

**TOWNSHIP OF SALISBURY
LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

**7:30 PM
August 13, 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, Licht, Schreiter, Hebelka, Hassick and Beck. Also present were Attorney Ashley, Township Solicitor; Mr. Tetterer, Township Engineer; Ms. Sopka, Director of Planning & Zoning and Mr. Soriano, Township Manager. Commissioner McKitish was not present (excused).

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Beck called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

On motion of Dr. Licht, seconded by Mr. Hassick, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to approve the July 9, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as submitted. All in favor.

1524 EAST EMMAUS AVNUE – MINOR LOT SUBDIVISION

Review proposed Minor Lot Subdivision of 1524 East Emmaus Avenue and 1550 Herbert Street both located in the R-3 Zoning District. Ms. Barbara Litzenberger owns 1524 East Emmaus Avenue (4.282 acres) and 1550 Herbert Street (3.01 acres). Applicant proposes the Subdivision and Lot Line Adjustments of two existing parcels: 1524 East Emmaus Avenue (Lot 1 equal to 4.28 acres) and 1550 Herbert Street (Lot 2 equal to 3.01 acres) to create Lot #3 for a new residential property.

Present Mr. Robert Piligian, PLS, of Bascom & Seiger Land Surveyors and Ms. Barbara Litzenberger, Owner.

Mr. Tetterer highlighted his review letter date August 7, 2013. There are a few items up for discussion and/or action by the Planning Commission. These items are related to Plan scale, natural features within 100 feet of the site, widening of an abutting street, depths of residential lots and all property corners are to be marked appropriately. Mr. Tetterer stated that considering the extent of the Plan, he would have no engineering objection to granting the requested waivers for each of these items.

Mr. Tetterer addressed sanitary sewer, water lines, storm sewer lines, drains, culverts, utility easements and restrictive covenants. A waiver to this section has been made in writing and since this Plan proposes an earth moving land development we would recommend that the entire development track be shown on the Plan and a waiver to this section not be granted.

A proposed driveway and utility easement are shown on the Plan. Per Keystone comments the Township Solicitor should review the proposed easement to see if it is satisfactory.

A deferral is required to curb and sidewalks section. Per Mr. Tetterer there is no existing curb or sidewalk along the south side of Emmaus Avenue within the general vicinity of this development.

There are a total of five street trees required to this site, a partial deferral to the street tree requirement has been submitted in writing and the Planning Commission should discuss this item.

In conclusion until the above additional information is provided and satisfactorily address we would not recommend engineering approval of the above referenced Minor Subdivision Plan.

Ms. Sopka highlighted her review letter dated August 7, 2013. Per her zoning review of the property they comply with the requirements. Ms. Sopka stated that the previous owners submitted a waiver request and discrepancies were noted and discussed with Mr. Piligian. Mr. Piligian stated that he would have a new letter for submittal prior to the next meeting. In addition, there is a recreation contribution to be paid to the Township in the amount of \$1,500.00 per new dwelling unit established. Maintenance Agreements must be reviewed by the Township Solicitor for shared driveways. It was recommended that due to the various steep slopes on the site it would be appropriate to consider restrictive covenants to protect the steep areas from further subdivisions. This should be placed on the site plan as well as each respective deeds where applicable.

Ms. Sopka referenced the issue of water service since Lot #3 proposed the utilization of an on-lot well compared to a central water system. The proposed Lot #3 did reference an individual well to service the residence as does the existing Lot #2 which has an individual well. She stated it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to evaluate both geographically and economically the need of the applicant to access the central water system or allow for an on-lot well for Lot #3.

Ms. Sopka stated that she does concur with the Township Engineer's letter dated August 7, 2013.

Attorney Ashley stated the question is if it is cost effective to connect the central system or not. An estimate should be done to clarify this. Mr. Piligian stated when the Plan was prepared the survey was done. The existing home located at 1524 E. Emmaus Avenue is connected to public water and public sewer. Along E. Emmaus Avenue the sewer runs on the south side and the water runs along the north side. East Emmaus Avenue is a State Road and since this is a water lateral house connection and not a main, or extension of a main, PennDot would require a boring done under E. Emmaus Avenue. The cost for boring can range from \$15,000-\$20,000 just for the boring because it is as deep as the water line which could go down four to five feet. A PennDot permit is required for this work with additional expenses. This is the reason why the well is being proposed. Most of the surrounding homes of this property are surrounded by wells.

Mr. Piligian stated that they would have no objection to placing a Note on the Plan as a restrictive covenants indicating that these lots shall not be further subdivided to create no building lots.

Discussion ensued regarding water service, wells and the surrounding homes. Driveways were discussed and it was recommended for a 24 foot wide paved driveway entrance. A Maintenance Agreement will be further discussed with the Township Solicitor.

The street trees were discussed and Mr. Piligian expressed the concern about site distance. He stated that additional street trees can be added if requested. It was discussed that two street trees are to be planted and three additional trees in the back. No trees are being removed.

On motion of Mr. Schreiter, seconded by Mr. Miller, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to table the Minor Lot Subdivision Plan. All in favor.

Review Zoning Amendments to proposed Health Care Transitional Overlay District

Present was Mr. Charlie Schmehl of (URDC) Urban Research Development Corp., Mr. Tim Siegfried of Norris, McLaughlin & Marcus, Mr. Brian Hardner, V.P. of Facilities & Construction for Lehigh Valley Health Network, Ms. Susan Hoffman, V.P. of Marketing & Public Affairs for LVHN, and Mr. James Rothdeutsh, The Pidcock Company.

Mr. Schmehl gave be brief history in regard to updating the Township Zoning Ordinance. It has taken over a year and a half in review, updates, meetings with the staff, residents, and Lehigh Valley Health Network (LVHN), etc.

Ms. Sopka stated that the overall intent of the Overlay Zoning Health Care is to accommodate medical facilities whether education or treatment and this needs to be clearly defined through zoning otherwise it opens up opportunities for interpretation.

Mr. Schmehl highlighted the two overlay districts. The first being the Health Care Overlay District (HCO) which is more than 500 feet away from residential lot lines. It is proposed to allow most uses, heights and coverage of the land. The second is the Transitional Overlay District (TO) which is 500 feet or less from the residential lot lines. Since the TO district is adjacent to the homes there is more control over the uses, heights and coverage. This has been emphasized upon a very intensive landscaped berm buffer between the residents and any new development within the campus.

Mr. Schmehl stated the list of uses and the intent of some flexibility, as well as the restrictions on accessory uses of the overlay districts.

Ms. Sopka inquired about the restrictions of non-related individuals sharing housing and would like clarification. It was discussed that three unrelated individuals can share a dwelling unit (house), however if it is a residents hall it would not be considered a dwelling unit and more than three individuals may reside there. Health care residential facilities are allowed in both overlay districts. These facilities can include hospice, nursing home, personal care, family lodging, and a resident's hall for students, graduate students and on housing for on-site medical staff.

The need for large-scale inoculations was discussed. Ms. Hoffman stated that they would like the flexibility to have public inoculations. They do the public inoculations at Dorney Park and Coca-Cola Park and the intention was not to bring them back onto the campus. We would like the flexibility because we are a designated site for emergency by the State and Federal Government. Mr. Schmehl recommended that the inoculations services will be for employees or during a public health emergency.

Clarification was made that tents can be used during a public health emergency and/or related training purposes. These tents and its duration will be based upon the need of emergency.

Representatives of the Hospital indicated there would not be housing of undergraduate students on campus. There is no emergency department in the TO district. Deliveries, trash and any noise association will not be permitted from 9 p.m. until 6 a.m. in the TO district. The TO district as proposed would not include a psychiatric hospital, drug or alcohol treatment center and no heliport. Mr. Hardner stated that they do not envision an inpatient or outpatient treatment center on this campus.

Mr. Schmehl discussed setbacks and building heights. He stated that there is a small setback from the highway, a 300' setback for building and parking structures from the lot line of a dwelling, a 100' paving set back from the lot line of a dwelling, a seven story height restriction in the HCO district and a three story height restriction in the TO district.

The berms, it's landscaping and berm heights were discussed. The berm-buffers are a key element. It would be topped with evergreen trees to shield the homes from light, sound and buildings. The berms will be between seven and 12 feet above the first floor elevation with 25 foot tall trees planted on top to help shield the residents. An irrigation system will also be placed with the berm. Mr. Hardner stated that for clarification purposes the berms will not be installed until they have land development plans.

Open land was discussed and 20 percent of the entire tract must be set aside for open land, this is basically vegetated areas, greens or buffer areas that could be accounted for in that 20 percent requirement. The shade trees will still be required in the parking areas.

Sign discussion is placed on hold this evening per Ms. Sopka request, as she would like to better review these provisions.

The floor was open for public comment. There were about six attending neighbors of the hospital who expressed their concerns and asked many questions pertaining to the berms, landscaping, landscaping maintenance, open space and storm water.

Mr. Schmehl stated that the zoning ordinance will be submitted to Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) for review. After that the Planning Commission will hold their public meeting. If recommendation of approval is set forth, the Board of Commissioners will hold their public meeting for approval of adoption.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

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

DRAFT