



# Allen Township Planning Commission

4714 Indian Trail Road  
Northampton, Pennsylvania 18067

Phone: (610) 262-7012

Fax: (610) 262-7364

---

William Holmes, Chairman  
W. Eugene Clater, Vice Chairman  
David Irons  
Louis Tepes, Jr.  
Alfred Pierce

Brien Kocher, P.E.  
B. Lincoln Treadwell, Jr., Esq.  
Ilene M. Eckhart, Manager

MINUTES  
ALLEN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
Monday, August 15, 2011  
7:00 P.M.

The regular monthly meeting of the Allen Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, August 15 2011 at 7:00 P.M. at the Allen Township Municipal Building, 4714 Indian Trail Road, Northampton, Pennsylvania 18067. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all present.

Roll Call: Present: William Holmes; Louis Tapes, Jr.; Alfred Pierce; David Irons; Eugene Clater; Brien Kocher, P.E., Jason Smith, Randall Wright (Hanover Engineering Associates) and Ilene M. Eckhart.  
Absent: B. Lincoln Treadwell, Jr., Esq.

Minutes: Mr. Tepes made a motion to approve the minutes of June 20, 2011; seconded by Mr. Irons. On the motion, by roll call vote, all supervisors present voted yes.

## General Business

Interstate Waste Services – Conditional Use: Mr. Brian Wehler, ARM Group Inc. has prepared revisions since the issuance of the August 11, 2011 Hanover Engineering letter of review, which he presented to the Commission along with a revised plan. He further responded to the comments concerning the parking requirements. Mr. Wehler noted that the Zoning Officer classified the use upon the Zoning Application recently proposed as Automobile Repair and Truck Terminal. He stated Interstate Waste Services intends to lease approximately 25,000 square feet of the 28,158 square feet

building. Of the 25,000 square feet to be leased approximately 4,800 square feet will be utilized as Automobile Repair (truck repair) and 4,700 square feet of building space as an Industrial Office Use and the remainder of the building being leased or approximately 15,500 square feet as a Truck Terminal Use. In the final parking calculations the smaller building needs to be included.

Mr. Wehler indicated that an Automobile Repair use would require 48 spaces (1 per 100 square feet plus one for each employee) with a net total of 96 parking spaces. In addition if the Industrial Office use is added the net for the site will be 112. It was clarified that the facility will be for Automotive Repair for their operation only. Mr. Pierce felt that the practical calculation should be for the dimension of the trucks to enter the site – not for standard passenger vehicles. The applicant indicated that the trucks will be parked inside the building and outside of the building. Ultimately 35 to 40 trucks may be on site at one time. Additionally, the applicant indicated that the container storage area will consist of variously sized dumpsters. Mr. Holmes felt that the total truck area as well as the container area needs to be calculated and added to the plan. Mr. Kocher indicated the plan that is presented to the Supervisors regarding parking must be complete.

Mr. Holmes questioned if there ever would be waste stored on the site overnight. The applicant indicated that the only time a loaded truck would remain on the site overnight would be in the case of a malfunction when the truck could not be emptied.

Regarding the existing sewer system the property owner/applicant shall provide information on the adequacy of the current system.

Mr. Pierce made a motion to recommend Conditional Use approval pursuant to the application received subject to the changes discussed above; providing for the truck parking area to the rear; that the applicant provide details on the storage of container area; that the applicant identify the use of the areas in the building to be leased and showing the smaller building and parking calculated for the uses within the smaller building; review of the existing sewage system to determine adequacy and that a note be added to the plan concerning the upgrade of the gravel area at the rear of the property if trucks are parked in the area in the future; seconded by Mr. Tepes. On the motion, by roll call vote, all Commissioners present voted yes.

Natural Area Regulations: Mr. Kocher had several outstanding questions concerning the development of the new regulations. He asked if the Commission had an opinion whether the Natural Area Regulations apply to all natural features present on a site or should they apply just too common open space areas? Mr. Holmes did not feel the new regulations should be imposed on all lots but rather where the conditions of the lots would warrant control. Mr. Tepes and Pierce felt the buffer requirements were already somewhat controlled by Commonwealth and Federal regulations. Mr. Pierce was concerned with the implementation of overly restrictive regulations. He felt that the thing that initiated this was to address Common Open Space within cluster-type development design and the question that was raised was how we monitor how the open space in these types of development is maintained. The question was how restrictive do we want to become; on the other hand, he felt it should apply to the public parks and areas designated as public areas. Upon this clarification, the Commission generally agreed that the regulations should apply to Common Open Space within cluster-type development and public land areas. Mr. Holmes is still concerned with properly scheduled

maintenance and monitoring of these types of areas. Following some further discussion, Mr. Tepes was concerned with the overregulation that this criterion provides. Mr. Holmes felt a section should be added to the ordinance to require notice to the potential owner of the property regarding the perpetual maintenance of the natural areas. Mr. Smith indicated that it takes several years to establish these types of areas. Mr. Holmes questioned if this manageable plan to enforce? Mr. Smith felt that if the open space can be developed over the first few years to establish and that possibly the areas may revert to a wooded area that is not infested with invasive species. In conclusion, the Commission felt the Natural Areas should be only applicable to the Open Space Areas and the Storm water Basins for the next draft.

Regarding the standard regarding walkway materials and if there is a preference of pervious versus impervious material, the Commission felt that the ordinance should require pervious but “hard” materials.

Regarding if the applicant should be given the option of developing their own Plan with their own standards, subject to Township approval, the Commission felt opening the required discipline to a “qualified environmental consultant” would be acceptable.

Regarding the mowing of side slopes the language should be changed to just the berm areas.

Regarding the establishment of a meadow that areas intended to be turned into natural wooded areas would not be mowed annually. Mr. Smith will clarify on a future draft. In addition, a section will be added to allow the Township to require additional years of monitoring.

Mr. Pierce was concerned with the assessment of these costs for the implication of these standards. This is to be reviewed concerning the legalities.

Open Wood-Fired Boiler Draft Ordinance: Mr. Holmes felt that the ordinance draft was very restrictive due to the area of land necessary to setback. Mr. Holmes further questioned the type of pellets to be made from clean wood. This language is to be clarified. Mr. Kocher questioned the need for an annual permit. Mr. Holmes felt with all the code requirements – do we really need to require an annual permit? He felt one permit was sufficient for the life of the system. Mr. Kocher questioned the stack height. Following some discussion, the draft language...”If there are any residential structures within 250 feet of the stack, the stack of the chimney shall extend at least as high above the ground surface as the height of the roof peaks of the residences plus 2 feet” was reconsidered and instead the minimum stack height should be determined by the height of the chimney of the structure plus two feet beyond the unit serves. Regarding the operational schedule, limit operation between the months of June 1<sup>st</sup> and October 1<sup>st</sup>.

Alternative Energy Production Facility: This ordinance draft is to address individual uses only not wind or solar farms. Farm type applications will require a separate set of regulations. Mr. Pierce questioned the number and size of the size of the panels allowed on a single lot. Following some discussion, the Commission agreed that if the ordinance sets the requirement subject to the average energy need of the home. This would be a manner to regulate the size and number. The Commission requested the preparation of a single amendment with all of the energy production regulations presented this evening.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Ilene M. Eckhart