

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The Planning Commission meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Thursday, June 15, 2006, 7:02 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. John Landis, Chair, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Present: John Landis, Chair; Gerry Szakmeister, Vice Chair; Fran LaBuda, Secretary; Hazem Hijazi, John Noble; Tom Maxfield; Brien Kocher, Engineer; Chris Garges, Zoning Officer; Judy Stern Goldstein, Township Planner; Stephanie Williams, Jr. PC Member; and Solicitor, Marci Schneider. Absent: Craig Kologie.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

III. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. BETHLEHEM RENEWABLE ENERGY LLC – BETHLEHEM RENEWABLE ENERGY FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN 06-05 – 2335 APPLEBUTTER ROAD – (TIME LIMIT – 08/16/06)

Mr. Landis said there's not a lot to address here. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the only concerns they have are issues that they are in the process of obtaining and that is certifications, and write-offs from the management areas. Attorney Preston said they have gotten some of those. Mr. Kocher said they are attached to Jim Birdsall's comment letter. Attorney Preston said they will take care of Chris Snyder's letter. Mr. Dobry said when the landfill was bought by IESI and the city let go of it, there was an agreement for the city of Bethlehem to provide fire service to the landfill. At the last Council meeting, they instructed them to make sure they understand it was part of their agreement. In talking to our Fire Chief, Chris Snyder, he said that the city has never responded to a call at the landfill. Mr. LaBuda said he disagrees with that. Mr. Dobry said Mr. Snyder was a bit protective of his fire company to serve this area. Mr. Snyder said he would talk with Council to get it ironed out. Mr. Dobry asked Mr. Snyder if he had a call where you could handle it, would you call the City? He said no, he has three other companies to help him out. He would ask the Fire Chief and Council to work that out. He has attempted to contact the City Fire Department a number of times and hasn't received a response from them yet.

Mr. LaBuda said if Mr. Dobry wants him to talk to the Commissioner, he will. Mr. Dobry said he would appreciate that. Mr. LaBuda said he will call them tomorrow. Mr. Garges said his suggestion would be if they don't get anywhere with that, send a letter to the Township saying he's tried to talk to comply.

MOTION BY: Ms. Szakmeister moved to approve, with conditions on the two letters.

SECOND BY: Mr. LaBuda

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

B. ABRAHAM ATIYEH - ATIYEH/2200 WASSERGASS ROAD LAND DEVELOPMENT 05-05 AND SITE PLAN 02-05 – 2200 WASSERGASS ROAD (TIME LIMIT – 09/08/06)

Present were Tim Siegfried, Attorney to the developer; Abraham Atiyeh, owner; Brian Ritter from Jenna Engineering; and Matt Stoltz from Jenna Engineering.

Attorney Siegfried said the developer has been going through the plans addressing the comments from the Township Staff.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said there are still a few big picture items. One is the tight access and the circulation throughout the site, and the other is a lot of plan clean-up. Things that are achievable and things they can actually get to, but they don't seem to be ready tonight yet for a motion. There's a lot left to go in the plans.

Mr. Atiyeh said they want to close the lower road and have access to the upper road and have a connector road between the two in front of the building. Being that both units are grade level, they feel that a road behind the road would be unnecessary and the slopes along the neighboring property are too steep to connect the road down there. They like the circulation the way it is. They feel it's good for marketing and a good access.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said as they stated numerous times, they feel the circulation is lacking on the site. There needs to be some coherent way to get around and through the site. They recommended to them before to come in with one driveway split and make it go around the building. Mr. Atiyeh said that would be more dangerous for residents walking and it would be a safety issue. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the issue now is when you come in with the one driveway.

Mr. Kocher said it's his understanding they had a meeting some time ago with some of their traffic people and they picked a location for a new driveway. Mr. Atiyeh said the driveway was in the middle. Mr. Noble said everyone recommended they lower their exit driveway and make one because of the grade difference between the road and the parking area. They failed to listen to this recommendation at our last meeting. The reason was safety and grade. If you look at your topo of this design, the topo lines get a lot wider as you get between the two driveways that are existing. Last meeting we recommended you put your driveway down where you had fewer grades and still get your clear sight triangles. You ignored our recommendations. Have your engineers looked at the grade? We, as a body, didn't recommend rotation around the building. We focused only on the safety of the driveway and the slope of the driveway and that was totally ignored. Mr. Atiyeh said he tried to work with the township. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the issue was the slope of the driveway itself coming in mid-level between the two dwelling levels. It was all combined in one issue. Mr. Noble said you almost have a fourteen foot drop, but if you come in from the side, you only have a two to three foot drop.

Mr. LaBuda said he has concerns with safety. Mr. Landis said a suggestion was made to move the driveway down. Mr. Hijazi said the concern is a safety issue. If Mr. Atiyeh can demonstrate that the existing driveway is as safe as what we are proposing, is that going to be something acceptable? Mr. Atiyeh said absolutely. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the engineers had a meeting out there. She sat in staff meetings with the issues. Her concern is the internal circulation is very steep. Mr. Kocher said there was a meeting with the traffic engineer from their firms. There was a location picked on to Wassergass that did meet PennDOT's sight distance criteria at a location that was discussed here to have safe internal access. Mr. Hijazi said there was a meeting and your engineer agreed about another location. Mr. Atiyeh said no, his traffic engineer agreed with this location he is talking about. His road on the top has the least pitch.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 15, 2006

Mr. Landis said it might be best if our engineering and planning people again meet together to resolve this issue. Mr. Ritter said they can put a cross section where the proposed driveway is currently shown, take a look at the other location, put a cross section through there, and show what the grading is and the impact is so we can take a look at it. Mr. Hijazi asked them to have that conversation resolved before coming here. Mr. LaBuda said go back to the minutes and take a look at them and see what everyone said. Mr. Maxfield is concerned with sight distance also. Mr. Landis said it needs to be resolved at the engineering level first.

Attorney Siegfried said looking at the Boucher letter, 1D, the latter part says "however, the plans do not indicate how the open space areas are to be preserved and maintained. The plans should be revised to indicate whether any deed restrictions are to be placed on the required open space areas". You are just looking for plan notes? Ms. Stern Goldstein said plan notes on what the intent is on the open space and how it will be maintained. Mr. Hijazi said you have two squares on the map, with something in between, what is it? Mr. Ritter said it's a grading difference between the two soccer fields, steep slopes and trees and brush.

Attorney Siegfried said 1F talks about the minimum 60 yards side yard, and there's a discussion that 40' is an easement, not a right-of-way. It's an easement? Ms. Stern Goldstein said your engineers need to work that out, and that will be fine. Attorney Siegfried said they will take a look at it.

Attorney Siegfried said 5C, your comment is the plan should be revised to show location of all trees with a diameter of 8" in caliber or greater. There isn't any suggestion that any of those trees are going to be removed. Ms. Stern Goldstein said you need to show where the 8" trees are on the plan.

Attorney Siegfried said 5E, they recognize that the ordinance suggests for new impervious cover that you need to provide some additional landscaping. They are adding impervious at different locations and taking impervious away at other places, so it's a net loss as to whether there is a requirement of additional landscaping. Ms. Stern Goldstein said if you document on the plan, she'll accept that. Mr. Maxfield said or you can permanently remove that lower road and that would take care of it.

Attorney Siegfried said item 6E, it appears the dimensions for some of the handicapped parking spaces in the plan do not match the dimensions listed in the sign tabulation chart. He said they will comply with that. Mr. Ritter said sign tabulation tells you the physical size of the sign which is 4" x 18". They show on the plan that criteria. This is the second time they talked about this. Ms. Stern Goldstein said if you communicated with us and showed us exactly what you are talking about in the interim, that would have helped. If you can send her the documentation showing her that, as they are seeing something else on the plan, she'd be glad to work with them. They will comply with everything else on the letter or come back.

Mr. Kocher said the two issues they have to work on are storm water. They want to make sure when the storm water hits the property line, it is dealt with as it leaves the property line. Second is the compliance for the on lot sewer requirements. We need to work together to get that straightened out. Attorney Siegfried said that's correct. Some items, like on B9, it says not more than 10 dwelling units per system, and he thinks there is one system that is going to be proposed, so they would be looking for a waiver to that. Mr. Kocher said you will have to identify those issues and then ask Council if they'd be willing to give a waiver.

Attorney Siegfried said on B3, it's a request of the engineer, it says "detailed survey information shall be shown for the existing storm drainage facilities along an upstream of Wassergass Road". His understanding is the township did or permitted modifications of those systems in the last couple

**Planning Commission Meeting
June 15, 2006**

of years, so he's sure they have some engineering data they could show the developer. Mr. Kocher said whatever they have, they'll be happy to show them.

Attorney Siegfried said there are storm water issues and sewerage issues. They have to be resolved between the engineers and then we'll have a better understanding of which waivers to request.

Mr. Hijazi said if your engineers can resolve these technical issues before the next meeting, that way everyone will be on the same page. Attorney Siegfried said sure. Mr. Atiyeh said they'll do the best they can. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it would be in your best interest if when you resubmit the plans, you include a response letter with those plans and address how and where on the plans you've addressed the comments so that both Brian and herself don't have to read their minds and guess.

Mr. LaBuda said a lot of these things should have been handled before this meeting.

Mr. William Geyer, resident, said he wants to comment on the water runoff problem. It runs right down into his field and it starts up on Wassergass Road. The Township has put three pipes under Wassergass Road and they are taking all that water and run it down an open ditch between Mr. Atiyeh's property and the neighbor. When it gets down to the end, somebody has a big pile of dirt and that water shoots all over on his land. This all comes down to his land. He's had Mr. Birdsall out there when there was a problem on Silver Creek Road. He showed him the situation. It is the same system when they put the school there in the 1950's. He has a lake every time there is a hard rain. Somebody should give him the time to come out and get this solved. Mr. Atiyeh said they are doing upgrades to the swale.

Mr. Jack Geyer, resident, showed the PC all the properties they were talking about. He said there were four new pipes put in. He showed the pipe of concern. There's a trench that runs down along the property and comes down and this property built up a dirt barrier so the water can no longer continue down. The water then pours over into their driveway. That driveway at times will get gullies in it that are 12" to 16" deep. The reason this happens is this lower area, there are catch basins which are tied into the whole water system in the school. If you allow things to grow in there, the leaves and all debris cover the catch basins and the water flows over the little dike there and comes down to his house. He built a storm system around his house that is 8' deep and filled with stone and pipe just to get the water away that comes down from the school property. There are times where they get a pond that is 2' to 4' deep with ducks swimming in it. Mr. LaBuda said he's sure the township will not put anything in there. That's a big project. Mr. William Geyer said you put things in Silver Creek Road all the way up. Mr. LaBuda said there was a discussion about this already. Mr. William Geyer told the engineer if they want to run a pipe down to the creek, he will allow them to put the pipe underground on his property as long as you run it along the fence row. He has been working and trying to talk to people. Mr. LaBuda said the PC isn't going to resolve this. Mr. William Geyer said what leaves Mr. Atiyeh's property and goes to his property, he is responsible for. Mr. Landis said not if it's not changed. If he makes it worse, yes. He's not responsible for all the water coming on your property if it comes from somewhere else. Mr. Atiyeh said they are trying to resolve the problem and can work something out. Mr. Noble said Mr. Atiyeh is not changing existing conditions out there. He will work with Mr. Geyer.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to table.

SECOND BY: Mr. Hijazi

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

C. **HOME PRO ENTERPRISES, INC. – SAUCON MEADOWS 2 MINOR #MIN 01-06 – 3588
LOWER SAUCON ROAD (TIME LIMIT 08/17/06)**

Present – Michael Waldron, Ott Consulting; Paul Dreyer, Owner and Brian Kostival, Owner.

Mr. Landis said this is a minor subdivision to subdivide the one lot. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the plan is a clean plan. Many of the items noted in the letter are items that had been reviewed and discussed and actually revised as part of their larger major subdivision; however, they prepared the plans for the minor before they had a chance to incorporate those things into the minor. It's a victim of time. They have already addressed some of the things. They are proposing to separate the one large parcel that is currently separated by road. It's two parcels so the one on the left of the plan can be conveyed, yet still use the bulk of that which would be deed restricted open space, with conservation easements on it to count as the open space and part of the lot area for the larger one. There are a lot of I's to be dotted and T's to be crossed. The big thing is the PC needs to make a recommendation on the open space issue as does Council. The open space for the cluster development, on the major subdivision, requires that first the applicant offer the open space to the township for dedication. In this case, the applicant does not intend to do that. They've explained to the PC before why they don't intend to do it and they explained it to Council, but that remains an open issue until they get to Council.

Mr. Maxfield said the type A minor subdivision is contingent upon the other side basically following through the other side of the road. Ms. Stern Goldstein said it could be subdivided into two pieces of property, but that's the way it is set up. The bulk of the lot on the western side of the road would remain with the conservation easement and deed restriction. That is an issue that the township staff discussed with the applicant. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the terms of the conservation easement have not been before the Township. Attorney Schneider said there was a draft submitted with some of the terms of the conservation easement and request that the Solicitor review it, but Council has to review it before they can comment on it. Mr. Kostival said they will go in front of Council. The only use they are looking for is either natural state or farming. Mr. Maxfield said his concern is that part of it is an identified area for the natural resources inventory, so he would think that Council would have some concerns about its use. Those details will be very important to Council. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the slaughter house in the area is being offered as a conservation easement. Attorney Schneider said there is some concern about the farming area, does that continue into perpetuity, etc.? If the intent is open space, then that question comes up as well.

Mr. Kocher said since this is a two lot subdivision in addition to the restrictions on the about open space for Lot 2, they want to make sure there is some restriction on Lot 1 since they are essentially approving a non building lot on Lot 1 and the plans have to be clear on there if the major falls dormant for ten years. It is a type A minor, so it does need a waiver.

Mr. Waldron said there are a couple of items in the letters that they felt they wanted to request waivers on. He prepared a letter in response to that to give to Mr. Garges. Mr. Dreyer said they took the conservation easement that the township provided to them and added some of their language and added the open space issues and submitted it back. Mr. Waldron said a requirement to improve Lower Saucon Road. It's their understanding that the township wishes to keep these roads in rural condition that they are in now.

Mr. Kocher said with any of the improvement issues on here, he would suggest that if the township does want to consider waiving them, they consider deferring them instead of outright waiving them so it's clear that it comes back to your decision when the major comes in. Linc is very familiar with this. Mr. Waldron said they would request a waiver from having to install street trees on Lot 1, and if necessary, defer them for Lot 2. The issue of open space, because it is two lots, it requires

**Planning Commission Meeting
June 15, 2006**

4,000 square feet of open space dedicated. Almost all of the majority of Lot 1 will be set aside for open space tied to the future development of Lot 2.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for the following: 1) a waiver is necessary to consider it as a minor subdivision because there is a previous plan submitted; 2) a waiver with today's dated letter, June 15, 2006, No. 1, you'd like to defer the road improvements along Lower Saucon Road on either side of Lower Saucon Road; 3) the planting screen and berm, 145-43B2, you would like to defer Lot 2 planting screen and berm and would like to waive that planting screen and berm requirement for Lot 1; and 4) the street trees for local streets we would okay a waiver for not planting street trees along Lot 1 and would defer a waiver for Lot 2 and request they look into possible replenishment of trees that would be taken down on Lot 2. The one they are not going to include would be the open space dedication which would be for recreation space as that will be a Council decision.

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of the minor subdivision subject to the letters of Boucher & James and Hanover.

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

**D. SMITH BROTHERS DEVELOPMENT LLC – DRAVITZ MAJOR SUBDIVISION
PRELIMINARY PLAN MAJ 02-06 – 2845 COUNTY LINE ROAD (TIME LIMIT 08/16/06)**

Present – David Martin, Keystone Consulting, Jerry Smith, Dan Smith and Kevin Horwath, Keystone Consulting.

Mr. Horwath said it's 22 acres with four lots along County Line Road. At this time, they revised the plan to show what's in accordance with a cluster development. There are two acre plus lot sizes. They've created an open space area and also created two open space areas. Pointing to the map, he said the developer's intent is that he wants to convey these two pieces of property to the respective property owners along County Line Road. The tracts would be deed restricted. The third tract would be either offered to the township for dedication of open space or maintained by one or several property owners in the subdivision. They are looking for a recommendation. They request that the buildable area tabulation include the resources from the two lots that would be conveyed, and consider it as a total development crediting towards the four lots they are proposing.

Attorney Schneider said they are interested in conveying the lots out, but having the acreage be counted into all of the calculations. It causes an issue because if the land itself is going into separate ownership, that creates a whole different scenario. We may be able to work with this, but may have to go about it a slightly different way. The underlying land can really technically belong to someone else. They can have limited rights with it with covenants running with the land that would go forever, but they can't actually own it and count it in the calculations. Ms. Stern Goldstein said there are some legal issues that need to be resolved. Mr. Horwath said their intent is to deed it as open space. Mr. Maxfield said as far as a conservation easement, they might have a hard time finding an agency that would put a conservation easement on two pieces of property like that which were being conveyed. The deed restriction would work.

**Planning Commission Meeting
June 15, 2006**

Ms. Stern Goldstein said the plan has come a long way. They've addressed the comments. There are still issues to be resolved like the disposition of the open space. The second is access easements for a driveway going through other properties, and the third is the issue of encroachment on to the subject site which would be in the area of open space, and the fourth is dotting a lot of I's and crossing a lot of T's. The plans need to be resubmitted.

Dan Smith said he contacted their title company and they did fax him a copy of the easement with all the page numbers on it and they will get that to Ms. Stern Goldstein.

Ms. Stern Goldstein said another issue was the encroachment of a structure. Dan Smith said he thought that was removed. He talked to the owner today Jerry Smith said the property is actually for sale and they'll get in there and remove the structure if it isn't already removed.

Mr. Horwath said with response to the open space, in situations like this, is there something the township would be interested in taking or would this be something to be left to the homeowners to maintain and own? Ms. Stern Goldstein said they are obligated to offer it to the township as part of the cluster. Mr. Maxfield said they possibly might be interested in it knowing what the surrounding area is, but he can't speak for the full Council. Mr. Garges said most of the natural resources on the site, are being protected. It backs up to Clover View. Mr. Maxfield said if the township were interested in obtaining this, what would be their access to the property? Mr. Horwath said there are actually two points of access, at the cul-de-sac and the end of County Line Road. He discussed moving the easement with Mr. Ty Johnson, and Mr. Johnson is not willing to approach his wife about it at this time.

Jerry Smith said they want to preserve the open space. He said if the township doesn't take it, they'd like to deed restrict it to two of the lots which would make them favorable as larger lots for sale. They'd be more than happy to do that too. He talked to Heritage Conservancy, and their feeling was it didn't adjoin to any other open space land, so they felt it wasn't a prime for open space. Either way, they'll accommodate whatever the recommendation would be.

Mr. Kocher said the two main issues are more detail on the intersection. The Police Chief did issue his recommendations in a memo dated May 31, 2006. The second is they have gone over all storm water infiltration. They want to make sure they do the soil test to back it up, and it shows they have already done the soil tests. Mr. Kocher said he doesn't know how far they have to widen, but they have to make sure it's clear to the people driving on it where the stripes are, etc. There will be some shoulder improvements and the Police Chief is suggesting a street light be placed there or maybe a reflective sign.

Mr. Horwath said it indicates the slope of County Line Road currently does not drain northward toward the pipe or proposed inlet. Would it be okay to put the cross slope of the shoulder that will collect and drain, but as far as the remainder of the alignment and the cross section of the roadway, it is proposed to leave it as is. Mr. Kocher said part of what you have to show in the additional detail they are asking for at the intersection is the elevations to make sure they have positive drainage and they may need to give a little blow up of that intersection so everyone is clear on it.

Mr. Horwath said one of the other comments from HEA, no. 18H, second paragraph, "ownership and maintenance of the proposed infiltration areas". Speaking specifically of the ones proposed to handle roadway runoff, is that something the Township would generally accept for maintenance? Mr. Kocher said it is a new area, one that they are trying to formulate staff recommendations to the Council on it. Mr. Horwath said one of the infiltration structures is proposed within the open space area, is this something that is permissible? It may not even be dedicated for township maintenance or not expected, unless it were to be an easement within the open space for ground water recharge area. Mr. Kocher said if it's underground, it should be okay.

**Planning Commission Meeting
June 15, 2006**

Mr. Horwath said they have shown on the plan a three way stop sign intersection. Is there any feedback on this? Mr. Kocher said the police chief does make a stop sign recommendation and when you see his memo, you'll know what he's talking about.

Mr. Horwath said he wanted to talk about the recreation fee. None of the land on that lot is really usable for any sort of field. There's just too much slope, so they'll probably do the fee in lieu of. Ms. Stern Goldstein said they need to address that with Council.

Mr. Maxfield said it's a pretty good plan and very creative.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to table.

SECOND BY: Mr. Landis

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

E. ASHLEY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – CHURCH HILL ESTATES MINOR SUBDIVISION MIN 02-05 – REDINGTON ROAD – (TIME LIMIT – 08/11/06)

Attorney Donchez from Ashley was present and Freddy Lutz, Consultant from Arro.

Mr. Lutz said there have been no major changes. Ms. Stern Goldstein said the plans have been revised to address most of their comments. What's left are rather minor in nature. They still need to demonstrate they have the permits for sewer. Under environmental protection standards, they are down to minor modifications and they know what needs to be done and they are confident they can do that. They will need zoning permits to take the trees down, and there's a typo in their impervious, they transposed the numbers for the two lots. The final issue is the recreation fee which will be addressed by Council. As long as they are agreeable to those items in the letter, it's pretty clear.

Mr. Kocher said they are requesting a waiver for existing features within 500 feet of the site. The other items are legal items associated with the fact that it's a final plan.

MOTION BY: Ms. Szakmeister moved for a waiver for existing features and contours within 500 feet of the site be shown on the plan.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

MOTION BY: Mr. Noble moved for recommendation of the minor subdivision subject to Boucher & James and HEA letters.

SECOND BY: Mr. Hijazi

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

IV. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MAY 13, 2006

Ms. Szakmeister said on page 1, CALL TO ORDER, change "Gerry Szakmeister presiding" to "John Landis presiding". On page 12 of 12, the first motion, under roll call should read "Mr.

**Planning Commission Meeting
June 15, 2006**

LaBuda and Mr. Kologie absent”. Also on the adjournment, it should be “Mr. LaBuda and Mr. Kologie absent”.

MOTION BY: Mr. Noble moved for approval of the May 13, 2006 minutes, with corrections.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 5-0-1 (Mr. LaBuda – Abstained, Mr. Kologie – Absent)

V. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Michael Stern, 3519 Route 378, Bethlehem, PA said the following:

“I have brought to the attention of the LS PC a number of concerns that are involved with the proposed car wash and restaurant at Route 378 and Oakhurst Road:

- A previous sinkhole located at Route 378 and Oakhurst Road – has it been completely resolved or will it be reactivated by this new business?
- Chemical residue?
- All night noise if business is operating 24 hours?
- Traffic pattern problems with the anticipated increase due to the Stabler lifestyle center on Center Valley Parkway. Will an additional lane be provided by proposed business along Route 378?
- The greatest concern is the storm water runoff that will be created when 60,000 to 80,000 sq. feet of existing water absorbing property will be converted to concrete or blacktop surfaces, eliminating all water capture. The only business on that property at this time is a roadside stand selling Christmas trees, fruit and recently, Easter flowers. That business did not involve a topography change from the present soil and grass which, in turn, absorbs excess water from precipitation. This existing water absorbing property is located above the level of the properties across Route 378 which are low lying enough that the township was unable to provide public sewerage in the past. Since there is no storm sewer or drainage system in place, there will be a problem with water run off when the property is converted. What is being planned to alleviate the future unwanted water runoff created by this business?
- Will the PC knowingly allow water runoff onto other neighboring properties without installing a storm water sewerage system?

Planning Commission said they can’t address this as it isn’t on the agenda tonight, but Mr. Stern should come to the meeting when it is being addressed and then he can speak.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mr. LaBuda moved to adjourn. The time was 9:05 PM.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Kologie – Absent)

Submitted by:

Mr. John Landis, Chair