



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, February 15, 2010 7:00 P.M.

The regular monthly meeting of the Allen Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, February 15, 2010 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, David Irons, Alfred Pierce, Louis Tepes Jr., B Lincoln Treadwell, Jr., Esq.; Brien Kocher, P.E. and Ilene M. Eckhart. Absent: David Irons and W. Eugene Clater.

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

General Business:

A. Warren and Joanne Koehler Subdivision: - Planning Module: Mr. Kocher explained this is the authorization to sign the Planning Module Authorization. Mr. Tepes made a motion to recommend approval of the DEP Non-Building Waiver and authorize appropriate signing by the Planning Commission by the Chairman; seconded by Mr. Pierce. On the motion, by roll call vote, all members present voted yes.

B. Hafner Zoning Application – Referred to Planning Commission from Zoning Officer: Messrs. Walter Hafner Jr. and Gordon Mann present regarding this item. Messrs. Hafner/Mann were represented by Mr. Brian Gasda, P.E., Lehigh Engineering Associates. Mr. Holmes made an opening statement that the Township Planning Commissioners were not necessarily opposed to Mr. Hafner's use at the Mann property but that a plan would be necessary for Mr. Hafner to proceed. Mr. Brian Gasda, Lehigh Engineering Associates, raised questions from the January Planning minutes. Mr. Gasda questioned several points from the minutes including, "*Mr. Holmes reflected that storm drainage onto*

School Road has not been addressed. Mr. Kocher indicated no form of storm water management facilities. The Commission referred to the testimony to the Zoning Hearing Board regarding the number of uses existing on the property. Mr. Pierce indicated he would like to see from the property owner a clear record of all of uses on the 83 acres and then the engineering details for all of the uses should be reviewed. Mr. Pierce further stressed that the Commission could not make a comparison, given the testimony given at the Zoning Hearing and the presented sketch. Following some discussion, Mr. Clater indicated that this should not be treated like any other application. Mr. Clater felt that the basic land development elements need to be provided. Mr. Pierce felt that the lease required a subdivision pursuant to the MPC. Mr. Pierce felt that the plan should be submitted for the overall parcel showing all uses.”, as included in the January minutes.

Mr. Holmes explained that it was a very difficult area regarding stormwater management. He indicated that he was concerned because the area was so prone to drainage problems that mud would be tracked into the road by the applicant's trucks. Mr. Holmes questioned Mr. Mann regarding the status of Pond Road, which was previously a Township Road that was abandoned. Mr. Mann suggested that he owns the road as a private road. Mr. Hafner felt it was private property. Mr. Treadwell felt that it was acting as an access road to the users/tenants/property owners there.

Mr. Pierce was concerned regarding the number of uses: four apartments and the house trailer across the street (Pond) across from the house that is vacant plus the Hafner business that is new. This is five rental properties plus the Hafner business. Mr. Pierce felt that the plan needed to clearly represent the number of uses. He was not overly concerned with the crops and fields. He was more concerned with the use of the structures whether they are agricultural or residential uses. Mr. Mann indicated two structures shown were old farmhouses. Two apartments above the garage. Mr. Pierce indicated he was not terribly interested in surveying the 83-acres but what types of uses and how they are located on the eighty three acres. He felt this could be done generically not necessarily surveyed.

Mr. Hafner wanted to know what he was to show on this plan and who was to do this? The Commission indicated that collectively (Messrs. Hafner and Mann) this is what was needed before Mr. Hafner can be comply. It was made clear that an 83-acre actual survey was not what the Commission was necessarily seeking. Mr. Pierce wished to create a clear record of what (uses) was on the property now.

Regarding the access driveway, which is basically formerly Pond Road, Mr. Pierce indicated that it needed to be clearly shown on the plan. Mr. Mann indicated that Pond Road, as the Commission may recall it, is not in the location that it original is as he recalls it.

Mr. Gasda questioned the level of engineering detail required to be provided. Mr. Pierce felt there was an attempt that was submitted with the initial Zoning Permit application, which was denied by the Zoning Officer. He felt that the information submitted was not cohesive. Mr. Pierce felt that the information presented needs to be clear enough the Commission can clearly determine the layout upon the land. Mr. Pierce referred to the Zoning Officers letter of January 27, 2010 documented what would need to be shown.

Mr. Kocher briefly indicated that sewage capacity would need to be documented. He indicated that it would not necessarily need to be a DEP application, but the applicant would need to demonstrate how it

is being currently managed. Mr. Mann indicated that there are two septic systems on the site that he was aware of. The system must be identified and represented on a plan.

There was some discussion, regarding what was the “front” of the property use. Mr. Pierce indicated that it is defined in the ordinance. Mr. Pierce indicated that Commission needed a baseline to review.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding other elements to be shown on the plan.

The Commission stressed that Mr. Hafner should proceed with his submission by the end of February for further discussion at the March 2010 Planning Commission Meeting.

C. Agricultural Regulations Review: Follow-up for future meeting of the Commission.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Ilene M. Eckhart