



Allen Township Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes July 18, 2022 7:00 P.M.

A **General Meeting** of the Allen Township Planning Commission was held on Monday July 18, 2022 at 7:00 P.M. at the Allen Township Fire Company Building, located at 3530 Howertown Road, Northampton, PA. Chairman Gary Krill led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Roll Call: Gary Behler – Present; Gary Krill – Present; Paul Link – Present; David Austin – Present; One Member Seat is Vacant; Stan Wojciechowski, PE, CME, Engineer (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.) – Present; Andrea Martin, EIT (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.) – Present; B. Lincoln Treadwell, Jr. Esq., Solicitor – Present; Ilene M. Eckhart, Manager – Present; Maurin Ritinski, Admin. Assist. – Present

Minutes: Mr. Behler made a motion to approve the minutes from March 21, 2022, seconded by Mr. Link. On the motion, by roll call vote, all Commissioners present voted yes.

Public to be Heard: No public comment.

Business Items:

A. Stone Ridge Phase 3, 4, 5, and Commercial Sketch Plan: Scott Pasterski, Keystone Consulting Engineers, provided a presentation of the sketch plan which was presented to the Board of Supervisors last week,. He was joined by Tim Livengood, Sarah Livengood, and Attorney Shulman.

Mr. Pasterski gave an overview of the features and locations of the sketch plan including the existing residential units, the proposed 84 twins with 4 of the parcels straddling the Township and Northampton Borough Line and 3 additional single family dwelling units in Northampton Borough. In addition, a relatively large commercial portion is exhibited on the sketch plan to the north of the existing residential units. The proposed commercial uses will include a super convenience market, fast food restaurant, a bank with a drive thru, a medical office space, and a self-storage facility. There is east to west access in the commercial area from Savage Road to Horwith Drive. An existing signalized intersection at Nor-Bath Boulevard (SR 0329)/Century Boulevard will also be utilized for access to and from the commercial area. Mr. Pasterski mentioned that the super convenience market will be developed by another engineer.

Mr. Behler and Mr. Link stated that their only comments at this time were stated during the Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. Krill questioned the plan for stormwater as the sketch plan illustrates that the existing rain gardens on the west side are removed. Mr. Pasterski explained that preliminarily they plan to relocate the existing ponds depending on the number of lots. He also noted that the stormwater for the commercial portion will be handled on site with underground facilities. Infiltration testing has begun and they are in the process of gathering additional data for calculations. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that the proof would need to be provided that the stormwater management plan will be effective. The comment in the review letter to the developer states that the plan needs to meet the requirements for the stormwater management ordinance. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that additional data, plans, and drainage calculations are needed. Mr. Wojciechowski

stated that water quality basins are usually designed to meet NPDES as well and that Stone Ridge will need to modify their existing NPDES permit in order to permit that water quality to be located elsewhere.

Mr. Krill questioned the plan for along Savage Road in regards to the 10 foot buffer that was shown on previous plans but never installed. He also stated that during the Board of Supervisors meeting the Supervisors stated that they would like originally deferred sidewalks to be installed. Mr. Pasterski explained that after review of the plan upon receiving this comment last Tuesday for the feasibility of sidewalks their team preliminarily determined that a sidewalk can fit along west side Savage Road. The team believes the east side of Savage Road is less conducive to sidewalks than the west side. Due to the swale and berm it would most likely require geometric waivers and include the absence of a grass strip. Mr. Pasterski stated that a waiver request and hardship letter with the justifications would be presented to the Township if needed during the preliminary/final plan submission. Mr. Link questioned the installation of sidewalks along Nor-Bath Boulevard (SR 0329). Mr. Livengood commented that previously the Board of Supervisors did not want sidewalks along Nor-Bath Boulevard (SR 0329) at that time due to a public safety concern. Mr. Behler stated that that may have been the case at that time and that he understands the reasoning but current circumstances override that decision. He stated that personally he is done with deferrals due to the hassle to try to get the deferred item installed at a later date. He stated that if the Township ordinance states that a sidewalk must be installed then the sidewalk must be installed. Mr. Link and Mr. Krill agreed. Mr. Wojciechowski mentioned that sidewalks are required by ordinance on Horwith Drive as well. Mr. Krill expressed the importance of sidewalks on Horwith Drive for pedestrian traffic down to Hollow Lane and onto the Nor-Bath Trail into Northampton. Mr. Link discussed a possible crosswalk installation across Savage Road for pedestrian traffic to and from the super convenience market and the Howertown Park. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that a crosswalk will be evaluated upon the completion and results from a traffic impact study. Mr. Pasterski stated that they will include any buffers and sidewalks in the plan for review.

Mr. Krill addressed the 25-foot wide buffer between the residential and commercial areas. Mr. Livengood commented that the buffer is already installed. Mr. Krill stated that the few trees currently there will not block the headlights coming from the commercial area. He stated that the buffer needs to be increased. Mr. Wojciechowski explained that the buffer will be required to be supplemented on the commercial side according to the ordinance.

Regarding the commercial access to Horwith Drive, Mr. Pasterski explained that this access to Horwith Drive was designed to reduce the residential and commercial traffic from commingling. Mr. Pasterski expressed his concerns if the traffic was commingled due to the self-storage facility traffic with trucks and trailers. Mr. Pasterski explained that the sketch plan is slightly non-compliant at the intersection of Horwith Drive and the commercial access drive as shown but can be made compliant with SALDO with a slight modification. Mr. Pasterski recommends that further modifications to the sketch plan should be held off pending a traffic study. Traffic calming measures for both the commercial area and residential area will be considered once the traffic study has been completed. Mr. Wojciechowski stated that a four-way intersection should be explored as a possibility as he did not recall making a recommendation to avoid the comingling of commercial and residential traffic. Mr. Wojciechowski also suggested evaluating the impact of a roundabout for this intersection as a traffic calming technique.

Mr. Krill questioned Mr. Pasterski if he had any further discussion regarding the bump out at the Savage Road entrance to the commercial area. Mr. Pasterski explained that he cannot comment on this as this area of the sketch plan is being further designed by a different engineer. Mr. Pasterski will inform the other engineer of the comments by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission regarding the bump out and intersection.

Mr. Krill questioned if the bank has interest or if it is just a placeholder. Mr. Livengood commented that it is a placeholder along with the fast food restaurant, but that they should materialize. He further clarified that

the bank may change to a different commercial use. Mr. Krill then inquired if the storage facility was certain to remain. Mr. Livengood explained that it will become a storage facility and the parcel is currently in the process of being subdivided.

Mr. Wojciechowski read through the review letter, dated July 7, 2022 (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.). The comments from the letter are as follows:

“ZONING ORDINANCE REVIEW

1. *§ 27-1419-A portion of the site is in the Airport Zone. The Airport Zoning line should be shown on the plans, and compliance with the Airport Zoning Performance Standards should be documented on any Preliminary Plans.*
2. *§27-1405.5–The standards of this steep slope section shall apply to areas of the site where the existing grades are above 8%. Preliminary plans should separately delineate areas of the site where the existing grades are between 8% and 15%, between 15% and 25%, and over 25%.*
3. *§27-1406–A Buffer yard is required along the rear of the commercial lots where they adjoin the residential subdivision. This buffer shall be shown on the Preliminary Plans and the rear access drive should be shown to be outside the buffer.*
4. *Any previously approved deferrals for buffering along Savage Road should be evaluated by the Township.*
5. *§ 27-1422–The Sketch Plan does not show the off-street parking and loading requirements for the commercial uses, nor is sufficient data provided to determine compliance with this section. Preliminary plans for the commercial uses should document compliance with the parking and loading requirements. Truck turning templates should also be provided on the preliminary plans to confirm that these vehicles can enter into and exit from their destination.*

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE REVIEW

6. *§ 22-406.I & § 22-406.K–Sidewalks should be provided along the entire site frontage with Horwith Lane, Nor-Bath Boulevard, and Savage Road.*
7. *§22-411.7.D(1)–The center line of a driveway at the point of access to a street shall not be located closer to a street intersection than seventy-five feet. Given the lot layouts, the driveways for Lots 36, 37 and 38 would appear not to meet this minimum.*
8. *§22-412.4.A–For Residential Subdivisions with 50 to 150 lots, 3 acres of land should be dedicated to the Township for recreation areas/open space or a monetary contribution may be in lieu of the land dedication. This fee is currently set at \$1,400 per lot per Ordinance 2022-07.*
9. *§22-412.4.A–Recreation land for the commercial properties shall also apply. A fee in lieu of may be accepted by the Township in lieu of this dedication. This fee is currently set at \$280 per acre per Ordinance 2022-07.*
10. *§22-502.2.A(1)–The number and area of existing parcels included in the development should be confirmed. The County Tax Map indicates four parcels are included in the development while the plan notes there are only three, with parcel L4 12 5M-53 0522 in Northampton Borough apparently being excluded.*

TRAFFIC COMMENTS

11. *A Transportation Impact Study (TIS) addressing the buildout of all residential (Phases 1-5) development and the build out of all uses for the commercial development should be provided. This TIS should be based on the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) Publication 282, Appendix A–Policies and Procedures for Transportation Impact Studies Related to Highway Occupancy Permits.*
12. *Written responses to the TIS comments/concerns identified in Isett review letter dated March 4, 2019, regarding Stone Ridge Meadow Commercial Development should be provided. The responses should be incorporated into TIS referenced above for both the commercial and residential portions of Stone Ridge Meadow development. Further, the TIS should utilize the current timing and phasing for the signals, as the timing and phasing for the signals along Route 329 has been altered since the last TIS.*

13. A PENNDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) for the proposed driveway from Route 329 into the proposed commercial development should be provided.
14. Revised Traffic Signal Permit Plans (TSPP) for the intersection of SR 0329 (Nor-Bath Boulevard) and Century Boulevard/Stone Ridge Meadow Driveway will be required for the PennDOT HOP permit. Proposed signal upgrades must be coordinated with the other signals recently installed or upgraded on SR 0329.
15. The rear access drive is over 2,000 feet long and, in this configuration, would allow vehicles to obtain excessive speeds. Traffic calming measures should be included on this plan to minimize speeding.
16. We recommend the intersection of the access from Savage Road and the rear access drive should meet PennDOT throat length requirements from Savage Road to the intersection with the rear access drive.

GENERAL COMMENTS

17. It is noted that the units on Lots 23-26 are all divided by the Municipal boundary line. These units take access and utilities from Road C which is solely within the Township. The Municipal line or taxing municipality must be addressed.
18. The proposed development is subject to the stormwater management provisions of the Township's SMO. The applicant should note that above-ground stormwater BMP's shall not be constructed on residential lots of 1 acre or less.
19. Stormwater management should include the impervious area considered for ANY required road widening, sidewalks, and provide for the maximum impervious coverage on each lot.
20. As noted in our 2019 review, the driveway connecting to Savage Road impacts the NPDES permit obtained for Phase 1 of this development by displacing one of its infiltration ponds. Calculations must be provided with the Preliminary Plans for the Commercial Development demonstrating that the proposed stormwater management facilities will provide the attenuation and treatment of the stormwater currently treated by this basin.
21. Similarly, calculations must be provided with the Preliminary Plans for the residential development demonstrating that the proposed stormwater management facilities will provide the attenuation and treatment of the stormwater currently treated by the basin on the western side of Phase 2.
22. A sewage facilities planning module application mailer will be required for the proposed development which does not have prior planning approval. We commend that separate planning modules be provided for the commercial development and residential development.
23. Attached is a review from the Township Environmental Consultant regarding Sewage Facilities Planning and Tapping Fees.
24. The Utility Plan includes different numbering for Lots 85, 86, 87 and 88 than the subdivision plan. The preliminary plans should include the consistent numbering of those lots.
25. We recommend a common fence or common landscaping be provided along the rear of the double fronted lots numbered 25 through 42 along Horwith Lane and Road "C" to minimize mismatched fencing from being installed by the lot owners.
26. The storm sewer system shown on the Utility Plan running through the rear and side yards of Lots 69 and 70 should be relocated to run along the lot lines.
27. Proposed storm inlets should not be located in front of driveways. The inlets shown in front of Lots 24, 25, 54, 59, 67, 74 and 79 should be relocated at least 5 feet away from the proposed driveways.
28. An area should be set aside adjacent to the cul-de-sac bulb for snow removal storage.
29. Permission is needed from PPL for the encroachments into the existing PPL easement.
30. Copies of any application made for the NPDES permit should be provided to the Township.
31. All outside agency plans must be supplied to the Township for review prior to or concurrent with each submission to the outside agencies. Waivers and variances may not be granted for 'situations' created by outside agency approvals."

Mr. Behler questioned Mr. Livengood if he was more likely to dedicate to the Township the land for recreation areas/open space or if he was favoring the monetary contribution option. Mr. Livengood responded that they would be more likely to provide a monetary contribution in lieu of the land dedication.

Regarding impervious coverage, Mr. Pasterski explained that more data is needed but that the storm water engineer is evaluating what is feasible. Mr. Pasterski questioned if it is realistic to assume that every lot will build out to the 40% maximum impervious coverage. He stated that they will continue to evaluate this. Mr. Austin commented that currently it is very common for residents to come before the Zoning Hearing Board with small lots in order to put in a deck, pool, sidewalk or a pool since it would put them over the maximum allowable impervious coverage. Mr. Treadwell suggested that the developer examine the impervious coverage of the existing residential lots. Mr. Behler commented that it is not fair to residents if the developer uses 39% of the 40% maximum impervious coverage. He continued to explain that impervious coverage does have a direct correlation with stormwater. Mr. Behler stressed the importance of getting the impervious coverage correct in order to handle the stormwater. Mr. Pasterski stated that they will run more calculations and come back with additional data and possibly a counter offer. Mr. Krill provided history on the stormwater on east side of Graystone Circle. He explained that there was a stormwater issue in the past that caused a large amount of complaints from residents. Mr. Krill noted that it seems to have been corrected due to the decrease in complaints.

Mr. Pasterski commented on the turn restrictions from Savage Road that the Board of Supervisors suggested. Mr. Pasterski stated that they will further evaluate this access pending the completed traffic study. He explained that they might not be able to restrict movements. Mr. Behler stressed the dangers of there being no turn restrictions from the access road onto Savage Road. Mr. Austin commented that the brand or tenant of the commercial facilities will directly impact the traffic flow generated. Mr. Treadwell stated that Savage Road is a Township road. He noted that both the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission are voicing their concerns with this intersection. Mr. Treadwell continued to explain that the tenant will have to agree to what the Township wants on the Township's road for safety reasons. Mr. Krill expressed his concerns with the intersection at Horwith Drive as well. Regarding the proposed intersection across from Century Boulevard, Mr. Behler commented that full build out will be three warehouses. Mr. Behler questioned the parking plan for tractor trailers that would drive straight across from Liberty Drive to visit the commercial area. He would like to see a plan for tractor trailer parking in the commercial lot because otherwise tractor trailers would be stopping on the roadway in the commercial area or along Nor-Bath Boulevard.

Mr. Treadwell stated that there are two commercial parcels with five different uses. He questioned how the parking areas are going to be delineated and assigned to each use. Mr. Treadwell further questioned if these uses will be leases, ground leases, or condominiums due to there not being separate lots. According to the sketch plan there are two uses on one parcel and three uses on the other parcel. Mr. Pasterski explained that they are currently planning on condominium lots.

Mr. Wojciechowski questioned if traffic warrants have been meet for the left and right turning lanes on Horwith Drive and a dedicated left turn off of west bound Nor-Bath Boulevard onto Horwith Drive. Mr. Pasterski explained that at the time PennDOT did not require a traffic signal analysis at this intersection. Mr. Wojciechowski recommends the need for a signal be reevaluated.

Public Comment Regarding Stone Ridge Phase 3, 4, 5, and Commercial Sketch Plan:

Tony Espinosa, 942 Graystone Circle, voiced his concerns for the increase in traffic on Nor-Bath Boulevard that the proposed commercial tenants will bring. Mr. Espinosa stated that there is a lot of truck traffic on Nor-Bath Boulevard and the trucks frequently use brake retarders. He proposes a sound barrier be

installed to decrease the sound coming from the highway and commercial areas. Mr. Espinosa stated that trees and shrubs will not provide an adequate barrier.

Mr. Behler found the comment to be interesting and stated that he could see the benefit to a sound barrier. He questioned Mr. Wojciechowski and Mr. Pasterski of the feasibility. Mr. Wojciechowski commented that it would provide both a visual buffer and a sound buffer. Mr. Austin questioned who would be responsible for maintaining the barrier wall once installed. His main concern was graffiti. Discussion continued regarding who would be responsible for maintaining the wall. Mr. Espinosa commented that he believes the builder should be responsible.

Diane Lariar, 943 Graystone Circle, was concerned about the residential roadway in Graystone Circle. She questioned the reasoning for there currently being no lights or sidewalk on the western side of the existing Graystone Circle. She expressed her concerns for the increase of speeds if the temporary roadway would be removed and connected to Horwith Drive. Mr. Behler explained that the temporary roadway was always planned to be removed with the final plan to be to connect the roadway to Horwith Drive. He stated that the engineers would evaluate traffic calming measures within Graystone Circle to improve safety and reduce speeding.

Cody McCabe, 948 Graystone Circle, explained where his residence is on Graystone Circle. He stated that six units on the north side do not have trees. He is unsure if there were any deferrals regarding this but he would like any deferrals to be evaluated. He would like to see the trees put in before further development.

Rick Ortiz, 932 Graystone Circle, commented that he believes the wall is a great idea. Mr. Link questioned if residents will want to see a wall in their backyard. Mr. Ortiz stated that looking at a wall is better than smelling nasty food from a fast-food restaurant. Mr. Ortiz also reported that he is getting water in his basement. He is concerned with the continued development causing additional problems with stormwater. He questioned where the water from the commercial area will go and he believes it should not be the resident's problem. Mr. Krill commented that the engineer is still evaluating this and Mr. Wojciechowski confirmed that no drainage plan has been submitted. Mr. Ortiz questioned if residents will receive a warranty for water damages. He also questioned if the commercial area will be lowered or raised in height. Mr. Pasterski explained that there will be a curb along the south side and there will be drainage.

Jackie Gallagher, 928 Graystone Circle, also reported that she and her neighbor at 926 Graystone Circle consistently get water in their basements since day one. She questioned if the additional development will make the problem worse. Mr. Treadwell commented that theoretically it should not get worse and that the plan is only a sketch plan and that it is the first time the Planning Commission has seen the plan.

Aubrey Gamble, 948 Graystone Circle, expressed her concerns with truck parking in the commercial area. She believes that this will increase the likelihood of truck idling. Ms. Gamble reports that there is frequent idling at Horwith Trucking and she can hear it. She would like a no idling zone. Mr. Austin commented that there are state level requirements for idling. He suggested that Ms. Gamble make a complaint to the state to have the situation at Horwith Trucking addressed and managed if it is not being complied with.

B. Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan – Lands of Setter Hill Farm LLC: Ronald Check, 20 Country Road, Setter Hill Farm LLC, stated that he purchased the former Mann Farm in October 2021. Mr. Check wished to show the Planning Commission the project, answer any questions, and obtain guidance on a few items.

Mr. Check reported that the existing farm is being donated to an Amish man from Kutztown whose home and barn burned down. He stated that the demolition is horrendous and is very slow. Mr. Check

explained that he has given the Kutztown man until the end of August to complete the dismantlement of the barns and clean up the site. He asks for patience and understanding during this phase.

Mr. Check reported that all existing structures, except for two, will be razed. The one barn, built in 1912, will be relocated which will be clarified on the plan. This structure will be utilized as a hay barn on the agricultural preserve land for the horse rescue project. Mr. Check explained that the four silos will be left intact but the color may be changed. Mr. Check would like to maintain part of the Mann Farm. Three of the silos only contain residual material and one contains about 4-feet of old material. These will be cleaned out and will remain empty. They will be sealed off with the existing 10-foot ladders. The existing concrete silo will be torn down due to safety concerns.

Mr. Check noted that no zoning variances will be requested. All plans are permissible by right. The property consists of 49 acres with 10 acres excluded from the agricultural preservation zone. Mr. Check stated that approximately 10 to 12 acres of the property will be used to farm alfalfa to feed the horses on the property. A stable will be located on the property. Mr. Check noted that his family is very active in a race horse rescue program. He explained that on the western side of the property there is a plan for a vineyard. It will take approximately 7 to 8 years of cultivation before wine can be processed.

The uses for the property will consist of agriculture, vineyard, winery, stable, and a special event center. Mr. Check explained that these uses are combined will be labeled for every building on the plan.

The four buildings on the plan have been sized by architects to fit all of the uses. The main building is approximately 50x100; the secondary building is approximately 40x60; the small building is approximately 30x30; and the relocated barn/stable is approximately 60x120. The open air event area is proposed to be an artificial turf layer for special events and tented events.

Mr. Check requested guidance on Item 2 under Zoning Ordinance from the Township Engineer's review letter. This comment from the review letter dated July 16, 2022 reads: "*Unless otherwise permitted by the Board of Supervisors during the Land Development review, the plans should demonstrate that any use or structure proposed occupies a portion of the lot sufficiently sized and oriented to allow it to be subdivided from the parent tract without creating any non-conformities per ZO §27-1404.2.*" Mr. Wojciechowski explained that this property is ineligible to be subdivided. This comment was made so that is on record. Mr. Treadwell further explained that this is not a waiver but does state that the Board of Supervisors is able to state that this section does not apply.

Mr. Check requested clarification and guidance regarding the comments under the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Review section of the review letter dated July 16, 2022. This section of the review letter reads:

1. *"Per the Official Map of Allen Township, Old Carriage Road is a Collector Road. The following is noted:*
 - a. *Per SALDO §22-406.J, collector roads shall have a sixty-foot right-of-way and a forty-foot cartway. Curbs and sidewalks are required on all collector roads.*
 - b. *The Ultimate Right-of-Way (30' from the centerline) with the corresponding bearings and distances should be shown on the plans across the entire frontage of Old Carriage Road per SALDO §22-502.4.C.*

- c. *The front yard setback lines should be measured from the Ultimate Right-of-Way lines per SALDO §22-502.4.I.*
 - d. *The area between the PennDOT right-of-way and the Ultimate Right-of-Way should be offered for dedication to the Township per SALDO § 22-406.*
 - e. *The eastbound cartway of Old Carriage Road should be widened to provide a minimum 12' wide travel lane, 8' wide shoulder, curbing, and sidewalk per §22-407.2. In lieu of this construction, a fee may be accepted by the Board of Supervisors to the Township Roadway Improvement Fund.*
2. *Per the Official Map of Allen Township, School Road is a Local Road. The following is noted:*
- a. *Per SALDO § 22-406.K.(1), local roads along a non-residential use shall have a sixty-foot right-of-way and forty foot wide cartway. Curbs and sidewalks are required on all collector roads.*
 - b. *The Ultimate Right-of-Way (30' from the centerline) with the corresponding bearings and distances should be shown on the plans across the entire frontage of School Road per SALDO §22-502.4.C.*
 - c. *The area between the PennDOT right-of-way and the Ultimate Right-of-Way should be offered for dedication to the Township per SALDO § 22-406.*
 - d. *The front yard setback lines should be measured from the Ultimate Right-of-Way lines per SALDO §22-502.4.I.*
 - e. *The southbound cartway of Old Carriage Road should be widened to provide a minimum 12' wide travel lane, 8' wide shoulder, curbing, and sidewalk per §22-407.2. In lieu of this construction, a fee may be accepted by the Board of Supervisors to the Township Roadway Improvement Fund.*
3. *Land set aside for Recreation/Open Space should be provided at a rate of one acre per 50 acres of total tract area per §22-412.4.C. The site is 49.07 acres; therefore, 42,750 square feet (0.98 ac.) would appear to be required. In lieu of providing land, a Recreation Fee of \$280 per acre may be accepted by the Township per Ordinance 2022-07.*
4. *Each Sheet should be numbered to show its relation to the total number of sheets in the plan, e.g., "Sheet No. 1 of 20 Sheets", per SALDO §22-502.2.C.*
5. *The plans should be reviewed by the Fire Chief. Any "No Parking" or Fire Zones should be shown on the plans per §22-502.4.N.*
6. *Erosion and Sedimentation Control (E&S) Plans should be provided and the Drawing Index on the Cover Sheet should identify these plans per SALDO §22-502.5.J.*
7. *An NPDES Permit should be submitted to the Township per SALDO §22-502.5.M. Post Construction Stormwater Management Plans (PCSM) associated with the NPDES Permit application should be provided per SMO §8-243.D and the Drawing Index on the Cover Sheet should identify these plans.*
8. *The plans should be reviewed by the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) per SALDO §22-502.6.F.*

9. *The Drawing Index should be provided on a sheet to be recorded. Additionally, the sheet on which the Drawing Index appears should bear the certificates and notices required by SALDO Appendix C.*
10. *The Drawing Index should note all plans to be recorded, including the sheet bearing the Drawing Index, PCSM Plans, and any other plans that may be required for recording.*
11. *Ultimately, all certifications by the property owners, engineer and surveyor who prepared the plan should be signed, sealed, and notarized, as appropriate, when the plan is presented to the Township for execution and recording per SALDO §22-503.3.J, §22-503.5.C, §22-503.3.L, and §22-503.5.A*
12. *The following approvals should be received prior to the recording of the plan:*
 - a. *Certification for the on-lot sewage disposal system from the Township Sewage Enforcement Officer per SALDO §22-503.4.A.*
 - b. *PADEP approval for the stormwater discharge into the unnamed tributary to the Hokendauqua Creek where it crosses Twin Brook Road, if required per SALDO §22-503.4.B.*
 - c. *An agreement and security to secure the completion of the required improvements per SALDO §22-503.4.E.*
 - d. *Approval of the E&S Plan by the Northampton County Conservation District per SALDO §22-503.4.F.*
 - e. *Approval of an NPDES Permit for construction per SALDO §22-503.4.G.*
 - f. *Easement documents and drawings per SALDO §22-503.I.*

Plans submitted to outside agencies for approval (i.e., PennDOT, NCCD, PADEP) must be supplied to the Township for review prior to or concurrent with each submission to the outside agencies. Waivers and variances may not be granted for 'situations' created by outside agency approvals that were not previously reviewed and approved by the Township.

13. *A plan to be recorded should include the street addresses for the lot, buildings or facilities as assigned by the Township per SALDO §22-503.K."*

Mr. Check stated that the main entrance to the property will be located across from Twinbrook Road. He reported that a pre-scoping meeting with PennDOT has been completed and PennDOT has provided their suggestions. Mr. Check intends to resubmit to PennDOT for determination if a scoping meeting is required. Allen Township will be copied on all updates and correspondence. Mr. Check questioned the ordinance that requires a 12-foot cartway and an 8-foot paved shoulder on Old Carriage Road and School Road. Mr. Wojciechowski further explained the requirements for non-residential use. Mr. Wojciechowski also clarified a typographical error in the letter regarding School Road and its incorrect designation as a Collector Road rather than a Local Road.

Mr. Check explained that he has no rights to the agricultural security area and therefore cannot give that land for right-of-way. Mr. Check stated that their attorney will be present at the next meeting to further discuss this. Mr. Check stated that there would be an isolated strip with an 8-foot shoulder. Mr. Treadwell recommended that Mr. Check request a waiver.

Mr. Behler expressed his concerns with School Road and the use of agricultural vehicles and traffic from special events. Mr. Check stated that the only agricultural vehicles are already on the property and will be contained to the property with the exception for travel to and from annual vehicle inspections. Mr. Check also explained that the only horse trailers on the roadway will be to bring the rescue horses to the property for the remainder of their lives and to remove them from the property at the end of their lives. No boarding of horses will be conducted at the property and there will be no commercial uses of horse riding. Mr. Check explained that address for the property will be Old Carriage Road.

The special event center will be for all types of special events including weddings, birthday parties, private picnics, family events, chamber of commerce events, etc. Mr. Behler questioned the possible winery use in the future and the size of the winery in terms of the traffic that it may draw and the parking that it may require. Mr. Check explained that they have reviewed the minimum requirements according to the ordinance and exceeded it in order to look towards the future possibilities.

Mr. Wojciechowski requested turning templates be provided for trailers and other vehicles accessing the property from School Road. This is to insure that vehicles will not need to cross into the on-coming lane to make the turn. Mr. Check questioned the length of the longest fire truck at Allen Township Fire Department so that they may template accordingly. Mr. Behler recommended accounting for any mutual aid trucks. Mr. Wojciechowski recommended that Mr. Check direct the question to Mr. Hassler, the Fire Chief. The plan will be reviewed by Mr. Hassler. Mr. Check will also need direction from Mr. Hassler regarding a Knox Box.

Mr. Check explained the stormwater plan for the project and the created waterways. All ponds will be wet ponds and maintain a minimum of 4-feet of water at all times. The ponds will be well-fed to a certain level. Ponds "B" and "C" will capture stormwater. A natural waterway will be created to transfer water into Pond "A" allowing the water level to equalize between Ponds "A" and "B". The water will then discharge down Twinbrook Road into a tributary. An aerator will be added to the one pond to beautify the property and provide a water noise for visitors. Mr. Behler questioned if keeping the water on the property is possible in order to avoid water going onto Twinbrook Road. Mr. Krill questioned how water will be maintained if it is continuously flowing. Mr. Check explained that the well will only be used to refill the pond. A 100 gallon per minute well pump will only be used when a wet switch is activated to bring the water level back up. The water leaving the property will be piped directly down to the stream. Mike Sodl, engineer at Vertek Construction Management, explained that currently the stormwater leaves the property and enters the storm sewer by the intersection and other storm sewers nearby. Whispering Hollow Mobile Home Park has their own MS4 and Mr. Sodl reports being directed to stay away from this area by the Township Engineer. Mr. Sodl explained the stormwater plan in additional detail.

Mr. Check requested the Commission's feedback regarding pond waivers. He reiterated that the ponds will be wet with 4-5 feet of water and the water static level will be controlled. They are proposing a 2:1 slope from the water level down with flat bottoms which will be stabilized with river rock. Above grade, outside the water they propose a 4:1 slope. Mr. Check will also be requesting a waiver from fencing. Mr. Wojciechowski expressed his concerns for safety with these waiver requests and would recommend a safety ledge in lieu of the fence. Mr. Check stated that this was a great suggestion and they will take this under consideration. Mr. Behler did not have any concerns with these waiver requests as long as the proper safety measures are put in place. Mr. Check also explained that proper measures will be taken and coordinated with the Township to ensure geese are kept out of the ponds.

Mr. Wojciechowski also questioned if Mr. Check will be requesting a waiver for the 10-foot wide access ramp. Mr. Check stated there will only be 2.5 feet from the top of the berm to the water level and will be seeking a variance for this.

Mr. Check spoke of the parking requirements and completing the ITE-970 for special events. Parking will be provided for 140 spaces while the ordinance only requires 90 parking spaces. The dumpster pads will reduce parking spaces by 4. He reports that PennDOT has classified this to be a low volume driveway.

Mr. Behler questioned the plan for sanitary sewer. He expressed concerned with the special events requiring additional planning. Mr. Check provided an update regarding perc tests and soil probes. He is in contact with the Township Sewage Enforcement Officer. Mr. Check explained that there is a primary and secondary system. The system has been designed to the maximum per SALDO with 20% added. The secondary system will be an at grade drip system due to its location in the agricultural preservation part of the property which prohibits raised mound systems. The primary system will be located behind the cell tower and the secondary system will be behind the barn. Mr. Check noted that a grinder pump will be placed at every building. As far as the well, Mr. Check explained that it was tested and it was determined to be 102-gallons per minute. An additional well will be drilled to the north of the large building for domestic water.

Mr. Check stated that he will also require outside approval, PennDOT, E&S, and Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. Mr. Check requested scheduling a workshop meeting with the Township Manager and Township Engineer. Mr. Check explained that they will revise the plans with the engineers and submit a resubmission.

Public to be Heard: No public comment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:41PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ilene M. Eckhart