

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 18, 2014 7:00 P.M.

The regular monthly meeting of the Allen Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, August 18, 2014 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; Alfred Pierce; Louis Tepes, Jr.; David Irons; Eugene Clater; Ilene Eckhart – Manager; Brien Kocher, P.E.; B. Lincoln Treadwell, Jr., Esq.

Minutes: Mr. Pierce made a motion to dispense with the reading of the minutes of June 16, 2014; seconded by Mr. Tepes. On the motion, by roll call vote, all Commissioners present voted yes.

Mr. Tepes made a motion to approve the minutes of June 16, 2014; seconded by Mr. Pierce. On the motion, by roll call vote, all Commissioners present voted yes with the exception of Mr. Clater whom abstained.

Old Business

1. **High Meadow Estates:** Noted.

New Business – No New Business items.

Ordinance Changes

- A. **Potential Ordinance revisions – multiple sections:** Mr. Holmes indicated that the Ms. Eckhart provided a memorandum for the Commissioners discussed based on the past several months plan review experience. She indicated that with the budget processing for 2015 beginning soon, this

may be a comprehensive review that the Board should consider funding. Mr. Pierce felt that small cell towers should be added for the review. Mr. Treadwell noted that this is the small broadband wireless units that would be collocated. The items presented by Ms. Eckhart included:

1. Number of driveway entrances allowed by ordinance and 30' width limitation for non-residential subdivisions.
2. Extension of cul-de-sac vs. through road design.
3. Contiguous tract sketch requirements and responsibility of property owners with regard to parcels in multiple municipalities.
4. Submission of plan sets when phases are to be considered and sequence of phases.
5. Parking/Loading area design requirements: specifically number of spaces provided, % of slope allowable, consistencies with Uniform Construction Code pertaining to ADA accessibility requirements.
6. Approval of truck route procedure pertaining to Township Roads.
7. Noise – zoning ordinance section – ANSI standards – look at entire “Hazards and Nuisances” Section contained in the Zoning Ordinance – raising of this section through review process or on occurrence or both.
8. Traffic Impact Statement and Traffic Assessments following development – provisions to secure subsequent studies and be required to provide remediation.
9. Stormwater – Basin side slopes in areas where wildlife impacts create attractive nuisance (perhaps add section in Airport Overlay Zoning District only).
10. Airport Overlay Zoning District – subsequent study requirements pursuant to NEPA. Also possibly update Zoning Map to reflect boundaries of Airport Restriction Line.
11. Stormwater Management Ordinance – reviewed due to changing standards and mandates of DEP/EPA.
12. Manholes and utility appurtenance – depth design safety limitations – location in right of ways.
13. Landscaping requirements – specification regarding initial plantings, additional consideration along parks or other specified uses.
14. Electronic plan submission – requirements.
15. Impervious coverage in residential applications – pervious paving (? Should we allow) and recognition of trend regarding outdoor living spaces especially in higher density. Impervious coverage

allowances in Industrial. Impervious coverage correlation between allowance and specific stormwater management design techniques utilized.

16. Further review of Uses, Definition of additional modernized Uses, in IC, I, HC and NC zoning district – possibly creation of new zoning district classifications. Also review of what may be better suited as Conditional Use vs. Permitted by Right or vice versa.

17. Items specifically in the purview of the Board of Supervisors – should additional items contain this same provision?

18. General update regarding consistency with other governing standards and references to standards

19. Performances standards installation of fences/gates

Mr. Kocher indicated that the land use review would be a much more involved process and that would involve a review of the Comprehensive Plan as well as other related issues. Mr. Clater felt the Comprehensive Plan held up well but he felt the recent letter received by the Township from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission which included a mixed use suggestion in the southern area of the Township was good feedback that should be explored further. Mr. Kocher felt a minor Comprehensive Plan Amendment could address the mixed use issue.

Mr. Clater had a few other suggestions to the items already identified including: 1.) definition of a linear park; 2.) buffer yards for Industrial Commercial Uses adjoining public parks; and 3.) the definition of linear parks. Mr. Clater further questioned referencing of newer standards throughout the Zoning Ordinance document in order to include published standard references. Following some discussion, Mr. Kocher indicated that if the Planning Commission identified their goals the ordinance documents could be tailored to include the standards that will best fit the goals as identified.

Mr. Clater further noted concerns regarding the wildlife restriction standards the FAA brought up during the course of the past plan reviews. He felt going forward; the airport or FAA should inform the Township which rules impact the Township's plan review process.

Mr. Clater further brought forward the concept of bicycle lanes for discussion.

Mr. Pierce raised an issue of people who do not maintain their driveways in a paved condition. On the question from Mr. Holmes, regarding paving of existing driveways, Mr. Pierce felt that all driveways (at least the end section where the driveway meets a public road) should be required to be paved. Mr. Clater also felt the Township could enforce standards where drives, which are in an unpaved condition, repeatedly wash out onto the public road. Mr. Holmes agreed. Mr. Clater felt the driveway issue should be in a free standing ordinance.

Mr. Kocher indicated that currently the Zoning Ordinance does allow residential driveways and farm lands to be unpaved. Mr. Pierce stated he was concerned for the future ramifications of the MS4 regulations. Mr. Pierce felt strongly that it should be included as part of this review process.

Mr. Pierce felt the Township should consider providing the Planning Commission with computers to review items going forward.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Ilene M. Eckhart