TOWNSHIP OF INDIANA

PLANNING COMMISSION

MAY 27, 2026

The regular meeting of the Indiana Township Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Daniel Taylor with the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting was recorded on audio cassette.

The roll was called and Planning Commission Members present were Peter Blume, Kevin McKeegan *(left early at 6:35 pm)*, Preston Moore, Daniel Taylor, and Michael Calandra. Also in attendance were Code Enforcement Officer Jeffrey S. Curti, Recording Secretary Jacquelyn Rouggie, Township Engineer Daniel Slagle from Nichols & Slagle Engineering, and Attorney Gavin Robb from Township Solicitor Tucker Arensberg's office.

APPROVED

REORGANIZATION MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 25, 2026

Mr. Blume made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calandra, to approve the February 25, 2026, Reorganization Meeting Minutes as presented.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 25, 2026

Mr. Taylor said on Page 3, in the 1st paragraph, 1st line, in the third full sentence, the word "the" should be added after "of" in the sentence reading "...results of Traffic Study..".

Mr. McKeegan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Blume, to approve the March 25, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

CANOPY RIDGE PLAN OF LOTS - SIMPLE SUBDIVISION

Commission Members were presented with a plan consisting of subdividing a 10.68 acre parcel into two lots. The parcel is a vacant lot located at 107 Monticello Drive *(private road)* off of Saxonburg Blvd., north of the intersection of Route 910 and Saxonburg Blvd. The parcel is zoned "MDR - Medium Density Residential". Matthew Schmidt from Hampton Technical Associates, Inc. was present to represent the Applicants Michael Castiglione and Autumn Adamiak. The Applicants own the parcel of land under the name: "MCAA Ventures Inc".

Mr. Schmidt said Lot 2B will be approximately ½ of an acre, and the remaining acreage will be on Lot 2A. He said public sewage is available. He said he feels most of the items in the Engineer's review letter dated May 21, 2026 are minor in nature and can easily be addressed. Mr. Schmidt said the Applicant has asked for a *waiver* from needing to provide a signed and recorded "Private Road Maintenance Agreement" due to the fact that the private road already exists and since no formal Agreement between the homeowners' living on the roadway currently exists. He

also said that they are not sure exactly which homes have legal use of the private lane.

Mr. Curti said he noticed that the property owned by the Orban's, who reside at 99 Monticello Drive, were left off of the Plans and need to be added. They currently use Monticello Drive to access their home. Mr. McKeegan said it is not clear as to which homes actually use Monticello Drive as their main access to their homes.

Attorney Alexis Wheeler said she represents the Applicant, MCAA Ventures. She said currently, three properties actually use Monticello Drive as their main access. She said the Palumbo and Orban properties use Monticello Drive as their address, but they also have driveways to access their properties from Saxonburg Boulevard. Mr. McKeegan suggested since there is no existing "Private Road Maintenance Agreement" in place for Monticello Drive, it would be a good time for those using the roadway to meet with the other property owners and form one. Ms. Wheeler said her law firm drafted an Agreement for the Castiglione's, but the neighbors they contacted to sign it have not responded to them. She said the Castiglione's plan to build a single family home on one lot for themselves to live in, and a new home for another family member on the other lot. Ms. Wheeler said it is an "unreasonable" hardship for the Castiglione's to have to get the existing homeowners' using Monticello Drive to enter into a formal "Agreement". She read an excerpt from a portion of the PA State Law regarding private roadways.

Mr. Moore said he is a licensed Real Estate Agent, and that most banks are requiring "Maintenance Agreements" for properties that have to access their homes by using a private roadway, or they will not lend them money to build. Mr. Blume asked if the "hardship" the Castiglione's are facing in getting an "Agreement" is because the existing neighbors are refusing to sign an Agreement; Ms. Wheeler said yes. Mr. Robb said he received a phone call from the Attorney of one of the resident's living on Monticello Drive. Mr. McKeegan asked when Monticello Drive was created. Ms. Wheeler said they believe it started sometime back in the 1980's but they were having trouble finding information. Ms. Wheeler said the private easements for the roadway are hard to determine. Mr. Slagle said the most recent subdivision along this roadway was the Celo Plan, and it showed there was access to the property by using Monticello Drive. Ms. Wheeler said the Castiglione's only plan for the two lots is for single family dwellings; no development, townhomes, etc. are being proposed.

Mr. Taylor asked how many properties actually use Monticello Drive as their primary access. He said the letter that was given to them by the "Landowners of Monticello Drive" says that five homes already use the private roadway. Ms. Wheeler said it is a matter of who has the actual "legal right" to use Monticello Drive as their only access to their properties. She said she feels at least two of the homes have other means of access.

APPROVED

Mr. Robb suggested that the neighbors that were in attendance at the meeting be given the right to speak about this issue. Mr. Curti said he noticed the Thompson family signed off on the letter submitted by the residents of Monticello Drive, but they actually access their property from a driveway off of Saxonburg Boulevard and do not have a Monticello Drive address. He also said the Plans are deceiving because the Orban property is not shown on the Plans. Ms. Wheeler said the Palumbo's can use either Monticello Drive or Saxonburg Blvd. Mr. Blume said he feels it comes down to who actually has the legal right to use the private roadway, and who just use it because of convenience. Mr. Robb said it is a matter of interpretation in determining the number of lots on a private roadway. Ms. Wheeler said if the Palumbo's lot is included, there are only four homes with access to Monticello Drive. A conversation was held about calculating the number of homes on the existing Monticello Drive.

(At 6:35 pm, Mr. McKeegan excused himself and said he had to leave due to another obligation.)

Mr. Slagle said that the Applicants previously had met with Mr. Curti and himself at least two or three different times to discuss their property and what could be done with it. Mr. Slagle said he prepared a review letter dated May 21, 2026, which he reviewed. He went over the various items addressed in his letter, and what needs to be added and/or put on the plans prior to the next meeting. Mr. Slagle said a Planning Module will be needed prior to connection to the public sewage system. He also said the Subdivider needs to sign and record a Maintenance Agreement with the primary property owner of the private street under "Article V, Section 295-30 - Streets" of the Township's Ordinance for use of the private roadway.

Ethan Shula of 105 Monticello Drive said all five (5) properties listed on the letter given to the Planning Commission from the "Landowners of Monticello Drive" access and use Monticello Drive. These five property owners also signed off on the letter. He said there is no public water available at the property that MCAA Ventures own, and that if public sewage is needed, it would need to be run from Saxonburg Boulevard. He said there could be issues with tying into gas and electric as well. He said he reached out to the Castiglione's last year about their intended use of the property, but they never responded to him. He said the Thompson family, of 3851 Saxonburg Blvd., signed off on the letter as well because they have frontage along Monticello Drive, but they do not use it. Mr. Shula said the property owners living along Monticello Drive are concerned that more than five (5) properties will be created on the private roadway. He also said the roadway is not conducive to being able to support the use of construction vehicles to build new homes on the MCAA lots, which are proposed to be built at the end of the private road. A discussion was held about which owners actually live on and use the private road. Lilli Palumbo of 101 Monticello Drive said she feels that five homes already use the roadway, if you include the currently vacant MCAA lot. She also

APPROVED

said mine subsidence exists in the area. Carolyn Owens, who was present to represent her elderly mother Dorothy Nypaver of 106 Monticello Drive, said that four of their family members take turns daily to come in to help care for her mother at her house. She said the road is very old, and there have been water issues in the past. She also said there is mine subsidence in the area. The Palumbo's and Orban's have easements to use Monticello Drive. Mr. Shula said his Legal Council Jeffrey Myers was unable to attend the meeting tonight, on behalf of the residents. Ms. Wheeler said she investigated the properties along Monticello Drive and was unable to find any recorded easements; she said she also has spoken to Mr. Shula's Attorney Jeffrey Myers.

Mr. Calandra asked if this is a legal issue. Mr. Taylor said it depends on how many people have access to use the private roadway. He said if more than five lots have legal access to Monticello Drive, then perhaps legal counsel need to meet and discuss what actions need to be taken. Ms. Wheeler said she feels this is a private issue, not a Township issue. She said she was only attending the meeting to discuss the waiver for the need of her clients to enter into a "Private Road Maintenance Agreement", not to discuss the number of lots that use Monticello Drive and if it exceeds the allowable number of lots using a private drive. Mr. Taylor said his main concern is the number of lots that are using the private roadway. He said he feels that only four lots are currently using Monticello Drive as their main access to their homes.

Mr. Robb suggested since Mr. Shula's Attorney Jeffrey Myers could not be present to represent his client tonight, that maybe he needs to attend the next Planning Commission meeting to present his case as to the number of people with legal access to Monticello Drive, as well as how many lots actually use the roadway. Mr. Blume asked if the Applicant would be willing to sign a document that only single family dwelling(s) would be built on the land if the subdivision is granted. Ms. Owens asked where MCAA plans to get their public sewage from; Mr. Curti from the rear of their property, not down Monticello Drive.

Mr. Blume made a motion, seconded by Mr. Moore, recommending TABLING the "CANOPY RIDGE PLAN OF LOTS - SIMPLE SUBDIVISION". Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

"DATA CENTER DEVELOPMENT" - Guidelines to Consider for possible Draft Ordinance

Solicitor Robb said that Data Centers have become a big issue lately in municipalities. He said there are already many in operation. He said his colleague Lexi Shapiro is in attendance at tonight's meeting. He said they have both been attending numerous meetings about Data Centers, and the need for municipalities to strengthen their Zoning Ordinances regarding the placement and regulations for

APPROVED

them. He said they want to ensure that Indiana Township is prepared if one would apply to be constructed in the Township.

Mr. Blume said municipalities cannot ban Data Centers from being built. Mr. Robb agreed; however, he said restrictions can be put in place as far as size, setbacks, which zoning districts they are permitted in, etc. They just cannot be exclusionary. A discussion was held about the areas where they would be most conducive to be permitted to be built, as well as other restrictions. Mr. Slagle said this item was put on the Planning Commission's agenda tonight as requested by the Township's Board of Supervisors so they can start researching the placement and restrictions on Data Centers.

Mr. Robb said he has a 'template' Ordinance that they can start with, which addresses water issues, noise control, lighting, fencing, etc. He said they can also look into what other neighboring municipalities have in place for Data Centers. Commission Members agreed, and discussed the need for having such an Ordinance in place in case a proposal is made to build one in the Township. Mr. Curti said there are items in the International Building Code that also address items regarding Data Centers. Mr. Robb said an "Emergency Response Plan" will also need to be established at some point. Mr. Taylor asked if the P.U.C. is setting the rates. Mr. Robb said he is not quite sure, but this will be definitely be investigated. Mr. Slagle agreed, and said that Data Centers cannot be denied being built, but they can be controlled. He said this is a 'hot topic' lately in a lot of municipalities. The PC Members, as well as the Engineer, Solicitor, and Code Enforcement Officer discussed Data Centers and various ways to put restrictions on them for the safety of the public, as well as the Township.

APPROVED

CORRESPONDENCE

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

Each Commission Member received a copy of the Planning Commission's Letter of Recommendation sent to the Board of Supervisors, which was written as a result of the Commission's March 25, 2026 regular meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Blume made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calandra, to adjourn the May 27, 2026, Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Jacquelyn A. Rouggie
Recording Secretary