

Borough of Canonsburg

Planning Commission

June 1, 2023

1. Call to Order: 7:00 PM

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Defillipo at 7:00 PM

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call:

Mr. John Defillipo, Chairman - Present

Mr. Eric Chandler, Vice Chairman - Present

Mr. Tim Bilsky - Absent

Mrs. Pat Briner - Absent

Mr. Steve Moskal – Present

Others Present: Solicitor, Joseph Dalfonso, Code and Zoning Enforcement Officer, Melissa Graff, Engineer, Jeff Marcink

4. Public Comments:

Gentleman speaker - Is this on planning?

Mr. Dalfonso, Solicitor – Yes, this is the planning

Gentleman speaker – Any planning?

Mr. Dalfonso, Solicitor – Um, on the agenda item

Gentleman speaker – I saw the post in the observer-reporter, and it said, this is June Planning

Mr. Dalfonso, Solicitor – Yes, it's the planning commission meeting

Gentleman speaker – Ok. Can I ask a question about planning?

Mr. Defillipo – Stand up please and state your question

Gentleman speaker – I can ask my question?

Mr. Moskal – Name and address first

Gentleman speaker – Dennis Smiddle, 631 Highland Ave, Canonsburg, PA. I appreciate this opportunity to once again present my recommendation for Canonsburg's future plans. At past Canonsburg workshop meetings, I submitted my expert plans for a safer and more beneficial playground in the East End of Canonsburg. None of my recommendations have received any comment or consideration from this borough. Rich Russo didn't have the honesty

Mr. Moskal – Excuse me, sir, is this referring to an ordinance or anything of that nature, or are you planning to talk about something that is unrelative to us?

Mr. Smiddle – I'm talking about Canonsburg's future plans for playgrounds

Mr. Moskal – It's not part of the planning commission

Mr. Smiddle – That's what the article said

Mr. Moskal – This is the planning commission where we deal with ordinances and variances and all things of that nature, and right now that's not what we are here for

Mr. Smiddle – I suggest you make your post in the observer-reporter a little more clear. It said planning commission

Mr. Defillipo – Yes

Mr. Smiddle – Don't you plan playground designs? Playground renovations? You're doing it right now

Mr. Dalfonso, Solicitor – Mr. Smiddle, I think your comments would be more appropriate for a council meeting. This board really doesn't have any control over

Mr. Defillipo – This is about the application for Harold Close

Mr. Smiddle – I think your planning meetings should be a little more appropriately written in the observer-reporter

Mr. Defillipo – Does anybody else have any comment on Harold Close's

Female speaker – Just so I can make sure I am addressing Harold and the brewery, is this acceptable to bring my concerns?

Mr. Moskal – We are talking about that

Female speaker – Ok

Male audience member – Are people being sworn in today?

Mr. Dalfonso, Solicitor – This is not a hearing

Mr. Moskal – It's not a hearing

Female speaker – My name is Melissa McNutt, I live at 614 Euclid Ave, I've been a resident of east end for 20 years, and I've seen a great deal in my end. I do have concerns regarding a brewery. My alley is Dogwood, my car has been hit twice, we've had a pedestrian hit which you remember. I've seen suspicious activity in my alley over the years. I'm dealing with very frustrating parking issues now. Dealing with the increase of apartments, which is um hogging up the parking space, which is public, but it's interfering with the residents that have lived in east end for a long, long time. I've had issues with Renovation Nation, one of those issues was one of their delivery trucks, which was an

eighteen (18) wheeler, ended up at my dead-end street and ended up pulling down my cable lines from my house, causing home damage. So, this is more than just a worry, a money-greedy way of making money, this is actually interfering with people's lives. Now, the way my house is situated, it's in the rear, and you would think I would never have those issues with an eighteen (18) wheeler ripping the cable off of my house, but I did. At no fault of my own because of a business that takes advantage of the open zoning permits. I could deal with a carpet place, even though those two ladies were not at all concerned with the neighborhood, let alone concerned with me and my house being damaged. Then we have that barber shop there on the corner, and now a brewery. It's only going to compact this issue so much more. I know Canonsburg is fully aware of the activities at my end of the street, if you allow these individuals to continue, you're inviting more potential problems on top of already existing problems. So, that concludes my concern.

Dennis Smiddle, 631 Highland Ave – Thank you. I have comments more pertinent to the brewery. I am proud to say I am a lifelong resident of 72 years in Canonsburg, PA. A lot of people didn't stay or live this long in Canonsburg. I remember my times in Canonsburg, especially in the east end very well. My dad worked at the Pennsylvania Transformer, my aunt and uncle owned and operated a bar/restaurant named Kutch's Cafe. There were a number of bar/restaurants in the east end of Canonsburg, due to the large number of employees at the Pennsylvania Transformer. They are all gone now, but I remember Carmen's where a kid could get a large slice of pizza for a quarter, a place called Natale's and of course, Kutch's Café next to where Sarris Candies is today. I spent a great deal of fun time with other kids in the lower east end, and at the playground in the middle of Perry Como Ave. Also, there were a number of other businesses in the east end, and there was a store on every corner. They are all gone now too, and the Dukis Grocery Store was probably the largest. This is how people got their groceries back in the day. My family didn't have a car, so we depended very heavily on going to the local stores. To deny the occupancy of a micro-brewery and possibly a restaurant or store in this area of east end

Canonsburg, is like denying a part of our town's history and legacy. It's like denying a reason to visit our town and great memories of our past. Why would anyone consider doing something like this in the first place, I mean not issuing an occupancy? I know all my east end friends would welcome this place wholeheartedly and it would be a reason for them to return to Canonsburg. Thank you.

Missy Monahan, 536 Euclid Ave – I am asking you along with the residents of Duquesne, Euclid, Franklin, and Perry Como Ave. that you do not approve this application for a micro-brewery at 546 Euclid Ave. This is a residential area where back in the 60's to late 80's was Dukis's Store with two apartments upstairs. My aunt and uncle used to live upstairs in that store. Back then, there was no parking for customers to go into the store. The residents that lived in the apartments, each resident had one spot plus the house on Perry Como had a spot, so that was three (3) spots that were needed to park there. If a spouse or someone else had a vehicle they had to either park on Euclid or Perry Como. If a customer was in the store or a resident was there, they were not able to park in the lot. Also, it took up spots on Perry Como, at which time it took up Mr. Conte's customers for his business on Perry Como. We have had parking issues on Euclid, Perry Como, and Dogwood Alley for many years, that continue today. Just now, as I am speaking to you, from 546 Euclid Ave, on my side of the street itself, down to 520 Euclid Ave, there are seventeen (17) cars parked there from houses, apartments, and residents. The house next door is an apartment, and they have two (2) cars, the house next door to me has two (2) cars, my house has two (2) cars. The couple that just moved in next door have two (2) cars, the lady next door has two (2) cars, there's an apartment complex there's two (2) cars there and so on and so forth. So, you are going to ask these people, just on that one side of the street, that when they come home they are not going to be able to park there, where they have been parking for thirty (30) plus years, to accommodate parking for a micro-brewery that we don't have, that we don't need. We also have other issues there. Between Duquesne, Euclid, Franklin, and Perry Como we have families that are hard of hearing, there are a few

that have dementia, there are other issues that need to be taken into consideration. There is an active church that is at 613 Euclid Ave, there's a school bus stop at Euclid and Como. There's a playground on Franklin Ave. Between Duquesne, Euclid, Franklin, and Perry Como Ave, we have all this traffic impact. Starting at Adams Ave, there is the Eagles, on Duquesne, there's the French Club, on Franklin, there's the PNU, on Highland, there's the Hofbrau. The little general which is now the CM Mini Mart, now you can go in there and buy alcohol. We don't need or want another establishment here, take it to your neighborhood, bring it to your establishment because back for as long as this building has been vacant, if Canonsburg would have stepped up and listened to the complaints about this building, the borough should have took it and made it a public nuisance and ordered to be demolished. For those of you that have kids, how would you feel if this micro-brewery was coming into your neighborhood? What would you do if it was two (2) doors down from you?

Mr. Defilipo – Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak? If not, we'll have Harold Close present his case.

5. New Business:

- A. The application by Harold Close, who is requesting conditional use approval to allow a microbrewery located at 409 Perry Como Ave/546 Euclid Ave (parcel #090-015-00-04-0018-00), Canonsburg, PA 15317 in Canonsburg Borough.**

Mr. Defilipo – Under new business, we have the application by application by Harold Close, who is requesting conditional use approval to allow a microbrewery located at 409 Perry Como Ave/546 Euclid Ave (parcel #090-015-00-04-0018-00), Canonsburg, PA 15317 in Canonsburg Borough. Do we have Harold Close present?

Mr. Dalfonso, Solicitor – Mr. Chairman before you get into it, um, we do have members of the public here. We do need a public comment portion

Mr. Defilipo – Do we have it before or after?

Mr. Dalfonso – Before

Rus Giancola, Representative of Harold Close – As you are aware we have submitted an application for conditional use approval.

Mr. Moskal – Your address, sir

Male Speaker – He is representing the applicant

Rus Giancola – We have been in contact with the engineer, Jeff Marcink who we received a review letter, two review letters this afternoon. In his email, he indicated there would be additional discussion about what is necessary for the conditional use application that would be deemed complete. So, at this time, we are not asking for a decision from the planning commission, we are asking that the decision be tabled until it is complete. If Jeff Marcink or anyone else has any comments on what else is needed for the application to be deemed complete, we are happy to hear them.

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – Just the point of order. This body is a recommendation body. By ordinance, by state statute, council needs to have their conditional use hearing within sixty (60) days of the application being submitted.

Rus Giancola – Being complete?

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – Being complete. So, if we are going to rest that it is not complete tonight, that's how we are going to proceed forward, correct?

Rus Giancola – We are in agreement that it is not complete, so the clock for a decision hasn't been triggered. We just want to make sure that we don't have to come back in a

month and it's still not complete. So, we would like to have whatever clarity we need to get it completed

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – Ok

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I'm just going to go through the letter here, and we can have a discussion on some of the comments. This is based on the June 1 letter

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – He just asked this board to table it.

Steve Moskal – So, why

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – He wants the engineer to go through the letter

Rus Giancola – We have the letter. If there's any comments or anything

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I'm not going to read the letter verbatim. I just want to go over some of the higher-level comments in here. My first question is this is being defined as a micro-brewery but none of the documentation shows where the beer is actually being brewed. Is the beer being brewed on site, or is it being brewed off site and being hauled in?

Male Speaker – It will be brewed on site

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Where is that going to occur, and how much space do you need? It doesn't look like you will have enough room in that kitchen area.

Male Speaker – Basement

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers - We will need a plan that actually shows where the brewery is actually located in order for this to be classified as a micro-brewery. It has to be brewed on site, otherwise, it looks to be more like it would be a restaurant or tavern. We will let you go back through the application and provide that plan to show the micro-brewery. There are some dimensional requirements. I understand the building is existing so we are

too concerned on the setbacks of the building itself, but as far as the other items in that section, the maximum impervious area will need to be addressed. Like I said, outside of that, the lot size is adequate we can't change that anyway, and the setbacks are what they are, because the building is an existing non-conforming use. We do need to address the impervious area and determine some sort of storm water control.

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Just to clarify your comments on the impervious surface, because the site as it sits right now is entirely impervious, and it was that way shouldn't based on the stormwater ordinance be as long as we don't increase that impervious surface, shouldn't that be deemed adequate for the storm section of the ordinance?

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I'd have to see what the pre-existing conditions looked like which was a demolished site when I was out there. It looked like there was some grass previously with that use, and with that site being altered and changed, we are dictated by an MS-4 permit as well, so we have to make sure we are in compliance, and we don't allow any run-off on any properties

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure, I get that I just wanted to clarify how the ordinance was

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah, I see you have some shallow swells, so I think we could work through that and probably make that work

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Yeah, we were good at collecting the water and getting to wherever we needed to. We weren't sure I mean wherever we need to take that water to we can, but we are going to make sure we capture it

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah, I think the swells would be viable some sort of plantings in there, more of like a bio retention area is something we would be looking for. I

think that would be doable we just have to make sure that gets addressed through this application.

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – I think space wise bio retention we wouldn't have the depth to do that. We could possibly do green space versus distinct flowers

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Ok. Either way I think we would need some sort of variance on that impervious area, but we will discuss that as we move forward

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Article 5 that's just some basic comments in there. Fire protection, I do want to see something for planning approval. The other items as far as noise, vibrations, smoke, ash, dust, I'm also noting that this applies to construction activities as well not just the operation of a micro-brewery. Just the

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Wouldn't the noise for construction not be applicable here though, like when they are doing their actual renovations. Isn't noise between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM acceptable?

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I'd have to review. I think its 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Ok, so as long as the work hours stay within that we should be fine.

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Right. There was a response as far as the odors. The applicant stated, "brewery design to address in construction documents" and I wasn't sure what that meant so anything that is part of construction needs to be submitted for review and recommendation by the planning commission. So, we do need to see any of those construction details

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Yeah, so the way I understood this to go is we came in for the conditional hearing first, and once we had that we could provide the plans for actual planning approval for the development of the lot. So, that's what we were submitting initially to get the approval for the permit to say we could put this micro-brewery here and then after that we would get the actual recommendation(s) to approve the renovations and the construction of that through the council. So, it would be kind of a two (2) piece where this seems to be taking everything all at once, which if that's the way you guys prefer to do it that's fine, we were going to do it two (2) pieces. I think that is where the disconnect is coming from

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I wouldn't disagree as like a preliminary approval and a final approval, but we couldn't give approval without seeing all of these items addressed

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Ok

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – That's the way I typically handle these

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah, because if we end up approving it and it comes back that one of these items can't be met, now we are kind of all stuck in the middle, do you have approval, do you not have approval

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure, sure. Yeah, we usually do like the preliminary and then the final, but that's fine

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – As far as lighting and glare, we do need to see the lighting plan. Erosion plans need to be submitted as well as some kind of post construction storm water management. I know you have some sort of calcs as far as how much run-off you are anticipating where the roof discharges and I would be happy to work with you guys on some sort of swell to maintain that run-off. Buffer areas, I see the buffer area has been

included that is going to be box wood shrubs, so if you can just let me know what species and size those shrubs will be. The same on the deciduous trees, I agree that two (2) would be needed based on the building footprint. You would just need to let me know the size and the species of the trees proposed

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure. We have the appendix view. We may change the shrubs as well just to come off of that list and make everything easier

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yep, that works too. Thank you. So, into Article 6, comment number two (2), those items need to be addressed. The first cycle review you guys provided a comment that the micro-brewery is listed as a conditional use in Table 301. That is correct, but under Article 6 it's stating standards for comparable uses not specifically listed, means it's not specifically listed in Article 6. So, if you see there's like daycare and different things but micro-brewery is not specifically listed so these comments would apply. It's pretty basic information. Number of employees, floor area, type of products, your basic operations. Section 170-603 you guys copied in some of that language as well so I kind of just moved that to the Article 6 area. So, it shows that this is going to be a three (3) bedroom, which requires a minimum of 1,200 sq. ft., you have at least that because you have 55x30 is what the plan shows, but there was some comments stating that the square footage is 1,632, so if you can just make sure those floor plans match and have the right dimensions on there. I'm a little bit confused by the apartment because there is a micro-brewery office and a restroom located inside of the apartment.

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – So, just to clarify, it's going to be a two (2) bedroom apartment instead of three (3). To meet the square footage requirements, it's going to be two (2) bedroom

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Ok. So, what about the office then? So, this is going to be a dual occupancy apartment? I'm confused by that. It looks like there is one point of ingress and egress for the apartment, and it looks like it is the same for the office

Brandon Wilttrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Yeah so that's going to be more for the brewery a storage area for them. So, it won't be highly used it will be more like excess storage.

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – So, your occupancy for the apartment I believe you already have because now that means dual use

Harold Close – The apartment is built out; the fire inspector has been out there and there were a few issues that needed to be addressed. Those issues have been addressed and once I have an actual tenants name the fire inspector will come back and sign off on the occupancy

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Occupancy for an apartment?

Harold Close – Just the apartment

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – So, what's the office? I'm just confused by that

Harold Close – It's just an extra area that I couldn't use as part of the apartment because I can't provide parking for it, so instead of having two (2) apartments upstairs, there will be one

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – But I guess to access that office you have to enter the apartment

Harold Close – No. There is a common hallway. Common stairway I guess that would be technically

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah, which is the same stairway as the apartment.
There's no separate door or anything like that

Harold Close – The main entrance at the back of the building, it is a common stairwell and at the top of the steps there is a fire door that goes to the right which is to the apartment and a fire door to the left which is the quote unquote office

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Right, but that's the hallway for the apartment. Like, to get from the kitchen to the bedroom, you have to walk through that hallway

Harold Close – No

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – That's what this drawing shows

Brandon Wilttrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Showed the planning commission a different drawing

Harold Close – There is a line missing. At the top of the steps there is a break

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – If you could get those revised and make sure the actual brewery is identified, we need more dimensions on there

Harold Close – Yes sir. I took actual measurements today

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Ok. Then I would also like this to be signed and sealed by your engineers

Harold Close – Absolutely

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – So, just continuing through submit the floor plan with dimensions, two (2) off-street parking spaces are required for that apartment, so we will want to make sure that there is signage restricting and reserving parking spaces just for the apartment, so everyone is aware. Then which two (2) spaces are reserved for the

apartment? It sounded like that was the stacked spaces one (1) and two (2), is that accurate?

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – That was the intention, yes

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – So, how do you get in and out of space number two (2)?

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – You would have to back in and out. It's like a single stall garage. A driveway with a single stall garage, you would have to stack your parking for a single residence

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I don't think that is acceptable. Article 8 of the zoning ordinance states, "access to parking areas shall be designed so as not to obstruct free flow of traffic. There shall be adequate provision for ingress to and egress from all parking spaces to ensure ease of mobility, ample clearance, and safety of vehicles and pedestrians. So, that stacked parking space does not comply since there is no ingress/egress or ease of mobility

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Ok. We can look at relaying out the parking lot

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Ok

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – The thought was there that anything with a commercial use where people would be coming and going we would have access to other spaces because we can stack in the ordinance with garages and driveways, that was the intention there

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – If there is another layout that works, I'd like to see it

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Yeah, absolutely

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers - Article 7 – Conditional Uses and Special Exceptions. Outdoor lighting is the only thing remaining in Article 7, so submit the lighting plan. Article 8 – Off-Street Parking. I guess this areas has the most comments and concerns. So, as far as just parking design, parking area shall be designed to provide sufficient turnaround area so that vehicles are not required to back onto the cartway of any public street. Som the four (4) spaces on Perry Como, they would have to back out into the street to get out of those spaces

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Yeah, that was the existing parking area that was there. Those were parking spaces whenever we acquired the lot. So, those were to be made as parking, those were the use of them prior, so we just reused that area

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I don't know that there was any approval of parking

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Well yeah that was what was there before

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah because that won't comply. You're going to have to back out of those spaces, and if you are in the space closest to the building, you don't really have any sight distance there at all

Mr. Moskal – There is no curb

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – There are four (4) spaces shown but there is no curb cut or driveway access off of Perry Como into the property, so you would be driving over the curb and sidewalk to get into those spaces, and it also shows a No Parking sign on the plans, and that's actually a 1-Hour Parking Sign not No Parking

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Ok. We missed that

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah, so then that would be eliminating an additional one (1) or two (2) parking spaces on the street. It is limited to one (1) hour, but that still

removes on-street parking. As far as access to parking areas shall be designed so as not to obstruct free flow of traffic. There shall be adequate provision for ingress/egress from all parking spaces. So again, that is more on the two (2) stacked parking spaces, so if that spot is occupied there is no ingress/egress for spot number two(2)

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering - Right

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – There is another ordinance comment where sidewalks occur in parking areas, parked vehicles shall not overhang the sidewalk unless an additional one (1) foot is provided in order to accommodate such overhang. So, again those four (4) spaces on Perry Como, those could be overhanging the sidewalk causing an ADA access issue. It's kind of tight, it might work, it might not. The ADA space you have shown there right at the entrance, make me a bit nervous because I believe you have to pull into that spot, you really can't back in in any way. Then they have to back out and they are going to back out into the driveway entrance and onto the sidewalk to exit that parking space

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – We could just potentially move that away from the sidewalk up closer but the thing with that is the ADA access would be at the front of the building, if we shifted it up and away it wouldn't be the closest parking space

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Any parking space there would have that same issue. I don't have the scale on me, but I am assuming that's an eighteen (18) foot line that runs from the building straight to the property line, so any spot there would have to back out into the sidewalk

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Uh, they would be backing into the access isle. It's a one-way access isle which is twelve (12) feet wide per the angled parking ordinance

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I'm just saying on the first spot right off of Euclid, when you pull in, you can pull into the spot, in order to back out, you're not backing out into your cartway, you're backing out onto the public sidewalk

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure, I see what you are saying

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah, so it technically states that you can't back out into a cartway is what the ordinance states. I know the sidewalk isn't a cartway, but it is a public right of way and I see a safety concern with that if there are children around especially with the park being close there. Just a couple additional parking space comments, one we already kind of talked through. How are those four (4) parking spaces along Perry Como accessed? Like I said, you would be driving over the sidewalk, so that's not a proper ingress/egress to those parking spaces, you would actually need a driveway off of Perry Como. As far as backing out, that would be in violation of the ordinance as well. Then the width those four spaces, it wasn't called out on the plan, so on the revision, if you can make sure everything is dimension or even if you can give me 24x36 because I can use a twenty (20) scale on the size drawing

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Ok

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Yeah, I thought maybe when I was looking it wasn't lined up with the bar scale perfectly. It didn't look like you had thirty-six (36) feet, you know the nine (9) foot wide for each of those four (4) spots, it didn't look like there was thirty-six (36) feet available it looked like it was closer to thirty-three (33), so I didn't know if those spaces actually fit in there or not. So, like I said, if you can get dimensions on your revised plan

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – No problem. Absolutely

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – I'm highly recommending trying to entertain another parking alternative, and I don't know that those four (4) spaces or the two (2) stacked would be acceptable, so I would see if there is another alternative for your way out

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Then just as far as markings, I understand that it is a gravel surface so you really can't paint everything, we wouldn't require you painting gravel, but you will need to make sure they are delineated in some manner just so you're not having a free for all through there

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering - Sure

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – But then also any of the reserved parking spaces for the apartment and any of the employees are going to have to have reserved parking spaces as well. We would like to see those carved out on the plans. I think that is pretty much it. I mean lighting, we will need to see that lighting plan, post construction storm water management plan, and then I just left the number of parking spaces required table in here. You're stating that essentially the parking I guess you are planning to limit your occupancy based on how many parking spaces can fit on site, so you want to be limited to thirty (30) occupants. How is that occupancy going to be controlled and monitored? Is there like a doorman that will be watching or something? I mean that can be addressed in Article 6, where there's the number of employees and their roles and identify that there as well

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Right. From our standpoint, do you have any recommendations what you would like to see for that, because any other business that is going out what regulations to they have to follow.

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – Generally it's the fire code official determining the occupancy of the building. With this, and it being conditional use, sure that can be an agreed to condition, but that's going to be tough to enforce on both sides of the picture. I mean if Mr.

Close has fifty (50) people in there one evening, he is violating his conditional use. Then again is there a borough official that is going to be watching him do that. It's going to be tricky solve I believe

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure, which would be the case with most businesses, correct?

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – Yeah, but the difference with the other businesses is the occupancy is the occupancy. This occupancy is strictly to provide adequate parking

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – There is the potential that the building itself could have a higher occupancy then

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – Correct. Then he would not be required to find additional off-street parking

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – I understand, right

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – Like I said, outside of that I left the table in there for how many parking spaces are required. If you can prove that it's a micro-brewery, then it would classify as all other uses, but I left that in there in case it ended up being classified as a bar/restaurant/tavern which is obviously quite a bit different

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering - Right

Jeff Marcink, KLH Engineers – That's all my comments, I would like to see the revised parking layout showing the ingress/egress, curb cuts that are there and proposed, and if you could make sure that all the plans have the added extra dimensions on there, I might be better off looking at them on my computer. If you make sure that all the plans are signed and sealed as well, and we get a complete building floor plan layout, so we understand where the actual brewery is located, if you have tables and chairs and anything else you have going on there for occupancy reviews as well

Brandon Wiltrout, Gibson-Thomas Engineering – Sure, no problem

John Defilipo – It seems as though you have quite a few issues that have to be taken care of. What's your recommendation, Jeff?

Joe Dalfonso, Solicitor – Mr. Chairman, the applicant did request that this be tabled in order for them to submit a complete application. If the commission would like you can make a motion to table this at the request of the applicant, to provide a complete application

Mr. Moskal made a motion to table this at the request of the applicant, to provide a complete application. Seconded by Mr. Chandler. All in favor. Motion Carries.

6. Old Business

None.

7. Adjournment:

Mr. Chandler made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:42 PM. Seconded by Mr. Moskal. Meeting adjourned at 7:42 PM.

Submitted by: Melissa Graff