

Borough of New Stanton
Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
June 8, 2016

1. Call to Order

Chair Denise Smyda called the meeting to order at 7:04.

2. Roll Call

Borough Manager Jeffrey McLaughlin took the roll. Those in attendance: James Evans, Jay Gomolak, Calvin Kauffman, Timothy Seale, Denise Smyda, and Raymond Strosko. Borough Engineer Emil Bove was also present.

3. Approval of Minutes – May 3, 2016 meeting

Tim made a motion seconded by Ray to accept last month's minutes. Motion passed.

4. Audience Comments on General or Agenda Items

Denise asked for comments. Being that there were no comments, Denise closed the comment period.

5. Old Business

A. Proposed Hilton Hotel Final Review of Land Development Plan

Denise introduced John Frydrych of R.A. National, the engineer for New Stanton Partners. Mr. Frydrych stated that since last month's preliminary review, he has been working with Emil and incorporating his comments into the design, including revising the stormwater management plan and the land development plan. He stated that he still needed to have the project reviewed by the Westmoreland Conservation District. Mr. Frydrych stated that based on the discussion at the last meeting he moved the proposed location of the dumpster from the northeast corner to the northwest corner and added a 4' wide sidewalk with a 3' grass strip.

Emil suggested that the Planning Commission and council come up with a design standard for sidewalks. At the last meeting it was recommended that for all new developments in the B-1 Business District sidewalks are to be installed, but no design standard was specified. Tim made a motion seconded by Ray recommending that John and Emil draft a sidewalk ordinance that meets federal, state and county requirements for review by the Planning Commission. Motion passed with Calvin abstaining.

Jim moved and Ray seconded that the Hilton Tru Land Development Plan be recommended to council contingent upon the approval of the erosion and sedimentation control plan,

stormwater management plan, and NPDES by the Westmoreland Conservation District. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Any Other Old Business

Denise said that we would discuss the balance of Old Business after hearing from our second guest.

6. New Business

A. Proposed Hampton Inn Preliminary Review of Subdivision Consolidation & Land Development Plan

Jeff introduced Bob McCollim from the Red Swing Consulting Group who is the engineer for the Hampton Inn being proposed by the Stanton Hospitality Group.

Bob pointed out that the site located between Broadview Road and Bair Blvd. abutting the old borough building, the Comfort Inn and Bob Evans is somewhat landlocked. Because of the interchange project, Bob stated that they are proposing that, at least initially, the main entrance for the development will be located off of Broadview Road on the Robert and Mary Quinn Property. In the future, once PennDOT is finished with the interchange the developer will seek permission to install an entrance off of the roundabout at Rachel Drive. They do plan to maintain the Broadview entrance as a secondary entrance. Mr. McCollim stated that the site including the Quinn property is 6.48 acres. There is a wetland on the site but it will not be developed. The hotel will feature 83 suites and approximately 750 square feet of conference space. The 4 story building will be 48' high, which will meet the borough's new proposed height limit of 50'. The site will also feature an undetermined stand-alone restaurant. The two uses will feature shared parking. They have already begun to work with the Westmoreland Conservation District on stormwater management. They will look at sidewalk options along Rachel Drive. Emil pointed out that a sidewalk would not be required along from Broadview Roads since that would be the developer's private driveway, but that in the future the developer may want to install a sidewalk or path along there depending upon their needs. Calvin asked about the installation of a fence at the back of the property. Bob said that there is no plan for a fence. Emil said that the ordinance does call for a buffer at the perimeter, a fence or vegetation could be used.

Emil pointed out that this is a preliminary review. Red Swing will need to come back for a final review at a future meeting. Emil gave Bob a copy of Borough Solicitor John Campfield's comments.

Emil stated that he and representatives of the borough need to meet with PennDOT because they have stated that they do not want any water going into their detention pond from new developments, even though the borough requires that in developing a site the amount of water coming from the site must be 80% of what it is before the site is developed.

Jim asked who is going to develop Rachel Drive. Emil stated that this needs to be discussed by PennDOT, the developer, and council.

Jim said that he would not be in favor of the plan unless the developer is able to access their site via Rachel Drive. Emil stated that we could require money be placed in escrow so as to guarantee development of the Rachel Drive access.

B. Any Other New Business

Being that there was no other New Business Denise asked that we return to Old Business.

Old Business

Denise asked about the suggestions that were made by the Planning Commission at the April meeting regarding the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. Jeff pointed out that as reported at the May meeting one suggestion, regarding the ambulance service, was accepted by council and incorporated into the proposed amendment. However regarding the balance of the other comments and proposed amendments, council asked that the Planning Commission review these items and bring them back to council, having a representative present to explain the Planning Commission's reasoning and to answer any questions. Emil suggested that perhaps council should form a committee so that when these items come up they could meet with the Planning Commission so as not to take up too much time at the council meeting. Denise suggested that a council member be appointed to the Planning Commission.

Denise also pointed out that in the minutes of the last meeting, from which she was absent, it was reported that the idea of a second monthly meeting was discussed, but a motion was not made. After further discussion, Jim made a motion seconded by Ray to add the fourth Wednesday as a second monthly meeting date if the advertisement of such a meeting schedule could be "piggybacked" onto another legal ad so as not to incur additional costs. Further, whether to hold the second monthly meeting would be at the sole discretion of the Planning Commission and the 21 day deadline for plan submittal will only apply to the first meeting of the month. Submittal of plans 21 days prior to the second meeting of the month will not dictate that the second meeting be held. Motion passed unanimously.

There being no more business, Jay made a motion seconded by Calvin to adjourn at 8:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey McLaughlin