

**I. OPENING**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The Joint Planning Commission and Council meeting of Lower Saucon Township was called to order on Thursday, May 23, 2013 at 7:00 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. John Landis, Chair, presiding.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: John Landis, Chair; Tom Maxfield, Vice Chair, Scott Kennedy, Sandra Yerger and John Noble, members; Chris Garges, Zoning Officer; Karen Mallo and Judy Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James; Dan Miller, Hanover Engineering; Linc Treadwell, Solicitor; Jack Cahalan, Township Manager. Absent: John Lychak & Craig Kologie

Present: Council Members: Glen Kern, President and Tom Maxfield, Vice President; and Ron Horiszny, member.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS – None**

**III. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL SALDO AMENDMENTS**

Ms. Stern Goldstein said they are going to talk about the Subdivision Land Development ordinance. The reason why they wanted both groups together is the ordinance proposes some major changes in the way subdivision, land developments are processed, are perceived, and are dealt with in the Township. This goes back to 2006. Sandy Yerger and Tom Maxfield were both Council members at that time. Tom was also a P/C member. They both were EAC members. They spent a lot of time with B&J looking at different things could happen to protect environmental resources. LST has a lot of environmental resources and the Township is divided into two parts. One is more developed and the other is more rural and resource protected areas that remain undeveloped. The desire at that time was looking at the types of development that were going to occur and the patterns of development that were going to occur based on the way things were being done at that time. We had just prior to 2006, had written and you had adopted the Natural Resource Protection standards in your zoning ordinance. That was a great leap forward to see what was preserved and what was worthy of being preserved. They were in the midst of just starting to do the Open Space Plan update. The Roth Plan, which was the joint park and recreation open space with Upper Saucon was in process, adopted in 2007. In 2006, there was a great desire in the Township to take a step back and look at the way things were going. The end of 2005, beginning of 2006, Terry Clemons was brought on board as the Township Open Space Solicitor. He was working with the Township on ways to preserve open space. He had talked at length with Council and the EAC about ways open space could be preserved and different ways to look at developments to preserve open space. During the same time, we started looking at cluster standard developments to help provide some density incentives for some types of developments in exchange for preservation of open space of natural resources protected areas or significant areas in the Township that were deemed worthy of preservation. We started looking at that, and there was the desire to preserve open space as development, open space in general, the referendum passed, you did start preserving open space between easements, outright acquisitions, and dedication of open space land in developments. All this was going on. They were instructed at that point to work on a subdivision land development, modeled on some ordinances that Terry Clemons had worked on. One was Milford Township in Upper Bucks County and the other one was in Wrightstown Township in Bucks County. B&J also worked for Wrightstown, so they had knowledge of that ordinance. This model was also used in Solebury Township.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said in 2006, they went through and had some regular meetings with Tom and Sandy and got some definitions and started to look at the way plans would be processed. It sort of stalled a bit then Hanover was brought on board because as Township Engineer they are dealing with most of the design standards, how wide roads are, how they are constructed, configurations of lots and things like that. This sort of took a back burner as they were busy with other things. There was a push in the last two years and Hanover spent a bit of time going through the design standards, back and forth. Ms. Mallo was working very diligently on this also. A couple of years ago in July, they came to Council with what they thought were big items to talk about. One was the premise of cul-de-sacs and how many houses on a cul-de-sac and got good direction from Council to see where Council's mind set was. They went back and worked a bit more and had staff meetings. Probably in the past year, they wanted to get this back to Council. They want to walk you through the basic big picture items. You were given lists and charts and current ordinances.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said she covered most of the revisions based on the model ordinances provided by Terry Clemons. Focus on Smart Growth design, that's what protecting environmental resources is called now. Early on, it was common sense, the cluster, smart growth, growing greener, best management practices. It all comes back to doing the right thing by the land. Changes are implemented in the design process and submission requirements. The way subdivisions will be processed and what applicants need to go through in the process and how subdivisions are designed. There will be new requirements for major subdivisions and land developments. This is the big part of it. All applicants for major subdivisions and land developments will have to do an ERSAP plan. It's Existing Resources and Site Analysis Plan and also a 4-step design process. It's an extra step and will mean an extra plan, although she's seen many engineers incorporate that information on a resource plan and just include extra notes. They have to include steep slopes, woodland, things like that but they have to do it up front. They have to identify all other existing resources, not just environmental. The purpose of doing that is part of the 4-step design process. You identify first what's on the site, then what's worthy of protection, and identify if they should be preserved or protected. Then you site houses, and then you draw in the roads and lot lines as opposed to the traditional engineering way of doing it. There's an engineering solution to everything, but unfortunately the way subdivisions are designed, it's the first shot that comes out the most efficient. It's a very good thing except when we are talking about the preservation of land. Rather than have your piece of land divided up into streets and lots to get every last house you can fit in the premise now is to see what is worthy of protection. Some municipalities engineers say you have pulled the rug out from under me. You can't do this. This isn't permitted in the MPC. It's against all the rules. It is permitted in the MPC. Under zoning, you are already permitted to protect environmental resources and agricultural resources. So subdivision land development is just echoing what's permitted in there and making sure it's incorporated in the design. It's really important to get the big pictures first.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said another change is there will be optional and recommended meetings, site plan visits and pre-plan conference. In LST, when they came on board in August 2004, the first thing they did was to make sure the needs and the wants are discussed up front. It doesn't do any good to have a developer or applicant spend \$100 or \$150 on preliminary plans and come in and bring a plan in they think will work and then the Township says that's the most precious piece of land there, can you move this around and move that around. At that point, there is so much money invested, that it really is a hardship to change it. The Township is frustrated because can't they see the big picture, didn't they understand that's what we wanted them to do. Well, no, because it really wasn't ever discussed. It's a lot less expensive and therefore a lot more agreeable for applicants to engage in discussion before they spend the big money. The pre-application meeting is one where they are encouraged to have as much of the ERSAP done as possible. That meeting it's published data and they can pull everything right up on line like the steep slopes, the woodlands, there's a lot they can pull up. They are not saying to out and do a \$15,000.00 survey for a pre-application meeting. Some people may have it, some may not. After the pre-app meeting, there is a site visit and then a pre-plan conference. The site visit and pre-plan conference can also involve the P/C. The P/C sees what is really on the site. Not everyone can read plans so

why should we assume that volunteers that are here can soak up everything from a piece of paper. A site visit is really worth it and they are making it part of the optional and recommended meetings. It's not mandatory. If we said the sketch plan and this process was mandatory, it would vest the rights of the applicant, and that's not something we are anxious to do. Attorney Treadwell said is the site visit mandatory for a major? Ms. Stern Goldstein said a site visit is not mandatory for the major at the sketch plan stage. It would be mandatory that the applicant permit the Township on the site if that's what the Township wants to go for. That's something as we go through this, the Township will have to weigh in if you are going to require the applicant to sign permission for the Township to access the site. That is one of the things we need to find out from P/C and Council. In Solebury and Milford they have to sign the rights for the Township to come on the property. Wrightstown they skirted around that. They never had anyone say no.

Attorney Treadwell asked Ms. Stern Goldstein to go back to the pre plan conference and explain that. Ms. Stern Goldstein said pre-plan conference is an optional and recommended one. That's before they submit the preliminary plans while they are in sketch plan so that before they submit their preliminary plan, and invest all that money, they have the ability to come in and in this case in the draft it would be to meet with P/C and to meet with Council. It would be provision to meet with both. Right now too many applicants come into the P/C and will spend six to eight months at P/C and want to go to Council, but can't go to Council until they are out of P/C. This pre-plan conference would be P/C and then Council, so they can get feedback from everyone. It's not saying that anyone is giving approval because you never, ever give approval at sketch plan. You can give guidance and suggestions and tell them to go work on something, but this gives the applicant to also go to Council. Attorney Treadwell said the difference between the pre-application and the meeting and pre-plan conference is the pre-application meeting is with staff whereas the pre-plan conferences are with the P/C and Council. Ms. Stern Goldstein said that's correct.

Mr. Maxfield said we talked that you can't require a sketch plan, is there any way the applicant can claim that the ERSAP is part of the sketch plan phase. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it's not required at sketch plan. It's required prior to or at the submission of the preliminary plan. It has to be done as part of the preliminary plan submission. They can do it at any point. For the sketch plan, she was talking about doing published data so you don't have to spend as much money. Mr. Maxfield said doesn't it suggest by its very nature that it should be the first thing done? Ms. Stern Goldstein said it should be the very first thing done, and that's why she's saying it should be done. They are strongly encouraging it, but it can't be required. If you require it, then you have a mandatory sketch plan which would vest the applicant's rights. Some Township's have done that. Milford Township had done that and she doesn't know if they still have it or not, and Terry Clemons had worked up some language in conjunction with some of the local attorney's in Bucks County something to the affect of this sketch plan it doesn't vest all of your rights, but the Township agrees not to change the ordinance for a period of like 60 days. It's so there's a little more trust there. She's not real fond of it and not sure how you feel about clauses like that. Attorney Treadwell said he's not fond of it. Mr. Stern Goldstein said they didn't include that in here.

Mr. Kern said what don't you like about it? Attorney Treadwell said he doesn't like going above and beyond what the MPC says. You're getting out into a grey area and basically agreeing with any applicant that comes before you that oh, we won't do this or that. It takes away the sum of the P/C and Council's authority to change the ordinance if you want to change the ordinance.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said she's a big fan of using the MPC to your advantage and staying to the rules and not going outside that box of rules. She's a big fan of pushing what you need to push environmentally as long as you are still within a safe zone. She said a few times their job is to give you their best recommendations and to make sure they're not creating a situation where the Township would be vulnerable. This is one she feels vulnerability comes into it. Attorney Treadwell agrees with Ms. Goldstein.

Mr. Landis said (could not hear him). Ms. Stern Goldstein said what's happening is Buckingham Township also has regulations like this as well as a number of other municipalities. They have ordinances that require the ERSAP plan. Since they are all required at the preliminary plan submission, applicants have gotten smart and realized if they have to do it anyway, and they have to at least go through the motions that they complied with the step design process, it's actually less expensive to bite the bullet and do it the right way to start with.

Mr. Maxfield said there's no guarantee if they started to do it at the preliminary plan stage right before that, they could come in and things could change in a major way. No guarantee that things aren't going to change. It would be smart for them to do it right up front. Ms. Stern Goldstein said that's correct. When looking at the ERSAP plan and doing the site plan visit and doing the site plan analysis process, it's not a subjective process to annotate what's there and to map the resources and then go through the checklist of what should be preserved and what needs to be preserved and the secondary areas for development. That stuff is not subjective. Once you get through what needs to be protected, sighting the building areas could be subjective, but you've worked out the hard stuff what should and needs to be preserved. Sighting a house and drawing lot lines should always be subjective and we as commonwealth landowners have rights. We're not taking that away or proposing to take that away.

Mr. Maxfield said they've seen this already at P/C where applicants come in and at the last minute do the natural resource inventory for the site. They are unwilling at this point to move things around. There is still that possibility where someone could come in waiting long for that analysis to occur and then have major changes where they didn't pay attention to any of the ordinances which we've had also. They come in and ask our engineer or planner to redesign it for them. If somehow we could get that idea out there that it's a really smart thing to do as it could really lead to extensive changes later if you're not in the process. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it would be much better for us. When she looks back where we were at August of 2004 and where we are now, although the last couple of years there hasn't been a lot of development, she'd say most of the developments that have come in since then, have come in to meet with staff and have gone through a sketch plan. Most, but not all, definitely more than had before when we looked at the records.

Mr. Landis said when he came on the P/C, there was a requirement not to review the sketch plan. (Could not hear rest of what he said). Mr. Maxfield said there was some sort of thing where they said if there was a sketch plan, they could claim later it was the preliminary plan when it was really not. Ms. Stern Goldstein said a lot of plan review and dialog comes down to money. How much money has someone sunk into something really is inversely proportioned to how amiable they are to changing something. Mr. Landis spoke (could not hear him.) Ms. Stern Goldstein said we have to remember and she has to caution everyone, that once regulations are in there and if an applicant does meet the letter of the ordinances, both subdivision land development and zoning, even if you don't like it, you are still compelled to approve it. The art of ordinance writing is to make sure the goals and objectives of the Township are being met in the ordinances. With your zoning right now, there's a lot of environmental protection in the zoning ordinance which is where it should be, but now the subdivision land development has gone and come up to be the true companion of the zoning ordinance and deal with that in the subdivision land development process so that it's in the forefront.

Mr. Kern said at some point in the process it would be interesting to get some input from developers to see what they think about this process and whether or not they think it's more expensive, less expensive, more cumbersome, less cumbersome. That would be pretty valuable input. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it's going to be interesting because if someone is used to just slapping a plan together, this is another step. It is more cumbersome; therefore, more expensive if you look at it like that. If someone is used to slapping a plan together and then having it reviewed, then kick back, review, kick back, review, essentially designed by review, it's going to be less expensive than going through that process if they actually take the time right up front. It depends on the applicant, the direction the applicant is giving their professionals, the ability of those

professionals to meet the goals and objectives of the applicant and to address the ordinance requirements and that all comes down to money and who is paying who what to do their job. Mr. Maxfield said he liked the term designed by review. That puts a name to something we've seen a lot. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it's frustrating on all sides and usually it's a really good applicant and those developments usually turn out to be some of the ones everyone can point to and be proud of in the community. They look forward to more of them up here.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said that is the overall concept. They've got a couple of big picture items she can start going over. She wanted to just talk big picture concept and a big difference to what your ordinance is today.

Mr. Garges said Ms. Stern Goldstein said it was just major subdivision and land developments, maybe where the cutoff is in case they don't understand that. What type of developments this would impact? Mr. Garges said your mom and pop breaking the lot off, that type of thing. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it would be optional for minor subdivisions which are the type A which in LST it's a lot line change. Mr. Garges said type A is three lots, type B is the lot line change. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it's optional for type A, the Mom and Pop type things, small subdivisions – small meaning lots, not acreage. You have to remember is someone has a 100 acre farm and they are going to divide it into three lots and meet the definition of a type A subdivision, they would then, have to say the rest of it is restricted from further development. If those lots were to be farther developed, then you could divide them into three lots and take each lot into three lots and you could skirt it. That's not going to be an option. Mr. Maxfield said how do we enforce that? Ms. Stern Goldstein said deed restriction. Mr. Miller said that's in lieu of the current provision which is basically since the ordinance has been adopted in 98 or whichever version it goes back to, that you would be looking back to that date. The way it's set up currently is back to the date the SALDO was originally adopted, if any more than three lots were generated from that, it becomes a major subdivision. Is that the way it's currently presented in the ordinance or is it starting from the new adoption date that you are going to deed restrict rather than rely upon the subdivision from the original adoption from the SALDO. Ms. Stern Goldstein said she's not sure of the exact wording right now and Karen is going to find it. The intent is not to have someone come back and carve up lots they've already carved up. The type B is the one that would be the lot line changed and it's not required at all for that. What they care about mostly with the lot line change is the same things they've always cared about for a lot line change and that is to make sure that whatever lot is having the land taken from it, doesn't become non-conforming than be defaults, like with impervious. That's usually what they are looking for and that won't change.

Mrs. Stern Goldstein said is there anything else Mr. Garges could think of? Mr. Garges said they were just talking about the minor and major land development. The minor land development used to be 10,000 square feet or less of new building, so that is now combined an it's just land development which would fall under the new regulations which is much more consistent with the rest of the world and what would normally happen is you start with land development and then you need to add on and you add on and if you were non-conforming to start with, non-conforming regulations permit you to do some natural expansion. This just treats all land developments as they are, land development. She asked if anyone had any gut reactions that they really didn't like this?

Mr. Landis said (could not hear him). Ms. Stern Goldstein said it could be at the applicant's request. It's optional and recommended. She's actually been on more of those types of visits whether it's been more formal process or just municipalities where they say sure, let's do it. What happened many times is it would be 9:00 am on a Saturday morning and the applicant brings a box of donuts and a box of coffee and you're out there doing it. She was at one in Monroe County where they did a hayride through 150 acres on a Sunday. People really did need to stay together and some of the points were not easy accessible. Small sites, some you can see from the road and other times what you see from the road is not really what the site is. Mr. Landis said he's never had any problem with it. Certainly if it was a larger subdivision, it would make a lot of sense. The smaller ones have a pre-Council meeting and have everybody be able to do it. He doesn't have a

problem with it other than finding the time when people could go. Ms. Stern Goldstein said some P/C's and governing bodies have chosen to do it at their normal meeting time and convene at their normal place and go out depending the time of year. Others advertise an extra meeting for that. She's attended ones on Saturday's and also at 5:00 pm on a Tuesday. You tend to have applicants want to bring you out to the site. When areas of their site are determined to be worthy of protection and they don't necessarily agree. They want to go out and show you why that's not worthy of protection and why this other part is there that they want to protect. Mr. Landis just wondered how that worked. Ms. Mallo said there's also a topic they brought up later on in the discussion that will need your input on. There is a letter that is in the appendix of your document that states that you have to submit a letter that the applicant allows you to access their property. Do you want to make that mandatory? Do you want to have to be able to go out on their property? Mr. Landis said we need it. Attorney Treadwell said you would need it for an applicant who says no. If you have an applicant who said no, he's not sure it's enforceable anyway. He doesn't think the Township can stand out there and say you have to let us on your property. It's private property. If you can see something from the road, you can see something from the road. The only time he would guess that the majority of the applicants would want to go out there if you have the opportunity to go out there would be for their own reasons. If they've identified things that aren't worthy of preservation, and they want you to see it, just to show that it's not really what it looks like on paper. If you get into that situation where someone says no, you're not coming out here, he doesn't think there's anything you can do about it. There's nothing in the MPC that says the Township is authorized to require people to let you on their property.

Mr. Maxfield said years ago they were talking that on the application you could check a box that says they would allow you to go on the property, but maybe we talked about it and it never occurred. Attorney Treadwell said do we have that? Mr. Garges said there was something that Linc looked at on our application, the way it was set up, and it did allow us the right to go on their property. He doesn't know if it was a specific note. We did this a few years back. Attorney Treadwell said it's fine until somebody says no, I'm not letting you do it. Mr. Landis said they have a right to let us on it, so why not have the checkbox as most everyone will probably check.

Mrs. Yerger said you talked in terms of the big picture and the proposed changes. Do you have any kind of timeline where we're going to bring this now? Some time has gone by, are we looking at ten meetings, six months, any idea at all? Ms. Stern Goldstein said her game plan was two years ago. They've gone through so much. Mr. Miller has reviewed the design standard section in detail. They've looked at it and identified the issues that they would need some input on. Ms. Mallo articulated one of those. That's from the model ordinance. Changes like that they get the direction. That's either in or out. Ms. Mallo is good at updating things. This process, depending on how long it takes with the P/C, assuming that Council says yes, it's worthy of continuing, let's send it to P/C for them to finished working on, and get something up to Council to eventually advertise for adoption, that could happen in short, realistically, in six months at P/C. It could be as long as the P/C wants it to be. She thinks if it starts taking over six months, they've lost all momentum and hope for this to continue on. It would have to be some regular monthly meetings and Ms. Mallo has the ability to make sure this is moving along. Mr. Miller has looked at it, and we can give you the good, bad and ugly of why things shouldn't be done. We can make some decisions and recommendations and bring it back to Council. That being said, even if comes back to Council after six months of P/C, it's not being adopted this year. That's going to put you around the time where Council will have to authorize it for advertising. The earliest it could be adopted would be February 2014. A good goal for this year would be for P/C to wrap it up and get it to Council. She's not saying to have marathon P/C meetings either, she's saying to tackle some issues each meeting and have those issues articulated as to what they are. She's also saying you are not going to go through this page by page and talk about each page. You are going to talk about it in chunks.

Mr. Garges said just looking at the 170 page document, it's very scary to see, but the three documents handed out tonight, if you just want to look at overview nuts and bolts of exactly what

changed, the one that says “Proposed SALDO Revisions Comparison with Current Standards” and “Current Proposed and Comments”, you can see the things in there once you get past the process that we just talked about like water testing from 50 units to 5 units; cul-de-sac length, etc. Those are some of the big things. From a planning perspective, you can wrap your brain around those pretty quickly reading those. The landscaping revisions, Ms. Mallo has a summary there and she has definitions that are added. They could even tackle this at the P/C meeting, document by document. Mrs. Yerger said how do we move forward with this from here on? Ms. Stern Goldstein said they’ve created little mini-bites for you. Mr. Garges said the big thing tonight is to think about the process change as it’s a big change. Mrs. Yerger said when we first talked about this, when she and Tom examined it from other municipalities, what she came away with, and you can jump in here and correct her, what she ultimately saw, even though there would probably be resistance from maybe developers who are used to the old way we used to do things, but in the end game, when the dust cleared and everyone sort of looked at it and realized that in the long haul, it was very linear for the most part. It was very orderly. It was very tidy and once you got into that system, it actually expedited in most cases, instead of going back and going back and revising and revising. It actually shortened the process for everybody and that was a win-win to your point. That’s what really appealed to her. Most people know preserving the natural resources is important to her, but she also likes the way this worked, it was very efficient. She’s sure people will disagree with her, but she likes the efficiency.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said the way they are attacking it is to make it efficient and to make it so the rules are there and the rules are known. That being said, there are a few municipalities that have given this process sort of a black eye, where in their sole purpose was to just string it out and drag the process out to cost developers more money. There are a few municipalities known for doing that. Mrs. Yerger said she doesn’t know how much tweaking needs to be done to try to prevent that for being used for those purposes. The way she would like to see this be implemented is it’s an efficient system for everybody. Mr. Maxfield agreed. What costs developers money is going backwards. Ms. Stern Goldstein said if someone is going to end up with x number of lots in their mind, but in reality it’s x minus 3, it’s a lot cheaper for them to get to x minus 3 sooner rather than later because of the carrying costs of the land and all the design back and forth. If you are going to end up with the same number, but you can do it in more linear and matter of fact manner before you spend the big bucks, it’s cheaper in the long run even though it’s not what they thought they had to start with, it’s going to be the same number.

Mr. Maxfield said have you found in doing the SALDO and things you are proposing, any contradictions from our existing zoning, things we are going to have to go back to and tweak? Ms. Stern Goldstein said Ms. Mallo has a list of things that might need to get tweaked in zoning; a list of things that were inconsistent with your existing SALDO that they are dealing with; a list of things that might need to change in the stand alone grading storm water management ordinances; so yes. Mr. Maxfield said if we were to adopt the SALDO, we’d be adopting the changes to the zoning at the same time? Ms. Stern Goldstein said she would like that to occur and at the same time, since you mentioned zoning, they’d like to wrap up with one little bow and either agree to do it right away, soon after, or at the same time. They have alternative energy’s and a couple of other things that haven’t been looked at in zoning and if you could do them together, it would be nice. They do understand getting one thing done at a time is also good, so they are out there. Your sign ordinance is out there for later on also. She doesn’t want all of that incorporated at the expense of not having your SALDO finally done.

Mr. Maxfield said they’ve been trained now to think of resources in a certain way. He knows things change. Did they run into anything the way they were thinking about resources, it changed? Like on a simplified version, something like riparian corridor recommendations, change, get bigger as time goes on. Do you run into anything like that, wetlands or steep slopes? Ms. Stern Goldstein said steep slopes are kind of a sliding scale depending on the train of the Township. She’s doing a lot of work in the Poconos and their version of steep slopes is a little different than LST’s. That’s dependant on the community. She’d say in riparian, that’s a sliding scale and has gone back and

forth. Flood plain they are waiting for FEMA so you have 180 days to adopt it. That will change some of your terminology. The way people look at geothermal has changed over the years. The concept of BMP's has evolved, but you have the stand alone storm water and management which is addressing that. Mr. Maxfield said he's be interested in for awhile everyone was recommending lump spreaders, and then they reconfigured some things. Ms. Stern Goldstein said that's all in your grading and storm water. The other part they are recommending, as Township staff, the whole Construction Standards, take them out of SALDO and have that be a separate document - the actual nuts and bolts of the construction standards. The landscape regs do go in SALDO. The one thing that did change, there's a lot more in the landscape regulations in the subdivision land development because you basically have not much, if any.

Ms. Mallo said the handout that says "Comparison with Current Standards", that's pretty much going to give you the items where they still need your input. Mr. Miller has a couple of items he'll need to review in terms of well and water issues. The changes are just to bring it up into other current ordinances. They did do a lot of changes with road, but nothing earth shattering in terms of new technologies or resource protection.

Mr. Maxfield said are we sticking with the road widths we had before? Ms. Stern Goldstein said you might want to save that for a night when you go into details. Mr. Miller said the majority of the details when they had the ordinance to review back in the winter of 2008, they incorporated most of the design standards back into the ordinance. Some things were found not to be continued; however, back in 2008, most of the current standards are in there except the ones noted in your attachment.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said they are here, as a group, they didn't want this to get too far away from the governing body and the P/C. She wants to make sure we're still in that concept they were in back in 2006. If Council has no objections, send it to P/C so they can work on it. They don't want to do anything out with formal direction. It's a big change. Mr. Maxfield said its simple changes. Mr. Noble asked if there would be a summary on the application giving them a heads up? Ms. Stern Goldstein said there could be a checklist developed. There is already a checklist. That checklist could include some of these items. Anyone who is going to submit a plan, will look under the submission requirements and that would spell out the items required. It would have the items and they would see the process. The Township has guidelines for the process which would be updated. She'd think when you roll this out, there would be some educational blurbs on the website. Mr. Maxfield said the summary a developer could look at it and it gives them some ability to direct them. That's a good idea.

Mr. Landis said the P/C needs some direction. Mr. Kern said good communication is desirable in the process. He would like to hear feedback from developers. Ms. Stern Goldstein said they have a staff meeting next Tuesday and maybe they can bat some ideas around on how to get some developers input and prior to June 5<sup>th</sup> Council meeting, maybe get some input back to Council. Mr. Kern said it would be good to get that feedback. Ms. Stern Goldstein said there will be some applicants, engineers and attorneys who will not embrace this. To some people, it won't make a difference at all. You may have some suggestions of developers to run this by.

#### **IV. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS**

##### **A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - APRIL 25, 2013**

Mr. Landis asked if there were any additions or corrections? No on raised their hand.

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of the April 25, 2013 minutes.  
**SECOND BY:** Mrs. Yerger  
**ROLL CALL:** 5-0 (Mr. Kologie and Mr. Lychak – Absent)

**Planning Commission Meeting  
May 23, 2013**

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

- Mr. Horiszny said June 10<sup>th</sup>, Volunteer Picnic at Town Hall pavilion starting at 6:00 pm. He said please P/C people come.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY:** Mr. Noble moved for adjournment. The time was 8:15 pm.

**SECOND BY:** Mr. Maxfield

**ROLL CALL:** 5-0 (Mr. Kologie and Mr. Lychak – Absent)

Submitted by:

---

Mr. John Landis, Chair