

Saucon Valley Partnership Meeting

Date: August 13, 2008

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: Lower Saucon Township

A. **Call to Order:** Ed Inghrim

B. **Roll Call:** Present: Ed Inghrim, Jane Balum, Priscilla deLeon, Glenn Kern, Tom Maxfield, Jack Cahalan, Charlie Luthar. Guests: AJ Schwartz and Carolyn Yagle from EPD; Tom Hart, Northampton County; Margie Segaline, George Howey, Jennie McKenna

C. **Council of Governments**

1. Minutes of the June 11, 2008 meeting were approved following a motion by Tom Maxfield, second by Ed Inghrim. Jack said there are copies of the minutes from June 30, 2008 from the Saucon Valley Partnership Public Meeting.
2. Treasurer's Report - Jack said the balance in the Treasurer's Report as of July 31, 2008 was \$8,659.79. We did make a payment out of that for expenses incurred for the June 30, 2008 public hearing which was \$150.76. The checking account balance as of July 31, 2008 is \$34,316.09. Since the June meeting, we have made a payment to Environmental Planning and Design of \$1,634.26. Motion by Jane to approve the Treasurer's report, second by Glenn.
3. Approval to pay bills - Jack said the first bill is from EPD for their services June 1, 2008 to June 30, 2008 is in the amount of \$4,204.68 (June 11 Steering Committee Meeting and Public Meeting on June 30, 2008). Motion to approve by Tom, second by Jane. Jack said there are two invoices from Diane Palik for her transcription services for the June 11 and June 30, 2008 meetings for the SVP for a total of \$120.00. Motion to approve by Jane, second by Glenn. Jack said we did pay for the food for the meeting on June 30th from the Township fund and it was \$150.76. Motion by Tom Maxfield for approval, second by Glenn.

D. **Citizens Commenting on Agenda Items:** None

E. **Citizens Commenting on Non-Agenda Items:** None

F. **Saucon Valley Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan**

1. **Draft Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan**

AJ and Carolyn said they will project the overview on the screen. The first slide is the agenda for tonight. This was a pre-public meeting at the end of June.

AJ said item no. 1; we had a little bit of discussion on implementation, possibilities or scenarios. We are going to give you a little bit more information related to that. We kind of diagramed some of these so you could compare and contrast some of the concepts and scenarios. They also put together a list of disadvantage and advantage descriptions that we'll talk about tonight. Carolyn will take you through a summary of the public meeting and try to put together a simple summary and they have input which is very, very helpful. We're on the right track. There are some suggestions in terms of refinement and clarifying different issues. You guys are not off the mark. There is consensus on most of the key concepts. C is letting you guys establishing direction for the next steps.

Scenarios - AJ said there are four scenarios.

1 **Scenario 1:** AJ said the first one maintains an independent zoning ordinance. As each of the
2 communities needs to address their zoning issues, you can do it together in terms of implementing
3 the comp plan, but you do have two separate ordinances. You're not sharing components in any
4 form or fashion. You have independent Planning Commissions and Zoning Hearing Boards. The
5 Partnership, in terms of the implementation of the zoning amendments, there are some changes.
6 Planning Commission is a recommending body and they recommend to Council. Anything that
7 needs any sort of judicial or interpretation goes to the Zoning Hearing Board and they make a
8 decision. Scenario 1 is basically status quo. The Partnership role, in that case is you can enjoy the
9 benefits of a multi-municipal effort meaning you can share land uses. You don't have to have a
10 joint ordinance to enjoy those benefits. You will need to have some sort of inter-governmental
11 cooperation. You'll have to have some form of ICA (Inter-Government Cooperation Agreement).
12 The content of that ICA basically is an agreement that if one of the communities makes a zoning
13 amendment change they agree to review it with your partner community. For example, if the
14 Borough would make some zoning amendments, they would review it with the Township. The
15 Township would give their comments. If the integrity of the comprehensive plan is being
16 undermined, then the Township can give comments back to the Borough. The Borough could still
17 say they are still going to advance on this amendment. That is where the ICA kicks in and you
18 want to define what the remedy is for that interpretation. If you disturb the integrity of the
19 comprehensive plan, you do open yourselves up to legal issues if someone would challenge you. If
20 the zoning amendments are not consistent with the comp plan, a property owner/developer could
21 question that.

22
23 **Scenario 2:** If the notion was to pursue a joint zoning ordinance as there are clearly some
24 efficiencies in doing that. It's different than your current situation. It looked like there was some
25 practicality going that route. Under Scenario 2 you would have independent Planning Commission
26 (PC) and Zoning Hearing Boards (ZHB). For example, Scenario 1, we're working on a project in
27 Pittsburgh with three communities. They've listed those communities and go back and see how
28 their ICA works. The Newtown, Upper Makefield plan fits under Scenario 2, where they have a
29 joint ordinance but have separate Planning Commissions and Zoning Hearing Boards. They deal
30 with any issues, special exception, variances, that type of thing. Because you still have the comp
31 plan, if there are amendments, the Saucon Valley Partnership (SVP) could really be that Steering
32 Committee because you have a joint ordinance. You need to have a Steering Committee that
33 works together on any potential amendments because you are collectively changing the ordinance.
34 For example, Hellertown can't go and change the ordinance by itself, neither can Lower Saucon.
35 In that case, the SVP is acting as an advisory body and making recommendations back to each PC.
36 The PC has to make the recommendations as you are the recommending body and make it back to
37 the respective council's. The SVP's role in zoning amendments, you are functioning more as an
38 advisory body. Scenario 1, the partnership is functioning as the COG as you do today; multi-
39 municipal issues as you do today, not zoning itself.

40
41 Glenn said is there a legal requirement for Scenario 2 for the SVP? AJ said no, it could be anybody
42 else. This group has become a ligament between the different muscles of the bones in terms of the
43 two communities and it seemed like a natural. There could be another Steering Committee that
44 could be created to play that role specifically. Carolyn said whatever entity that would be, would
45 be spelled out in the ICA. This body's function is to serve as advisory role. AJ said the ICA in
46 Scenario 2 takes on a little bit of a different role as the Partnership is a little bit different. You
47 don't want to define by-laws, like what you are doing, but roles and responsibilities of the
48 partnership relative to the PCs and the ZHBs should be spelled out in the ICA. It's best to do that
49 as you don't get into a crisis situation and then have to figure out what you have to do. Deal with it
50 as part of the ICA now. It'll be a good way to see if you want to go in this direction or not. Once
51 you talk about the issues of the ICA, you get a sense of is this a good way to go. Glenn asked AJ to
52 give him some examples of the benefits of the joint zoning ordinance? AJ said he's going to
53 project out five years. If you have a joint ordinance, you can go the route to do joint code
54 enforcement, more administration things as you have one document. You can maintain separate

1 Code Enforcement Officers. The first scenario, the community we mentioned can't do it as they
2 have separate ordinances. We have other communities we are working with that are under
3 Scenario 3. They want to go the route of centralized code enforcement and administration. They
4 are not consolidating. The amount of building permits they have, it makes the most sense. That's
5 one advantage. The second advantage is you worked together to put your amendments together,
6 you do have separate ordinances, and when it comes time to deal with things like conditional uses,
7 variances, and special exceptions, you are going to see some different decisions made. The
8 decisions may have an impact in terms of the Joint Comprehensive Plan. Under Scenario 2,
9 because in order to deal with those types of things, even though you are going to the ZHB, you are
10 writing the conditions together so there is a little bit more uniformity in terms how you interpret the
11 ordinance.

12
13 Mr. Maxfield said how are you making the recommendations together in Scenario 2? AJ said as
14 you are drafting the ordinance, you are setting up the basic roles that your independent ZHBs
15 interpret. You have a little bit more control on how they will interpret things. You don't have that
16 with Scenario 1. By law, it still doesn't take away that when things get to Council, you can add
17 conditions, but your basic conditions are supposed to be in the ordinance. The property owner is
18 supposed to know what they are getting into before they start pursuing something. Carolyn said an
19 example, a land use, in writing a joint zoning ordinance, you come up with one provision, some
20 could be assessments or impact studies for certain uses as you know they are big ticket items that
21 are impacting the whole network, both communities. The fact that you are able to work through
22 that as a provision together and recognize this land use, it might have a big potential to increase
23 traffic problems in both communities, therefore, we've identified that this is something we are
24 sharing. If you had separate ordinances in Scenario 1, one community might say traffic is very
25 important on this issue and the other community may or may not say it's important. AJ said
26 standards can be modified or waived. You can't do that as easily under Scenario 2 as you are tied
27 together. That's a good example. You try to spell it all out. Tom Maxfield said under that
28 scenario, that special exception comes to the PC for review. AJ said it goes to the ZHB. They
29 have to interpret the general conditions you already established. They have to be reflecting back on
30 what you collectively agreed upon. Glenn said can you do it only on things that are relevant to
31 Hellertown and Lower Saucon Township or does all of the ordinances have to be included? If
32 traffic applies, can it be tailored to that? AJ said the three communities in Scenario 1; they will
33 have a couple of components that are exactly the same in the three ordinances. The one
34 community, he's not sure how long they will stay as a common element because in the past the
35 community has been quick to change things. They may all agree that this is how our storm water
36 design standards are going to be, here's how you will go through your calculations, that
37 community, in the past, has made changes that have affected the other communities and have gone
38 ahead and moved on. You can work together, such as this is the traffic impact standards or impacts
39 we want to have and you both agree on that. If one of you wants to make a change, they can go
40 and make a change and the other doesn't have a lot of relief. In itself, that may not jeopardize the
41 integrity of the comp plan, it may create other impacts. It's all trust you are generally taking about.

42
43 Tom Maxfield said under Scenario 2, Council can give their opinion about a variance request
44 coming through, even though we have this joint zoning ordinance, once it gets to that point, it's
45 handled on one side of that graph, but the other side, we are allowed to comment and send our
46 comment to our ZHB, does it go to the other entity for comment? AJ said yes, Hellertown, if there
47 was an issue going to Lower Saucon's ZHB, Hellertown can testify. There's that legal convention
48 of do you have standing? If you are a property owner and fighting against PennDOT, there are
49 times you go to court and don't have legal standing. You don't have some sort of stake in the
50 whole thing. You could live three blocks away from the track where the project is and you don't
51 have standing. You have a joint ordinance, both communities share that standing.

52
53 Margie said all issues that come before the board go to both boards? AJ said no, we're only talking
54 about the zoning items. If there are some ordinance type of issues, like a subdivision, it wouldn't

1 come to both boards. The elected body still has the final decision. Perhaps there's a project
2 proposed, and it's a conditional use type of situation, that purely goes to the Council. Council
3 makes the decision. It's in Lower Saucon and they say it's good in our community, but then
4 Hellertown comes to the public hearing and says but look how it's impacting their Main Street,
5 that's where the ICA comes in. Lower Saucon approves the plan, then Hellertown has some legal
6 relief to fall back on to be able to resolve the situation, which means the tail end of it is court.
7 Carolyn said in the ICA there is an opportunity to identify step 1, stop where we are and talk about
8 it, get together at the table and hash it out. If that doesn't work, then there's step 2 and step 3.
9 There's a code in the ICA that you can get that back on the table and work through it. AJ said you
10 know procedurally what you need to do to go through this process.

11
12 Priscilla said what about the time clock? AJ said that is a dilemma, the Township would have to
13 make a decision on how to take action. Assuming you went ahead and approved it and Hellertown
14 said alright, you may have to stop the developer down the road. There are some legal ramifications
15 with the developers and you want to hash this type of thing out with the ICA.

16
17 **Scenario 3** – AJ said this is a joint zoning ordinance and the creation of a Joint Planning
18 Commission and independent Zoning Hearing Boards. He talks about this scenario as they are
19 currently working with several communities on it. They decided to go the route of the Joint
20 Planning Commission to help further enhance coordination so all site plans are going to that
21 Planning Commission. They created sub-committees within the Planning Commission. When a
22 site plan comes into Borough A, the sub committee reviews that plan and gives a recommendation
23 to the Joint Planning Commission. The PC then, nine (9) members, makes a recommendation to
24 the elected body of Borough A. They use the sub-committee as a way of having representatives
25 with the local knowledge review the plan. You don't have to do it that way, but they felt it made
26 the most sense and it's working out very well. Carolyn said the sub-committee has special
27 meetings and are able to devote the time and come back with their recommendations. AJ said two
28 of the three want the Joint Zoning Board. The third won't agree to that. The reason they won't is
29 they feel issues like variances, special exceptions, are best dealt with at the local level. In their
30 mind, it still allowed local control by having the ZHB deal with those things.

31
32 **Scenario 4** – AJ said this is joint zoning ordinance, Joint Planning Commission and Joint Zoning
33 Hearing Board, the most efficient and the most radical in terms of a change itself. Scenario 3 and
34 4, the Partnership really doesn't play a role as you now have a Joint Planning Commission. The
35 Partnership is now functioning as the COG. You can testify and when there are issues, you can go
36 to your elected body. The Joint Planning Commission is the one making recommendations back to
37 the perspective communities. In all four scenarios, the Councils have the final decision. What
38 happens if there is a decision, and one community is different than the other communities, then it
39 goes back to the ICA. Each one of the ICAs, depending on the four scenarios, does change shape
40 to some degree in terms of complexion.

41
42 AJ handed out the black and white handouts with different scenarios. It's a real simple summary.
43 You can see independent versus joint and see the cascade of Scenario 1 going down and Council is
44 always independent. Advantages and disadvantages are listed at the bottom of each page, we focus
45 on the administrative. Some of the key ones to hit on – the primary disadvantage of Scenarios 1
46 and 2 is maintaining that level of integrity for the joint plan. Scenarios 3 and 4 introduce you to the
47 Joint Planning Commission which gives you more control. In most cases, the issues will be dealt
48 with at the PC levels than with the respective Councils. That's the problem with Scenario 1, if
49 your issues don't emerge until they get to Council level, then you have a clock ticking against you
50 in terms of making decisions. In terms of advantage, when you get to Scenarios 3 and 4, 3, if they
51 were asked, which would you recommend, he'd recommend 2 and 3, particularly 3, because you
52 have a joint planning commission, but you have a separate zoning hearing board. It makes a lot of
53 sense. When you are trying to establish setbacks in a neighborhood, which clearly is an advantage
54 in Scenario 2 and 3. Tom Maxfield said he's thinking of the function of the PC and any

1 recommending body, in our township, we all recommend specifically to Council, so is Scenarios 1
2 and 2, with the way the arrows are going, the Partnership really can't make a move or do anything
3 until it goes back to Council and they give their okay. The arrows between the Planning
4 Commission and the Partnership - really everything should go back to Council before it goes
5 between those two entities. The EAC, we like to make recommendations to the PC sometimes, but
6 we don't do that until we make the recommendation to Council first, then we are able to make the
7 recommendation to the PC. Do they make provisions for these types of scenarios? AJ said no.
8 They've had discussions on this, and they are really not clear, so what you feel is the right thing to
9 do, you are burdening property owners and potential developers. Under Scenarios 1 and 2 you
10 clearly added a complete new layer. Can you have a zoning task force made up of EAC and PC
11 members? – It's possible. There probably is another layer and more time to be taken.

12
13 Tom Maxfield said can a Council delegate it's authority to a partnership or a COG? AJ said no,
14 it's a law. You can give the PC more power in terms of a subdivision ordinance where the plans
15 never go to Council. For a zoning type of thing, it's an ordinance or a law, so you can't give that
16 authority to somebody else.

17
18 Priscilla said when we formed the COG, we never envisioned us being a mini PC. The reason for
19 doing this was to serve the communities and let the appointed bodies do their things. AJ said you
20 need to have some communicating group.

21
22 Glenn said while that may not have been the initial plan when we formed the Partnership, things do
23 evolve. It may be that the SVP becomes that entity because it kind of makes sense. Priscilla said
24 then we have to form another group for that and we will be going in another direction. AJ said
25 there is a resource limitation. Glenn said the SVP could be any group.

26
27 Tom Maxfield said he was thinking it was a recommending body and all recommending bodies
28 report back to the Council. AJ said you are actually an advising body. Recommending body is the
29 Planning Commission. Advisory and Recommending are two different things. Glenn said the
30 Environmental Advisory Council (EAC) is an advising body. Tom Maxfield said eventually the
31 Partnership becomes a clearing house and the Councils become the rerouted center. AJ said the
32 two boxes that have the SVP, that only turns off and as needed, it's not an everyday thing. It's only
33 when there is an issue crossing over those imaginary boundaries. You all have the background to
34 deal with this.

35
36 Tom Maxfield said once the system is set up, like for variance requests, those automatically go to
37 the other entity and you can bypass that whole thing. Glenn said if you flip to Scenario 3, that does
38 make more sense with the Joint Planning Commission as the SVP doesn't have to get involved
39 with that and the two groups that are already doing it and doing what they always do. Tom
40 Maxfield said Scenario 3 is a lot cleaner, especially when you mention the commissions; it makes
41 sense to him administratively. AJ said this is something that doesn't happen everyday. When it's
42 time to make amendments to your ordinances, the notion of reconvening some work group to deal
43 with an amendment and they need to get up to speed with the issues that a Joint Planning
44 Commission is already aware of as they are the ones that are starting to formulate what the
45 recommendation amendment should be to pass on to the respective councils.

46
47 Ed said from a school board perspective, Scenario 3 makes a lot of sense as he couldn't convince
48 the school board members to get involved in that. They have no authority at all. AJ said the ICA
49 that we drafted for the three communities doing Scenario 1; they have the ability to use their code
50 enforcement, neither of them are collectively the size of your communities. They had a steering
51 committee and that's their version of the yellow box in the middle. The moment there's an
52 amendment needed, the way their ICA reads, the Council calls the Steering Committee back
53 together and that is the task of the Steering Committee. Because they are infrequently meeting, the

1 membership of the Steering Committee changes as they may not do anything for three years.
2 That's another drawback; there are long periods of time.

3
4 Tom Maxfield said after it goes to your Steering Committee, then where does it go? AJ said it goes
5 to each of the PCs and they have to come together anyhow because they have to reach an
6 agreement they have to give to the respective Council's.

7
8 Priscilla said when we have our subdivision applications, do the municipalities share copies of the
9 plans back and forth? Charlie said if it's adjacent. We did that with Bethlehem as there's a self
10 storage place right on our border with Bethlehem. Priscilla said if Hellertown sends Lower
11 Saucon something, a plan A, does Jack send that to the PC? Jack said it's been awhile since we
12 received a copy of a plan from another adjacent municipality. Charlie said the way Bethlehem did
13 it, they went to DCED and they shared it with the Engineering Department and it was a technical
14 review rather than a PC review. Tom Maxfield said if a plan came in and it totally met the zoning
15 ordinance, you'd share this with the other community. Scenario 3 you would do that. For instance
16 if a Wal-Mart came into the middle of the township, you are supposed to inform all your adjacent
17 entities, not just Hellertown of the proposal and they, in theory, are supposed to have the authority
18 to kind of weigh in on it.

19
20 AJ said his suggestion is there is no urgency. Their question is if you are thinking about doing
21 something together, even going to DCED to get funding, he would suggest whatever decision you
22 make, put that in the comp plan and make it a specific recommendation that you are going to
23 further that possibly because DCED wants to see that there is some credence to what you are
24 planning on doing. You frame out the implications and the rationalities and you make a decision.
25 The timing of this, let's pretend you were able to get adoption of the plan by October, the DCED
26 grant is rolling, and there's not a certain deadline, when you submit your grant, but you want to
27 have the ICA as part of that grant application.

28
29 Priscilla said LVPC does a great job, we have a good representative on behalf of the township, but
30 that's one person compared to how many people are on the PC? That means 29 other people have
31 to know about Lower Saucon and Hellertown when they render a decision. Since we had that
32 meeting, people are territorial. Like Bethlehem, they put all their undesirable projects near our
33 borders and we are left out in the process. She doesn't want to see the communities dividing. They
34 formed this COG to bridge the communities. We need to respect each other and remember where
35 we've been and how we've got here. Glenn said under Scenario 3, the Joint Planning Commission
36 is smaller and sometimes smaller is better. The whole idea of the partnership was to enhance the
37 communication between the communities. The Joint Planning Commission will do that. It's just
38 Hellertown and Lower Saucon folks and its gaining better communication and communicates back.
39 That's enhancing what we have without diluting or changing. Priscilla said maybe we're not there
40 yet for the joint zoning ordinance and she doesn't want to see the multi-municipal plan go down the
41 tubes because we took a big step. Glenn said that might be the next baby step. Tom Maxfield said
42 at least things could be absorbed over time. AJ said when you go change an ordinance, it takes a
43 year and a half and it takes a little while until people get accustomed to it.

44
45 Someone said in this tab you are going to add, the words are excellent, it's a natural progression or
46 evolution and this is what the group should look at. AJ said what is the next baby step to take.
47 Priscilla said it's kind of like the time span that it's going to take out to build out the community;
48 we don't know how long it will take.

49
50 Tom Maxfield said he hopes we have enough time to plan this, and if we don't plan as a regional
51 area, someone is going to plan it for us. We have the casino coming and the development on the
52 old steel site, they are not waiting for our evolution. We already see how Bethlehem is dealing
53 with their fringe communities. There will be bigger tasks that are going to have to get done.

1 AJ said if you have any questions, call or email us. The three communities that are doing Scenario
2 1, we had to have a lot of pow-wows and to everybody together. This is all new for everyone. It
3 does take a little bit of time. Tom Maxfield said how long does it take to get a zoning ordinance
4 for an area of this size? Recognizing that the two communities have different goals, what would be
5 a time line for that? AJ said fifteen to eighteen months because zoning is different than comp
6 plans.
7

8 Carolyn said eighteen months is when everyone is on board and ready to move to keep going
9 through the process and recognize the goal and recognize we need to come out with the decision
10 and keeping everyone abreast and current with the issues so they see the relation between a
11 decision that was discussed month 1 versus month 5. If you keep the discussion moving forward, it
12 helps to get things out on the table. In July and August, when she was talking with the public and
13 the PC and all of you, we've accomplished a lot of discussion in the last eight or nine weeks with
14 all the different groups. There's even been a discussion about having the PCs coming together for
15 a joint meeting in September to look at this together.
16

17 Carolyn said we started in June with the drafting. We met with Hellertown and LST Planning
18 Commission and got feedback from various degrees from both bodies. We've gotten clear
19 direction from LST about three or four key issues we need to enhance or expand on in the draft and
20 make some edits. In Hellertown, the focus of the discussions have really revolved around the
21 concepts, the missions we are moving forward and Hellertown's PC emerged with they are ready to
22 move on to the next steps. That's pretty exciting that Hellertown is ready to move on. They will
23 go back and talk to Hellertown as both PCs have had meetings without them. They have
24 categorized the comments into three different pieces. The first is concept refinement or
25 enhancement. The second set relates to content and the third is layout of the organization. In terms
26 of concept, this is the meat of the presentation. The comments we received, related to the concepts,
27 is revising the boundary area of the municipal service boundary. They got the markup from the
28 township and they are tightening that up a little bit and removing portions of the area from the
29 boundary. She had a map and showed the audience where some of the boundaries went. She said
30 they are also revising the municipal service area. No. 2, is in adding additional components to the
31 township's previous open space efforts and successes. We're also sort of doing a different layering
32 system in terms of the greenway corridor so there's a clearer presentation to the local greenway and
33 making some additions to that system so there's a little more connectivity. In the Wassergass area,
34 recognizing that it wants to be a rural residential area, there is still support there. The concept was
35 discussed at the public meeting and it is relating to the kinds of things we explored from an
36 infrastructure, pedestrian networks, development, right of ways, in this area. Someone said we
37 don't want to encourage additional people or development into that area.
38

39 Carolyn said No. 4, strengthening the concept of the Hellertown hub, just calling more attention to
40 that in terms of it being a priority area where improvements are made and services and retails and
41 all types of things that can serve the overall reason really are. In addition to this list, we've
42 received a letter from the PC that was issued to Borough Council and the Mayor. To compliment
43 the hub, is the transportation component and they want to look at the parking aspect and that's
44 something in the plan we can call attention to the progress made.
45

46 Carolyn said the big one is No. 7 as there was discussion at the Hellertown PC, the comment
47 started with the recreation authority, and what it extended into was an action plan, that would be
48 more specific such as: do this, form this. Look at the feasibility of doing this next. That feasibility
49 study is actually part of doing it. It's not just study it, then put it off to the side. Let's study it and
50 figure out how it can work. That's pretty exciting.
51

52 Priscilla said regarding the Joint Recreation Authority, the SV Community Center is really doing a
53 good job of providing recreation programs to the township and she would not be in favor of
54 anything that would take those programs away from them. AJ said the comment applies to a lot of

1 recommendations. We may have to go back and look at these specific actions because of the way
2 some of these are phrased. Charlie said the specific thing we were raising with this one is we
3 already have SV Youth Sports and the children all play together and are all sharing fields, and it's a
4 no brainer, and we are there already. They weren't touching the community center. They were
5 touching on the pool. There was a DCNR course taught back earlier in the year and they
6 addressed a joint recreation commission and there was a building converted like the school, and it
7 had the community center, sports teams, everybody in there all working together planning their
8 events. Their focus was more on the sports that is already there and starting from there.

9
10 Jack said the first step we would take before we decide anything would be to do a joint recreation
11 plan or feasibility study.

12
13 Carolyn said No. 5, there was a discussion of some of the goals. We can take a look at them.
14 There were some specific recommendations about parking in the Borough and that is approaching
15 churches or other public areas about potential for sharing parking areas on the weekends or coming
16 up with some sort of agreements.

17
18 Carolyn said the next page, No. 1, empathizing Hellertown is friendly for business/jobs and we
19 referred to Hellertown as an urban location. A couple members said we aren't urban, we're a small
20 town, and we have to look at that again. Closeness of the communities based on their history, we
21 have to look at that a little bit. Carolyn said in terms of the theatre, maybe expanding that session
22 about becoming a cultural resource, and spreading out its audience to several generations. There
23 was discussion on some of the dates that Hellertown was settled and incorporated as a Borough.

24
25 Carolyn said emphasizing plan potential in relationship to job and youth, talking about that a little
26 bit more. Revising the action plan time frames was another concept thrown out. Instead of short
27 term, long term, which do have broader range, as well the flexibility, there was the concept that the
28 person identified could we put these in a little bit priority order. The Executive Summary was
29 talked about and the action plan, emphasizing the goals and make sure that is clear in the Executive
30 Summary. Someone said how you want to do the Executive summary. AJ said we've done some
31 that are about four pages, and 8-1/2 x 11, and more brochure oriented, they put it in the new
32 resident packet, what do you think will be the most effective and the most mileage out of? Charlie
33 said the PC looked at it and it involves all of the entities. They wanted this sort of as a placemat
34 you'd have in front of you at the breakfast table and you have all the facts in front to them so
35 Council, all Boards know those are the things you are shooting for. It's something you can refer to.
36 Tom Maxfield said in the comprehensive plan we should be positive and not too restrictive. AJ
37 said think about it. Carolyn said we know we have some things that we are ready to take on. She
38 asked are there any other points or anything we haven't touched on? Jack said this is what you are
39 going to send back to the Lower Saucon Planning Commission? Carolyn said yes, she'd like
40 general direction from you. Here is a listing of the items which were just up on the screen. With
41 the exception of No. B8, about identifying specific order of tasks, there are all suitable that we
42 would present them to the Steering Committee as they make sense to incorporate the changes.
43 What we would like to do then is expand a little bit upon this and ask what is the task we're going
44 to do to complete this step? This is the list we would send to the Planning Commissions so they
45 can see yes, our comments are being addressed; we agree that is what we are going to show in the
46 comprehensive plan. We won't have made all of the changes in the document itself, but in the
47 outline of those tasks, then the PC can determine is it appropriate now that it's a step to go to
48 Council to start the public review and hearing of the document. That's our next step, and the
49 timing of that is impacted by two things we've talked about tonight. One is the zoning scenario
50 and the other item is phrasing of the actions or introductions to the actions to the action plan.

51
52 Tom Maxfield said remember at the PC meeting he had concerns of the term "Infill" and we
53 adapted that to LS to be basically adaptive reuse. He has the same sort of problem with No. 5. This
54 recommendation came from the Borough PC and he has questions about a word in there. He

1 doesn't know what the Borough means by "industry", but he doesn't think LST wants to open new
2 areas to industry. Industry to us would be warehousing, which would be light industry which we
3 would be in favor of. Charlie said that's not was intended. They meant commercial, job creation.
4 Carolyn said it's suitable of non-residential development. Tom Maxfield said with the
5 development on the steel site, some will be heavy industrial. Someone may read this and think
6 about opening up Applebutter Road, expanding the heavy industrial area that is now limited to our
7 landfill further down and making that bigger. That wouldn't be really good for us. Jack said the
8 other one he noticed, which was brought up by our Planner, was the impact of Lehigh University.
9 Carolyn said we need to look at the action list and get it back to all of you. It will go to PC with
10 the list of comments. Jack said did you want a vote from this body? Carolyn said yes.

11 **Motion by Priscilla to take the list of "Summary of Key Planning Commission**
12 **Comments/Preferred Direction", strengthen the priority language, and present to the**
13 **Steering Committee for approval and then send it to the Planning Commissions, seconded by**
14 **Glenn. All in favor.**

15
16
17 AJ said he will send it back to the SVP, to make sure they are comfortable with the language, and
18 then send it to the Planning Commission. When they see it, they may say it still may have to be
19 stronger.

20
21 Tom Maxfield said he thinks it should go to Council and then Council should direct it to the PC.
22 AJ said you can decide that. Priscilla said the Councils already said that when the SVP engaged in
23 this process, Planning has to be involved because of what it is, so it already was a given that they
24 would be a working part of it. Tom Maxfield said he'd like to ask the Solicitor about this and the
25 process, the protocol, where it goes. We've got to get that straight. If it takes one more little step
26 going to Council first, and then they say it's okay to let Planning Commission review it now. AJ
27 said you need to make sure you are comfortable with this. Priscilla said technically the PC should
28 have gone through the Council and Council should have said go to the Partnership. In your case, it
29 is not unusual to have a Steering Committee, and go through a chain of review and there's a give
30 and take going back and forth until ultimately your PC has to make the recommendation to Council
31 and that's where the MPC comes back in. The MPC is completely silent about a Steering
32 Committee and always revert back to the PC as they make the final recommendation. Tom
33 Maxfield said AJ said as long as it gets the final recommendation from the Council? Then he'll
34 keep quiet now. Charlie said the Steering Committee will look at the information on September
35 10th. We talked about a Joint Planning Commission meeting on the following Thursday, is this
36 going to be presented to them or does the Steering Committee present it? AJ said we should be
37 presenting it, which means we have to get stuff to you guys for the couple key things so we can
38 finalize it. Carolyn said it is appropriate at that meeting so everyone is hearing it and can go back
39 into their own groups and make their specific recommendations.

40
41 **G. Brief Reports and Discussion Items**

42
43 **1. Casino Impacts Funding – update**

44
45 No update

46
47 **2. Joint COG Projects**

48
49 No update

50
51 **3. Polk Valley Road/Walnut Street Intersection Enhancements – update**

52
53 Jack said we have finished the joint paving project. Ed said they wanted to thank the Borough and
54 the Township. They did a professional job. Jack said he and Charlie put together a draft press

1 release, telling how it was paved, what was paved, the cost savings to the school district and the
2 taxpayers. Please review it and get back to him. If you approve, they'd like to release that to the
3 press. The only thing he saw in the press so far was a negative comment. Ed said we saved over
4 \$150,000 on that project. Motion by Tom Maxfield, second by Glenn to approve the press release.
5

6 **4. Joint Enterprise Zone with City of Bethlehem – update**

7
8 Charlie said he did talk to the City of Bethlehem and they are still getting ready to name a
9 coordinator.
10

11 **5. Hellertown – Lower Saucon Compost Center – update**

12 No update
13

14 **6. Tax Reassessment – update**

15 No update
16

17 **7. Fire Services - update**

18 No update
19

20 **8. Leithsville Act 537 Plan – update**

21 No update
22

23 **9. Other Issues (Meeting of Northampton County COGs' PSATS Conference Offer)**

24 Ed said there will be another meeting with the County COG on September 23, 2008 if anyone is
25 interested in going. He was planning on going. If anyone else wants to go, email Jack Cahalan or
26 Tom Hart directly.
27

28 **10. Rails-to-Trails**

29 Jack said they held a public meeting on the SEPTA Rails to Trails and got information out to the
30 public and are still meeting with SEPTA. They are addressing any concerns that property owners
31 may have. They will send letters to property owners letting them know about this information.
32 The Rails to Trails information and map is on the Township's website.
33

34 **H. Events Calendar**

35 Priscilla said her blog is more updated and she doesn't like to keep sending Sandy revisions. The Cemetery
36 Tours are wonderful. They are Thursday, August 14 and Friday, August 15, 2008 from 6:00 PM to 8:00
37 PM. Community Day is August 16th. We have the barn tours on September 13, tickets on sale at the
38 township and the Heller Homestead.
39

40 **I. Adjournment**

41 Motion by Tom Maxfield, second by Glenn to adjourn. The time was 9:28 PM.
42

43 **J. Next meeting is Wednesday, September 10, 2008 at 7:00 PM, Saucon Valley School District; October**
44 **8, 2008 – Hellertown Borough and November 12, 2008 at Lower Saucon Township.**
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53