MINUTES
SCOTT TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
301 LINDSAY ROAD, MAIN MEETING ROOM
SCOTT TOWNSHIP, PA 15106
June 3, 2026

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mark Mox at 7:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Joe Orbovich	Present
Donald Kaminski, Secretary	Present
Kenneth Lee, Vice Chairman	Present
Martin Palma	Absent
Robert Burlett	Present
Trevor Tizard	Present
Mark Mox, Chairman	Present

Present – 6 Absent – 1

Also, Present: Mark Mox, Planning/Zoning/Code Enforcement Officer
John Vogel, Tucker Arensberg, PC; Township Solicitor
Marie Hartman, Lennon, Smith, Souleret; Township Engineer
Stephanie Wilshire, Assist. Zoning Officer, Planning/Code Enforcement Admin. Asst

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS LISTED ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments on items for review and consideration.

ITEMS FOR REVIEW & CONSIDERATION

Motion to approve the Minutes for the March 4, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting

Motion by Tizard, second by Kaminski to approve the Minutes for the March 4, 2026 Planning Commission meeting with one revision.

All in favor
Motion Carries (6-0)

Review and Recommendation of the Land Development and Subdivision Plan for the Sahrista Plan of Lots on Old Greentree Road.

Applicant:
Doug Tait – Tait Engineering
908 Perry Highway
Pittsburgh PA 15229

James Dinert – Sahrista Development
311 Woodcrest Dr.
Coraopolis PA 15108

Mox began by saying the applicant is re-subdividing what was already subdivided a few years ago from six lots to five so that the lots are wider. Mox asked the Engineer to go over the review letters from June 2, 2026.

Hartman began by stating there were no comments on the Subdivision Plan portion of the application – the plan met all of the requirements from the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. She reviewed and explained comments from the Land Development portion of the application:
Zoning:

1. The Ordinance requires an application that includes information relative to steep slopes that has not been provided.
2. The Ordinance requires steep slope areas of greater than 25% not be disturbed but the plan proposes disturbance of greater than 25% slope areas and looks to be limited to the construction of the swale and drain at the rear of the units.

Mox asked if Comment 2 would fall under an exception for essential services for utilities.

Hartman said that goes to what is essential services.

Mox said this is an exception that has been allowed as long as there was an easement over it and the essential services are within the easement.

Land Development:

1. The applicant must provide an itemized quantity takeoff and unit price cost estimate for the proposed work. The cost estimate helps determine the bond amount. This would include everything involving site work – earth disturbance, sanitary sewer connection, water line services, stormwater management system etc.
2. The Developer should contact the Township Solicitor to initiate preparation of the Development Agreement and Stormwater Management Agreement.
3. A Geotechnical Report wasn't reviewed before this meeting – the Engineer received a copy at the meeting, and it will be reviewed.

4. A Site Conditions Report must be submitted.
5. A Phase One Environmental Site Assessment must be submitted.
6. An Infrastructure Demand Statement must be submitted.
7. Preliminary floor plans for the proposed townhouses must be submitted.
8. Identify allowable slope disturbances within the slope zone analysis tabulation.
9. The applicant requested a modification for provision of a traffic impact study. The modification may not be necessary as it is unlikely that the development produces greater than 100 peak hour trips. Applicant to provide a statement with trip generation estimates.
10. The applicant requested a modification for the provision of a roadway structural analysis. The modification is not necessary as the development is not anticipated to create excessive traffic volumes of excessive loads. This could be dismissed.

Stormwater Management:

1. The plan includes calculations for a small project stormwater management plan. As greater than 5,000 sq. ft. of new impervious area and .25 acres of impervious area is proposed, a complete stormwater management plan must be provided for review.
2. The drainage swale shown on the plans appears to discharge directly onto Old Greentree Road. The discharge from this swale must be managed.

Tait asked, regarding the swale, if there is a preference where the stormwater should terminate. He said they would anticipate taking the swale to the front yard. The rock sumps will overflow into the landscaped areas.

Hartman reviewed that there are five units and each one has a rock sump. The three units in the center appear to have the rock sumps under the driveways. The two on each end have rock sumps to the side. The rock sumps are taking the foundation drains, maybe the roof drains and drains in the driveways. In the back of the units there's a pipe coming out of each of the units coming from the roof or foundation drains that are going to the swale. The swale in the back has an underdrain under it and it wraps around the side and disappears. The entirety of the water generated on the site needs to stay on the site.

Tait said that basically the front half of the building and driveway would drain to the rock sumps and the back half of the building and rear patio would drain to the infiltration trench that runs parallel with the back of the building. The property sits on the high side of the road. The basement is on grade in the front and the first floor is a half foot up from the patio at the rear. The rear yard will slope back towards the swale.

Hartman added that the hillside behind comes toward the units.

Tait said that's why the trench was added to take the water away from the back of the units.

Hartman said that this doesn't qualify for small project stormwater management. It's greater than 5,000 sq. ft. of impervious and doesn't qualify. She asked where are the storm drains on Old Greentree Road.

Tait said they are past the newest townhouses. The nearest catch basin is quite a distance.

Hartman said if they were seeking relief from the Stormwater Management Ordinance that wouldn't be something she could grant.

Vogel said they might be able to ask for a modification and the Planning Commission would recommend and Board of Commissioners pass it.

Tait asked if he could ask for a modification tonight.

Hartman said they would still need better calculations and the swale needs to be managed in some way.

Lee asked what the square footage is.

Tait said with the building footprint, driveway and patio it was approximately 1,700 square feet per unit or 8,500 square feet. He asked about using a level spreader or other means.

Hartman said there will be water from the hillside, water from the building going to that swale and they can't let that water get to the road.

Tait said they have nowhere to discharge as there's no storm sewer on that part of the Old Greentree Road.

Hartman suggested he take another look at managing the stormwater on the site – showing calculations - and then asking for a modification to use the Small Project Stormwater Management Plan. She asked if they were able to somehow have an agreement with the owner of the undeveloped adjoining property, maybe for a detention.

Burlett asked if they could extend the size of the rock sumps.

Tait said that they possibly could.

Mox asked if they would have to add easements over the swale and the rock sumps.

Tait said there is an existing 20 foot easement along the back property line.

Hartman said they would need an easement for the swale in back and along the sides.

Lee said the elevation plans provided were dated last year. He asked who the designer is because the title block is covered.

Dinert said he thinks the architect didn't update the revision date of the plan. He said he would submit new elevations with the architect's name showing. He asked Marie about the floor plans.

Hartman said the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance requires the applicant to submit a floor plan and not just the building elevation. She asked what is the disturbed area.

Tait said he believed it was 16,000 sq ft.

Hartman said that they didn't need an NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit, they just need an E&S (Erosion and Sediment Control) Plan. She asked if he knew if the adjoining property had an NPDES permit.

Mox answered that it was probably just an E&S Plan because it started out as a PRD (Planned Residential Development). And when the developer came in with a revised plan to develop just four townhouses, the Board of Commissioners made him give up the PRD.

Hartman said she is asking because the NPDES permit should have been closed or renewed.

Motion by Orbovich, second by Burlett to table the Land Development and Subdivision Plan for the Sahrista Plan of the Lots on Old Greentree Road.

All in favor
Motion Carries (6-0)

Review and Recommendation of the Subdivision Plan for 1391 Scrubgrass to divide one lot into two.

Applicant:
Rashed Alsoud
3012 Banksville Ave.
Pittsburgh PA 15216

Mox explained that this is the 5 acre parcel next to the Scott Conservancy on Scrubgrass Road. He asked Marie if the stream located on the parcel needs to be shown on the plan.

Hartman said yes, it should be shown.

Mox said the floodplain must also be identified. He noted there is an out-building located on the new parcel that isn't allowed because an accessory structure needs to be accessory to a primary structure.

Alsoud said the structure is in the process of being removed.

Mox asked about the 15ft by 15ft canopy noted on the plan.

Alsoud said that will also be taken down.

Hartman reviewed and explained the comments from the Engineer Review letter dated May 26, 2026. She repeated that it needs to be noted on the plans that the shed and canopy are to be razed.

Zoning:

1. The Zoning Table provided noted that the 25% of the depth of the lot as measured from the street right-of-way line…needs to be revised on the plan. Surveyor likely had old information.

Subdivision and Land Development:

1. Because a new lot is being created the applicant shall provide documentation of PaDEP Sewage Facilities Planning Module approval. The form needs to be prepared and then signed by the township.
2. Scrubgrass Road is a State Route and the PennDOT HOP note is a required clause on this plan.
3. The plan must identify the location of the FEMA floodplain or floodway. If none is present, provide a note stating that the site is not located within a FEMA floodplain or floodway.
4. The signature block labeled Township Declarations references the Planning Commission. Revise to reference the Board of Commissioners.
5. Provide the review clause for Planning Commission signature. The Planning Commission is the recommending body and the Board of Commissioners is the voting body. A signature from both are needed on the plan.

Lee asked if the two lots will use the same access point.

Alsoud said yes.

Hartman asked if the Township would require a Maintenance Agreement between the owners of the two lots, understanding that it's the same person now but could be two different parties in the future.

Vogel agreed because the owner might sell one or both lots at some point.

Hartman said a Maintenance Agreement could state that the two owners must jointly maintain the driveway. If there's no agreement the owners might not agree who is responsible for the driveway.

Mox asked if it could be noted on the Subdivision Plans.

Hartman said yes.

Mox asked how this can be enforced.

Vogel said it should be a simple Maintenance Agreement between the owner of record and the other owner of record and then recorded with the county and then noted on the plan. This would be the way to enforce the joint maintenance of the driveway.

Mox added to the #5 comment that another clause should be added to the plan which states when the applicant actually received the plan in case recording the final plan is delayed somehow.

Alsoud asked how complicated will it be to build a house.

Mox said he would have to provide plans to comply with the International Residential Code and there will be inspections for everything.

Motion by Burlett, second by Lee to recommend the Subdivision Plan for 1391 Scrubgrass to divide one into two, subject to satisfying the comments of the Engineer Review Letter dated May 26, 2026 and the following additional conditions:

1. Add a note to the Subdivision Plan that specifies that the existing 15ft x 15ft canopy and the vinyl/wooden shed are to be razed on parcel 2
2. Show the tributary stream on the Subdivision Plan.
3. Execute and record a Maintenance Agreement for the common access drive that will be shared by the two proposed lots. The Agreement must be recorded prior to final execution of the subdivision plan by the Township. A note shall be added to the Subdivision Plan that acknowledges the Maintenance Agreement and specifies the recorded book and page numbers.

All in favor
Motion Carries (6-0)

Continue discussing the ordinance(s) to prohibit storing dumpsters and storage containers in the roadway.

Mox asked if everyone had a chance to read the updated ordinance provided. He asked Vogel if we would also need an ordinance to modify the Zoning Ordinance.

Vogel said no.

Mox asked if Section 10 – Inconsistent Ordinances – would mean that the Zoning Ordinance would be inconsistent with this ordinance and is that okay.

Vogel said that if there's a conflict between this ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Ordinance governs.

Mox said we have a section in the Zoning Ordinance that deals with dumpsters. While it might not conflict with the Zoning Ordinance, it will be more strict. He asked if we should add the word "dumpster" to the definition of Portable Storage Container. He also questioned "cargo van" because this could be a licensed vehicle that is legally allowed to be stored in the roadway.

Vogel said he used language from another ordinance. We should change this example to suit the Township.

Mox suggested removing "box trucks" and "cargo vans" and including inoperable vehicles instead. This would mean it's not a licensed vehicle, it doesn't run, has a flat tire, etc.

Vogel said that would work. He asked if we should change what the Portable Storage Container is used for.

Mox said the definition of Portable Storage Container should include storage if items people want to keep and storage of items people want to dispose of.

Kaminski asked if we would add a separate definition for dumpster. He suggested adding the words "or disposal" in the definition.

Burlett asked if we could add dumpster as defined in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mox said there's no specific definition of dumpster in the Zoning Ordinance.

Vogel said adding "disposal of" after "used primarily for the storage of" in the definition.

Mox agreed. He said we also need to include "dumpster" with the other containers into that definition. He doesn't think items 5 or 6 in Section 4 are not necessary as the Township Code Enforcement, Planning and Zoning office handles all permits and doesn't require a two-stop process for approval. He suggested changing Section 5 by removing "The Borough Manager" to "Zoning Officer." He asked Vogel if Section 5 item 1 was needed.

Vogel said that item 1 should stay.

Mox suggested also changing Section 5 item 10 and remove "Code Enforcement Officer" and replace with "Township Zoning Officer" for the emergency permit. He also wants added to Section 7 item 1 that "no storage outside of the container is permitted." He asked if Vogel thinks the fine is enough.

Vogel said for Summary Criminal Offenses $600.00 is the maximum.

Lee asked if the Township should allow portable storage containers to be 12 feet wide or 8 feet wide – this is referring to Section 5 item 8.

Mox said 8 feet because that's what the Zoning Ordinance states.

Motion by Kaminski, second by Tizard to recommend to the Board of Commissioners the discussion of the Ordinance to regulate Portable Storage Containers and the approval to advertise.

All in favor
Motion Carries (6-0)

Discuss the model ordinance to regulate Date Centers

Mox began by saying that the State is in discussion to create their own regulations. PA House passed Bill 2151 that would provide a model ordinance for regulating Data Center. The Senate Committee must still vote. After the Senate votes and Governor approves it the law will be drafted which could take up to nine months.

Vogel said he sees some of these ordinances with many sections including zoning use, detailed performance standards, impact studies that involve screening, noise and lighting. Additionally, they include what may be involved in decommissioning and liability which includes power, water and broadband.

Mox liked the Penn Future model ordinance that was designed for Allegheny County. He also looked into Data Center Ordinance guides and toolkits. The Penn Future seems pretty comprehensive. The Planning Commission needs to realistically look at what Zoning District these Data Centers could go in and how large they could be.

Hartman said there are different kinds of Data Centers. First the Township would have to look at a location that the Township would be ok with and wouldn't impact the character of the adjoining zoning district. Some townships are incorporating an overlay.

Mox suggested a property off of Washington Avenue at the end of a side street zoned Industrial that has been an eyesore for years. It might prompt a storm sewer replacement along Washington Ave.

Hartman said there is stormwater associated with that development. In her experience the Data Centers don't use a lot of water for average daily usage but it's the fire demand where water is needed. However many of them are using their own storage tanks and creating their own suppression systems instead of upgrading public infrastructure.

Kaminski noted that several of the model ordinance provided mentioned an internal cooling system.

Mox said power demand continues to be an issue for Data Centers.

Vogel said that the Township cannot zone the use out. He asked what's the smallest size for a Data Center.

Lee said 50,000 square feet which seems small. He said it seems like every different ordinance that was reviewed has their own focus on what they prioritize. Lee looked up an ordinance from Ashburn VA which has the highest concentration of Data Centers. Their ordinance states they can't "start it up" unless the applicant has guaranteed power. Ashburn doesn't want residents to have to pay for the power. Their regulation requires certification that power is available. Lee also mentioned PA Governor Shapiro's GRID (Governor's Responsible Infrastructure Development that sets guidelines to regulate large-scale projects like Data Centers) Program as a starting point regarding power.

Vogel said they could theoretically put it anywhere with Conditional Use approval right now and the Township does have some ordinances that would regulate noise and access to water.

Burlett said these Data Centers generally come in three sizes – small data centers can be under 5,000 sq ft and mid-size are 5,000 to 50,000 sq ft. We shouldn't want to discourage a small complex from wanting a Data Center if they have need for it, but we should have some control over them.

Lee said we should be providing the framework for these categories.

Vogel said in many cases the Township just might not have the room for these. Maybe only a small Data Center.

Kaminski said they should limit size of Data Centers with distance from homes, screening and other restrictions.

Mox suggested the Planning Commission take a closer look at the Penn Future model for Allegheny County. Then discuss any changes they would like to see at the July meeting.

Lee said his concern is the ordinance doesn't cover electrical as much as he'd like.

Public Comments:

There were no additional public comments on items not on the Agenda.

Adjournment

Motion by Mox, second by Burlett to adjourn the meeting.

All in Favor
Motion Carries (6-0)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Attest: _____

TOWNSHIP OF SCOTT
SEAL
ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA.