MINUTES
SCOTT TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
301 LINDSAY ROAD, MAIN MEETING ROOM
SCOTT TOWNSHIP, PA 15106
July 1, 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	Present
Robert Burlett	Present
Trevor Tizard	Present
Mark Mox, Chairman	Present

Present – 7 Absent – 0

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

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 June 3, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting

Motion by Tizard, second by Orbovich to approve the Minutes for the June 3, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

All in favor
Motion Carries (7-0)

Review and Recommendation of the Sahrista Plan of Lots Subdivision Plan to resubdivide six lots into five lots on Old Greentree Road.

Hartman confirmed there are no comments on the subdivision portion of the application.

Mox reviewed the comments from the Allegheny County Economic Development review letter regarding the Subdivision portion of the application. The letter offered the following comments:

- It is recommended that the owners' information for the neighboring parcel labeled "The Mead Plan of Lots" be drawn lighter to prevent confusion – it could be interpreted as being included in the plan.
- To ensure the owner is aware that the recording of this plat does not change the ownership of the property and that they will need to record a deed, a "Deed Required Notification Clause" should be added to the plans and the owners should sign it.
- The Allegheny County Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance states that color maps may not be used.

Review and Recommendation of the Sahrista Townhomes Land Development Plan on Old Greentree Road.

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

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

Mox reviewed the comments from the Allegheny County Economic Development review letter regarding the Land Development portion of the application. The letter offered the following comments:

- The consolidation plan should be recorded first.
  - The consolidation plan should also be attached in the land development plan as a separate page in addition to the current existing conditions drawing on page 1.
- The site plan drawings should only show port-consolidation conditions.
  - The Slope Zone Map on page 2 should be updated to show post conditions and the original lot lines and names should be removed.
  - The original lot lines and names should be removed from the drawings on pages 3, 4, 5 and 7.
- It is recommended that the owner's information for the neighboring parcel labeled "The Mead Plan of Lots" be drawn lighter to prevent confusion – it could be interpreted as being included in the plan.
- The Allegheny County SALDO states that color maps may not be used.
- The location, size and specifications for private improvements were not provided on the plans submitted.
- The location, photometrics and specifications for lighting were not provided on the plans submitted.
- The plan only proposes five red maple trees. Are they the only form of landscaping proposed?
- Certificates were not provided on the plan submitted, if applicable.

Mox asked Hartman to go over the comments from the Engineer Review letter, dated June 30, 2026.

Zoning:

1. The Ordinance requires a statement relative to steep slopes. The applicant indicated that a letter from a Soils Engineer would be provided at a later date.
2. The Ordinance requires that steep slope areas of greater than 25% not be disturbed. The plan proposed disturbance of 25% or greater slope area. Any relief would require a variance.

Tait said a soils report was provided after the 2nd submittal deadline.

Hartman said any reports submitted after the deadline have not been reviewed yet.

Tait said he believed this would be the area covered under essential services.

Mox said in the Zoning Ordinance under the Steep Slopes there are exceptions. How it's looked at as an essential service is that under stormwater improvement the Township would require that the applicant must accept any upstream flow of water and must allow it to drain through their property in such a manner. The Township looks at this as an essential service because they require that they do this under the stormwater ordinance.

Hartman asked how the mechanism for approval would be noted.

Mox said it would be an exception that is in the Zoning Ordinance.

Hartman said she would update the next review letter with this exception.

Land Development:

1. The Ordinance requires that the applicant shall post completion security. A quantity takeoff and unit price estimate were received. The required bond amount will be determined and provided under separate cover following resubmission of an updated plan set addressing remaining comments.
2. The Ordinance requires a Development Agreement be executed with the Township. This is pending.
3. The Ordinance requires preliminary major land development applications to include a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. The letter was received yesterday but not reviewed yet.
4. The Ordinance requires major land development applications include a preliminary building floor plan of all levels including square footage of development, proposed usage, types of rooms, door locations, window locations and service areas. This was provided but much of the text and dimensions in the provided floor plans sheets are illegible.
5. The Ordinance requires major land development applications include a traffic impact study. A trip generation report was provided. The applicant has submitted a request to waive the requirement to provide a traffic impact study. As fewer than 100 peak hour trips are proposed a traffic impact study is not required.
6. The Ordinance requires major land development applications include a roadway structural analysis. The applicant submitted a request to waive the requirement to provide a roadway structural analysis for the development. As fewer than 100 peak hour trips are proposed, a roadway structural analysis is not required.

7. The ordinance states that each lot shall be served by public water and sanitary sewers and the developer and/or landowner shall be responsible for entering into a developer's and/or landowner's agreement with the Township to provide such facilities in accordance with its rules and regulations. The limits of pavement and curb repair along Old Greentree Road necessary for the water lateral installations must be shown on the plans. Relevant Township details for restoration must be included. Restoration must be shown in accordance with current Scott Township construction standard details.

Tait said the water company will do the tap-in and the street opening permit. Will the note on the plan still be necessary.

Hartman said yes. The water line needs to be shown on the plan.

Stormwater Management:

1. The ordinance requires a stormwater management plan be submitted. The applicant has submitted a request to waive the requirement to provide a complete stormwater management plan for the development. As greater than 5,000 square feet of new impervious area and 0.25 acres of impervious area are proposed, a complete stormwater management plan must be provided for review. Also, it appears gravel sumps are proposed to collect runoff from the townhouses; the sumps do not appear to have an overflow. The applicant must clarify how runoff from the gravel sumps is to be permanently removed; provide field measured infiltration rates.
2. The ordinance requires the discharge of stormwater runoff shall be to a well-defined drainage course, which has a defined bed and bank. A portion of the swale on the east side of the townhouse cluster has been replaced by conduit and a level spreader. Details and sizing calculations for the level spreader have not been provided to show that the peak post-development 100-ear discharge is not greater than pre-development 2-year discharge. A waiver request must be submitted for the proposed level spreader.

Hartman stated that the most difficult comments to answer will be stormwater management.

Tait said they are looking at the feasibility of taking a pipe down the road to the closest catch basin.

Mox asked Hartman if she could see any other way of doing this without putting in this storm line.

Hartman said the calculations must be done first and that should give them the answer. She asked if there was any way to use the land on the opposite side where there's a rock sump – can something different be done there? It looks like the swale run-off is going to the left side and everything else is going to right side.

Tait said what's being shown is for the 2-year discharge as if it's a small project system. If they take the 100-year discharge down to the 2-year it'll be so big that they'll have to use a tank. Then how do they get the water out of the tank. That almost forces them to get a connection to the stormwater system. He asked for

clarification that these individual townhomes couldn't be considered individual small project design. Would that be something they could get a modification or waiver for.

Hartman said they would still need an overflow out of the rock sumps.

Tait there is a pop-up overflow detailed on the plan.

Hartman said that is an unmanaged overflow.

Tait agreed.

Hartman asked what the mechanism would be to ask for the board to allow the applicant to use a small project approach rather than a what the ordinance requires.

Puchalski said that would be a separate discussion to determine how to go about that. She asked Mox and Hartman if this request would require a lot of modifications.

Mox said in the Stormwater Management ordinance there is a section that discusses modifications. The applicant would have to show that there's a hardship that doesn't allow them to comply with the ordinance as written.

Puchalski said that there's a high threshold in that hardship language which means that the topography or something related to the property wouldn't allow the applicant to comply with the ordinance. She said they should follow the process noted in the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Mox asked, as an example, if they weren't able to extend the line down the road that could be looked at as a physical hardship that no matter who developed this property would have to deal with.

Puchalski said yes.

Mox read Section 110 A-D of the Stormwater Management Ordinance that regulate waiver or modification requirements. Item D refers to Stormwater Management Article V - Design Criteria. He asked if this modification would even be allowed.

Puchalski asked if the required request for modification had been made in writing per the Stormwater Plan.

Tait said they had requested a modification to allow a Small Project design but didn't include the reason why. He said this request would be similar to a Variance request.

Mox agreed.

Tait said if they look into putting that pipe down the road and find it can't be done we could complete a modification request including hardships.

Dinert asked if that is something needed before the next scheduled meeting.

Mox said yes if they wanted to be on the August agenda. He recommended Dinert look at the feasibility of connecting to the existing storm line first.

Dinert asked if the storm line in the street does needs to be extended to the beginning of his property

Hartman said they would extend the storm line to the point where they would need to connect to it. She recommended that when they provide their waiver request make sure they show what storm they're capturing. If making the sumps larger would help, she would recommend they do so. If the overflows activate which would flow directly to the road and then go downhill – there should be some attempt to mitigate this.

Lee asked about the three center units. The space between the entrance door and the garage door is maybe two feet. He asked where the gas and electric meters will be placed and where the owner will put their garbage and recycling cans.

Dinert said the electric meters will be placed on one end. Gas meters will be on the side of the end units. He said there's space inside the garage for trash cans.

Hartman suggested that if the trash cans are kept inside the garage there may not be room to park two cars. It might be something to look at.

Dinert said there is additional space along the sides of the garage by the stairwell to store trash cans or shelves.

Lee said it looks like there's a two foot recess beside the foyer and it's conceivable that there's room inside the garage for trash cans. He suggested showing this on the plans.

Motion by Kaminski, 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 (7-0)

<u>Review and Recommendation of the Variance Application for relief from strict compliance of the side yard setback requirement at 566 Robin Drive.</u>
7/01/2026

Applicant:
Tom Galluze – Applicant's Father
130 Woodridge Dr.
Carnegie PA 15106

Mox said the applicant wants to rebuild the deck off the back of their home, and this would interfere with where the pool has been placed in the back yard. They want the stairs and landing to be constructed to the side of the deck going down to the side yard. The neighbor next door is the mother of the applicant and has a similar deck/stairs set up in her backyard. He explained to Galluze that the Planning Commission is a recommending body and the final approval could only come from the Zoning Hearing Board. Mox verified that there is about 10 feet between the house and property line. He asked Galluze to explain the hardship.

Galluze said that the stairs would end at the only flat area of the yard. There's really not another good area to put them.

Motion by Orbovich, second by Burlett to recommend to the Zoning Hearing Board the Variance application for relief from strict compliance of the side yard setback requirement at 566 Robin Drive.

All in favor
Motion Carries (7-0)

Discuss the model ordinance to regulate Data Centers

Mox started by stating the importance of getting regulations in place because information on Data Centers is constantly changing. The ordinance should regulate where they go, provide setback requirements, establish provisions for Conditional Use and provide utility requirements that need to be provided at the time of submittal.

Puchalski said there's been some talk that the Governor and the legislature might establish a moratorium for a time to allow municipalities to get their ducks in a row to establish ordinances that will regulate Data Centers.

Mox said he can see a few parcels in the C3-General Commercial and I-General Industrial zoned areas were Data Centers would be a good fit. The PennFuture Model Data Center Ordinance is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for Date Centers which is something to keep in mind particularly when it comes to accessory uses. It seemed like it's almost a given that there will be some sort of accessory use with the Data Centers. He reviewed the definitions – Sensitive receptor and Sustainable yield. Mox asked Hartman if drilling wells would be allowed.

Hartman said typically Data Centers don't require a large amount of daily water usage. The biggest use of water would be for fire protection. The large data centers will get approval from the water authority and secure the daily demand and then they'll want to building a tank on site for fire protection.

Burlett asked if they use fire suppression or fire sprinklers.

Hartman said those buildings aren't usually sprinkled. The tanks on site are for firefighting.

Lee said he thinks the water demand is more for cooling – air conditioning and water cooling systems. He said the ordinance would realistically regulate just three different sizes of data centers. His concern is being thorough without overcomplicating things, and defining the benchmark.

Mox said the Planning Commission's should get something on the books because the state is going to delay regulating these Data Centers for about a year. He doesn't believe the Township would be a candidate for the largest centers simply because of lack of space. And the Zoning Ordinance already has maximum lot coverage and minimum lot area for both Commercial and Industrial. He asked for advice regarding the existing definitions based on the law and engineering – are they adequate or should there be changes?

Puchalski said she would recommend a draft be provided that can be reviewed and red-lined. In her experience some of the biggest concerns are noise in the context of vibration - measured by DbC which requires a particular expertise - water consumption and emergency response plans.

Mox said those items are covered in this model ordinance. He asked Hartman if LSSE can provide a Township specific ordinance as a starting point.

Hartman said they would be able to do that with guidance from the Planning Commission.

Mox said he would like to use the PennFuture as a guideline. This would be an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance so there would need to be changes on the first page to include the current governing bodies. Section 2 should be changed to indicate Data Centers would be allowed by Conditional Use. Mox asked if anyone considered if another Zoning District should be included with C3 and I.

Lee asked if Manor Oak on Cochran could be considered. It's a good amount of land but it's not close to utility rights-of-way which is a disadvantage.

Kaminski agrees using the model as a format is good but disagrees with adding so many details that it handcuffs the Township because this is evolving and we should stick to some generalities so that it's scalable to protect the Township. If it's too specific we might be revisiting this every six months.

Lee agrees this is going to be constantly evolving but thinks we need to be selectively specific.

Burlett said we need to be careful and not try to solve every possible scenario.

Mox said that the Conditional Use would be subject to applying for Preliminary Land Development approval at the same time.

Puchalski said there's some concern with requiring Land Development approval only for this use. There's potential opportunity for a challenge because we would be treating the Data Centers differently.

Hartman said they would need to go through Land Development approval anyway. They should need at least a concept of the Land Development to receive Conditional Use approval. Maybe it should be a two-step process. She asked what if an applicant comes through Conditional Use approval and conditions are imposed. Then they go through Land Development approval and there are other things that weren't evident before that would have triggered additional conditions.

Puchalski said additional conditions can be imposed for Land Development approval as well.

Mox said under the Conditional Use provisions there are a number of safeguards that applicants need to demonstrate compliance with, and they apply to all uses. He read the Conditional Use provisions in the Township Zoning Ordinance 1688 as it relates to water, traffic, noise, public safety, etc. He noted that conformance with applicable requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance is built in as well.

Burlett asked if the conditional use provision regarding the petitioners not adversely affecting transportation or unduly burden water, sewer, school, park or other public facilities was a standard clause in a zoning ordinance.

Mox said yes and that the provisions came from the Pennsylvania Municipal Code.

Burlett asked if the provision covers public facilities then why the supply of electric is such a big thing for data centers.

Mox said it's not just electric. There will be sewer discharge as well.

Lee suggests adding language that applicants will supply the power without charging citizens more.

Puchalski said the issue is the centers are having such an effect on the grid that the power companies must assess higher to cover the usage.

Lee said the Governor published the GRID document with intentional regulations for utility companies so that they don't charge residents more. The Data Centers should pay a prorated cost to upgrade the power. The Governor said there will be no state funding for these projects unless the Data Centers do that.

Puchalski cautioned that the Township cannot overstep the regulatory rights regarding these centers. This would be more the purview of the state.

Mox said residents shouldn't feel much of an impact from a Data Center that is 100,000 square feet or less. We want to limit where they go, limit the size that can be built and specify the approval process which is Conditional Use. Many of the concerns will come out in Conditional Use and Land Development.

Burlett asked what an applicant would do if they find a parcel that is not zoned C3 or I.

Mox said the applicant would have to try to get a Variance and show a hardship that the parcel could not be developed in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Kaminski asked about lot coverage regulations. If someone wanted to build a 100,000 square foot building they would have to have at least a 200,000 square foot lot. There aren't that many large lots available.

Burlett said theoretically someone could buy a series of parcels and develop that way.

Kaminsky thinks the conditional use provisions are general and the Planning Commission can ask questions that have to be answered.

Mox agreed and added that we need enough information to determine if the applicant wasn't a good fit for the Township then they could be denied. Maybe they couldn't provide adequate fire protection and there weren't

enough utilities and the applicant is choosing not to upgrade. Mox started going through the model ordinance starting at Section 3. He asked Puchalski where in the Zoning Ordinance these regulations would go.

Puchalski said after the engineer puts together these regulations the ordinance should then go to the solicitor's office to go through it, format it and add it into the Zoning Ordinance and amending it appropriately. It will likely need to be tweaked.

Mox asked that Section 3 B be updated with language that states the dimensional standards will be in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance and underlying Zoning Districts. He asked if the minimum lot areas and building heights need to be specified for Data Centers or can the dimensional requirement stated in the Zoning Ordinance be sufficient.

Puchalski said it would be easier to use what is already stated in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mox asked if the maximum height of Data Center Accessory Uses be specified because it is not in the Zoning Ordinance for Industrial Zoned District.

Puchalski said yes it would be best to specify.

Mox said under the C3 Zoning District the maximum height for accessory use is fourteen (14) feet which seems low. The maximum building height for Industrial Zoned District is fifty (50) feet. He suggested using half of that or twenty-five feet for accessory use in the Industrial Zoning District.

Puchalski said she thinks that's appropriate and suggested adding language that this regulation supersedes with any conflicting language in any of the underlying zoning districts sections.

Mox said that is kind of what is stated where it reads "Uses shall be in accordance with the existing standards with the following exceptions." Section 3.B.3 will be kept and changed to twenty-five feet. He referred to a footnote number two which advises Data Centers not be treated as accessory uses.

Puchalski said this is referring the larger scale Data Centers where nuclear power plants are being built in order serve a Data Center. This may not be applicable to this Township.

Mox read Section 3.B.4 which require a minimum setback from a property developed with a Sensitive Receptor which is defined as any residential use, school, preschool, child or adult day-care center, hospital, assisted-living facility, long term care facility, nursing home, personal care home, retirement community, treatment center, community center, place of worship, park (excluding trails), campground or dormitory.

Puchalski said she typically sees a minimum of 2,000 ft to 1,500 ft. The Township must calculation whether there's enough area for this use to exist by doing a Sensitive Receptor analysis.

Burlett asked how the Township would come up with a minimum setback number.

Lee said there should be different setbacks for a Sensitive Receptor as opposed to a setback from a highway.

Mox suggested using a minimum of 250 ft from a boundary of a Sensitive Receptor. Our Zoning Ordinance has both Residential Zoned districts and residential use. He would prefer to only protect the Residential Zoned districts and not the residential use because this would limit the location too much.

Puchalski asked if Mox thinks it will be less restricted by stating Residential Zoning District than residential use.

Mox said yes. Referring to Section 3.B.5 he asked if "as established in the Zoning Ordinance" be stated.
3.C Landscape Buffer suggests using all except for number 4 and changing that to "All plantings shall be approved by the Board of Commissioners upon recommendation by the Planning Commission."
3.D Equipment Screening suggests using the 250ft as the measurement from a public roadway, residential or other relevant Zoning districts of the lot line of any Sensitive Receptor.
3.E Noise and Vibration – Mox asked for any recommendations regarding noise and vibration not in our Noise Ordinance.

Lee said his firm has hired several acousticians and the cost to hire one may be higher than an engineer or architect.

Mox pointed to Table 1, comparing it to the current Noise Ordinance. The decibel levels on this chart are lower than what the Township Noise Ordinance allows. He suggested making them the same as the Township's current Noise Ordinance.

Burlett said these Data Centers operate 24 hours per day and would have to drop down at night to be compliant.

Puchalski suggested requiring a Noise Study to show compliance. Although she thinks it's going to be difficult to find an expert in this particular matter.

Mox continued:
3.F Water Supply-Water Feasibility Study - Mox suggested changing the river basin name and determining whether a study or aquifer test are even needed. He asked Hartman to provide her recommendation regarding what is needed under the Water Supply items. Water Supply topics continue through 3.K.
3.L Power Supply provides for the Data Center applicant to provide documentation from the electrical service provider certifying that the capacity is available and that electric service provider will service the Data Center.
3.M Emergency Management 1.a should be updated to Conditional Use.
3.N Aesthetics deals with architectural details.
3.O Parking – Mox suggested having enough parking to cover two shifts because they'll overlap. He asked Hartman for a recommendation.
Mox suggested looking at the surface water withdrawal standards and whether the Township will need these or not. He asked Hartman to make the suggested and her recommended changes to the model ordinance and then forward the example to the solicitor for review. He asked the Planning Commission to look closer at decibel levels before the Planning Commission reconvenes.

Public Comments:

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

Adjournment

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

All in Favor
Motion Carries (6-0)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

Attest: _____