

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The Planning Commission meeting of Lower Saucon Township Council was called to order on Thursday, September 18, 2008, 7:05 P.M., at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Mr. John Landis, Chair, presiding.

ROLL CALL: Present: Jack Cahalan, Township Manager; John Landis, Chair; John Lychak, John Noble, Fran LaBuda, Secretary; Craig Kologie Tom Maxfield; Dan Miller, Engineer from Hanover Engineering; Chris Garges, Zoning Officer; Stacy Ogur, Planner from Boucher & James; Linc Treadwell, Solicitor. Hellertown Planning Commission: Donald Rohrbach, Planning Commission Member; Frank Pazzaglia, Secretary; Ronald Shegda, 4-Year Member; Phil Weber, Matthew Millren, Acting Chair; Charlie Luthar, Manager. Absent: Hazem Hijazi

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS

III. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. LOWER SAUCON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION & HELLERTOWN PLANNING COMMISSION

1. RECOMMENDATION OF THE MULTI-MUNICIPAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Present – Carolyn Yeakel & AJ Schwartz.

Carolyn thanked everyone. With her is AJ Schartz. They have seen many of the members at the different meetings. They are excited to be part of this historic occasion with the two Planning Commissions coming together. They have been working on this for the last two years. They'd like to go over the recent progress. They are at a point where they have a list of everything that needed to be incorporated into the comment draft for the official public review. They put together a first draft of an Executive Summary which highlights the mission and the goals of the plan, key recommendations and some of the basic foundations of things that have gone into the planning document. They are also going to be preparing another type of Executive Summary, one that is geared towards sort of a community wide distribution that the communities could have in their administrative offices or in the library where someone could pick up a quick summary of what is happening and what is proposed as part of the comprehensive plan efforts. As you are all moving forward in the years to come, everyone can understand what the basic foundations are.

They've also responded to your comments in terms of some of the map recommendations, and the revisions to those. They have a small map up front, but they also have one they will hand out to everyone. Lastly, they have the action plan which is part 2 of the comprehensive plan book and they've made some revisions to that based on your comments as well as our additional comments with the partnership this summer so you'll be able to see the progress we have made. After we do all of that presentation, we'd like to have time for all of you to talk with one another about opportunities you see in the comprehensive plan and have part of the session where you can all think about things that are on your mind or in the short term or long term that would be exciting for you to pursue.

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

Carolyn said all of you should have the summary of the revisions that have been a compilation of your comments plus the presentation they made recently to the Partnership. They've incorporated the spirit of everything that has been identified. They put into three different categories: things they need to refine or enhance, or we need to look at the concept. Some of the things you want changed related to content and that's the second list. Then on the third part of the list are the layout and organization refinements that you have requested. They tried to categorize those into three types of simple changes and the Partnership is in favor of these type of items. She asked if anyone had any questions? No one raised their hand.

Carolyn said the next thing they want to do is look at the action plan which is in Part 2. On the first page are actions that have revisions to them and there are actually six of these. No. 2, 3, 10, 19, 29 and 30. They have put in the original text beside each number, then below that in italics, they have taken a draft of what we would propose to be that refinement. They have reviewed this list with the Partnership and they have given some recommendations and they've incorporated that into it. There's another item, No. 8, on page 3 that was a recommendation that is looking at the specific plan for the Wassergass and Lower Saucon Road. They have identified that one because of the nature of what a specific plan is and how it is important for this area to remain in sort of a rural resident type of appearance. The six that are on the first page, sort of look at what the request was for being more specific, more action oriented, rather than evaluate some of the next steps. The request from all of you, as a Planning Commission, was to look at these as being specifically what is it we want to do, following that evaluation. The words in the italics, look at each one of those. We also have reviewed these with the Partnership.

Mr. LaBuda said the financial responsibility for such an Authority, how would that be worked out since the majority of the recreation is in Lower Saucon Township. Hellertown has one or two. How would that be worked out? Would that be incorporated into this planning? Carolyn said in terms of looking at the feasibility? Mr. LaBuda said financially. Carolyn said that is one of the next steps that would be coming out is to look at the different types of structures. They have identified that it could be a Recreation Authority or it may be something else that is different than an Authority, but the important factor is to keep it as a publicly accessible entity, something that really does incorporate the activities of both communities. As part of the next step, it is to study that feasibility and coming together with a realistic structure is something that could be right in line a months from now, a couple of weeks now from, whenever you'd all like to think about that. Mr. LaBuda said he just saw his school board paper and he doesn't want his taxes to go up. Carolyn said one of the comments we received at the Partnership meeting was the school district is ready to come to the table to help and be part of that process and they are wanting to be a partner in that structure so there's a lot of opportunity to consider that as part of the feasibility, the financing structure of it and looking towards them as an equal.

Mr. Frank Pazzaglia said how are 2 and 30 significantly different and how are 3 and 29 significantly different? There's subtle differences in the way they are stated and if they have to stand as separate recommendations, is there a strategy behind that? Carolyn said she'll go with No. 30 first and then tie that to 2. In terms of looking at the Open Space Plan, rather than just saying access the opportunities of it, first, we were identifying that to pursue potential granting funding as a collective body for developing that type of plan. As part of doing that study, you can identify and go into further detail about the questions, for example, is the recreation authority or whatever type of structure feasible? With that, it feeds into No. 2 action, where there are things that we would be looking at in further detail after that study was completed. The Parks and Recreation Authority or whatever structure it would be is one that would be involved at one level and different at another level. Mr.

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

Pazzaglia said doing 30 feeds information into 2, is that correct or 2 feeds information into 30? You have immediate and short term, so if it's 30 into 2, then immediate and short term need to be flopped. AJ said customarily the scenario you described would be true. You want to go through the comprehensive park plan process to evaluate, in terms of the feasibility of, is there joint opportunities, and if so, how do you manage those joint opportunities? As part of the comprehensive plan, we've gone through enough of the process to know there are clearly more benefits than any liabilities, so that's why we were suggesting doing actually the Authority first and one of the immediate actions of the Authority is to do the comprehensive park plan. It was tailored to your particular situation. If you go somewhere else, he would maybe give you a different answer. Through all the discussions, and the one really unique thing, is the school district being at the table, in terms of recreation, is almost unheard of in Pennsylvania. The fact that they are opening their arms and saying there are facilities that we can jointly use, it is really unheard of, and again, you need to get some of that stuff organized in terms of how you structure that before you start dealing with the Comprehensive Park and recreation open space. Again, it was designed for your particular situation. Some other places, it would be a little bit different, the way the priorities are established do make sense.

Mr. Shegda said it makes sense what Carolyn and AJ are both saying here. You create an Authority first if that's desired, and then the Authority creates the plan. Maybe to best answer the question, 30 should follow no. 2 and be no. 3, in order. Related to that, it's an organic plan and one of the goals, the good fruits of what we are doing here, we are talking to each other and this is a picture of what that's about. The two neighbors speak to each other and eventually the Planners go to another project and we are talking to each other with new ideas and new plans for the future. He gives credit to Community Day and he doesn't know who it was, but it's the good effort of bringing neighbors and citizens together at Community Day. They were talking about the comprehensive plan, and related to No. 3, and someone brought up the Public Library, and asked why isn't Lower Saucon part of Hellertown's Library and it was pointed out you have membership in the Bethlehem Library. This seems to something worthwhile, not only as we are talking, but the possibility of a Recreation Authority. The pool is the big magnet that all the families share in here at Dimmick Park, but perhaps as the result of this plan, as it's organic, and always changing, and once it's on paper, it changes more, but perhaps Lower Saucon should consider, although Bethlehem is a close neighbor, maybe we have a closer kinship to Hellertown, that Lower Saucon should think about becoming part of the Hellertown Library and becoming part of that.

Carolyn said following up with 3 and 29, the consideration for 29 with being short term, is building upon the discussions that have started as part of the comprehensive plan process with the Fire Departments and the EMS and recognizing the momentum is initiated and continuing to grow and pursuing that and nurturing that and identifying ways in which those services can be efficient and that there is quality to them is an important aspect. Over time, with No. 3 as this ongoing activity, and as more opportunities arise for potential joint efforts, you've started with recycling as one of those, just have that be something that is always on the back of people's mind...is this feasible, is it suitable and is it something we are ready to do? It's a strategy, and the reason they are separated between 3 and 29 is the way the action plan is categorized, so some of these more administrative type or organizational type are at the beginning, and as we get into more specific topics, they appear further into the list, so that's why they are separated.

AJ said that's an important part, the number on the far left column is almost irrelevant, it's almost an ID that we can all kind of reference things easily. The relationship of different actions is really established because of the priority. Carolyn said the last item, in terms of

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

building on the comment about this being fluid, the action plan was something that changed many times over six or seven months in terms of the partnership's consideration and public meetings we've had. This also, as you are moving forward, in terms of the plans implementation, is going to be changing too. As you make progress or other actions arise, you'll be looking to keep this updated as well.

Mr. Maxfield said No. 29B, he knows we talked about it at the last Partnership meeting. We talked about the aim of it being at non residential mostly and he mentioned in Lower Saucon we encountered some problems about residential units accessing one access point. Could that be clarified more? It's kind of wide open. Carolyn said we will clarify that in the action plan. They put it in more of the text in terms of the document. They will put it specifically in here as well.

Carolyn said the next item is the map. The map is based upon the comments they've received in terms of your reviews and there are two primary changes to the map. One is the municipal service boundary and the other is the inclusion or addition of some locally oriented greenways and the hierarchy that was shown on the map as well. They have taken the markups that you have given us and recognized this is the status of the draft map that they have and they would be putting this out for you to take a look at. Recognizably, this is a diagram and is not parcel specific. It is the culmination of all of the different maps we have put together and the ideas that go along with the nature of the recommendations in the plan.

Mr. Shegda said does this map then update or replace the opportunities and challenges map that's in the draft? Carolyn said no, if we go to the document, it's going to be replacement in Part 1, Recommendations, Page 1-36. AJ said the shapes on 1-15 will match.

Carolyn said the third item on the comprehensive plan map as well as what is incorporated into the land use map, the page 1-15, is we have looked at the Wassergass area to remain as rural residential designation. Previously, it was identified as a different type of designation, so this map has the summary of the land use recommendations of the resource and open space recommendations of the pedestrian network as sort of the spine of the potential system and some of the areas of where trailheads could be incorporated into them on the municipal service boundary.

Mr. Pazzaglia said he had a question about the rural residential in the Polk Valley Watershed which is one of Hellertown's main water supplies. He is a little bit ignorant about what the rules are currently for development within that watershed. If you look at this map, you'll see the upper portion of that watershed is designated open space, but another part of the watershed is designated rural residential, so more development in the watershed impacts the water supply, so what are the current rules and he's curious how they might be incorporated or modified in this current plan. AJ said when you say rules, do you mean as in existing zoning? Mr. Pazzaglia said there are some existing homes in the watershed right now and he is saying existing zoning, is it possible to develop more land in the watershed as it now stands? AJ said as it is today, yes. The long and short is that Pennsylvania law kind of limits us in terms of how much development can be discouraged. For example, a watershed protection overlay could be a zoning technique that is used, but it is typically regulating areas of disturbance so the amount of pervious, impervious will deal with chemicals and things like that related to a particular land use or an operation or a business. It doesn't regulate density and that's a dilemma. We had a lot of discussion about this with the Partnership in terms of different techniques as there are, in some cases, techniques, and some of them have not been thoroughly tested in the courts so there is some legal jeopardy and everybody is a little nervous about going in a direction

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

that there is uncertainty, and if we go this way, that we are in good, legal standing, so we took the tools that really were available and the municipal services boundary is one of the best tools because controlling where storm water goes in the future, while it doesn't define a specific density, it does shape where growth happens. Consequently, that was really the foundation stone that land use control to protect the watershed was. Mr. Pazzaglia said if the municipal services boundary that has a dark dashed line, were to have a cauliflower shape into the Polk Valley Watershed, there would be a mechanism? AJ said there would be a rationale for development to occur which would be countered to many of the objectives in the comp plan and that's why the municipal services boundary has taken the shape and has been contracted. The municipal service boundary, through the evolution of this plan, has gotten smaller in some cases. It has gotten more sensitive to topography and some of the engineering issues. From a municipal Authority standpoint, it's more realistic, can we get service to those areas in some point in time if it's going to be an extraordinary type of construction, back off of that – it doesn't make sense. There's a lot of discussion how to protect that watershed and this was a key component. Reducing density because the township density is pretty much as low in those areas as you can legally get it, it was not something we could push further. Again, you are getting in unpredictable waters in terms how the communities were challenged. Mr. Landis said he knows what you are saying, your major area is in our least dense zone. We actually were ones that talked about the sewer boundary being not pushed back. Mr. Maxfield said we do have a watershed protection overlay and the major landholder in the township is the Hellertown Authority and they have the major part of that watershed area. The Authority would be the person in control for the applications of buildings for that site, and hopefully, we won't have any. We also got a couple of overlapping plans. Part of the upper part of the Polk Valley Watershed area actually feeds Springtown too, which we have different data for that, so we're trying to protect that entire area to protect multiple municipalities water sources.

Mr. Shegda said the municipal services boundary, that's for water and sewer? AJ said conventionally, it really effectuates the sewer because the sewer is really the gravity flow and the way the boundary generally is laid out currently is related to the topography, but it can be tied to water. In most of our conversations, it's really focusing on the sanitary sewer. In terms of a public utility, water can be incorporated in that boundary. Mr. Shegda said on the topic of water, he sees all of the creeks except one are named, and that is Spring Creek since all the other creeks are named. AJ said they will move some things around and get it in there.

Carolyn said in the last couple of weeks, they had some communication with the Borough and their communications with the Municipal Authorities, so that's something we are continuing to get some other comments on as part of this. We think we can get into a little bit more in terms of understanding how that can be incorporated into the plan. We are definitely moving forward in the communications in getting everyone on to the same page or in the same book. Mr. Shegda said regarding Silver Creek, after Ivan from a few years ago, we want to keep every possible eye on that creek. Carolyn said are there are other questions on the map? No one raised their hand.

Carolyn said the last item is the Executive Summary. They've taken a first shot here. It's about eight pages summarizing the overview of the plan which is inclusive of the planning process, the mission statement, the goals, the opportunities and challenges as well as moving into the action plans and the key recommendations. All of these have been vetted from the comprehensive plan itself. On the back side of it is a smaller version of the map. In terms of the overview, recognizing that the three entities of the Borough and the Township and the School District have made a historical movement here in terms of this multi municipal effort. As part of the process, how this 24 month project has been

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

responding to comments that have been at the Partnership level, have been at the public meeting level, and meetings with all of you as this effort has moved forward. On page 2 we start to outline what the municipalities planning code offers to communities that do multiple municipal pursuits...some of those advantages that are incorporated into the municipalities planning code. She's looked at zoning in a different manner, looking at different types of designations like we were talking about the municipal services boundary as an opportunity. Looking at process for the development of regional impact. That's something that is offered to multi municipal efforts. Specific plans are another tool that we have been exploring and there are those detailed actions in the comprehensive plan. Then just as the years have progressed and the state has looked at the opportunities for communities that do pursue mutli municipal efforts, those are advantageous to them as well as to you, so they've become priority type of projects that the state has considered as part of funding.

Carolyn said we move into the Mission Statement and the goals. The ten goals, and the Mission Statement foresees all of them, and it was in terms of a request from all of your feedback. We've taken a shot at that and would open it up for your comment, suggestions or consideration that you may have. That statement says "Hellertown Borough, Lower Saucon Township, and the Saucon Valley School District, under the guide of the Saucon Valley Partnership, have prepared a multi municipal comprehensive plan that seeks to plan for the balanced growth that will maintain and enhance the residents quality of life and the distinctive character of each community by capitalizing on the natural, cultural, recreation and commercial aspects." Recognizing that all of you, as a collective, has so many assets in each of those vanes, from your history, that is something that is deeply rooted in all of you as an area here, and the way in which your communities have grown. Each of you have opportunities and each of you have challenges. Being able to work together on those and balancing those out through this process and the years to come is something this plan seeks to embody. The goals of balancing initiatives, managing growth, coordinating your infrastructure, improving your transportation solutions, reinforcing downtown Hellertown as the hub of this area, encouraging infill and it should be redapative reuse, enhancing the continuity of resources, strengthening roles, fostering volunteerism, and maintaining fiscal responsibility are those key items that we've pulled out. The other pages highlight some of the general opportunities and challenges that have been assessed as part of this, and there are many more. The plan goes into those descriptions in greater detail, but highlighting them here. There is transportation and infrastructure, the public spaces and recreation open space opportunities, and then finally looking at sort of the business community and economic development because as part of this effort there was that deeper analysis into what is happening in terms of your population and economic patterns and how those are both opportunities and challenges to moving forward in terms of the non residential development basis in the plans and in your community.

Carolyn said the last page is 6 and 7, talking about the action plan and what the nature of that action plan is and that it is something that has some priorities, but those priorities can also be changing or there is some time to do these things and you are all interested in those. There are some priorities that have come about and those are the nine that are listed. That is sort of the summary. We'd like to take this in a slightly different form to incorporate into more of a quick handout that all of you will have available for residents, whether they be newcomers or lifelong residents.

AJ said the eight pager is designed for you, for the two bodies, as well as elected officials. It's almost as like this is something we are suggesting you keep in your folder. It's a quick index and when you're in discussions and are reviewing a site plan, a development proposal or a concept, you are able to pull this out quickly and see how things fit within the

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

framework of the goals, some of the key recommendations, etc. We tried to really format it so it was almost a cliff note version of what was in the plan. If there is feeling you want it to be expanded a little bit further, we can do that. Where it does kind of stop short is where it is getting into the details and the action, and that's kind of the trade off of not creating the plan in itself, but giving you something that is handy to pull out. The other exhibit we'll hand out is almost a promotional or outreach type for businesses or residents, so the content of it is different. What you are seeing is an example. We are looking to get some feedback. The Partnership has given us some direction and the next step is to put something together.

AJ said the example was done in the Borough of Mechanicsburg. Mechanicsburg has gone through a lot of different planning initiatives over the last six or seven years, so the orientation of their handout was to focus on the comprehensive plan, but at the same time, incorporate some of the other stuff that's going on in their particular community. The notion, as Carolyn said earlier, could be a piece that is at the Borough office, it could be at the library. They are even giving it to Realtors so it goes into a realtors information packet. It's sending a quiet message that there are certain things in the community that the community expires for, so those perspective residents understand that and it becomes an expectation or assumption that everybody is going to be working together to achieve the elements of the comprehensive plan. The layout is in color, and much more graphically oriented as proposed to the eight pager we handed out which is mainly focusing on the nuts and bolts. It is something the partnership wants us to put one together, and it'll have a different purpose and orientation.

Mr. Pazzaglia said something he sees with the Mechanicsburg one is the demographic snapshot and we don't have something like that in our comprehensive plan. He's wondering whether his colleagues think that's a good idea. He personally thinks that it's a good idea. Mr. Shegda said he takes the idea to take the Executive Summary and plug it in here somewhat. AJ said you may have two forms of the Executive Summary. What goes in the document itself may be a little bit more detailed and this one is literally an 11 x 17 fold that is literally treated as a handout and is inexpensive to reproduce and conveys a lot of information and doesn't get into all the details that you may want to have within the document. Carolyn said the nature of the content is generally similar. Mr. Shegda said the goal would be to have this in color? Carolyn said yes. Mr. Shegda said he really likes this and they really listened to them and they are really to be commended and it makes it accessible to the 15,000 residents of the two communities. It would be something of value for everybody. He was captured about what Frank Pazzaglia said about the demographic snapshot. Not so much, the 2.2 households, he wouldn't be looking for a lot of statistics, he'd be looking for maybe the incorporation, the most interesting, historical and current fact about both communities. What is really interesting with Hellertown, not so much as demographics, but really to give appeal and interest and that there is something unique about these two communities. On the whole, this is really something worthwhile to end up with.

Carolyn said if you have any other questions, they can answer them, but if you have questions for one another, please talk about them in further detail. Mr. Landis said we obviously need to find ways to work together, which this would do, and any time we can, where there is a joint thing, do it. Mr. Pazzaglia said as soon as the plan gets approved, once it goes through the public process, its incumbent upon both of us to look at these action plans. They are essentially, when you say, immediate, short term, long term, those are benchmarks and if this thing is to become a reality, we'll have to work out the mechanisms, then in two years we can say, yes, we did that. Mr. Landis said we need to work together in terms of developments outside of our area. Mr. Maxfield said we have to

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

be working together when some of the things being planned around our municipalities come to fruition. If not, we're going to be lost. This is an excellent entry for the whole process and he's really looking forward to seeing what we can do.

Mr. Shegda said he has a question for our Lower Saucon colleagues, it's on page 3 on the Executive Summary, Point No. 5, reinforce the hub. Are you all comfortable reinforcing downtown Hellertown? Are you comfortable with the idea of "Reinforce downtown Hellertown as the focal point or hub for the delivery of goods, services, civic activities and regional identity". Is that a comfortable idea? Mr. Maxfield said it is for him. When we talked about Executive Summary, this came up at one of the Partnership meetings, it's almost like this Executive Summary, referring back to that point, to reinforcing the hub is going to have a dual purpose because the unstated aim of Lower Saucon is basically not to inflict more residential type of stress on Hellertown and yet reinforce Hellertown and make it the hub for the entire thing. In some areas, we'd be discouraging what we'd be encouraging in other areas, not residential, but development of a kind. When this Executive Summary comes out, it almost has to be focusing of energies within the two communities from one kind of development that has been occurring that's been driven by forces other than people from the community to a community plan, where we want it to go and why we want it to go there so we have some sort of hand on the steering wheel. He got involved in Government because he felt we had no hands on the wheel and things were out of control for awhile. He's very much behind this idea and very comfortable.

Mr. Shegda said he lived in Boston and they consider them the hub of the universe. He's not going to quiver over the term, but he doesn't necessarily see them as the hub, he would tend to hear town center and Main Street. That's really the hub and that's how people refer to it.

Mr. LaBuda said he has a comment and a question. Looking at all of these things, he doesn't see any real cost to them, this could almost all be implemented without a major amount of money. The only thing he sees is the public safety end, the merger of the resources. That really has to be thought out because it could be a costly item and his comment, is what are you going to name this community? Mr. Landis said first you start working together. Carolyn said the goal is working together, you are two communities with significant distinctions, character, your intensity, the services or the features or assets you have, so it's the cooperative effort you have. We really have enjoyed working through this with you. You have all learned a little bit about each other as far as opportunities and challenges that have been emerging and been discussed and being able to provide some realistic next steps for all of you and the timeframes to do those. The timeframes, they are goals. If you are even starting some of these goals in the timeframes, you've made a lot of success. Continuing on, looking at them, assessing them, and seeing what is feasible at certain points of time, is going to be work, but it's going to be exciting and rewarding.

Mr. Kologie said has any task been selected as the first priority as to say, okay, let's do this and we should probably accomplish something to know we can work together and can actually follow through on what's said here. Maybe that's our role to pick something we can work on and actually do it and show both communities, this can work and this can be a successful process. Mr. Shegda said that topic actually came up at one of our meetings and we were identifying the possibility of the recreational authorities especially with the pool. Mr. Kologie said that's something that's being done without our participation. If you look at the local athletic groups and how the school and the communities work together with using the fields and the facilities, that's a good model to use. Mr. Pazzaglia said Mr. Luthar brought up at least one example of beyond recreation where the two communities are working together. Mr. Luthar said the compost center and how the public is working

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

together with Public Works, and it's been tremendous and the effort that has been put together with the Saucon Valley School District. Mr. Kologie said it's good to record those things and show them as successes.

AJ said one of Mr. Pazzaglia's earlier question was to identifying or commenting on the need to get together more frequently than this historic event itself so you can talk about different issues or next steps? One thing not detailed in the plan is how frequently we need to get together. Mr. Pazzaglia said there might not be something formal in the plan as setting some kind of schedule but there's plenty of language in the plan, and those things can't happen unless we start getting together. We could have individual conversations, but ultimately, we probably will have to have some kind of joint meetings. AJ said it is not unusual in a plan we will institutionalize or attempt to institutionalize, some sort of process so that the plan doesn't sit on a shelf. In that kind of strategy, we'll literally ask Planning Commission to do almost an annual or bi-annual evaluation. What have we been able to accomplish? What should we look at doing over the next two or three years? In this way, you are able to go back to the elected body and give them a report of what is being accomplished. In some cases, we will make a suggestion of institutionalizing a summit and talk about these kinds of things and talk about issues. Mr. Pazzaglia said this is an important point that we have to address. If we just nonchalantly say get it into the document, we're bound by it. Is it something we want to grow organically or it happens when it happens or it goes into the document and commits us now? It was agreed that it needs to commit us now...anything less than that would be months and years. Mr. Millren said looking at this, based off immediate and short term goals, when this gets adopted, it would have to be more than a year. For short term, we're saying six months to two years. AJ, said Mechanicsburg, as an example, he can honestly say this started as an outcome of the plan, they were quietly doing this, they started to do a Main Street program, and do some other things, but they hadn't really gilled together all these different initiatives. It was through the conference and plan process that they developed a discipline to convene all these major groups and stakeholders together to talk about things on a periodic basis...sometimes because implementation and horizons vary. In some cases, they used the session almost as a planning session trying to get the things organized, almost designating who is the task master, kind of the worker bees, etc. You can major this kind of risk collaboration and these kind of get togethers to do a lot of different things. Mr. Pazzaglia said he likes the word he used, "stakeholders". Could he suggest in the interest of time, with the experience you have with these plans, identify what would be a good stakeholders group and would it be a stakeholders meeting, and run it by us, and independently we could discuss it if we like the language and give you feedback. The one thing that is also going to have to incorporate, based on your experience, somebody is going to have to set an agenda, someone is going to have to set time tables, and in a general stakeholders meeting, you have to set how agendas will work and who will be the boss. AJ said every plan needs some sort of prophets and shepherds; otherwise the plan will just sit on a shelf. What you said is exactly that. There has to be some entity or person or a series of people that are leading the charge. They themselves aren't necessarily doing the implementation, but they are keeping it fresh in everybody's minds, so we'll take a shot at coming up with something and our understanding of your communities and run it up the flag pole and let you react to it. Take transportation, yes, in some cases, there would be a regional task force to go beyond Hellertown and Lower Saucon Township, so we can look and see how that type of situation or scenario would fit into any working group. Mr. Lychak said what we are trying to accomplish here, could very easily affect or disaffect what Upper Saucon or Bethlehem does, so he thinks it's important that they be included on some level. Mr. Maxfield asked if we could develop some kind of framework where we would meet at different levels at different times, and he's thinking about our EAC, which was initiated by Mike McKenna, where we had a Hellertown representative sit at our

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

meetings, then Mike moved on and we now have another representative and we get Hellertown reports about things that may affect us, which is really a nice information sharing thing. Then they should be those larger meetings where we get together, jointly, or quarterly, and really talk about issues that could affect both communities. Mr. Shegda said it seems to make sense that we want to see somewhere in here the Lower Saucon Planning Commission and Hellertown Planning Commission will adopt a meeting schedule to jointly assess implementation of our comprehensive plan for recommendations to our mutual governing bodies. AJ said in words, yes. Mr. Shegda said Mr. Kologie was asking about models and where can we get started. I think there's a shining model sitting right in front of us of joint cooperation, and that's the relationship between Jack Cahalan and Charlie Luthar. Not only do they have a professional relationship, but you can also see a friendship between them. There's a model of the Town and Township working together. He knows there are people from the community in the audience, and if people came for this specific historic meeting, and he hopes they found it helpful.

Carolyn said as the overview, each Planning Commission, after this evening, they are going to be preparing the final document in terms of getting it to the stage of the 45 day public review. What would need to happen is each Planning Commission would have to make the recommendation to their Councils that it is ready to go out for that 45 day review, then once the Council's forward it and have that 45 day review, that's when the additional public comment comes in and there is then the final preparation of the document in response to the comments and directions we get from the different communities, then present it back to the Council's for their consideration and adoption. However you like to have the comment this evening, and then recognizing through this fall and winter, its anticipated there be that public review period. Mr. Landis said as far as our part goes, you'll now be preparing the final draft, and then when you have that done, we would then recommend. Carolyn said the timetable is looking forward to giving it to the Partnership at their October meeting and then following that meeting, looking to forward it on to you. Mr. Landis said when that plan is adopted, that's the time we are going to have a joint meeting. He thanked everyone for coming.

B. ELAINE TARANTINO – TARANTINO MINOR MIN 01-08 – 3770 OLD PHILADELPHIA PIKE – TIME LIMIT 09/16/08

Mr. Landis said letters were received from Boucher & James and Hanover (HEA).

David Martin, Keystone Consulting Engineers and Mr. Gary Tarantino were present. Mr. Martin said he has both letters and has no objections to anything in the Boucher & James letter. There is one item in the HEA letter that he'd like to clarify under Subdivision and Land Development comments, which is A10, as per discussion by PennDOT, an HOP (Highway Occupancy Permit) permit is not required for the inlet because all the work would take place outside of their right-of-way, but one is still required for their sanitary sewer lateral across Seidersville Road. Mr. Miller said that's fine. They have a letter they received that PennDOT sent to them which said two things, one they will issue an HOP once the driveway cut has been made and one that says they are okay with the inlet and they just don't want anything to do with it. They want to say you can put the unit on there and the implication is they don't want to own it, they want the township to own it. It says it's outside of our right-of-way, do anything you want to do.

Mr. Martin said they will comply with both letters. Mr. Landis said we can go ahead and do the waivers. Mr. Noble said the only concern they had was the first waiver with the 500 feet surrounding the site, the downstream water impact. Mr. Miller said he can't say there won't be any impact, they are doing what the ordinance would require them to do, to address the impacts. They are required to infiltrate the roof top, they've check to make sure they can do that. They are

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

looking to get a waiver to move the dwelling up closer so there is less non infiltrated impervious. He has not seen any analysis of downstream and he doesn't think the ordinance would require that.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Noble moved for approval of waiver of Section 145.33.C(1) and (2) and 145.34.B – existing features within 500 feet.
- 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. Hijazi – Absent)

Mr. LaBuda said we're giving all these waivers without approving the plan. Which is first? Attorney Treadwell said you should go through the waivers first. If you decide to not give a waiver, then the plan needs to be changed.

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Kologie moved for approval of waiver of Section 145.36, 145-41.B(4) and 145.45.B(9) for the width of the street, not making the street wider.
- 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. Hijazi – Absent)

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of waiver of Section 145.46B, the utility easements and lot lane drainage.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Noble
Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 6-0 (Mr. Hijazi – Absent)

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Noble moved for approval of waiver of Section 145.43.B(2), lot frontage and improvements to the road widening and planting screenings.
- 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. Hijazi – Absent)

- MOTION BY:** Mr. Lychak moved for approval of the plan itself, subject to Boucher & James and Hanover Engineering letters.
- SECOND BY:** Mr. Noble
Mr. Landis asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments? No one raised their hand.
- ROLL CALL:** 6-0 (Mr. Hijazi – Absent)

C. REEN DEVELOPMENT CO LLC – DAVE SELL – REDINGTON ESTATES AT LOWER SAUCON MAJOR SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLAN #MAJ-03-06 – REDINGTON ROAD (TIME LIMIT 09-27/08)

Present – John Hacker, Counsel for the developer, Larry Turoscy, Tony DiMinchi, and Tracy Hollinger from Lehigh Engineering. Mr. Hacker said the tree issue is resolved. The big issue on this plan has always been the community sewage system and they really had no guidance, so they went to Council last month and they indicated they preferred a public system. They sat down with Gar Davidson and that process is starting to go forward. As far as the review letters, issues are resolved. A lot are outside approvals and there are some drafting issues and there have been discussions and they have been resolved. They believe they are ready for preliminary approval.

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

Stacy Ogur, Planner, said they have resolved the woodlands issue. The consultants met with the Project Engineer, and the applicant and discussed the woodland, in question, and the woodland has been added back onto the plans as originally shown. It does not affect what the plan is proposing in terms of what is permitted, so that is fine. Their only remaining comment is when they resubmitted the plans, the site capacity calculations failed to include the addition of the new woodlands. She contacted Mr. Hollinger and discussed it with him. He resubmitted the site capacity calculations, she reviewed them, and they were correct, so as long as they revise and submit with those new calculations, we're good.

Mr. Miller, Engineer, said they have a list of things they have to do, but none of those items are going to be of a nature that will substantially change the plan. There would definitely have to be another informal submission to HEA to make sure they've addressed every single item before it goes to Council, but they don't see any reason for it to be held back.

Mr. LaBuda said what about No. 18, the waiver? Mr. Hacker said there are three waivers, one is improvements to Redington Road, one is for the swales and the third is for the configuration of Lot 5. Mr. Landis asked about the sewer issue. Attorney Treadwell said that's a Council issue.

MOTION BY: Mr. LaBuda moved for approval of the waiver, Section 145.41(B)4 for the improvement of Redington Road.

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Hijazi – Absent)

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved for approval of the waiver, Section 145.43(A) 5 & 8, Lot 5 has an irregular shape.

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Hijazi – Absent)

MOTION BY: Mr. Kologie moved for approval of the waiver, Section 145.48(d) on the swale.

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. Hijazi – Absent)

Mr. Landis said as far as the plan itself goes, comments from the Board or audience? Mr. Maxfield said just make sure it is complete before it goes to Council.

MOTION BY: Mr. Maxfield moved to recommend preliminary approval of Redington Estates preliminary plan subject to the Hanover letters and subject to our standard condition that a complete, clean plan go to Council.

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

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Hijazi – Absent)

D. ROCK STREET DEVELOPMENT – VICTOR FRYE – 2200 WASSERGASS ROAD LAND DEVELOPMENT 05-05 AND SITE PLAN 02-05 – 2200 WASSERGASS ROAD – (TIME LIMIT 10/26/08)

Present – Gary Elbert, Attorney Stephen Boell, Bryan Ritter, Jenna Engineering.

Mr. Boell said they are here tonight before they go to the Zoning Hearing Board so they can get some special relief. First, they require special exception to change the existing nonconforming use of the school into our proposed use which is a long term stay suite facility. In addition to the use relief, they require several variances relating to the setback and location of certain facilities with regard to storm water and waste disposal within the setbacks and with regard to distance for the driveway. We are here tonight as a precursor to that. We welcome your thoughts.

Mr. Ritter said it's a long term Saucon Short Stay Suites. They are looking for a facility and trying to deal and address many of the concerns, driveway location, minimize the paving materials, clean the site up, parking on the north side of the building. They are removing the parking lot in the front as there was always concern about the driveway the way it comes off at a very bad corner, and this will eliminate that. As far as sewage flows, it will be less than what the school had, and they are working closely with HEA. Their sewage flows are less. They did some traffic generation for the project, and are less than what the school would have generated. They believe they are reducing the impact of what it was when it was a school. They've worked with Mr. Geyer on the storm water and actually have an agreement with him with what they are proposing on the property. That addresses many issues of the storm water, not only with Mr. Geyer, but with properties to the west.

Mr. Boell said they have to show for the special exception, ordinance 180-100F and will walk through the elements with Mr. Ritter.

Mr. Boell: The school is a pre-existing, nonconforming use?

Mr. Ritter: Yes

Mr. Boell: This plan previously was before the ZHB for the identical special exception approval for a garden apartment use?

Mr. Ritter: Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Boell: That special exception was granted?

Mr. Ritter: Absolutely

Mr. Boell: In the course of presenting the evidence for that, was evidence demonstrated and will we demonstrate tonight that this use will not be changed into a conforming use.

Mr. Ritter: That's correct.

Mr. Boell: And the reason is that the school structure end of it itself prohibits use of the property for residential and limited other uses in the R40 district?

Mr. Ritter: Right

Mr. Boell: This use is less objectionable with regards to traffic, dust generation, noise, waste disposal and appearance to what's currently located on the property in the form of the previous operation of the school?

Mr. Ritter: Right.

Mr. Boell said you will hear from Mr. Elbert about the operational design of the building. Attorney Treadwell said did you do a traffic study? Mr. Ritter said they did put some numbers together comparing the school to the short stay suites. He can provide copies to them. Attorney Treadwell said can you compare the short stay suite to the Garden Apartments? Mr. Ritter said he can do that, but not tonight, but will do so when he goes to Council.

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

Mr. Boell: It's our position that under the zoning ordinance, it must be compared to the non conforming use, which was the school, and not the Garden Apartment use, which was never constructed or seen through?

Mr. Ritter: There was some construction started, but he sat down with his client and envisioned what they would like to see what the property would look like to the neighborhood, not a detriment. He showed pictures of the envisioning to the Commission members.

Attorney Treadwell asked about the water and sewage? Mr. Ritter said the school had 12 EDU's of sewage flow and this proposal they are looking at 9 EDU's, and that's using twice the peak day average. Mr. Landis said in a facility like this, you'd usually have to have public water and sewage? Mr. Ritter said right, obviously, we've had several discussion and the issue of bringing public water and sewage, there is concern it could trigger a lot of development out there and the township doesn't want it to go in that direction. With the existing well and another test well that has been done, we can on lot take care of the issues with water and sewer. Regarding the Garden Apartments, this is a less intense sewage use and traffic use. It favors the property much more. There are 36 units proposed. The original Garden Apartment usage was 24 units. Mr. Kologie said what are you using for your sewage flow per gallon? Mr. Ritter said they are using 100 gallons per day in accordance with DEP, and they've looked at other facilities and provided information to HEA and they have a general consensus. Mr. Noble asked about laundry facilities and dining facilities? Mr. Ritter said they would be off site.

Mr. Elbert said they will be catering to corporate and institutional clientele who are on long term and temporary stays. They feel that the property can be developed in a good fashion and it won't look like a hotel and will focus on a design that is pleasing. We wouldn't be looking for people to drive off the highway and come to our facility. There will only be five employees on site. Each unit will have a microwave and a sink, but not a full kitchen, and no dishwashers. Mr. Maxfield said how do you propose to control your clientele if someone does drive off the street? Mr. Elbert said from a marketing plan standpoint, as intended, we would likely have a contract for six months and sell out the units for everyday. A 14 to 18 week range would be acceptable. They've looked at other facilities in the Lehigh Valley where their actually average daily flow is 53 to 58 gallons per day. We would be designed for 100 gallons per day, would you see that – no. The type of system there now is an in ground system with multiple tanks in the parking lot area.

Mr. LaBuda said who from anywhere is going to find Wassergass Road on a dark night? How will they get to the place? How did you come about this concept? Mr. Elbert said our target customer is someone who is not on the beaten path or the hotel environment. They might have a hard time getting there the first time, but he doesn't think it will be a major obstacle and because they are not catering to the highway customer, it's not a major obstacle. Mr. LaBuda said you don't want any kind of clientele in that area who is going to be adverse, that's a residential area. Mr. Elbert said it would hurt our business bringing that type of clientele in, so that's why we would cater to someone who would be there for a long extended stay.

Mr. Noble said we have to look at this from a planning aspect and not a business aspect and is the use okay, he's the one who has to make the money.

Mr. Ritter said we have more advantages like we had years ago like map quest and a tom tom.

Attorney Treadwell asked what was the next step? Mr. Boell said it's going to the ZHB in October and then to Council.

Mr. Garges said from a zoning standpoint, what they are looking for is transferring use and the use that most closely resembles that use is a hotel use and are there any safeguards that can be built into

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

this that, if that use, which would fall into the terminology in our zoning ordinance, is transferred to a hotel use and this business model wouldn't work out, and a hotel would want to come in, they would still have that use approved as a hotel. Attorney Treadwell said we can build conditions into the Zoning Hearing Board, like a 30 day stay. Mr. Garges said is there any feedback from the board or any conditions they would want to alleviate some of the concerns of switching hands and not turning it into something we don't want, more of this type of extended stay use versus the hotel use so that there next guy that buys the property can say it's a Motel 6, and that use is already transferred. Mr. Boell said you are willing to accept conditions on this use to alleviate some of those concerns to differentiate this from a Motel 6? Mr. Elbert said absolutely. Mr. Kologie said under that scenario, a corporation could rent a block of rooms for a period of time, but there could be guests coming in and out for a shorter period of time. Even though the corporation rents it for twelve weeks, they may have multiple people coming in. Mr. Elbert said it is possible, but in that situation, a corporation may want to have to put them up in a hotel on a beaten path, this is to get away from the come and go hotel model. Mr. Kologie said on the zoning, you refer to it as a school and it hasn't been a school for many years. In our zoning, do other ordinances put a timeframe on how long a nonconformity exist? Attorney Treadwell said if it's abandoned after a year. Mr. Boell said this building is so unique, that it's still a school. Mr. Kologie said it could be adapted to a museum if someone wanted to put a museum on there. There could be many things. I think it's a very strong argument. Mr. Noble said that's not for us to decide. Mr. Maxfield said what happens after that year? Attorney Treadwell said if it's been abandoned for a year, then the next use that comes in has to be conforming. The question the applicant is asking of this Planning Commission tonight is do you think it's a good idea or not? Mr. Garges said and on top of that, are there any recommendations by ordinance for the ZHB, that's the main reason they are here tonight, for the site plan recommendation to the ZHB? Attorney Treadwell, said understood, but we don't even have a site plan? Mr. Garges said yes, this is a formal submission, it's been tabled and held out for a while, but there was a formal submission.

Mr. Ritter said you have a credible developer this time and we worked with Mr. Geyer to a great extent and have an agreement with him on the storm water issues and are making great strides to correct the issue and get an appealing plan to the township to what's there now rather than ripping everything down and putting houses down there.

Mr. Garges said in the Zoning Ordinance, it may not hurt to read the two or three permitted uses in that district. There aren't that many permitted by right. Mr. Boell, said cemetery, golf course, and residential.

Mr. Kologie said if we were to recommend to the Zoning Board if they deem this a permissible use, we'd like to see some certain conditions be put on, and then that goes into the record. Right now, as a board, we can recommend conditions. If we say nothing, then the Zoning Board can unconditionally approve it. Attorney Treadwell said it must go to the Council before the Zoning Hearing Board and they will have an opportunity to oppose it, support it, or take no action. Mr. Ritter said the local sports organizations that use the fields down there, can they still use them if it becomes a short stay? The answer is yes. If a residential area goes in, those fields go. Mr. Noble said we can suggest conditions now.

Mr. Kern said is this similar as when it goes to Council and you can take no action, oppose or send it to the Zoning Hearing Board? Attorney Treadwell said no, that's solely Council's decision. The Planning Commission has an opportunity to review the site plan and suggest possible conditions to the ZHB, if in fact, the ZHB grants the use.

Mr. Kologie said did the applicant prepare a list of conditions, like the 12 to 18 week stay that you will present to the ZHB? Mr. Boell said no, but they willing to listen to what condition they would suggest.

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

Mr. Elbert said they would have a sign which would say it's a short stay. Attorney Treadwell said what kind of sign are you referring to? Mr. Elbert said it would be a small sign on the property stating it's a short stay facility.

Mr. Noble said we can have the building set there for another twenty years or we can have this gentlemen give a business proposition and present it to the ZHB, and then the applicant can buffer it so the neighbors like it and you can't see it from the road, and buffer the sides. Mr. Kologie said the lighting in the back might have some impact which will have to be looked at.

Attorney Treadwell said the best thing this Commission can do is suggest conditions if the ZHB finds it an appropriate use.

Planning Commission said they could suggest conditions as follows:

1. Minimum stay of eight (8) weeks
2. Buffered from view of Wassergass Road and adjoining properties
3. Entrance oriented to the south, parking to the south
4. Low cut off, down pointed, shielded lighting with no impact to neighbors
5. No onsite banquet facilities
6. No onsite food services
7. No onsite laundry facilities

Mr. Boell said the only one they object to is about the full hotel capacity, as it's not their intention to go that way. They will be right back to where they were with the Garden Apartments and another four years where they are going to do nothing because those calculations can get into a whole bunch of stuff and then the financial model falls apart.

Attorney Treadwell said if the model doesn't work and it gets sold as a hotel, it puts the township in a horrible position.

Mr. Boell said based upon the comments of the Planning Commission, they need to do a lot more homework with the issues of the water and the sewer and they would like to table everything until they can talk to his client and grant all extensions that are necessary and will communicate with staff. Your comments are very instructive.

MOTION BY: Mr. LaBuda moved to table.

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. Hijazi – Absent)

IV. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JULY 17, 2008

Mr. Landis said the July 17, 2008 Minutes are prepared. He asked if there were any comments? No one raised their hand.

MOTION BY: Mr. Noble moved for approval of the July 17, 2008 minutes.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

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

ROLL CALL: 4-0 (Mr. Kologie and Mr. LaBuda - Abstained)

**Planning Commission Meeting
September 18, 2008**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS
None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Mr. Noble moved for adjournment. The time was 9:35 PM.

SECOND BY: Mr. Maxfield

ROLL CALL: 6-0 (Mr. Hijazi – Absent)

Submitted by:

Mr. John Landis
Chair