TOWNSHIP OF INDIANA
PLANNING COMMISSION

JUNE 24, 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, Preston Moore, and Daniel Taylor. Michael Calandra and Kevin McKeegan were not present. Also in attendance were Code Enforcement Officer Jeffrey S. Curti, Recording Secretary Jacquelyn Rouggie, Engineer Lydia Herring from Nichols & Slagle Engineering, and Alexa Shapiro from Solicitor Tucker Arensberg.

APPROVED

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 27, 2026

Mr. Taylor said on Page 3, in the 3rd paragraph, in the last sentence, the word "in" needs deleted and the sentence should read: "He also said the Subdivider...".

Mr. Moore made a motion, seconded by Mr. Blume, to approve the May 27 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

CANOPY RIDGE PLAN OF LOTS - SIMPLE SUBDIVISION

Commission Members were once again 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. and Attorney Alexis Wheeler from Strassburger, McKenna, Gutnick & Gefsky were present to represent the Applicants Michael Castiglione and Autumn Adamiak. The Applicants, who own the parcel of land under the name "MCAA Ventures Inc", were also present.

Ms. Wheeler said she spoke to the Attorney for the Shula's, who said he did not want to meet with her. He said she could resend the "Road Maintenance Agreement" which was prepared months ago around again but said she might want to wait and see if the subdivision request is approved. Ms. Wheeler said the property owners have an access agreement in their deed to use Monticello Drive, and it is also shown on the plan. She explained she had done extensive research into who had actual easements to use Monticello Drive. She said the only recorded easement she found was only for the original lot from when it was owned by the Celo family back in the 1940's or 1950's. Mr. Blume asked if any other lots have deeds showing they have access to use the private roadway. Ms. Wheeler said the other lots use Monticello Drive, but she was unable to locate anything recorded in their deeds. She said originally it was said that five (5) lots access Monticello Drive, but she said now only three (3) lots officially have access. She said she feels it is unfair that her clients should bear the burden of producing a "Maintenance Agreement" for the privately owned Monticello Drive. She proceeded to explain the depth of research she had done. She also quoted excerpts

from various Ordinances and laws. She said, according to the Township's current "Permitted Uses" in its Zoning Ordinance, her clients could build a two-family dwelling, a church, a school, etc., but they only plan to build a single family home on each lot.

Katelyn Shula of 105 Monticello Drive said when the Celo property was subdivided, there was only one vacant single family home located on the parcel which they purchased. She said they bought the home in 2021. She said the new property owners of the larger, vacant lot, Mr. Castiglione and Ms. Adamiak, did not reach out to the other property owners regarding what they planned to build on the parcel. Ms. Shula said there are already five lots that access and use Monticello Drive to get to their homes. She said the Orban family, that reside at 99 Monticello Drive, were not included in the count of the number of homes using Monticello Drive. She also said the Palumbo family have frontage on Saxonburg Boulevard and were not counted. She said due to dangerous sight distance issues, they cannot enter/exit their homes from Saxonburg Blvd. However, both families have Monticello Drive addresses. Ms. Shula said she understood limiting the number of lots permitted on a private drive was to not overburden the private roadway.

Autumn Adamiak said she and her husband, Michael Castiglione, purchased the vacant, 10.6 acre lot about 3 years ago. She said they had a number of "Advisory Meetings" with Engineer Dan Slagle and Code Enforcement Officer Jeff Curti about what they could do with it. They said Mr. Slagle said the first two lots should not be included in the number of lots on Monticello Drive since they have frontage on Saxonburg Blvd. They said they hired a lawyer to draw up a "Private Road Maintenance Agreement", and circulated it to the neighbors, but nobody responded to them. She said they have no intention of damaging the private roadway.

Mr. Blume said he feels the main issue is whether the first two lots should be counted in the five lot maximum allowed for a private roadway, and asked if they had legal rights to use it in their deed. Attorney Shapiro said there is no legal verbiage to indicate which homes should actually be included in the count of the number of homes using the private roadway; it is up to the Planning Commission to determine how many homes they feel should be included in the number of homes having access to Monticello Drive. Ms. Herring read an excerpt from the Township Code regarding Private Streets - Section 295-30 Streets, Subsection (A). A discussion was held about how to interpret the number of lots actually to be counted as using a private roadway. The Planning Commission wondered if what is stated in a property's deed should be used, or the number of homes that actually use a private road to access their property should be counted. Ms. Shapiro said she feels the deeds should be looked at to determine who has access, not who actually uses to road. She said she agrees with Ms. Wheeler that the best way to handle the situation is to resolve ambiguity. Ms. Shapiro said she feels it depends how it is interpreted by the Planning Commission Members as well.

Ms. Shapiro said under "Permitted Uses", they can build more than just single family homes on each lot. Mr. Blume said at the last Planning Commission Meeting, the property owners of the vacant lot committed to only building a single family home on each lot.

APPROVED

Ethan Shula of 105 Monticello Drive agreed and said at the last meeting that the property owners agreed to only build a single family home on each lot. He handed out a map he created showing all of the lots along Monticello Drive to the Planning Commission Members. He explained the concept of his drawing. He said there are already five lots that use Monticello Drive to access their homes, but unfortunately, it is not documented in their actual Deeds. He had copies of Deeds as well. He said he was concerned if MCAA Ventures subdivides their lot into two parcels, then that would create 7 lots using Monticello Drive. Mr. Shula said the landowners only approached him about the "Maintenance Agreement", but none of his neighbors. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Shula if he is against the lot being subdivided; Mr. Shula said no, but he would like it to be restricted that only single family dwellings could be built on each parcel, and that all utilities would be underground. A discussion was held about where the public utilities are currently located, and whether the lines would run down the private roadway. Mr. Shula said Oakmont Water told him that two new lines would need to be constructed down the private road. Mrs. Shula said according to maps they have seen, Monticello Drive is completely located on the property they own. Everyone else just has easements to use it. Mr. Moore asked who currently maintains Monticello Drive; Mr. Shula said he does. A discussion was held about the costs involved in maintaining a private roadway, and how these costs are split between property owners. It was also discussed as to how a limit could be put on the type of home that is built on the land, including Accessory Structures, such as the possibility of asking for Special Exception Uses, i.e. living quarters in a private structure on the same parcel. Mr. Curti said schools and churches are Permitted Uses in an "MDR" Zoning District, but a lot of other factors come into play regarding construction on a private roadway.

Mr. Curti said that the Applicant's Attorney Alexis Wheeler was not at the first two Advisory Meetings that he and Mr. Slagle had with the property owners, but she was at the third one. He said discussions were held as to who actually has legal access to use Monticello Drive, and the number of homes that should be included in the count. Mrs. Shula said the owners of the vacant lot at 107 Monticello Drive will not communicate with the existing property owners as to their intentions of what they plan to do with their land. She said in the past, they had first talked about building duplexes on the property. Mr. Blume asked if a condition could be put on approval of the subdivision that only single family homes could be built. Mrs. Shula said she is mainly upset because Mr. Castiglione and Ms. Adamiak do not want to communicate with the existing neighbors about their intended use of their vacant property.

Lilliann Palumbo of 101 Monticello Drive said she has lived in her house for 32 years. She said the Township assigned them an address of "Monticello Drive" many years ago, and the same with the Orban family. She said the new owners have never reached out to them about their intentions with the land. She said the owners of the vacant land recently had large equipment brought in, down the private roadway. Ms. Adamiak said they were having Soil Sampling done on the property, due to settling issues that a neighbor had advised them about. Ms. Palumbo said there are currently five lots using the private drive, and she feels like nobody is doing their due diligence when counting the number of homes using the private drive. Mr. Taylor said he feels if they do not have legal access in their Deeds to use the private roadway, a home

APPROVED

should not be counted. He also asked how it will be determined on who should pay for the maintenance of the private roadway - those who have legal access to it, or those who actually use the road. He said he feels that it should also be taken into account that Emergency Access vehicles must be able to access each lot along the roadway. He said a "Maintenance Agreement" really helps in determining who should pay to maintain the road.

Mr. Taylor made a motion recommending APPROVAL of the "CANOPY RIDGE PLAN OF LOTS - SIMPLE SUBDIVISION", conditioned upon any outstanding items remaining in the Engineer's letter dated May 21, 2026. Commission Members also suggested the following conditions be considered by the Board of Supervisors during final approval:

1. ***The Applicants agree to build only one single family dwelling unit on each of the two lots***
2. ***The Applicants would repair any documented damages caused when public utilities are brought up Monticello Drive (private road) to service the two new homes***
3. ***The Applicants will repair any road damages that may occur from construction vehicles during the building of the new homes***

Mr. Shula said a representative with Oakmont Water Authority told him that two lines would need to be installed to supply public water to homes built on the new lots. Mr. Blume said he is in favor of Mr. Taylor's motion. Ms. Shapiro asked about the number of properties to be counted as using the private roadway, and if they agree that right now three parcels legally use Monticello Drive. Mr. Taylor said he feels only the lots with legal access should be included in the count. Mr. Shula asked if this means that no further subdivision of properties could occur on Monticello Drive unless it was brought up to Township Standards; Mr. Taylor said yes. Ms. Shapiro said there is no promise that no further subdivision could occur; she said actually one more could happen if the verbiage in the deeds were changed.

Mr. Taylor amended his motion to include that the Applicant requested a waiver from the requirement to record a maintenance agreement executed by the owners of property abutting Monticello Drive. The Planning Commission directed the Applicant to make a good faith effort to work with owners of lots along Monticello Drive to negotiate a maintenance agreement. If the Applicant is unsuccessful, the Planning Commission recommended granting the requested waiver in light of the Pennsylvania statute establishing contribution requirements for repair of private roads.

The Motion was seconded by Mr. Moore. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Taylor reminded audience members that the Planning Commission is a recommending body only. They make a recommendation to the Township's Board of Supervisors, who then approve or deny any plans that are submitted.

APPROVED

OLD BUSINESS:

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

Ms. Shapiro said a "draft" sample Ordinance has been put together for the Planning Commission's review and comment. She said that Data Centers cannot be 'banned' from being allowed in Municipalities in PA; they have to be permitted to be allowed somewhere. She suggested the Commission may want to consider the same zoning districts where Solar Energy Systems are permitted: "O/C - Office Flex Commercial" and "LI - Light Industrial". Mr. Blume said there are many conditions that need to be considered, such as noise regulations, etc. Mr. Curti said perhaps separate setback requirements should be considered. Mr. Taylor suggested they review the "draft" Ordinance page by page, and make recommendations and suggestions as they go. Minimum lot areas were discussed, along with height regulations, and setbacks from various businesses and zoning districts. Landscaping buffers and fencing was discussed, as well as Noise and Vibration levels. The impact to the public water and sewage supply was discussed. Mr. Taylor said he likes the wording in the section on decommissioning the site. Parking spaces were also discussed.

Mr. Blume said there is a House Bill pending giving municipalities a 180-day moratorium for any proposed Data Centers being considered for approval until municipalities can get their Ordinances updated. Ms. Shapiro said this is something that cannot be counted on until it is passed. The discussion continued as to where to permit Data Centers. Ms. Shapiro said they have to be careful to make sure the Ordinance is not too restrictive. Mr. Curti thanked Solicitors Gavin Robb and Alexa Shapiro for putting together the 'draft' Ordinance for them to work with. Commission Members agreed that this is a good starting point.

Jon Neumann of 222 Chatham Lane, and also the Township Representative from Voting District #5, said he appreciated all the work that was being put into the document. He said he felt using the Solar Ordinance as a 'model' was also a good idea. He said he feels it is important that good communication is kept between Data Centers and First Responders. He also felt it was best to keep moving in getting a final Ordinance in place as soon as possible regarding Data Centers. He thanked everyone for helping to get the Ordinance together as quickly as possible.

Discussions about various issues, including electric rates and regulations, continued. Everyone agreed they feel that they are on the right track in developing a strong Ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Blume made a motion, seconded by Mr. Moore, to adjourn the June 24, 2026, Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Jacquelyn A. Rouggie
Recording Secretary

APPROVED