

**APPROVED**

**MUNICIPALITY OF MT. LEBANON  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**DATE:** Tuesday, January 15, 2019

**TIME:** 7 p.m.

**PLACE:** Mt. Lebanon Municipality – Commission Chambers

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Suzanne Seiber, James Cannon, Andrew George, Clint Rounsfull, Dennis Pittman,

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Municipal Planner Ian McMeans, Municipal Engineer Dan Deiseroth

**1. Minutes**

- a. October 23, 2018 meeting. Mr. Pittman moved and Mr. Cannon seconded to approve the minutes of the October 23, 2018, Planning Board Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. Other Business**

- a. Appointment of the planning board liaison to the economic development council (EDC). Mr. Cannon moved and Mr. Rounsfull seconded to nominate Andrew George as planning board liaison to the EDC. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Cannon moved and Mr. Roundsfull seconded to appoint Mr. Pittman as alternate to the EDC. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. Old Business**

- a. Request for recommendation of an ordinance amendment. In August 2018 the Planning Board discussed a list of recommendations from municipal staff for amendments to Chapter XVI of the Mt. Lebanon Code, *Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance* (SALDO) to clarify and update a number of provisions in the SALDO.

Mr. Pittman asked about section 816, landscaping and screening standards. If there is a change of ownership would the new regulations come into effect if the existing facility is non-compliant, before an occupancy permit is re-issued.

Mr. McMeans said the new section 816 would give the municipality the ability to enforce upkeep and maintenance of landscaping plans. A new applicant would have to adhere to the standards, and section 816.4 gives specifications for continuous maintenance standards. The municipality would then have the authority to cite an owner under this ordinance.

Mr. Pittman asked if section 816.1.3 is for construction of parking garages.

Mr. Deiseroth said no. That section is meant for open spaces.

Mr. Deiseroth made indicated that section 816.2 – if items 1, 2, 3 face a residential zone it must be equipped with a removable screen, but there is no definition of a removable screen.

Mr. McMeans read section 816.2.2 and explained the area being screened could not be more than 20% visible.

There was discussion regarding definitions and explanations of screening, open areas, and loading docks. Mr. McMeans took notes to put before the solicitor for clarification.

Mr. McMeans had other items for the board's consideration. Section 817.1.4 regarding pervious pavement needing to accommodate a 10-year storm. He asked the board if this should be more or less strict. He said the number of a storm should not be too low, causing flooding, but higher storm number would affect cost how much stone should be under pervious pavement. Currently there are no standards for pervious pavements.

Mr. Deiseroth said he feels this section is not necessary because of the recently adopted stormwater management ordinance.

Mr. George said he feels the comment "per industry standards" related to the maintenance of pervious pavements is vague in section 817.1.2.

Mr. Deiseroth said this is explained in a later section.

Mr. McMeans said there is a requirement in the zoning ordinance and it is being added to the SALDO that any development with private stormwater facilities must submit an annual report to the engineer.

Mr. McMeans said in section 817.1.9 said pervious pavement shall count as 55% impervious surface in any zoning district for the purpose of impervious surface coverage calculations. This was seen recently with the proposed Pennsylvania Boulevard development where it was proposed pervious pavers would be used for the driveways in the front yard. The current front yard impervious surface requirement is 55%, meaning there cannot be more than 55% impervious surface. He asked if the board had any opinion on the percentage number of 55%.

There was discussion between the planner, engineer and board members to determine allowable pervious vs. impervious surface requirements.

Mr. Deiseroth recommended 60% based on engineering standards for support should the requirement be challenged.

Mr. Pittman asked if the municipality would need a basis in case of challenge of the requirements.

Mr. McMeans said there needs to be some type of standard for developers. Because this will be in the SALDO appeals would not go to the zoning hearing board, but instead could apply to the Commission for a modification to the SALDO.

Mr. Deiseroth said they should encourage developers to use creative stormwater management methods, while still being able to submit a project.

Mr. McMeans said the standards will apply to all districts—not just residential but commercial districts as well.

Mr. McMeans said he took notes that he will pass along to the solicitor for review.

Mr. McMeans asked if the board wants to allow ribbon driveways.

Mr. Cannon said he is against demanding aesthetics as the board sees them.

Mr. George said he does not see a problem with ribbon driveways.

#### **Citizen Comments**

There were no citizen comments.

The board decided not to take action on the ordinance at this time. They would like to see the changes to the SALDO once the solicitor has had time to correct wording, and will review the solicitor changes at a later meeting.

#### **4. New Business**

There was not new business.

#### **5. Citizen Comments**

Mr. Pittman, 375 Anawanda Avenue, said his neighbors asked if the engineer would explore the light standards at Baptist Homes to see if they meet standards.

Mr. Deiseroth said this would be reviewed by the chief zoning officer.

#### **6. Next Meeting** — The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Mt. Lebanon Planning Board is **Tuesday, February 19, 2019**, at 7:00 p.m. Please be advised the Planning Board meetings are on the third Tuesday of each month.

#### **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.