

**TOWNSHIP OF SALISBURY
LEHIGH COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

**7:30 PM
December 11, 2012**

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, Schreiter, Hebelka, Hassick, McKitish 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 Licht was not present.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Beck called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

On motion of Mr. Hassick, seconded by Mr. Miller, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to approve the November 13, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as amended. All in favor.

Review the proposed amendments to Salisbury Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance as prepared by URDC.

Mr. Schmehl began with the Zoning Ordinance and inquired if the members had any questions or concerns. Ms. Sopka stated that she is still evaluating the Zoning Ordinance and will be meeting with the Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) next week for review. The Health Care Overlay District update was also in question. Ms. Sopka stated that she is unaware if the neighborhood meeting took place with Lehigh Valley Health Network representatives. She stated that she would be contacted once the meeting took place and issues were resolved.

Mr. Schmehl provided the members with a complete draft of the Subdivision Ordinance (SALDO) for review. He stated that he would like to discuss the draft at the scheduled January 8, 2013 Planning meeting.

Mr. Schmehl stated that they are not proposing a revolutionary change to the existing Zoning Ordinance; they are just "cleaning it up".

Attorney Ashley reviewed the Ordinance and addressed concerns about wording, the exclusions and definitions for land development. His concerns are for accessory use maximum building size for commercial properties, lot consolidation deadlines, preliminary plan, and all communication methods. Mr. Schmehl stated that he will address his concerns and make changes accordingly.

Mr. Tetterer reviewed the Zoning Ordinance and addressed technical concerns. Mr. Tetterer stated he is in agreement with Attorney Ashley in regards to land development definitions.

Mr. Tetterer addressed open space and inquired if detention/infiltration basins are going to be considered as open space? Mr. Tetterer stated that no buildings or fences can be placed on top of an underground detention basin. Mr. Schmehl stated that to consider open space it must be proved that this space serves a purpose, e.g. a baseball field.

Mr. McKitish wants the wording to be explicit in regards to underground detention basins as he does not want it to be used for anything other than open space. Mr. Schmehl will address this issue.

Discussion continued about above ground and underground detention basins and who will be responsible for the maintenance. Mr. Tetterer stated that each municipality looks at the maintenance differently. He stated that generally the Township does not want to maintain a detention basin; it is normally the homeowner or developer's responsibility to maintain it. However, Mr. Tetterer stated that per Act 167 Agreements and recorded deed, if a complaint or suspicion of failure is made the Township will have the authority to inspect detention pond.

Mr. Schmehl reviewed the options that the Township can require for detention basin maintenance. Mr. Tetterer stated that there will have to be some changes with the respect to current regulations.

Mr. Tetterer stated that a street classification map needs to be included in the plan with definition.

Mr. Tetterer reviewed a few items that he believes are important and should be included on the plan. Discussion ensued in regards to all the following items: 1) Sinkholes and how developers need to clearly note the location of sinkholes or suspected sinkhole on the submitted plan, 2) the statement of intent, 3) certification of property ownership, 4) preliminary plan submission and /or resubmission date be 25 calendar days as opposed to the ten day submission date due to larger developments, 5) to incorporate a Post Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) plan into the preliminary plan which changes the way a developer looks at a property, 6) the difference between the preliminary plan and final plan, to keep them separate, and 7) requirements of existing site features within 100 feet of the site for small development waivers if applicable.

Mr. Tetterer stated that he needs to finish reviewing the minor subdivision portion of the SALDO plan. He will address his comments at the next scheduled meeting.

Mr. Schmehl discussed full plan copies. Mr. McKitish and Mr. Hebelka stated that they want to see copies of the full land development plans.

Mr. Schmehl provided the members with a draft of Article 10 which will be discussed at the scheduled January 8, 2013 meeting. He highlighted a few items that he would like the members to focus on and asked for the recommendations in January.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Mr. McKitish, seconded by Mr. Schreiter, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 to adjourn the meeting. All in favor.