

**Marshall Township
Planning Commission**

**525 Pleasant Hill Road
Wexford, PA 15090**

May 5, 2015 - 7:00 PM

Present: Ron Baling, Elaine Hatfield, Todd Shaffer, Kim Herbert,
Bob Edwards, Kim Herbert

Absent: Jeff Davison, Larry Payne

**Planning Director/
Zoning Officer:** Nicole Zimsky

Engineer: Art Gazdik

Secretary: Sandy Bauer

Solicitor: Blaine Lucas (not present)

Others:

Mr. Baling called the meeting to order at 7:16 p.m.

MINUTES

- ❖ Approval of the April 20, 2015 Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Shaffer moved to approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Edwards seconded the motion. Ms. Herbert abstained. Vote in favor of the motion was unanimous [5-0].

PLAN(S)

- ❖ The Keiser Plan; SUB-FIN 15-08;99 Harmony Road; Plans dated 03/06/2015; **deadline: 7/29/2015**

This plan was originally a fast track approval, however, it doesn't qualify as one. One lot is changing in size by more than the minimum lot size allowed for a fast track application. Ms. Zimsky explained that there are two lots involved. The location and specifics of lots were discussed. Thomas Keiser of 154 Laurel Crest Drive was present. He explained that he wants to manipulate Lot 1 to include the existing house with intent to sell it. The second lot will be awarded the additional property and remain vacant. He has no plans to develop it now. Ms. Zimsky explains that both lots conform to size and area and shape requirements and is therefore, a simple subdivision. John Harvey of 154 Hilltop Lane spoke. He stated that he has read that Ascent Properties LLC. purchased 99 Harmony Rd. (lot 1) on November 26, 2014 and believes that Etter Trust owns other lot. He asked what are the development plans for these lots? Ms. Zimsky states that Mr. Keiser owns both properties.

Ms. Hatfield moved to approve. Mr. Shaffer seconded. Mr. Edwards abstained. Vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

- ❖ Thorn Hill Hotel Complex REVISED; SUB-FIN 15-10; Brush Creek and Knob Road, plans dated 4/14/2015; **deadline: 8/3/2015**

Mr. Greg Banner, with Key Environmental, represents Thorn Hill Associates. Mr. Banner detailed the shortcomings of previous plans that were not approved. The revised plans combine previously presented lots three and four, to make a revised lot three. Mr. Banner addressed a concern posed by member of the Board of Supervisor that a proper lot needs to be accessible from the front of the lot. Mr. Banner states that there is no reason for vehicle access to the wetlands and conservation easement. These can be accessed from the southwest corner of the property where the trail system will connect. He stated that Mr. McFadden believes that this is now a compliant plan. Ms. Chelsea Dice, who represents Thorn Hill Associates, asked Mr. Gazdik and Ms. Zimsky if they believe that the revised plan is compliant with respect to ordinances regarding subdivision. Ms. Zimsky provided her comments to the Planning Commission. Mr. Gazdik stated that lot configuration is compliant but questioned easements, trail conditions, ingress/egress issues and shared facilities. Ms. Zimsky stated that she needs clarification of easements. Ms. Zimsky discussed the nature of agreements, which are conditional upon approval. Mr. Gazdik stated that the slope of the trail and alignment need to be reevaluated. Mr. Shaffer asked about workable slope specifics. Ms. Herbert wanted clarification of entire lot access. Is this remaining issue? Mr. Gazdik and Ms. Zimsky state no. Ms. Dice clarified that Mr. McFadden had that concern previously and that he stated at the concept plan meeting that he believes that compliance is met. She agrees to access agreements. Mr. Shaffer asked if there is a stormwater detention pond by the trail. Mr. Gazdik explained that it is a protected conservation area and it cannot serve a stormwater management purpose for the RIDC. It will remain undisturbed.

- ❖ Thorn Hill Associates, LP; SP(LD)15-04; Brush Creek and Knob Road, plans dated 4/14/2015; **deadline: 8/3/2015**

Mr. Banner stated that with regard to the grading plan, there is no change to Hotel One or Hotel Two with the main entrance remaining at the light at Knob Road. Hotels Three and Four have been combined into an L shape. The revised plan maintains approximately 210 rooms and has added parking. Mr. Banner detailed the revised plan. Meeting space was suggested by Board of Supervisors. Parking spaces are based on a formula of one parking spot per two individuals. Planning Commission members stated their concerns. Mr. Baling asked a question regarding grading of the L shaped building. Mr. Edwards asked about entrances; where will they be and how many? Ms. Hatfield asked if the meeting space is connected to the rest of the hotel, to which Mr. Banner stated that it is connected from above. She also asked if there are any food facilities? Mr. Banner responded no, besides continental breakfast will be offered by the hotel. Ms. Hatfield remarked that this seems odd. Mr. Gazdik asked have you analyzed eliminating tunnel? He further indicated that the Fire Marshall may not approve of the tunnel as it is presented. Ms. Zimsky stated that there will need to be another public/fire access. Tunnel specifics were discussed. Mr. Banner agreed to revise the tunnel. Mr. Baling initiated conversation regarding parking. Mr. Shaffer requested proposed elevations. Mr. Banner stated that they have provided elevations previously. He stated that Building One will be a Staybridge Hotel and that he has

several elevations for that building. The second hotel will be a Holiday Inn Express. Beyond Hotel One, he can only provide a conceptual elevation for Holiday Inn Express. For the third building, he only has some ideas of materials that might be used. They do not have a flag at this time. Ms. Dice asked if the site plan is amended to eradicate the tunnel, does she have to resubmit plans to planning because her client has a timing issue due to financing? Ms. Zimsky stated that in her opinion, nothing is serious enough in her comments to warrant tabling the plan. Mr. Shaffer conceded that the plans are much better but would want to see it after tunnel removed. Ms. Zimsky suggested an additional meeting in two weeks. Mr. Baling stated that he is uncomfortable with the arrangement of Hotel Three. Mr. Banner committed to revising the plan and coming back on May 18th. Mr. Banner explains the stormwater management situation and encroachment by way of the sanitary sewer connection. Mr. Gazdik requested a rough idea of a floorplan and elevations for building three for the next meeting. Ms. Herbert asked if the tree issue has been resolved since the last meeting. Mr. Banner's reply is no, it has not. There is no way to avoid the 18" trees and further explained their intentions for tree replacement. Brief conversation regarding impacted trees ensued. Ms. Herbert questioned the need for the meeting space. Ms. Zimsky pointed out that the Board of Supervisors was envisioning a large conference facility with food service and hotel accommodations. Mr. Baling clarifies that he would like to eliminate the meeting space, make it smaller or encompass less floors to which, Mr. Banner explained, would cause construction to change. Mr. Gazdik suggested amendments for the next meeting. Mr. Edwards questioned the quality of the hotels. Ms. Dice clarified that the municipality has no authority to condition a particular brand of hotel. Instead, they will be given a architectural design allowance. Ms. Hatfield expressed that, in years to come, hotel three would become an unknown factor. Ms. Dice suggested that they could record an architectural benchmark with Mr. Lucas and that this is as far as she is willing to recommend to her client.

- ❖ Thorn Hill Associates; CU 05-02; Brush Creek and Knob Road; plans dated 4/14/2015; **deadline: 6/12/2015**

Mr. Banner explained that the project will not negatively impact adjacent property owners. He stresses that the plan meets all stormwater requirements, directing water to the wetlands through the spill way and that it will not allow the volume to flow into Brush Creek. Mr. Shaffer asked why is the trail asphalt and not concrete as it should be? Mr. Banner replied that it should be fine as asphalt. Mr. Gazdik suggested that some investigation should be done as to whether it is required. Ms. Herbert agreed that this may be a variance issue and concurred with Mr. Gazdik.

Mr. Shaffer voted to table the Subdivision, Land Development and Conditional Use plans until May 18, 2015. Ms. Herbert seconded the motion. All in favor. Vote for the motion was unanimous. [5-0]

ADJOURN

Since there was no further business to come before the Commission at 9:08 p.m., Mr. Shaffer moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Hatfield seconded the motion. All in favor. Vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. [5-0].

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Bauer
Receptionist