



Allen Township Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes January 27th, 2025 6:00 P.M.

A **General Meeting** of the Allen Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, January 27th, 2025, at 6:00 P.M. at the Allen Township Municipal Building, located at 4714 Indian Trail Road, Northampton, PA. Gary Behler led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Roll Call:

Present: Gary Behler; Gary Krill; Felipe Resendez, Jr.; B. Lincoln Treadwell, Jr. Esq. Solicitor; Layla Denissen, Engineer (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc); Ilene M. Eckhart, Manager; James Young, Zoning Officer

Absent: David Austin; Paul Link; Andrea Martin, EIT (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.); Stan Wojciechowski, PE, CME, Engineer (Barry Isett & Associates, Inc.)

2025 Reorganization: Mr. Krill stated that the Supervisors indicated during their reorganization meeting that the Chairman and Vice Chairman should change every year. Mr. Krill indicated that he felt that no one else wished to be Chairman. Mr. Krill made a motion to nominate Mr. David Austin as Chairman; seconded by Mr. Resendez. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Mr. Behler made a motion to nominate Mr. Paul Link as Vice Chairman; seconded by Mr. Resendez. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Minutes: Mr. Krill made a motion to approve the minutes from December 16th, 2024; seconded by Mr. Resendez. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Public to be Heard: There was no public to be heard.

Business Items:

- A. **Willow Ridge Estates (Savage Rd.) Major Subdivision Preliminary/Final (90 day 2/22/2025):** Mr. Rocco Caracciolo introduced himself as working for Jaindl Land Company and discussed the reasoning behind the plan's absence during the last meetings. He stated that the comments from Barry Isett's review letter dated January 24, 2024 are will comply. Ms. Denissen stated that Barry Isett did not have anything to highlight except for the waivers. Mr. Behler questioned if they saw all the comments and can abide by them. Mr. Caracciolo indicated that was correct. Mr. Krill questioned if the future owners of Lot 4 would be able to build structures such as a shed or pool. He expressed concerns for the floodplain. Ms. Denissen indicated that they would not be able to build. Mr. Krill summarized that Lot 4 would not allow the owner to build anything because of the floodplain taking up most of the lot. Mr. Caracciolo stated it would depend on what size house they choose. He explained that one of the problems with the property

being by the creek, is that there is a very high water table and that was one of the lots that had a more favorable infiltration rate. Mr. Krill expressed concerns for people who would buy the lot and not realize they cannot build on the lot. He worried that if they do not realize this and come back to the Township, then the Township will have a problem. He stated that he would like the buyers to know that they cannot put anything on the property when they go to purchase the lot. Ms. Denissen added that there is a drainage easement that encompasses the whole basin that the future owner would need to be aware of. Ms. Eckhart questioned if there is an ability to have fencing in the basin area. Mr. Lew Rauch, Engineer of Lehigh Engineering Associates, Inc., stated that there could be a fence around it and that there is room to work so that items could be around the perimeter of it. Mr. Caracciolo stated that they can put notes on the plan and record sheet stating that accessory structures cannot be built. Mr. Treadwell questioned Mr. Caracciolo if there could be a declaration of covenants and restricts for the entire project that gets recorded before anybody gets a deed. Mr. Caracciolo stated that was correct. Mr. Treadwell explained that the declaration would state what the property owner can and cannot do. Mr. Behler questioned if the Planning Commission would need to add the declaration of covenants into a condition. Mr. Caracciolo indicated that the declaration of covenants would be a fair condition and will be completed to the satisfaction of the Township Solicitor and Township Staff.

Mr. Behler questioned if the waiver requests should be gone through one by one. Mr. Treadwell indicated that they could go through them if they want to, however, he did not believe that the Barry Isett Office had any issues with the waiver requests. Mr. Treadwell summarized the waiver requests from the Barry Isett & Associates, Inc. letter dated January 24th, 2024:

"1. SALDO Part 3 §22-306 and §22-307 to accept and review the subdivision plan as a Preliminary/Final. The section reference should only be from SALDO §22-307.3. If approved by the Board of Supervisors, the Waiver Requested Note 4 on the drawing should be revised to reflect SALDO §22-307.3 only. We defer to the Planning Commission to review this request.

2. SALDO §22-411.4 which prohibits residential driveway access to a collector street. We have no objection to this request.

3. SALDO §22-409 which requires sidewalk along streets. A bituminous walking path is proposed along Willowbrook Road in lieu of a concrete sidewalk. This walking path utilizes the existing pedestrian bridge of the Dry Run that was previously constructed with the Willow Ridge development. Concrete sidewalks are proposed along the frontage of all lots on Savage Road. We defer to the Planning Commission to review this request.

4. SALDO §22-411.2.E which requires lot depth to be between 1 to 2-1/2 times lot width wherever feasible. The maximum depth to width ratio of 3.5:1 is proposed. We have no objection to this request.

5. SMO §8-224.15 which requires the impervious coverage used for stormwater management designs be the maximum impervious coverage allotted per the zoning ordinance. The applicant is requesting a partial waiver from this requirement to allow the impervious coverage used for the stormwater management design to be based on the zoning requirement for only the area outside of the existing floodplain. We have no objection to this request.

6. SALDO §22-406.J which requires two 12-foot traffic lanes and two 8-foot shoulders on Willowbrook Road. We defer to the Planning Commission to review this request.”

Mr. Krill made a motion to recommend approval of the waivers; seconded by Mr. Resendez. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Mr. Behler stated that they had some discussion about the end property on the corner of Savage and Willowbrook Road, specifically where it goes up to the trail. Mr. Behler questioned if there were any outstanding issues regarding the walking trail. Mr. Treadwell stated that it is discussed in the Barry Isett letter dated January 24th, 2024. Mr. Treadwell indicated that he believed that it was explained that the trail will need to be investigated and to make sure that the owner of lot 8 knows that there is a trail going through the property that the public will have access to. Ms. Denissen stated that comment 8, a, b, and c from the Barry Isett Letter dated January 24th, 2024 discusses the proposed walking path and the easements with the walkway. Mr. Behler questioned if there was a consensus on the winter maintenance. Mr. Caracciolo stated that it is a bituminous trail path and it was discussed if it would be required to have winter maintenance. Mr. Behler questioned if the maintenance needed to be on the property title. Mr. Treadwell stated that it should be on the declaration of covenants and restrictions. He explained that the declaration will allow the property owners of lot 8 to know that they are responsible for winter maintenance on that portion of the trail. Mr. Behler questioned if there would be an issue adding the trail to the declaration. Mr. Caracciolo stated that they did not have an issue.

Mr. Resendez stated that he would like to make a motion to recommend preliminary/final plan approval. Mr. Treadwell stated that the motion would be to recommend preliminary/final plan approval with the conditions that they clean up the plans as much as possible before it goes to the Board of Supervisors and to submit the draft declaration of covenants and restrictions for Township review before it goes to the Board of Supervisors, as well as meeting all the comments in the Barry Isett review letter of January 24th, 2024. Mr. Resendez made a motion to recommend approval as stated by the Township Solicitor; seconded by Mr. Krill. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

B. Dollar General (Cherryville Rd.) Land Development Preliminary/Final (90 day 4/24/2025): Mr. William Owen of Penntex Ventures introduced himself and Mr. Dennis J. Reichel, PE, LEED AP. Mr. Owen indicated that they have been in contact with Barry Isett and discussed the waiver requests. Mr. Owen stated that in the Barry Isett letter dated January 24th, 2025, the waiver requests were commented on. He stated that Penntex does not have any objection to them. He stated that they would make adjustments to three waivers which would allow them to not need the waivers. Mr. Owen explained that they will work to address the maintenance concerns as well as the easements. Mr. Owen stated that Penntex will comply with placing a sidewalk at the front of the property where the access driveway is. He indicated that they added the sidewalk to the back of the building as well. Mr. Behler questioned where the rear sidewalk is shown on the plan. Mr. Reichel indicated that Mr. Behler is viewing an older plan and explained where the rear sidewalk would be located on the new plans. Mr. Owen stated that the rear sidewalk would be located at the southern end of the property. Mr. Owen stated that they received the project's technical review letter on January 27th, 2025, which is in regard to the NPDES.

Mr. Behler expressed interest in discussing the site's buffering. Mr. Behler questioned what the buffering would look like around the residential areas and questioned what the southern side of the property would look like. Mr. Owen stated that they were in compliance with the buffering criteria. He

stated that they would need to figure out what the width of the easement would be, which will allow them to figure out what can be planted, however, they will cover the area with as much buffering as possible. He stated that the buffering is subject to change once the lateral location is discovered. He stated the lateral will determine if any trees will need to be moved and a shrub planted in its original location. Mr. Behler indicated that previously, Mr. Krill brought up the sidewalk on Cherryville Road and the property owner next to the Dollar General. Mr. Behler indicated that he is aware that there will be some involvement from the Township and possibly the property owner. Mr. Owen stated that he is willing to make the sidewalk installation on the neighboring property a condition as long as they have permission from the property owner. Mr. Behler stated that he believed that from a Township perspective, that they are trying to reach out and contact the property owner. Mr. Owen stated that he would need to figure out the grading. He stated that they could write a check for the estimated amount of the sidewalk installation and have the Township employees install it. Mr. Treadwell stated that the Township does not have the staff to install the sidewalk. Mr. Treadwell stated the condition would have to be that the Township gets all the permissions necessary to install the sidewalk. He added that the only issue would be PennDOT. Mr. Owen stated that they would take care of the PennDOT aspect. Mr. Treadwell stated that the Township will work with the property owner to obtain all of the permission. He stated that it would make sense to have one contractor install the sidewalk. Mr. Behler questioned if Dollar General would have winter maintenance in place on their portion of the sidewalk. Mr. Owen indicated that is correct.

Ms. Denissen indicated that she wanted to discuss the three waivers from the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, which read as follows:

“11. SMO § 8-229.9.J, which requires stormwater basin spillways to be directed away from residential dwellings. To protect downstream properties, a spillway and grading should be provided. Should the overflow structure fail, water should be conveyed off the property so as not impact neighboring residential properties. Therefore, we do not recommend this waiver be approved.

12. SMO § 8-231.8.B, which requires the spillways for BMP’s 1 and 3 to convey the 100-year event and be protected from erosion. Any spillway conveying basin overflows should be protected from erosion. Therefore, we do not recommend this waiver be approved.

13. SMO § 8-231.8.F, which requires a basin fence when within 25 feet of a nonresidential building. Given the residential character of the neighborhood, we do not recommend this waiver be approved.”

She stated that if Dollar General is no longer requesting the three waivers, then that was fine. Mr. Treadwell questioned if there are only eight waivers being requested. Mr. Owen stated as per Barry Isett’s letter, the waivers requested are numbers three to eight. Ms. Denissen discussed items one and two on the Barry Isett Letter dated, January 23rd, 2025, which read as follows:

“1. The Owner of the 5-foot-wide sanitary lateral easement should review and approve the work being done within the easement. The proposed grades over this narrow easement range between 2.5:1 and 3.8:1. This may make maintaining the lateral in a 5-foot-wide easement difficult if not impossible.

2. We recommend a walkway be provided from the sidewalk on Cherryville Road to allow pedestrian access to the store from Cherryville Road.”

Ms. Denissen stated that the 5-foot-wide easement has concerns due to the proposed steeper slopes, interfering with the access to the sanitary lateral. She stated that if it would need to be dug for replacement or repaired it would be difficult as they would need more access. She stated that the owner of the lateral would need to find the new easement passable. Lastly, she noted the walkway on the property’s frontage. Mr. Owen indicated that they were fine with both comments.

Mr. Resendez made a motion to approve all the waivers; seconded by Mr. Krill. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Mr. Behler summarized the waiver requests from the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, which read as follows:

“3. SALDO § 22-306, which requires separate submission of preliminary and final plans. We defer to the Planning Commission to evaluate this request.

4. SMO § 8-224.3, which requires a freeboard of 1.0 feet for the 25-year storm and 0.5 feet for the 50- and 100-year storm events between the water surface and the invert of the spillway. Additional analysis was provided showing that back-to-back 100-year event storms can be contained in the BMP-3 without overtopping. We have no objection to this request.

5. SMO § 8-229.9 which requires certain loading ratios of drainage shed area to an infiltration area. The Applicant’s Geotechnical Engineer has reviewed this requirement and we have no objection to this request.

6. SMO § 8-229.9.B(2)b, which establishes setbacks from basin to building foundations. The Applicant’s Geotechnical Engineer has reviewed this requirement and we have no objection to this request.

7. SMO § 8-229.9.B(2)h, which requires a basin to be offset 50 feet from a right-of-way line. We have no objection to this request.

8. SMO § 8-231.8.F(5), establishes a setback from the water surface in basins and buildings during certain storms. The Applicant’s Geotechnical Engineer has reviewed this requirement and we have no objection to this request.

9. SMO § 8-231.8.I, requires a basin to have an access ramp for maintenance equipment access. We have no objection to this request.

10. SMO § 8-232.2, sets a minimum velocity of three feet per second for flow in a storm pipe. The PCSM Plan notes that if necessary this storm line will be flushed. Therefore, we have no objection to this request.”

Mr. Krill made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors with all the comments

in the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025 as well as the additional conditions that were discussed and cleaning the plans up; seconded by Mr. Resendez. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Mr. Treadwell stated that on the Willow Ridge Estates, Barry Isett's letter was dated January 24th, 2024, the date should have been January 24th, 2025.

C. Syncarpha Allen I Solar Farm (Kreidersville Rd.) Land Development Prelim. (90 day 3/27/2025):

Mr. Christopher Sespico, PE, introduced himself along with a Syncarpha representative, who was not named in the meeting. He indicated that there is a list of waivers that they were requesting. Mr. Treadwell stated that there were six waivers being requested. Mr. Treadwell stated that Barry Isett indicated that Syncarpha does not have waivers numbered three and four from the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, which read as follows:

"3. SALDO §22-502.5.A which requires will-serve letters from water and sewer supply utilities. This waiver request is not applicable as the site is not in public water and sewer service areas and potable water use is not necessary for the proposed land development.

4. SALDO §22-502.5.B which requires a completed Land Development Planning Module. This waiver request is not applicable because a no planning determination satisfies the ordinance."

Mr. Treadwell explained that there are only four waivers on the Barry Isett letter, which read as follows:

"1. SALDO §22-402.C, §22-402.D, §22-409, and §22-406.J which require curbs and sidewalks along Kreidersville Road and Spring Hill Road.

2. SALDO §22-412.3 and §22-406.H which require a cartway width of 40 feet and a right-of-way width of 60 feet for Kreidersville Road and Spring Hill Road.

5. SALDO §22-502.6.A.3 which requires a formal notation regarding notice of onlot sewer permit requirements. We have no objection to this request.

6. SALDO §22-502.6.A.4 which requires a formal notation regarding notice of lack of guarantee for onlot well water adequacy. We have no objection to this request."

Mr. Sespico questioned comment seven from the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, which read as follows:

"7. The centerline of the driveway should be at least 200 feet from the intersection of Kreidersville Road and Covered Bridge Road per ZO §27-1413.B(6b). The Zoning Officer should review this requirement."

Mr. Treadwell stated that he spoke with the Township's Zoning Officer, Mr. James Young. Mr. Treadwell stated that they felt that the driveway is pre-existing and that the comment could be answered with a notation that it is a pre-existing driveway with a pre-existing access point. Mr. Sespico referenced number

8 and 9 from the Barry Isett review letter dated January 23rd, 2025, which read as follows:

“8. The access drive should be paved with a dust-free material acceptable to the Board of Supervisors per ZO §27-1413.B(7).

9. The access drive should be less than 28 feet wide at the property line and curbed at the street line per ZO §27-1413.B(8). This section allows the Board of Supervisors to modify these requirements.”

He stated that they are proposing the access drive to be compacted with a stone material. Mr. Behler questioned if the stone material is considered to be dust free. Ms. Eckhart stated that there maybe a PennDOT requirement to have the access drive be paved so far off the right-of-way. Mr. Sespico stated that both Allen I and Allen II projects will be paved at the entrances of the access points. Ms. Denissen stated that clarification is needed on the plans on what type of stone will be used. She explained that the stone type, 2A has fines in it and questioned if they would be willing to use some other type of stone. Mr. Sespico questioned if the stone type 57 would be preferable as it has a higher coarse grade. Ms. Denissen indicated that was acceptable.

Mr. Sespico stated that they are requesting a waiver for curbing requirements. He stated that the width of the access will be designed to meet minimum PennDOT standards. Mr. Behler stated that comment 9 will need to go to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Treadwell stated that was correct, however, he felt that there would not be a problem with it as the property would be visited a few times a year. Mr. Young questioned if there would be enough room for the gate to be open without blocking the roadway. Mr. Behler stated that the vehicles and trailers will need to be off of the roadway. The Syncarpha representative stated that they would make sure that there is enough room for trailer and mowing equipment to get into the property.

Mr. Sespico read comment ten and fifteen from the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025 which read as follows:

“10. Per ZO §27-1407.H(5) a note should be added to a plan to be recorded indicating that after installation of the solar panels, if there is any glare that poses a safety risk for drivers, the developer shall remediate the glare.

15. An easement should be dedicated to the Township along the 100-year floodplain boundary of Hokendauqua Creek per SMO §8-231.2.”

Mr. Sespico noted that a glare study has been performed and if there is any glare it will be mitigated. For comment 15, he questioned what kind of easement is needed. Mr. Treadwell stated that they should show the floodplain line on the plan. Mr. Treadwell stated that if the Township was planning on building something in the floodplain area, they would want an easement, however, he felt that the Township would not be doing anything or maintaining the area therefore an easement would not be necessary. Mr. Sespico indicated that in the Plan Presentation section of the January 23rd, 2025 Barry Isett letter, they will adjust the plans accordingly.

Mr. Krill questioned if there would be units that make noise. He asked what they were and how many would there be. Mr. Sespico explained that the units are the invertors. He elucidated that the panels

create DC electricity, the inverter converts it from DC to AC. He stated that there will be about two dozen of the string inverters. He explained that they will be dispersed throughout the solar farm and if they break, it would mean they would be replaced like a hot swap. He stated that they are about the same size as a window A/C unit and they are about the same noise level too, at about 55 to 60 decibels. He stated that at the property line, they will not be heard because they are located at the center. He explained that noise will only be heard during the day and not at night due to the inverters shutting off. He stated that the transformer will make a low buzz sound at around 70 decibels and that will be located at the entrance of the site.

Ms. Eckhart questioned if the fence would be installed prior to the installation of the solar panels. The Syncarpha representative stated that typically they are installed prior to installation, however, he was not sure if phasing was provided for this project. Mr. Krill stated that the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission indicated that as many trees as possible need to be kept. Mr. Sespico indicated that on the drawing that is being presented tonight the areas that are in pink are trees that will be removed as necessary and anything outside of the pink areas will remain.

Mr. Resendez made a motion to recommend approval for waivers one, two, five, and six as stated in the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025; seconded by Mr. Krill. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Mr. Treadwell questioned if they were seeking a waiver for preliminary/final plan approval. Mr. Sespico stated yes. Ms. Denissen indicated the waiver request would be for SALDO §22-306 and 307 and would be to accept review of the plans as preliminary/final. Mr. Resendez made a motion to recommend approval of the waiver for preliminary/final plan as stated by the Township Engineer; seconded by Mr. Krill. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Mr. Behler made a motion to recommend approval of the Syncarpha Allen I Solar Project with all the waivers that the Planning Commission approved as long as it meets all the conditions in the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, and in addition recommend approval by the Board of Supervisors as it relates to the zoning item #9 on the Barry Isett letter for the zoning requirement relating to the 28-foot wide at the property line and curb at the street line; seconded by Mr. Resendez. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

D. Syncarpha Allen II Solar Farm (63 Spring Hill Rd.) Land Development Prelim. (90 day 3/27/2025): Mr. Sespico stated that the comments for the Barry Isett letter dating January 23rd, 2025 are similar to the ones from the Allen I project. Mr. Behler questioned if waivers three and four were needed. Mr. Treadwell stated that they were not. Mr. Behler questioned if they wanted to add a waiver for preliminary/final plan review. Mr. Sespico stated yes.

Mr. Krill questioned about the noise and if the one house on the property and the neighboring house would have any noise from the inverters. Mr. Sespico stated that the homes would be close to the solar panels but not the inverters. Mr. Sespico stated that he can make it a condition to not have inverters in the area near the homes. He explained that it is preferred to have the inverters towards the middle of the farm. Mr. Behler questioned if Mr. Krill would like to add that as a condition. Mr. Krill stated if they say they typically place the inverters in the center of the farm then he felt that there was no need for a condition.

Mr. Resendez made a motion to approve waivers one, two, five, and six as stated in the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, as well as the waiver for preliminary/final plan approval as it relates to SALDO §22-306; seconded by Mr. Behler. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Ms. Denissen stated that she wishes to highlight comments seven through nine from the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, which reads as follows:

“7. The access drive should be paved at least to the intersection of the driveway to the residential dwellings and the driveway to the equipment pad area. The material used for the remainder of the access drive should be a dust-free material acceptable to the Board of Supervisors per ZO §27-1413.B(7).

8. The grade of the access drive should not exceed 10 percent per ZO §27-1413.B(5b). The Zoning Officer should review this requirement.

9. The access drive should be less than 28 feet wide at the property line and curbed at the street line per ZO §27-1413.B(8). This section allows the Board of Supervisors to modify these requirements.”

Ms. Denissen stated that for number seven, Barry Isett recommends that up until the intersection where the access drive splits to the residence and to the solar facility it would be paved with asphalt or concrete to address erosion concerns, and then the rest can be stone 57 past the entrance of the solar farm gate. The Syncarpha questioned if the asphalt would change the impervious calculation for the NPDS. Mr. Sespico indicated that the NPDS requires all stone material to be considered as pavement, meaning it may not make a difference. Mr. Sespico discussed outlets, culverts, and basins that are designed to account for all of the erosion that’s coming down from the slope. He explained that they are proposing a rip rap ditch on the side of the access point to collect the stormwater and direct it to the ditch and then the culvert. Ms. Eckhart questioned who would be responsible for maintaining the driveway. Mr. Sespico indicated that they would be responsible up until their site. Ms. Denissen questioned if there was any objection to bringing the pavement up to where the grave roadside ditch, labeled as RD 1, ends. She stated that there is another stormwater comment about the LOD, which seeks clarification that there would not be any disturbance in that area. She stated that if the steep slopes are disturbed then it could cause more erosion and more of a stormwater issue. Mr. Sespico questioned which area she was referencing. Ms. Denissen stated it is the area that is highlighted in the Barry Isett, January 23rd, 2025 letter. Mr. Sespico stated that he was not anticipating any clearings in that area and it would remain as a meadow. Mr. Behler questioned what the rationale was for not paving up to where Ms. Denissen is suggesting. The Syncarpha representative stated they were not sure if that paving would address the stormwater concerns. Ms. Denissen stated that they are proposing to pave about 75 feet from the roadway. She indicated that there are stormwater measures in places, such as the swales along the up-slope side of the access drive and then pipes underneath so that the stormwater does not flow across the access driveway and into the road as it does now. The Syncarpha representative questioned if the material 2B would be helpful with erosion. Ms. Denissen stated that if the erosion is coming from upstream, the 2B would fill in with fines and there still would be an issue down at the street. She said stone and pavement would be less likely to erode than what is currently there. Ms. Eckhart questioned if there were any water bars on the driveway itself that are being installed as diversions to help slow the water volume down. Mr. Sespico explained that the idea is to regrade the land to the one side so that all of the water goes to where it is designed to go, as opposed to the water bars directing it.

Mr. Young stated that it appears that the stormwater channelizes along the road. Mr. Treadwell indicated that the issue is debris getting into the road. Mr. Treadwell stated that based on what is being proposed, there will be 75 feet of pavement before you get to the road and then above the pavement, stone. He indicated that the only item that's ever going to get to the road if there is enough water velocity would be the stone. Ms. Denissen requested that the paving area be clearly marked. Mr. Young questioned if under normal circumstances would Syncarpha be responsible for cleaning up any erosion. Mr. Sespico indicated that would be something to include in the O&M requirements and recording that with the deed.

Ms. Denissen indicated that she wished to discuss item eight on the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025. Ms. Denissen explained that the driveway is preexisting and is following existing grades. Mr. Treadwell indicated that they should place a note on the plans stating that it is a preexisting driveway. Mr. Behler questioned if the driveway is preexisting that means that they do not need to meet the requirement. Mr. Treadwell indicated that is correct. Mr. Treadwell questioned if the number nine would be similar to the Allen 1 project with the property line. Ms. Denissen stated that was correct. She added that Barry Isett would also like to have the plans to show any existing right of way where the property line is. Mr. Sespico questioned which item she was referring to on the Barry Isett letter. Ms. Denissen stated it is item 31 on the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025, which reads as follows:

“31. Final plans should show centerline, cartway width, and right-of-way width of Kreidersville Road and Spring Hill Road per SALDO §22-502.3.A.”

Mr. Sespico stated that they would comply. Mr. Sespico indicated that in the comments, there was a clear sight triangle and what was depicted in the zoning ordinance is different than what PennDOT requires. He explained that the site triangle was going to be far back off the road and that the assumption that the entire triangle needed to be clear seems to be excessive for 75 feet as opposed to the PennDOT's 10 feet off of the cartway. Ms. Denissen stated it is because the driveway is considered an access drive which is why the large site triangle would be required. Mr. Treadwell stated that there would only be about twelve trips a year and the site would not be busy like a McDonald's where cars are pulling in and out every day. Mr. Treadwell stated that they should work it out where they can get the clearest site triangle that they can obtain. Mr. Krill stated only a few people will be driving on the road because it will be turned into a cul-de-sac. Ms. Denissen indicated that the PennDOT requirement would be okay. Mr. Sespico indicated that the County Conservation District submittal has been made and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission comments have also been received and will be addressed.

Mr. Resendiz made a motion to recommend approval for the preliminary/final plan approval for the Syncarpha Allen II Solar Farm as it relates to the Barry Isett letter dated January 23rd, 2025; seconded by Mr. Krill. On the motion, by roll call vote, all present Commissioners voted yes.

Mr. Behler questioned if at a Board of Supervisors meeting, could there be a discussion about reviewing the Township standards. He indicated that as they saw tonight, the PennDOT sight triangles are different from the Township's and he felt that it would be beneficial to start reviewing typical routine waivers.

Public to be Heard: There was no public to be heard.

Announcements: Mr. Behler announced that the next Planning Commission meeting will take place on Monday, February 24th, 2025, at 6:00 PM at the Allen Township Municipal Building located at 4714 Indian Trail

Road, Northampton, PA.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amber R. Averbek