

**FOREST HILLS BOROUGH
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2016
7:00 P.M.**

Norm Keller called the Planning Commission's June 1, 2016 special meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL : Norm Keller, Chairman - present
 Paul Kimicata – present
 Lisa Michel - absent
 Scott MaGaw - present
 Marilyn Gelzhiser - present
 Matthew Rendulic- present
 Steve Greenberg - absent

Quorum present

Also Present:

Alyssa Golfieri, Assistant Borough Solicitor
Amie Courtney
Vivian Broz
Kay Powerdley
John Wagner
Bernie Lamb, Pfaffnan & Associats
Jimmie Dececco, Pfaffnan & Associats

III. ADMINISTRATIVE

1. Call for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 27, 2016 meeting.
Moved by Paul Kimicata; Second by Matthew Rendulic. Motion carried.
2. Tonight's special meeting was advertised pursuant to the requirements of the Pennsylvania Sunshine Act.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. 340 Barclay Avenue Variance Request

John Wagner is requesting a variance from the prohibition against constructing an accessory use/structure closer than five feet to any lot line and ten feet to any principal structure under Sections 27-1011.3.A.(2) and C of Chapter 27 of the Forest Hills Code of Ordinances, Zoning, as amended, in order to permit the construction of a carport on property located at 340 Barclay Avenue, Allegheny County Block and Lot No. 372-N-32, in the Borough's R-1 Single Family Residential Zoning District.

- a. Applicant's Presentation:

John Wagner, Subject Property Owner – After constructing a carport (i.e., accessory structure) on his property, Mr. Wagner was informed by the Borough’s Zoning Officer/Code Enforcement Official that the carport did not comply with the Zoning Ordinance because it was located less than 10 feet from a principal structure and less than 5 feet from a property line. Mr. Wagner indicated that the carport location is OK with neighbors; Mr. Wager spoke with every neighbor before putting the carport up. Due to the size of Mr. Wagner’s van, he needed a carport that was at least 12 feet wide. Mr. Wagner hired a company from North Carolina to construct the carport; the company never indicated zoning approval may be required. The carport is bolted into the concrete footer; the carport is not attached to the single-family dwelling on the subject property. The carport cost Mr. Wagner approximately \$3,000. Since being notified of the violation, Mr. Wager has done everything he needs to do to remedy the same. Un-aware of the zoning requirements, Mr. Wagner acknowledged that he just missed the ball on the requirements.

b. Planning Commission Discussion:

Planning Commission suggested Mr. Wager review and be prepared to address the requirements for a variance at the upcoming Zoning Hearing Board hearing. The Planning Commission also suggested Mr. Wager bring letters of support from his neighbors to the hearing.

c. Public Comment: None.

Call for a motion to *Recommend Approval* or *Recommend Denial* of Mr. Wagner’s application seeking a variance from the prohibition against constructing an accessory use/structure closer than five feet to any lot line and ten feet to any principal structure under Sections 27-1011.3.A.(2) and C of the Borough’s Zoning Ordinance in order to permit the construction of a carport on the subject property.

*Motion to recommend approval by Marilyn Gelzhiser; second by Scott MaGaw.
4-1 vote in favor of recommending approval; motion carried.*

2. Borough of Forest Hills Land Development Plan

The Borough of Forest Hills is seeking land development approval to construct a new municipal building on property located on Greensburg Pike in the Borough’s R-2 Low Density Residential District, currently designated as Allegheny County Block and Lot No. 373-L-70. This application is made pursuant to Part 3 of Chapter 22 of the Forest Hills Borough Code of Ordinances, Subdivision and Land Development, as amended.

a. Solicitor’s Comments/Prior Communications

- What is the purpose/parameters of the Planning Commission’s review?

The purpose of the Planning Commission's review is to determine whether the Borough's proposed land development complies with the Borough's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

- Is the proposed building a conditional use or special exception?

The proposed building does not require either a conditional use or special exception pursuant to Section 27-107, which is reflected in the Borough's pending Zoning Ordinance amendment (which the Planning Commission reviewed last month).

- Are there waivers or variances requested?

There are no waivers or variances requested.

- Is there a review letter from the Borough Engineer and the County planning agency?

The Borough Engineer issued a review letter on June 1, 2016.

The County has not yet issued a review letter. The Borough's land development plans were transmitted to the County on May 27, 2016. The County's review letter is due June 26, 2016. The Borough will circulate the County's review letter once received.

- The proposed land development plans will be reviewed by the Borough's Tree and Shrub Commission on June 8, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

b. Borough's Presentation

Bernie Lamb and Jimmie Dececco from Pfaffnan & Associates gave a presentation of the proposed plans and individually addressed all of the Borough Engineer's comments in the June 1, 2016 Review Letter. Mr. Lamb and Mr. Dececco also stated that:

- The lighting on the site will be LED with bollards to entrance and additional lighting of police entrance;
- Two bio-retention areas with a large stone sump for stormwater management is proposed;
- Four ADA parking spaces are proposed (two near entrance of Borough building and two near entrance of ball fields);
- Access from site onto Greensburg Pike is only for use by Borough Police and is intended as an exit only;
- There is more parking proposed on the site than currently provided at the existing Borough building on Ardmore Boulevard;
- A monument sign is proposed to be located along Greensburg Pike to direct the public.

c. Planning Commission Discussion

Scott MaGaw asked whether a traffic study has been or will be performed. Mr. Lamb and Mr. Dececco indicated no traffic study is necessary for the project and thus would not be conducted.

Paul Kimicata questioned whether the architect and engineer considered or consulted the Borough's Comprehensive Plan when designing the proposed building. Mr. Lamb and Mr. Dececco stated they did not participate in deciding on a site within the Borough to locate the new Borough building. Rather, Mr. Lamb and Mr. Dececco were merely give the site and asked to design the proposed building.

d. Public Comment – None.

Call for a motion to **Recommend Approval** or **Recommend Denial** of the Borough's application seeking land development approval to construct a new municipal building on property located on Greensburg Pike in the Borough's R-2 Low Density Residential District, currently designated as Allegheny County Block and Lot No. 373-L-70.

***Motion to recommend denial by Scott MaGaw; second by Matthew Rendulic.
4-1 vote in favor of recommending denial; motion carried.***

V. COMMENTS

1. The regular Planning Commission meeting that is scheduled for June 29, 2016 at 7:30 PM is cancelled.
2. The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for September 28, 2016 at 7:30 PM.
3. The Planning Commission would like to begin meeting at 7:00 p.m. in 2017.
4. Planning Commission suggests that the Borough's Code Enforcement/Zoning Officer publish an article in the Borough's newsletter that remind residents to call the Borough to confirm they don't need a Zoning approval or permit for a home improvement, regardless of how minor the improvement may be.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Paul Kimicata; second by Marilyn Gelzhiser. Meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.