

PLANNING COMMISSION**JUNE 4, 2013**

The special meeting of the Borough of Plum Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 4, 2013 at 5:30 pm in the Municipal building located at 4575 New Texas Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15239. Chairman, Robert Zunich called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm; led the Pledge of Allegiance; asked for a moment of silence; called for a roll call.

PRESENT: Robert Zunich, Mark Allison, Martin DeGore, Ron Gancas, Emil Heintzinger Robert Kalichuk, Tom Oslick, Jr.

Also Present: Jason Straley, Planning Director, Robert Mitall, Borough Engineer, and Linda Stremple, Recording Secretary

Minutes

Mr. Oslick then made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 20, 2013; seconded; minutes unanimously approved.

New Business**Site Plan****SP-2-13 – Port Authority of Allegheny County – Site Plan for a park and ride facility at corner of Rte. 286 and New Texas Rd. – “H-C” Highway Commercial Zoning District**

Mr. Zunich asked for a representative for the Port Authority of Allegheny County.

Mr. Larry Smitley of the URS Corporation stated that URS Corporation prepared the documents.

Mr. Zunich asked the Borough professionals to bring everyone up to date. Mr. Zunich stated this item was a site plan for a park and ride at Yurchison’s former commercial facility at the intersection of New Texas Road and Route 286. Mr. Zunich asked if the other park and rides were closing. Mr. Smitley replied no; Port Authority needs as much space as they can get; there is a problem regionally on where people can park; an assessment was made; this property, owned by PennDOT is available; and the additional 64 spaces will be a benefit to the travelers.

Mr. Zunich asked Mr. Straley to explain where they were with respect to tonight’s agenda. Mr. Straley stated one set of revised plans the Planning Commission members received at the last meeting; applicant had asked for additional time to address the comments of the review letter from Mr. Mitall’s office, which was done. Mr. Straley had one remaining issue, for a stop sign at the exit of the facility onto Route 286; stop sign to be labeled and provide detail, which has been done.

Mr. Zunich asked if that was the only change. Mr. Straley responded that it was the only change since our last meeting. Mr. Straley stated there was a reduction in the parking spaces; called for

parallel spaces in between the parking roads; professionals requested these be removed or defined; the parallel spaces were removed.

Mr. Zurich asked if the applicant has complied with all requests. Mr. Straley replied yes.

Mr. Zurich then asked Mr. Mitall for comments. Mr. Mitall stated there were minor comments and those changes have been made.

Mr. Zurich asked for questions from the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Kalichuk asked how long park and ride would be in existence at this location. Mr. Smitley stated he did not believe there was any plan to pull any of the routes that feed into that area; the 430 stops mentioned in the stop consolidation in the news were stops with zero (0) to three (3) patrons; the route and intersection of New Texas Road is very popular; suspects this park and ride would be there for a while, or until PennDOT decides they need the property for something else. Mr. Kalichuk asked if they would be willing to invest the money and next year PennDOT says get out. Mr. Smitley replied yes.

Mr. Allison asked Mr. Mitall about a comment that there seemed not to be enough room to back out of one of the handicapped spaces and this had been reviewed; the handicap parking at the far right corner. Mr. Mitall stated this space was over by New Texas Road and it was doable. Mr. Allison asked if PennDOT has given permission to Port Authority for parking; if Port Authority had encouraged parking there, currently and that was not wanted by PennDOT. Mr. Smitely replied he did not believe there was any arrangement for parking; it was probably what they call hide and ride. Mr. Allison asked if the bus stop on the Burger King side inbound was in front of Burger King or is it in front of what will be McDonald's. Mr. Smitely replied the stop is to be across from the parking lot; through the New Texas Road intersection for the stop, not by Burger King; signal improvements were done. Mr. Allison mentioned these improvements were for crossing lanes. Mr. Allison had a concern about a comment that the buses do not pull off the road and if they go through the intersection, the intersection will be blocked. Mr. Smitely stated he thought there was a wide burm there and he would convey this message to Port Authority.

Mr. Zurich asked for public comments. There were none.

Mr. DeGore made a motion to approve SP-2-13; seconded by Mr. Heintzinger; unanimously approved.

Mr. Straley then advised Mr. Smitely the Planning Commission recommended approval of the plan; asked Mr. Smitely to remain for the Council Work Session which begins at 6:30 pm; and informed him if Council decides to make this application a voting issue, representation will be required at the Council Meeting, Monday, June 10 at 7:00 pm; normally a letter is provided with these dates.

SP-3-13 – Plum Borough School District – Site plan for a new elementary school at 315 Holiday Park Dr. –“R-2” Neighborhood Residential Zoning District

Mr. Zurich announced the next item on the agenda SP-3-13 a site plan application for the Plum Borough School District for a new elementary school at 315 Holiday Park Drive.

Bill Roth of PA Soil and Rock, who are the engineers for the Plum Borough School District for this project, introduced himself.

Mr. Zurich stated this application was tabled at the May meeting and commission members walked away with plans which were substantially complete; there are some new comments by the professionals May 30th letter; asked Mr. Straley where they were from his perspective.

Mr. Straley stated Mr. Mitall's staff met with them on May 17 prior to the meeting and that is why the Planning Commission received the plans May 20th, the day of the meeting. Mr. Straley had three (3) outstanding issues: 1. - need for an additional street light or building light; the building is shaped like a C; the photometric plan has no light placed in between the building, but has since been addressed; asked for three (3) sets of revised plans because there was not enough time to send out the plans; 2. - overlooked on the first review, the need for an opaque dumpster enclosure and has since then been added; the detailed sheet provided did not show that opaque dumpster enclosure, but Mr. Roth will provide that detail sheet with that item shown. 3. - The comments in the review letter from the Allegheny County Economic Development Department in the Planning Division, were given under their review to be in accordance with the Allegheny County Comprehensive Plan, but are not needed on the borough end.

Mr Mitall stated they did meet prior to the Planning Commission Meeting and there was no storm water management for the existing school built in the 60's. They have had to address the Plum Ordinance and the state's requirements for best management practices, which has been done. Mr. Mitall asked if it was an 85% release rate. Ms. Martha Frech of PA Soil & Rock stated it depended on which sub basin, but it was mainly 80% they had directed it to; some are 50 and 60. Mr. Mitall stated that means whatever was running off now had to be less with the improvements, and should see a decrease in the volume of water running down the hill into the streams; there is the hope of putting some water back into the ground water system; because of existing utilities, water lines, sewer lines which will be revised, they will need to get approval from the Plum Municipal Authority, which will probably request a grease trap if it has not already been installed.

Mr. Zurich asked Mr. Mitall if it was his opinion the plan is ready for Planning Commission action and asked for questions from the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Gancas asked Mr. Mitall to go over the storm water runoff. Mr. Mitall explained that many years ago the Turtle Creek Watershed Association had Allegheny County and Westmoreland County participate in a basin wide study, which divided the whole water shed into sub areas. Mr. Mitall stated that as Mr. Roth's associate indicated, because this is located on top of a hill, each

sub area has a different release rate, some 50%, 85%; to which Ms. Frech added 80, 160. When you take these into aggregate and try to come up with a composite, they have gone through an extensive report and said whatever comes off of this site, will be a number less than that. The numbers have been worked through and they have met Plum Borough's Ordinance which is the requirements of the Turtle Creek Water Shed.

Mr. Kalichuk asked if the area where the tanks will be was perk tested. Mr. Roth stated Martha Frech would answer this question. Ms. Frech stated they were going to do perk tests in a few areas where the filtration systems would be; the bedrock is shallow on top of the hill; decided to put the infiltration systems basically where the existing building is being removed, which would have a sub base and a sub grade; the system, mainly of gravel, will store the water and release it out slowly; the other area, the bio-retention area will be placed mainly on structured fill and that area will have an under drain system composed of piping and rock, acting also as an infiltration system; if it doesn't perk below, it will go slowly through the filter system and the gravel system and release slowly.

Mr. Kalichuk asked if was in a controlled fill area; if the control fill area would be compacted through 100%; why wouldn't the water go out through; would it flow through the bedrock. Ms. Frech answered yes in the bio-retention area; yes, 100%; if it doesn't go through that area, it will go under the under drain system, which is composed of a gravel bed, acting as infiltration. Mr. Roth stated that bio-retention means they will have plantings there to take up the water as well. Mr. Kalichuk asked how many thousand gallons would be stored there. Ms. Frech would have to go through calculations; it would be a couple cubic feet. Mr. Kalichuk's main concern is that it would not seep out into people's back yards located below. Ms. Frech stated basically, now it is uncontrolled going to people's homes, going through a piping system with no infiltration system, no storage system. Ms. Frech stated they are planning to capture the water going into the back yards and directing it into that underground chamber, which directs it away from the homes. Then the water will slowly seep into the storm pipes into the proposed new pipe on Bar Harbor. Currently, the pipe goes from the school through people's properties down to Bar Harbor. Ms. Frech stated they would like to redirect it away from people's homes and bring it down the walk path, going along Bar Harbor into the street itself. Mr. Kalichuk asked if they would be making the situation better for those residents. Ms. Frech stated the proposed system is meant to be an improvement.

Mr. Kalichuk asked Mr. Roth if he was engineering the school building; if he would be handling the basic construction on the work site. Mr. Roth replied he was not engineering the school building and he would not be constructing it, it would go out for bid. Mr. Kalichuk asked that since it was so close to the Junior High School, background checks be done on not only the employees, but also the contractors.

Mr. Roth introduced, Arnie Caffas, the President of PA Soil & Rock, who stated they will have the same background checks for every employee who works six (6) days over the life of the job, which is required, as was done with the Pivik project,. Mr. Kalichuk asked Mr. Caffas the following questions: if they were in charge of the Pivik project; if they did the drilling; who did

the core testing on Pivik; did they had anything to do with the building. Mr. Caffas replied: they tested the fill; L. Robert Kimball did the drilling and the site design for Pivik; L. Robert Kimball did the core testing on Pivik, but PA Soil & Rock would be doing the core testing for Holiday Park; no they had nothing to do with the building.

Mr. Kalichuk asked Mr. Straley if the building will come back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Straley replied no; it would come back through the building permit process. Mr. Mitall's office oversees the site development, infrastructure inspections, and borough staff with the site plan and building inspections. Mr. Kalichuk mentioned he saw nothing for a security system to prevent something from happening like Sandy Hook and who would be responsible. Mr. Straley stated that would be on the school district. From our end we have the Knox Box installed for buildings over 50, 000 square feet to allow for emergency services to gain access. Mr. Kalichuk thought maybe the school district could install a double entry system at all doors. Mr. Straley stated the actual plans for the building have not yet been submitted.

Mr. Oslick asked if the parking was adequate; would parking be enough for after school activities. Mr. Straley stated the parking was actually over the required number of spaces and were proposing 104 spaces; probably not enough for after school activities; the requirements state 1 & ½ parking spaces per class room, plus estimated on the square footage of the auditorium, which is their gymnasium, only requires 87 parking spaces.

Mr. Allison had questions concerning logistics during construction. Assuming school would be in session during some of the construction, the fence that goes over the driveway prevents access to the side parking at the junior high. Mr. Roth stated the fence does not prevent access to the side parking; will maintain the ability for the teachers and staff to enter and exit. Mr. Allison stated the on drawing C106 show the fence going over the road twice. Mr. Kevin Hammer, site engineer stated that fence was for the demolition portion of the project. Mr. Allison stated it was on drawing C107 also, which he assumed was during construction. Mr. Hammer stated the fence was on the drawings, but has since been removed; it was intended only for demolition. Mr. Allison had problems with the staging area: at least 50 cars every morning and afternoon would be directed to go to the turn around, because the busses use the parking lot where the staging is set. Mr. Caffas stated they observed the busses and only the parking guard used the staging area. Mr. Allison asked what overflow parking was available for after school events. Mr. Caffas said that would be an issue. Mr. Roth stated it was a tight site. Mr. Allison asked if once the site was excavated could the parking area on the far side become a staging area instead of being completely open. Mr. Roth state that once the site was graded, and paved in certain areas, it could be moved over, but there would be a period of time when this would be needed because of the tightness of the site. Mr. Allison asked if demolition and excavating would be during the school year. Mr. Roth stated demolition was separate from this site plan. Mr. Caffas stated demolition would take place during summer break and work on site grading would begin around September 1st.

Mr. Allison asked if there would be a lot of staging with the excavation and was concerned with parents and equipment crossing the road; asked if the workers were done about the same time.

Mr. Caffas stated, work time would be normally 7:00 am – 5:00 pm and would be accelerated so they would be working longer days.

Mr. Kalichuk stated there are about 20 – 25 busses that park there and wasn't sure what would happen. Mr. Caffas stated the staging location was based on the fact that 3 or 4 of the 6 lanes in the center are used and the 2 or 3 to the left of where the busses currently pick up are not used and are open. Mr. Allison stated he's never seen them pulling into the left and coming around the circle getting in line; they don't use the area where the staging is to do a U turn. Mr. Caffas stated that was correct.

Mr. Zunich asked for public comments. There were none.

Mr. Oslick made a motion to approve SP-3-13, Plum Borough School District at 315 Holiday Park Drive; seconded by Mr. Gancas; approved with Mr. Kalichuk voting no.

Mr. Straley informed Mr. Roth that the next meeting would begin at 6:30 and the Borough Council Meeting would be held June 10, 2013 at 8:00 here in Council Chambers.

Mr. Straley thanked the Planning Commission members for their attendance tonight.

Mr. Zunich stated Mr. Straley's letter mentioned there were no new items received and Mr. Straley replied there were no new items and therefore no June Meeting and the deadline for the July meeting is mid June.

Mr. Gancas made the motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Oslick adjournment was at 6:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Allison, Secretary
Planning Commission