

**I. OPENING**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The Planning Commission meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Thursday, May 20, 2010 at 7:00 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. John Landis, Chair, presiding.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: John Landis, Tom Maxfield, John Noble, Craig Kologie; Dan Miller, Engineer from Hanover Engineering; Chris Garges, Zoning Officer; Kevin Kochanski, Planner from Boucher & James; Linc Treadwell, Solicitor and Jr. Planning Commission members Jameson Packer and Eubin Hahn. Absent: Haz Hijazi and John Lychak

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS**

None

**III. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. SAUCON VENTURS LP – RAMZI HADDAD – 2200 WASSERGASS ROAD LAND DEVELOPMENT #LD 05-05 SITE PLAN #SP 02-05 – 2200 WASSERGASS ROAD (TIME LIMIT 05/24/10)**

Jim Preston, Attorney for the applicant; Ramsey Haddad, principal of Saucon Ventures; Sue Kandil, Project Engineer from Jena Engineering were present.

Mr. Landis said we are here tonight to make sure we have enough of a plan so you can go in front of the Zoning Hearing Board. Attorney Preston said additional drawings were submitted to you. They are here to answer any questions anyone may have. Mr. Landis said as far as the calculations go for the hallways, etc., they did a very fine job. The only thing he would have, and we don't need to resolve it here right now, when the spaces are allocated on the plan, how are we going to implement that as the building develops? We need to work something out, but this will come back for site plan review. The fact is the spaces are there. He wouldn't want to see a situation where it can be developed and the parking lot isn't done before it's developed in full.

Mr. Kochanski said they do have a review letter dated May 12, 2010. Some of the items are repeats from their previous letter and that's because the applicant has indicated they will address those at the land development stage and they don't take any exception to those items. They are plan cleanup items. Mr. Landis said we'd want to see the ones that do not give the necessary information to the Zoning Hearing Board for them to make a decision. Mr. Kochanski said they discussed those items at the last Planning Commission meeting from the site plan requirements. You were comfortable with the information shown on the plan. There were some items that they couldn't comply with and they have sought relief from the Zoning Hearing Board on that and that's included on their relief. He doesn't see any real issues with that.

Mr. Miller said he has nothing of note other than the conference room hasn't really been identified to be a internal use only as it was presented verbally. That was a major concern. Mr. Landis said when you did it, it required space that required parking. In that regard, they defined it as office space. They have 47,000 square foot and took off about 6,000 or 7,000 square feet and it came down to roughly 40,000 square feet. That turns out to be shy of about 300 spaces, and that's fine with him.

Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.

Attorney Treadwell said you can make a motion to approve the site plan for use by the Zoning Hearing Board and pass it on.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved to recommend approval of the Site Plan for use by the Zoning Hearing Board and that the Site Plan move forward to the Township Council, subject to the following conditions: 1. The applicant shall comply with the comments set forth in the Boucher & James, Inc letter dated May 12, 2010; and 2. The applicant shall comply with the comments set forth in the Hanover Engineering Associates, Inc letter dated May 12, 2010.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Kologie

**ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mr. Hijazi and Mr. Lychak – Absent)

**B. ALEXANDER PATULLO – WOODLAND HILLS COUNTRY CLUB PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT #LD 03-09 – 4166 LOWER SAUCON ROAD (TIME LIMIT 06/09/10)**

Mr. Scott Mill, Landscape Architect with VanCleeef Engineering Associates; Carl Janecka, Project Engineer from VanCleeef Engineering Associates; and Alex Patullo, applicant were present.

Mr. Mill said they are here tonight to have a brief discussion regarding the plans. The plans were submitted back in the fall of last year. They received review letters from Hanover as well as Boucher & James. There are many comments, but as they work through the project, they will be able to address most, if not all, of those comments. We're here to mainly discuss a few main bullet points and to find out if you have any comments or feedback for us to go back to looking at the plan and revising the plans. It's been three years since they've been here with a sketch plan. The layout has not changed a whole lot since that time. The road configuration is pretty much the same. The clustering of the lot pretty much in the same location as they were before. The idea of preserving the existing restaurant, bar and banquet facility is still out there. They are still contemplating that. Since the time of the sketch plan and now, they've done the soils testing to confirm septic suitability for the primary and backup systems. They've looked at the wetlands and the waters and verified their locations as well as the hydrant soils. They've also done infiltration testing for stormwater management for the stormwater design. The site is approximately 150 acres. It is currently a golf course with the banquet facility, pro shop, the restaurant and bar. It's zoned RA with 40,000 square foot lots. The requirement would be for 50% open space which they meet with the plan. Most of that open space is designed to contain a lot of the natural resources that exist currently on site. The plan has been before you previously as a sketch. It's also recently been in front of the Zoning Hearing Board to confirm the existing use as a restaurant, bar, and banquet facility to get the variances.

Mr. Landis said what variances did you get? Mr. Patullo said it was a variance to keep it as is, a banquet facility and Mr. Patullo occupying the downstairs. It was granted. Mr. Landis said you are just talking about the banquet facility. Mr. Patullo said it was a formality and they wanted us to go in front of the Zoning Hearing Board and get that okayed, which they did.

Mr. Kochanski said the current banquet facility/golf pro shop is an ancillary use which is permitted under the golf course. Since the golf course is going away, the applicant wouldn't be entitled to use the existing facilities as a primary use. They went to the Zoning Hearing Board as a private club, which they received relief on to operate as a private club for profit. There was a condition with the hours, which they had to cease public operations by midnight. Mr. Landis said the variance allowed it to be used as a private club. Attorney Treadwell said a private club. The use it best fit what the applicant wanted to do and currently had was a private club, but the private club definition said it could not be for profit and it could only be utilized for members only. The relief they got from the Zoning Hearing Board was it doesn't have to be not for profit, it can be a for-

**Planning Commission Meeting  
May 20, 2010**

profit club and it people other than members can come to the club. It's the same use that it is currently with the golf course. As far as the banquet facilities go, there will not be an open 8 hour a day restaurant/bar that type of thing. It's only for certain events that get reserved. Mr. Patullo said it's only for weekends and special occasions. Mr. Landis said when this development goes in, there will no longer be a golf course. It will be a place where you can have a banquet or a wedding.

Mr. Mill said they were in front of the Zoning Hearing Board. They also met with staff in March to review quite a few of the issues that were raised in the review letters and there were still some comments that needed to be resolved and we're looking for a recommendation from the Planning Commission to see how we move forward with this and to get feedback from you. Mr. Landis said there are a number of items on the review letters. The plan is nowhere complete so they are not going to make any recommendations. We'd rather have you work with the staff to resolve your problems. Are there any items that you would like to bring in front of the Planning Board for some type of direction now that would affect that? Mr. Mill said there are a few, one of which is regarding the recreation land, whether it's a fee in lieu of or providing no land itself. They were proposing it would be a fee in lieu of. Attorney Treadwell said that's generally a Council issue. Planning doesn't do that. Mr. Mill said along the same line, what form would the Township like to see, like an HOA or dedicated to the Township. Attorney Treadwell said that's a Council issue as well.

Mr. Mill said the next item is curbing. They generally show curbing on the plan. They received feedback that the Township does not generally like to see curbing. There may be some engineering issues that they have not fully dove into as of yet. Mr. Maxfield said is your stormwater plan based on the curbing? Mr. Mill said yes. Mr. Landis said we need a stormwater plan. Mr. Noble said this is a cluster development; it's going to be a lot tighter than 40,000 square feet. Mr. Patullo said they wanted to come back to you with a full set of plans and recommendations made by the professionals and put this to rest.

Mr. Mill said there's a slight conflict between the cluster ordinance and SALDO with proximity to the street trees to the street. SALDO generally requires one to two feet from the right-of-way, but then the cluster requires it five to eight from the cart way which it ends up being a little bit of a discrepancy and it's more of a formality than anything. If you'd be willing to grant that waiver so it doesn't end up being three or four feet from the right-of-way. Mr. Landis said he'd like you to work with the professionals as he doesn't know where the inconsistency is. Mr. Miller said we have been going by the cluster ordinance.

Mr. Mill said some of the studies they have requested waivers from, and he doesn't know if this is in your realm or if Council decides, but there is a requirement for a development impact statement, the traffic study and the well study. Mr. Landis said that is a requirement. Attorney Treadwell said what was the reason for the waiver request? Mr. Patullo said we have a lot less traffic coming out of this place than what it would have been with the golf course. Mr. Mill said based on the IET manual, golf course, kind of keeping separate the banquet facility, as a stand-a-lone, the golf course would generate more traffic than the 49 single detached family homes. Mr. Maxfield said on paper, not in real life. This is quite a lot of homes. Mr. Miller said another way to state that is the peak hours would probably be different. The peak hours for the golf course do not line up with the peak hours for the residents. Mr. Maxfield said he doesn't know how you can really get away without a traffic study. You're opening it up to an existing neighborhood area.

Mr. Mill said the other one was a well study. It's kind of a similar thing when the golf course is operational and when it's drawing for irrigation for the sprinklers and fairways not versus what the draw would be for single family detached homes. We discussed this briefly at the staff meeting providing numbers to show what the draw is. Mr. Landis said what is the current well situation there? Mr. Mill said the requirement for a well study is if you have more than nine or ten homes. Mr. Landis said you have a water supply now, one or two wells? Mr. Mill said three wells. Mr.

Landis said he thinks you are going to have to do a well study. Attorney Treadwell said there are three wells now and the proposal is to have what? Mr. Patullo said they are going to drill new wells. Mr. Miller said may they use the wells that are there to do the testing; they don't have to drill new wells to do the testing. Mr. Maxfield said where are the wells located? Mr. Patullo said there are some in the fairways. One is by the clubhouse and one by the maintenance building. Mr. Landis said you are going to have them near where they are going to be building. Mr. Kologie said there is a lot of technical information that the staff is going to have to review. Mr. Patullo said the wells they have now, there's so much water there, and they get 90 gallons a minute on the one well. There's plenty of water there. The houses would use a lot less water than the golf course did. Mr. Miller said the location of the wells may or may not be fine, but we can talk about that. Mr. Landis said let the professionals discuss that one.

Mr. Mill there were a couple relating to the lot sizes and shapes. There is basically a requirement the lots generally have to be in a square or rectangular shape. There are a couple on the plan that basically because of the septic suitability areas, some of the lots had to be configured to contain those septic areas. They kind of deviated from that general square or rectangular shape. Mr. Miller said they would have to review those things, in detail, at the time. Mr. Landis said we can't go with a flag lot or anything like that. Mr. Mill said there are some other waiver issues, but with your staff and engineer, they can resolve some of the issues.

Mr. Kochanski said both Hanover and Boucher & James prepared a review letter. There are numerous comments in there, most of which they have not addressed. There are more serious zoning issues like site capacity calculation, natural resource protection, etc. He's assuming you are still working on those issues to see how you are going to address them. Mr. Miller said he has three general questions for guidance. The curbing was already discussed. The other one was currently several of the road water infiltrations are shown in the open space or spanning two different lots. Does the Planning Commission have a preference as to whether they are put in the open space, as shown? That can't be used toward their open space requirements, but having it be on the open space lot and being on a single lot or having it be in multiple ownerships?

Mr. Kologie said is there going to be an HOA created for this project? Attorney Treadwell said he thinks that's one of the issues. The only reason for an HOA would be to own the open space. There are no other common amenities or facilities. Mr. Kologie said he thinks it would be better to keep the stormwater facilities in common areas versus on private lots, just from a maintenance standpoint and try of putting the burden of maintaining stormwater on an individual property owner. Mr. Miller said are the ones that are spanning two lots, are they going to be jointly owned or HOA? Mr. Mill said he thinks they are going to be HOA. Mr. Maxfield said would you be looking for two types of management for the open space one and the on lot ones? Mr. Mill said he thinks they would just because of the burden on the one or two lot owners. Mr. Miller said we are talking about two different on lot systems. One that is just getting the roof water and one that is getting the road water. Mr. Landis said the roof one is contained in everybody's lot anyway. It's the roadway water that you have the problem with either going to open space or to a couple of lots. A couple of lots, if you don't do an HOA, he'd see a problem with maintenance. Mr. Mill said they can deal with that. Mr. Miller said one other thing to discuss is they provided street lighting in accordance with zoning and SALDO requirements. It is his understand that this Commission tends to like less street lighting. Mr. Landis said yes, this has been the direction of the Council. Mr. Miller said he'd think they may want lights at the intersections. Mr. Maxfield said that would depend on the recommendations from the Police and Fire. For the crucial areas, you would probably need lights.

Mr. Maxfield said on one of the notes from our engineer, there's a conflict between the Northampton Soil Survey with hydrate soils and your onsite investigations and it says the center part of the site is not hydrate, which he finds puzzling because he's gone back to the historic maps and that is an old stream bed. The stream had been rerouted since the 1920's. He finds it hard to believe that it's not hydrate soils anymore. Mr. Mill showed the Planning Commission the area

that was a concern. Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any comment or questions? No one raised their hand.

**C. LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP – JOSEPH DRAVECZ – DRAVECZ/LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP MINOR #MIN 02-10 (CONSERVATION EASEMENT TO TOWNSHIP) – 2388 APPLE STREET (TIME LIMIT 08/18/10)**

Attorney Treadwell said Mr. Dravec and the Township have come to an agreement to purchase six lots in the back and approximately seven acres of the lot in the front as well as a conservation easement over a large portion of the remaining lots that are left in Mr. Dravec ownership. The purpose of this plan is to cut off that approximate seven acre parcel so that the Township can purchase it. Mr. Miller said and to put the easement on the larger parcel. Mr. Landis said we're only looking at the subdivision of the seven acres. The other part of it, the sixteen acres is not part of this.

Mr. Miller said it should say preliminary final plan. Mr. Garges said should we ultimately look to consolidate all of these lots all together? Attorney Treadwell said at some point we might want to consider that. We have to settle on this and have to get this lot cut off. Hanover would have had to do a lot more survey work to consolidate all those lots together.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved to recommend Preliminary/Final Approval of the Subdivision plan.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Noble  
**ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mr. Hijazi and Mr. Lychak – Absent)

**IV. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 15, 2010**

Mr. Landis asked if there were any additions or corrections on the April 15, 2010 minutes.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Kologie moved for approval of the April 15, 2010 minutes.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
**ROLL CALL:** 3-0 (Mr. Noble – Abstained as he wasn't at the meeting; Mr. Hijazi and Mr. Lychak – Absent)

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS**  
None

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Noble moved for adjournment. The time was 7:50 PM.  
**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield  
**ROLL CALL:** 4-0 (Mr. Hijazi and Mr. Lychak – Absent)

Submitted by:

---

Mr. John Landis  
Chair