

**TOWNSHIP OF SALISBURY
LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

**7:30 PM
January 8, 2013**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Salisbury was held at the Township Municipal Building located at 2900 South Pike Avenue, Allentown, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania. Present were Commissioners Miller, Hebelka, Hassick, McKitish and Beck. Also present were Attorney Christopher Gittinger, Alternate Township Solicitor; Mr. Tettermer, Township Engineer; Ms. Sopka, Director of Planning & Zoning. Mr. Soriano, Township Manager and Commissioners Licht and Schreiter were (excused) not present.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Beck called the meeting to order.

RE-ORGANIZATION OF OFFICERS

On motion of Mr. Hassick, seconded by Mr. McKitish, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 to nominate Mr. Charles Beck as Chairman of the Planning Commission. All in favor.

On motion of Mr. Hebelka, seconded by Mr. Miller, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 to nominate Mr. Stephen McKitish as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission. All in favor.

On motion of Mr. McKitish, seconded by Mr. Hassick, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 to nominate Mr. Joseph Hebelka as Secretary of the Planning Commission. All in favor.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

On motion of Mr. McKitish, seconded by Mr. Hassick, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 to approve the December 11, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as submitted. All in favor.

Review the proposed amendments to Salisbury Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance as prepared by Urban Research Development Corporation (URDC).

Mr. Schmehl provided a series of revisions that were discussed from last month's meeting.

There was discussion regarding above-ground and underground detention basins, the construction specifications of the basins and the need to keep this land as open space. Mr. Schmehl stated that normally parking lots are placed over detention basins requiring the construction specifications to be strong enough to hold the weight of a fire truck or service vehicles. Mr. Tettermer stated that no vehicular activity would take place over the detention basins and under SALDO the detention basin section should be considered part of maintenance whether it is above-ground or underground. Mr. McKitish believes this section needs to be defined explicitly and addressed properly so that nothing impacts the basins (i.e. trees, fence posts, etc.).

Infiltration was discussed. This is an important issue as the Township wants to prevent the possibility of new sink holes. Mr. Tettermer stated that the Township is responsible for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permitting. If the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) states that a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is required for site development, the site has to be maintained to prevent the Township from MS4 violation. Mr. Tettermer stated since the Ordinance is being

updated, infiltration should be included and also note that agreements will be required and reviewed. Mr. Tetterer stated he would look further into infiltration for more specifics.

Mr. Schmehl responded to Mr. Tetterer's January 3, 2013 comment review letter. Mr. Schmehl stated that all items have been addressed however there are some that require discussion.

Mr. Tetterer stated that the Township needs to incorporate square footage for projects less than 5,000 square feet. Any project less than 5,000 square feet should be submitted with a grading permit application and plan, erosion control plan and be reviewed by the Township Engineer as a small project. Projects that are 5,000 square feet or more automatically get reviewed by the Lehigh County Conservation District (LCCD).

Mr. Tetterer discussed cartway size and off street parking. He stated that the existing Ordinance has a 30 foot wide cartway to the curb. He stated that the MS4 Best Management Practice (BMP) requires limitation on the amount of impervious surface if applicable. Mr. Tetterer believes that in a residential area where there is minimal on street parking expected to consider reducing the cartway from 30 feet to 28 feet wide. Mr. McKitish believes that reducing the width of a street could cause parking problems especially when parking is on both sides of the street. Mr. McKitish stated that depending on the area it is not a "one size fits all" and the Township needs to be mindful of what the issues are within particular zoning areas. It was discussed that the cartway should be clarified around density diversity per zoning.

Mr. Tetterer stated his concern for redevelopment. As redevelopment takes place there may be situations where what is now "less dense, becomes more dense". In that aspect, Mr. Tetterer stated that there needs to be a way to make the parking work in the purposed development and request the developer to adjust their development plan to meet reasonable parking restrictions for on and off street parking. Mr. Schmehl recommended using the standard 30 feet as the standard requirement for curbed streets and 34 foot wide streets for apartments, townhouses or narrowed single family lots.

Mr. Tetterer stated that the Planning Commission will have the discussion and provide recommendations of on street parking and the location of it for each purposed development. In that, with the recommendations of the Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners will make the final determination where on street parking is acceptable. He believes one side of the road is preferred to both sides.

Ms. Sopka stated she would like the Department of Public Works and the Salisbury Township Police to review and make recommendations in regards to the streets, street widths and the accessibility of emergency vehicles for this portion of the SALDO.

Cul-de-sacs were discussed. Mr. McKitish stated that there needs to be a secondary means of ingress/egress for emergency purposes and public safety. Discussion ensued on the frontage setback requirements, per lot, for each zoning district including the length of the street. The members agreed to keep the existing Ordinance as addressed.

Driveways were discussed. There should be one driveway to one dwelling unit, commercial unit and institution/industrial principle uses. The size of driveway could depend on the size of the lot per development.

Mr. Tetterer discussed the importance of separation between street trees and utility easements. He provided a few recommendations, e.g. to keep the utilities in the right-of-way of the road and allow the street tree easement behind the right-of-way, etc.

Floodplains were discussed. Mr. Tetteimer stated that floodplains need to be defined so when it is reviewed they can abide by the Ordinance. Mr. Schmehl recommended requiring a floodplain study where there is not a defined floodplain. The members discussed to consider all waterways, ponds, streams, etc.

Mr. Hebelka believes that on-lot water systems, private well location installation requirements, pump tests, monitoring drawn, and interference on adjacent wells should all be looked into. Mr. Hebelka will provide additional information for reference in regards to this issue.

Mr. Schmehl concluded advising the members that he has asked Pidcock Company to provide any comments and resident's concerns in regards to the neighborhood meetings with Lehigh Valley Health Network (LVHN).

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commission voted to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned. All in favor.