in accordance with law, was called to order by the Chairman at 7:30 P.M., Thursday, February 16, 2006, in the Board of Commissioners Meeting Room, 1820 McLaughlin Run Road.

PRESENT: Scott R. Slagle, Chairman  
David Wade, Secretary  
Robert J. Ridge  
James Sekela

Shannon Miller, Planning and Zoning Administrator  
Ruthann L. Omer, Township Engineer  
Christopher Cahillane, Representing the Township Attorney  
Kathleen R. Oberle, Recording Secretary

ABSENT: Marvin Haddox, Vice Chairman  
Joel Helmrich  
Douglas L. Shuck

PUBLIC: Approximately fifty (50) persons

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF  
JANUARY 19, 2006**

A motion was made by Mr. Ridge, seconded by Mr. Wade, and carried unanimously that these minutes be approved for filing as written.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**PLC05-0021 – WIN-UPPER ST. CLAIR, L.P. – UNIFIED CONDITIONAL  
USE/PRELIMINARY AND FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT**

Present were Brandon Miles and Dale Greco of Paradise Group, along with Bob Gales and Kimberly Gales-Dunn of J. R. Gales & Associates. Mr. Miles explained that they have eliminated the widening of North Highland Road along with the two-way traffic around the building on the south end, which now permits construction of a 3' landscaped retaining wall. They are still requesting a modification to permit a parking deficit of 3 spaces.

Kim Gales-Dunn addressed the comments in the Staff Report and noted the following:

- concrete wheel stops will be added;
- additional “Do Not Enter” one-way signs will be added;
- parking stall sizes have been corrected;
- “Two-Way Traffic Ahead” signs will be installed;

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**2.**

- the storm sewer could not be located, therefore they will video the sewer prior to construction;
- details have been provided for the 3' landscape wall.
- the remaining modifications requested are as outlined in the Staff Report.

Ms. Miller acknowledged receipt of revised plans submitted earlier that day.

Mary Lou Blair, 4 Patton Drive and Laura Vincenti, 14 Patton Drive, questioned the dumpster location and the entrance respectively. Ms. Miller explained that this application was originally forwarded to the Board of Commissioners by the Planning Commission on January 19, 2006 for the scheduling of a public hearing absent a recommendation. The applicant then chose to file amended plans and return to the Planning Commission in order to obtain a recommendation.

**MOTION:** THAT the Planning Commission recommends approval of the application subject to submission of three (3) complete sets of revised sheets and related materials addressing the items in the Staff Report dated February 14, 2006, the Township Engineer's review memo dated February 7, 2006, and the Township Traffic Engineer's review letter dated February 9, 2006, by Friday, February 17, 2006 at 12:00 P.M.

Motion by Mr. Sekela, seconded by Mr. Wade, carried by unanimous voice vote, 4-0.

**PLC05-0022 – PITTSBURGH SOUTH – MARRIOTT SPRINGHILL SUITES  
REZONING - 1610 – 1630 N. HIGHLAND ROAD**

Mr. Ridge recused himself due to a business conflict. Mr. Cahillane confirmed that a quorum exists for action on this application.

Present were Chris Peters of Kratsa Properties; David Cocco, Vice President of Hotel Operations for Kratsa Properties; Fred Valencenti, Real Estate Appraiser; Chuck Wooster of David E. Wooster & Associates and Roberta Sarraf, Planner.

Mr. Peters explained that after the last Planning Commission meeting, it was their intention to meet again with the residents; however it was clear that regardless of how many meetings were held, the residents were opposed to this project. After distributing eight (8) photographs to the Planning Commission, he then outlined the following reasons to substantiate the rezoning request.

Photograph 1 is a view from the front door of 1610 N. Highland Road looking at the existing Chi Chi's building. Photograph 2 is a view looking out the door from 1630 N. Highland Road. He noted the elevation difference between the site and the adjoining residences along Patton Drive. In addition, the site is immediately adjacent to commercial uses. Photograph 4 is a view from Patton Drive where the Lincoln Point Apartments are clearly visible.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**3.**

Mr. Peters noted that the residents concerns included traffic, environmental problems, strangers in their neighborhood, and property values. He acknowledged that may have written letters petitioning that there is no compelling reason to change the zoning; however, for the reasons stated above, Mr. Peters feels the rezoning is justified.

He noted that the following consultants would address residents concerns: Chuck Wooster of Wooster and Associates for traffic issues; Roberta Sarraf, an experienced Land Planner who has worked in both Upper St. Clair and Mt. Lebanon, David Cocco of the Marriott Hotel to address the viability of a hotel in this location; and Fred Valencenti, Real Estate Appraiser, who will address property values.

Mr. Peters explained that the existing zoning would permit development of conditional uses such as a group home for troubled youths, elderly care facility or assisted living facility. He opined that the site plans for developments of this nature may in fact look very similar to what they are proposing. By way of reminder, he noted that at this point, the application is for rezoning only. Should it be approved, the Township will have ample opportunity to impose conditions at the land development stage of the project.

He cited photograph 5 as depicting their proposed hotel behind Chick-fil-A. Photograph 8 shows a side view of the hotel from Patton Drive. Photograph 6 is a view of the hotel looking down between residences at 12 and 14 Patton Drive.

Mr. Peters commented that the rezoning is in keeping with the 1995 Comprehensive Plan in that it looks to permit land suitable for redevelopment to be developed and contains commercial uses along Rt. 19 north of South Hills Village.

Chuck Wooster of David E. Wooster and Associates, traffic engineering consultants, explained that they were retained by Kratsa Properties to look specifically at what the trip generating characteristics of the existing site in Upper St. Clair would be under the existing zoning compared to the proposed zoning assuming the "highest and best use of each zoning classification." He noted that the highest and best use for the existing R-3 zoning appears to be single family residences. Under a generic plan prepared by Lennon Smith Souleret Engineering, five single family residences could be constructed. Under the proposed C-2 zoning, any type of retail would represent the highest and best use. Again Lennon Smith Souleret Engineering prepared a generic plan showing a maximum 10,400 square foot building to house small retail shops.

The table below shows trip generation comparisons prepared by Mr. Wooster between the two land uses for just the property in Upper St. Clair, as well as for the entire parcel. Mr. Wooster explained that there are not a lot of trip generation studies for hotels, so their review was based on a 109 room "motel," which actually generates more traffic than a business hotel.

<b>Peak Hours</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Trips Generated</b>
AM	5 single family homes in USC only	13 vehicles
PM	“ “ “ “	7 vehicles
AM	10,400 sq. foot anchorless retail in USC only	19 vehicles
PM	“ “ “ “	60 vehicles
AM	109 room motel in BOTH communities	43 vehicles
PM	“ “ “	60 vehicles

Mr. Wooster cited the Upper St. Clair traffic study general threshold of 75 vehicles in the peak hour, and noted that neither use, even at full development of a motel, would breach that figure. While the proposed use would generate more traffic than single family homes, Mr. Wooster felt that the difference is not considerable.

Roberta Sarraf cited the 1995 Comprehensive Plan, which is currently in effect, and addressed several issues she felt were relevant in this case. Table 2-5 lists 38 historic properties within the community by location, date of construction and comments. In 16 of the 38 properties, there are no comments. One of these is the Williams house at 1630 N. Highland Road. In addition, only 2 are listed on the National Register. There is also no historic district established and no regulations that would govern the rehabilitation or demolition of any historic structures other than the two which are on the National Register.

Ms. Sarraf explained that the central portion of the building is the historic structure, which was owned by Congressman Fulton, who constructed two wings on either side of the residence and added siding. This limits the historic character of the property. While it could be restored, the structure is limited for habitability due to the narrowness (12.5 feet deep) and the fact that there is no kitchen.

Ms. Sarraf noted that the current owner of the property has authorized her to state his willingness to donate the structure to the Township, the Historical Society, or any other agency that would be willing to accept it, provided it is determined that the house can be moved.

At Table 2-2, there is a chart of underdeveloped and undeveloped land by zoning district. In the C1, C2 and C3 districts, there are no properties that are either undeveloped or underdeveloped. One of the goals of the 1995 Comprehensive Plan is to “contain nonresidential uses in seven areas of the Township.” Two of those refer to the Light Industrial Districts along McLaughlin Run and lower Boyce Road and five of them refer to commercial areas, specifically South Hills Village, the Route 19 North area in which the subject property is located, and the Painters Run/Bower Hill Road corridor. She noted that commercial uses are also allowed in the Restricted Manufacturing district, which is the zoning category in McLaughlin Run and lower

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**5.**

Boyce. In acknowledging the pending 2005 Comprehensive Plan, Ms. Sarraf suggested that the Township may wish to reevaluate land uses in the immediate area of the newly constructed Abbeyville Road connection.

Citing the 2004 Inventory of Commercial Properties booklet, which provides potential developers with information about vacant properties zoned and/or available for redevelopment, Ms. Sarraf noted that one site that has already been redeveloped is the Chick-fil-A property. She stated that there are no vacant lots in the Route 19 corridor.

In looking at the underdeveloped/undeveloped land by zoning district and also the 2004 Inventory of Commercial Properties, there is a scarcity of land zoned to develop authorized uses in the C1, C2 or C3. With respect to the hotel specifically, she noted that the properties in the McLaughlin Run or lower Boyce corridor would probably not be attractive to a developer because of the remote location and lack of highway orientation and visibility. She therefore felt that in order to provide for hotel development within the community, property needs to be redeveloped or the C2 zoning classification must be expanded.

Ms. Sarraf commented that the zoning classification in Mt. Lebanon is R-5, in which the following may be constructed: a professional office where each office does not exceed 1,000 square feet, personal care boarding facilities for 5 to 15 residents, a nursing home without size limitation, a hotel, motel or a multifamily multistory residential building allowing first floor commercial uses. The height limitation in this district in Mt. Lebanon is five stories and 75 feet.

By comparison, the R-3 district in Upper St. Clair is primarily a single family zoning classification. However by Conditional Use Approval in this district the following are permitted: group homes and group dwellings, personal care homes with resident limitations, and a long-term nursing facility of 20 or more beds. She contends that the structure built to house a long term nursing facility would be similar in magnitude to the proposed hotel.

According to Ms. Sarraf, compatibility of zoning from one community to another is important and Mt. Lebanon has already recognized that this is a more intense use location. The C2 district in Upper St. Clair carries the following protections; 1) all uses are Conditional Uses, giving the municipality the most control over the development; and 2) it allows conditions to be placed on the approval. She suggested that expanded buffering would be a logical condition to be placed on the Conditional Use approval for this proposed land development. She pointed out that the current vegetation on the site consists of deciduous trees, which does not provide a year round screen.

In evaluating a rezoning, consideration must be given to whether this is spot zoning. Ms. Sarraf opined that this is not spot zoning inasmuch as it is a logical expansion of existing commercial zoning across North Highland Road. The elevation differences would support the rezoning. Traffic can be managed by N. Highland Road because most of the trips into and out of the site would be through the improved intersection. She felt that N. Highland Road functions as a collector street because it carries traffic from the local neighborhoods to Route 19, the arterial road. She believes that the proposed rezoning would be compatible with the adjacent municipality's R-5 zoning, which does allow limited commercial use as well as high rise,

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**6.**

multifamily, hotel/motels and nursing homes. She recommendation that the rezoning be favorably considered.

Fred Valencenti, owner of Community Appraisal Service on Boyce Road, stated that he has been a resident of Upper St. Clair for 35 years and a real estate broker and State Residential Certified Appraiser for 34 years. He was Vice Chairman for 3 of his 5 years on the Allegheny County Assessment Appeals Board.

According to Mr. Valencenti, the total assessment on the existing three parcels is \$455,300, which at 29 mills generates \$13,204 in tax revenue. The proposed new hotel is \$8.5 million, which would generate approximately \$246,500 in tax revenue. He added that “the Township needs every bit of tax increase we can get, because of Mr. Onorato’s proposal for the assessment going from the 2005 certified values to 2002 certified values.” Based on OPA (Mr. Wilson) the 2005 certified value for Upper St. Clair Township is \$1,642,130,690. For 2002, it is \$1,606,166,970 for a shortage of \$35,900,000 for Upper St. Clair Township. He felt certain that millage would need to be raised and couldn’t understand why all of the communities haven’t banded together it a class action suit.

As far as commerce is concerned, he felt that retailers, restaurants and the entertainment industries will all win with a hotel because of the additional revenue. There is an opportunity for 25 new jobs. He stated that he has known the present owner, Alex Bunson, for 25 years. To his knowledge, these properties were on and off the market for at least 10 years and Mr. Bunson had the foresight to purchase them about 16 years ago because “he knew what the site was going to be worth down the road.”

Mr. Valencenti commented that any change brings controversy. The first was the cell tower when “everyone said Deerfield Manor will go down between 20 and 40%, that was the projection by somebody with a wonderful crystal ball that properties would decrease.” Since the tower has been up, he compared sales of 20 homes, 10 directly behind the tower and 10 directly across the street where he felt the impact would be greatest. There have only been two homes that have decreased in value, one by \$1,210 and the second by \$35,000. So he felt that basically, 19 out of 20 homes did not decrease in value. He cautioned about future use of chattels in the high end market, because of the assessment problem, “where people say, ‘Okay, I’m going to give the seller \$50,000 for the driveway, and the window in the kitchen.’” This amounts to tax evasion, and Mr. Valencenti predicted this will happen more frequently.

Another property Mr. Valencenti cited as a comparison was the Rent-A-Space on Boyce Road, where there was concern about a decrease in property values. From the resales he checked, that has not happened. He explained that the ex-solicitor’s office building at 1105 Boyce Road was sold by Mr. Hackett in 1998 to Mr. Morosco for \$270,000. It closed again in September of 2005 for \$440,000.

As a third controversial location, Mr. Valencenti cited the original Kaufmann’s at the Galleria where there were houses surrounding the site. He stated that those houses have not decreased in value since that time. Next to the Meadowlands Holiday Inn, he noted that Heartland Homes

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

7.

built 589 units and for the first 2 years, access was through the hotel parking lot to get to the new construction site. Those homes have not depreciated.

As a former member of the County Assessment Board, he stated that 70% of appellants complained that “they overpaid for their property because the wife liked it and I just didn’t want to hear any more.” Today’s buyers are very intelligent and should be aware of what they are looking at surrounding their homes. He contends that even if this project doesn’t go forward, another project will, and this zoning will be changed at some time in the future.

To Mr. Valencenti, the North Highland Road corridor has always been a “commercial site use” and he contends that the property values have not gone down on either street since he’s been in the Township. He concluded by stating that he only sees a positive win for all concerned.

David Cocco spoke next, as Vice President of Hotels for Kratsa Properties, a 45 year old Pittsburgh based real estate development company who specializes in building, managing and developing select service hotels in suburban markets. He explained that they have encountered opposition from residents in the past and have always stayed the course because they have experienced that the “end result is right for the community,” and is embraced by the public and residents for the following reasons:

- Management training to go out of the way to work with the community;
- Involvement with local chamber of commerce;
- Cash donations to the Township Police and Fire Departments, local schools, religious venues;
- A history of no problems in communities as evidenced by construction of a second hotel with no objections;
- Donation of indoor pool area to fire department for training;
- Donation of meeting rooms to police department;
- Involvement through promotion and provision of space to hold training sessions on topics such as proper use of child safety seats or educational crime sessions; and
- Commitment to doing what’s best for the community.

Mr. Cocco acknowledged that this site is a valuable piece of property and will be developed some day, if not by Kratsa Properties, then by someone else. He cautioned that a developer of a senior care home or juvenile home may not be a local company who wants to get as involved with the community. In conclusion he stated that it is in the best interests of Kratsa Properties as a Pittsburgh based company to make this project right for everyone.

Concerning comments made by George Justice, owner of the Holiday Inn Select, Mr. Cocco pointed out that the purpose of Mr. Justice’s presentation was to protect his asset. He then gave a brief history of that 40 year old hotel, which was built in the late 1960’s originally as a Sheraton Hotel. He noted that the Marriott did a feasibility study which supports the need for a quality hotel in this area.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**8.**

Steve Worobe of 203 Keifer Drive stated that there is no compelling reason to change this zoning. He feels that N. Highland Road provides a natural barrier between the commercial and residential uses.

Laura Vincenti of 14 Patton Drive felt that the rezoning request does not meet the guidelines required by the Township. She referred to a handout which was distributed at the January 2, 2006 meeting of the Board of Commissioners which begins "Dear Upper St. Clair Resident, Welcome to the meeting of the Board of Commissioners...." It contains information outlining six points which must be considered by the Board in dealing with a rezoning. Mrs. Vincenti addressed the first point, which is "compatibility with adjacent uses and zoning." The site is currently zoned residential and is abutted by twelve (12) residential properties. It is part of a cluster of twenty-five (25) identically zoned properties when including the properties on N. Highland and Patton Drive, in addition to the rest of the neighborhood. Therefore she felt that a change to commercial would not be compatible with the existing residential.

Mrs. Vincenti was concerned about her view from her back door, where she will see the hotel, its parking lot and its green roof and lights, etc. She reminded the Commissioners that they themselves identified N. Highland Road as a residential street during the development of the former Chi Chi's site for overflow parking. Parallel parking along N. Highland Road was proposed by the WIN-Upper St. Clair developers, and it was specifically opposed by the Planning Commission because they "did not want people parking on a residential street."

Mrs. Vincenti reminded the Commissioners that the original reason for tabling at the January meeting was to afford the developers an opportunity to meet with the residents. No meeting was held. Concerning tax revenue and cash donations proposed to be generated by the developer, Mrs. Vincenti stated that any good corporate neighbor would do the same.

Concerning the inevitability of development on this property, Mrs. Vincenti stated that "there will never be development on this property if this Board doesn't approve it." She asked that the Planning Commission consider the entire community, particularly those in the immediate area.

Laura McChesney, whose property at 18 Patton Drive directly borders the site, stated her concerns about safety due to the proposed 30 foot hillside excavation and the fact that she has two small children. The continuing revolving door associated with a hotel is disturbing and she asked the Planning Commission to vote no.

Pierette VanRyzin, owner of 14 Keifer Drive, stated that she also owns a residence at 2031 Allison Drive. She explained that business hotels in particular generate traffic between the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:30 AM, the exact time that school children are waiting to board buses. Concerning home values in this neighborhood, she noted that they recently moved to Allison Drive and are preparing to list their home on Keifer Drive. Her realtor is "freaking out, saying we've got to get this done before this (rezoning) happens." She is further concerned about what will happen to her home on Allison Drive if the Township is willing to change zoning and the character of neighborhoods in order to generate tax revenue. She questioned what guarantee she has for the integrity of her back yard in the new neighborhood, which adjoins a light industrial district. If this rezoning is approved, Mrs. VanRyzin felt that no resident, especially those

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**9.**

anywhere near commercial areas, can have any confidence in the integrity of their neighborhood. She requested careful consideration of the precedent that could be set with this rezoning.

Owner of 10 Patton Drive, Maria McDonald referred to applicant's photograph number 3, which is a picture of her backyard and the swing set which belongs to her daughter. She noted that Kratsa Properties went onto her property without her permission to obtain this picture. She is very concerned about safety, and reminded the Commission that the applicant told the residents that "they actually preferred the site of the Washingtonian to build this hotel, but the man listed as the contact had not been returning their phone calls."

Bob Egeland, 115 Locust Lane, explained that he is an engineer with Consolidation Coal Company and requested that the property not be rezoned for the following reasons.

- Consultants can be hired to come up with any answer requested by their client.
- This issue isn't about whether we need a hotel; it's about encroachment into residential property.
- Concern about commercial creep, lighting and traffic 24 hours a day/7 days a week, which will have a negative effect on property values. Mr. Valencenti's examples were of existing commercial properties and existing residences with not one example of a commercial property encroaching on a residence.

John Palmieri, 12 year resident of 218 Keifer Drive, requested that the natural barrier provided by N. Highland Road between the commercial and residential development not be taken away. He is not concerned about a potential increase in millage, because he feels "it's worth it" to live in Upper St. Clair.

Janie Taraszewski of 7 Patton Drive expressed concerns about safety, particularly because she has two autistic boys, one of whom is "a bolter that likes to leave the house." She is concerned about the safety of her sons in general, but a hotel will add another dimension of concern.

Joan Shinavski, 6 Keifer Drive, expressed strong opposition to the project because of how the character of the neighborhood would be changed. She was concerned that the photographs presented by the developer did not accurately reflect the final project. The introduction of a transient population into an exclusively residential neighborhood was a major concern. Ms. Shinavski believed that the residents' acceptance of the proposed rezoning should be a critical factor. She reminded the Commissioners that there is absolutely no reason that the site cannot be used for residential development, as confirmed by the developer's own experts as the highest and best use as presently zoned.

Long-time resident of 202 Locust Lane, Marge Shiffer commented that the tax paying residents of the Mitchell Corners area "have been donating to the Township forever." She contrasted the proposed development, which will have access to residential streets, to similar developments such as Timber Creek, Painters Plaza, Pinehurst and Pinebridge Condominiums and Abbeyville, all of which have access to major roadways, not residential streets. The existing SpringHill Suites are all in commercial areas. Mrs. Shiffer requested that the same consideration be given to those residents north of Fort Couch Road as is given to those south of Fort Couch Road. As examples, she cited the buffer area between Consol and the residents on Warwick Drive and in

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**10.**

the Springfields Plan. Mrs. Schiffer stated that the SpringHill Suites will not be their neighbors, but rather the occupants of the 109 beds in that hotel will be their neighbors. Upper St. Clair already has several group homes and nursing homes. All are good neighbors and none generates much traffic.

Regarding commercial creep, Mrs. Schiffer called attention to Donati Road in Bethel Park, which started out thirty-five years ago as a residential street and now contains no private homes. Mrs. Schiffer said she has always admired the integrity of the Township Commissioners, where the residents have always been put first. She hoped this practice will continue.

Concerning the existing buffer, Mr. Peters reminded the audience that most of the trees on the site are deciduous and could be removed at any time by the owner. He explained that the hotel will be limited to three stories. By way of clarification, Mr. Peters noted that Chuck Wooster's comments about "highest and best use" were made in terms of traffic generated by those uses, and not the highest and best use of the property. In addition, most of the traffic will enter the hotel site from N. Highland Road and make an immediate right turn into the property or from Abbeyville Road directly into the property, so that Route 19 is really the main road for ingress and egress.

Speaking as a Township resident, Mr. Valencenti explained that he went through a similar circumstance in 1972 when the zoning for the Crossgates Realty property was changed. At that time, he lived in the last house on Long Drive behind the site and was upset about traffic so he moved. He noted that the market value cannot be predicted for at least 3 to 5 years when a zoning change is initiated.

As a 27 year resident of the Township, William Campbell of 122 Keifer Drive expressed concern about the danger of the cliffside that will be created after excavation for the hotel. He added that to his knowledge, the Township prohibits 24 hour businesses. In addition, the security lights will pose a nuisance. Mr. Peters explained that a privacy fence would be installed at the cliffside as both a buffer and safety feature.

Marge Schiffer commented that Mr. Bunson has not been a good neighbor in that the residence is in disrepair. Joan Shinavski asked Mr. Valencenti how much revenue he generates from his business contact with Mr. Bunson because she questioned his sources and felt they were biased. She also questioned how much traffic is generated by the cell tower. Mr. Valencenti explained that he used past "controversial" matters and his findings show that other than the two houses he mentioned, there was no effect on the market value of properties after the tower was installed.

As a resident for 40 years, John Holveck of 23 Locust Lane commented that the traffic this past Christmas was "horrendous." The new Abbeyville Road extension is a welcome relief but he is concerned that construction of a hotel will again create an excessive traffic problem for their neighborhood.

Len France of 8 Patton Drive suggested that the Commissioners should be very careful what they approve because what is approved today is not necessarily what will ultimately be constructed.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

**11.**

Mr. Wade stated that the key issue for him is whether this rezoning will change the characteristic of the neighborhood. He visited the site, and viewed it from the Chick-fil-A parking lot and determined that if we rezone this property, the residents' view would change from looking at commercial property "at arms length" to "in their face. To him it clearly changes the characteristic of the neighborhood. "

Mr. Sekela appreciated all the information provided by both the developers and residents. He commented that one of his big concerns is maintaining the diversity of housing and there is currently very little R-3 zoning. A rezoning would amount to an erosion of this already underrepresented segment of the housing market. Another concern is that there is the vacant property (former Washingtonian Apartments) just south of this site and north of Fort Couch Road, which is either undeveloped or underdeveloped and has potential before he would be willing to vote to encroach upon residential property.

**MOTION:** THAT the Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Commissioners deny this application for rezoning.

Motion by Mr. Sekela, seconded by Mr. Wade, carried by unanimous voice vote, 3-0, with one abstention by Mr. Ridge.

Mr. Wade explained that the application will be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for scheduling of a public hearing, at which time they will take formal action.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**RECOMMENDATION RE. FINAL DRAFT 2005 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

A brief presentation was made by AJ Swartz of Environmental Planning and Design (EPD). The Draft Plan has been forwarded to the adjacent communities, the School District and both Allegheny and Washington Counties. The Plan is also available for public review in the Township offices and Library. The 45 day review period required by the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) ends March 30, 2006. Staff is currently working with EPD to complete the Action Plan and the Report Card, and it should be forwarded to the Planning Commission within the next week.

The Planning Commission will hold a public meeting on March 16, 2006 to obtain comments from the general public. On March 6, 2006, the public hearing will be scheduled by the Board of Commissioners for April 3, 2006.

**MOTION:** THAT the Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Commissioners schedule the public hearing on the 2005 Comprehensive Plan for Monday, April 3, 2006.

Motion by Mr. Sekela, seconded by Mr. Wade, carried by unanimous voice vote, 4-0.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**RECOMMENDATION RE. AMENDMENT TO BY-LAWS FOR THE PLANNING  
COMMISSION**

Ms. Miller explained that staff is recommending that the By-Laws be amended in order to avoid future confusion as to recommendation options afforded the Planning Commission.

MOTION: THAT the By-Laws of the Planning Commission be amended as recommended.

Motion by Mr. Wade, seconded by Mr. Ridge, carried by unanimous voice vote, 4-0.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, it was moved, seconded and carried unanimously that the meeting be adjourned at approximately 9:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kathleen R. Oberle, Recording Secretary