

I. OPENING

CALL TO ORDER: The Planning Commission of Lower Saucon Township was called to order on Thursday, June 27, 2019 at (time not noted), at 3700 Old Philadelphia Pike, Bethlehem, PA, with Tom Carocci, presiding as acting Chair.

ROLL CALL: Present: Tom Carocci, Vice Chair; Haz Hijazi, Secretary; Sandy Yerger; Kathy McGovern, and John Noble, members; Jim Young, Zoning Officer; Linc Treadwell, Solicitor; Kevin Chimics, Engineer; & Mike Beuke, Consultant. Absent: Craig Kologie, Chair & Scott Kennedy

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN AGENDA ITEMS – None

III. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. MOTORCAR PAINT PROTECTION PRELIMINARY & FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN #01-19 - KBH REAL ESTATE HOLDING, LLC – 3542 ROUTE 378 – EXP. 08/21/19

Dennis Benner stated that he is the attorney for KBH and present are Mike Russek, consulting engineer, Kenny and Ben Harmony, owners of the property. What is being proposed is a motor paint protection business. It's a professional service because he brings cars into the shop.

Ben Harmony stated that like the screen protector on your smart phone, the same concept is for your car. It will go on the paint and you can't tell that it's on there and it prevents chips from any debris hitting it. When you pull that off the car, the paint underneath is still brand new. It's generally used on more higher end vehicles but it's becoming more popular now that I do it on anything from Hondas and Toyotas to Ferraris and Lamborghinis. The product is applied the same way as a screen protector for your phone but with soapy water and it gets squeegeed out with a squeegee and then we let it dry and tuck the edges in. It's a very simple application. I have a big vinyl machine that will cut it out to the different make or model of your car. So, if you bring me a Toyota Camry, I go into the data base and put in your make and model year and it cuts out each piece that I need and I apply it with a squeegee and soapy water.

Kathy McGovern stated that it says here that you don't need any special ventilation, there's no products, no odors or harmful chemicals involved. It just is almost a self adhesive kind of thing.

Ben Harmony stated correct, it is a self adhesive. So, the only things that I would use is water and soap; and then water and alcohol. There are no harsh chemicals; it's all stuff that you can go to CVS and buy as household appliances.

It was asked you're also doing detailing and ceramic coating?

Ben Harmony answered correct. Generally not a lot of lower end detailing, it's more of a higher end shop where I'm not going to do many \$200 services, most of my services will be \$1000 plus. The car gets dropped off and it stays in there until it's completed and the customer comes to pick it up.

Kevin Chimics asked you're going to have a wet shop too?

Ben Harmony stated that there's a wash bay. John Noble stated it looks like you got public sewer. Ben Harmony stated there is public water and sewer.

Tom Carocci asked so how does it stay on the car wash process?

Ben Harmony stated that is correct. When the car comes in, the car gets washed and then it will go into a clean bay and stay inside until the customer picks it up.

Tom Carocci asked how many cars will you have inside at one time in the building? Ben Harmony answered I believe we can fit 5 to 8. Generally in a week, 5 to 10 is my average flow. So, I would be able to store a week's worth of cars in there. I also do some dealers in the Valley, so those cars come in and then they might leave the same day so that's something I wouldn't need to store.

Kathy McGovern stated that she saw somewhere that the projected use of the water was nominal. Ben Harmony stated that 162 gallons a day we went through and he gave me the metrics of the pressure washers he uses and how much he uses per car.

Kathy McGovern stated that when you're talking about detailing, what does that mean as far as water use.

Ben Harmony stated that the only water use in terms of detailing would just be for the initial wash of the car. After that, you're just using general cleaning products, so I don't really need water for those. The water is mainly used for the washing and the application of the film. Generally my business is more of the film; I don't do as much of the detailing thing because it has become so popular.

Dennis Benner stated that there's a threshold issue here and that is the definition of what it is that he's doing. We believe it's totally a permitted use as a personal service. I think it's identified here as a craft shop. It makes a big difference in terms of a lot of the other comments that Boucher and James have flagged here. The bulk of the rest of the review letter, we can certainly talk about the bulk of the reviews and the comments are acceptable to the applicant.

Mike Russek stated that we don't have to focus on everything because most of everything is a will do.

Dennis Benner started to review the Boucher and James letter. The use, we believe, is a personal service as opposed to a craft shop. This matters because if it were a craft shop, it would be a retail operation and he's selling nothing here. It would require 40 parking spaces.

Linc Treadwell stated that it doesn't fit neatly into any of our use categories; so, we had a staff meeting with the applicant and we basically came to the conclusion that it was a craft shop at that time because it was a permitted use. But, we had an idea at that time what the parking ramifications that would be. So now when we look at it, when you look at the personal service aspect, there's much less of a parking aspect. Do you have this business now, do you operate it somewhere else?

Ben Harmony answered yes.

Linc Treadwell asked how many cars do you normally have parked outside in parking spaces? Ben Harmony answered one. Is that basically an employee? Ben Harmony answered yes, that's operating out of a two bay garage.

Linc Treadwell stated that it seems as though that the 42 parking space requirement is way over what's actually needed. Did you discuss this with Mike about what other changes would apply to the plan if it's a personal service as opposed to a craft shop? Ben Harmony stated that it's really just the parking spaces. Linc Treadwell stated that he doesn't have a problem if we call it a personal service. That makes more sense. You're showing 5 spaces on the plan.

Ben Harmony stated that we have 5 spaces plus we have all the bay spaces inside.

Haz Hijazi asked how many employees do you have? Ben Harmony answered currently 1 part-time and myself.

Kathy McGovern asked what about the detail shop piece of it?

Ben Harmony answered generally it's the two of us that do a lot of the work, so I don't really plan on hiring anybody else currently. That's not to say if the detailing doesn't pick up that I wouldn't hire one other person to handle the detailing; but, my current employee will do all the detailing and the wrap of film work.

Kathy McGovern asked so you have a car that's in the bay to put the wrap on it. What about your detailing cars and then how long do they wait?

Ben Harmony answered the detailing cars can be picked up generally the same day. Just because I don't want to store people's cars more than I have to.

Mike Russek stated that the way that this fits into the parking requirements under personal service, there's only one category under parking and it's personal service which would cover anything from dry cleaner to tailor. There's three spaces required per practitioner. He's the practitioner of the business and one space per employee. So, if he had either a full-time or part-time employee that would be five spaces total that would be required. That's the only requirement of the ordinance. We actually went through and looked at the metrics of how he would operate. In his business description, we went through that in detail that he's not a high volume and not doing \$200 details, he's a higher end car detailer, so it's going to be not a frequent mass turnover of vehicles.

Dennis Benner stated that moving on through item number one, all of the rest of it is no problem.

Mike Russek stated item 2a is a will do and is just a drafting item of identifying maximum impervious coverage. One of the items that we have here is with respect to nonconformity is maximum total of all floors is 10,000 square feet. When you include the house, the detached garage and this building, we're at 10,850 square feet. What we did when this comment came up is went back and found historic photos of the two greenhouses that were there. I know exactly what the smaller building was because we had the foundation actually surveyed which was 2800 square feet. I took that and superimposed it on the aerial to estimate the size of the other one and the other one was 4400 square feet; so, basically the total previously is an equivalent match in floor area. The question would be from a legal standpoint is we believe that we have an existing nonconformity that we're complying with where we're just matching floor area of what the prior nursery greenhouses were on the property. We would need to have verification on this.

Linc Treadwell asked what does that section say, Mike Beuke? What does Section 180-76 E refer to? Mike Beuke stated that's a bulk requirement. It's referring to every floor of a building needs to be calculated and it can't exceed 10,000 square feet on the site. So, if you have a two story building, you have to count both floors. Linc Treadwell asked so that's a requirement no matter how big your lot is? Mike Beuke answered yes. The maximum total floor area of all floors of the building, 10,000 square feet. Linc Treadwell asked no matter what you're doing? How does a shopping center get built? Mike Beuke answered that's a GB-1 district which is different from the GB-2.

Linc Treadwell stated that if it says the building, then we wouldn't count two buildings as one. This building is what? Mike Russek stated that it's 7200 square feet and is actually matching what was there previously as far as total square feet. Sandy Yerger asked so this isn't going to take up new space, it's going to be the same as what was there originally? Ben Harmony stated that basically we're putting it right in the same pad area.

Mike Russek stated that we can comply with item C, the height requirement. Item D is a 5 inch adjustment on the wall location to get it in the 30 foot front yard setback and is a very minor adjustment. Moving on to Item 3 for protection standards; when we went through and obtained the grading permit originally for this building, when Ken had no plans for it in 2017 we went through the environmental protection standards in detail with the Zoning Officer because we had to comply with those for the grading permit application. One of the things that was concluded was that because the site when it was originally developed, everything was padded in, you come off of 378 it was graded, the house was padded in, it was graded up to the pads of the nursery greenhouses and it was regraded up to Old Philadelphia Pike. When you look under the definitions of resource protection in the Zoning Ordinance, it actually says natural features that are regulated and the definition of natural is not made by human kind or altered by man. So this entire site essentially except for a slight fringe on the southern side and maybe along Old Philadelphia Pike, the whole site has been previously altered and disturbed. When we went through this with the Zoning Officer, we had concurrence for the grading permit and the calculations that are on the plan are exact carry over from the grading permit when we converted from that to this land development plan. So, our position would be that a lot of these site capacity calculations with regard to the steep slopes and woodlands. We had resolved all that as part of the grading permit, nothing has changed. The grading permit was issued in November, 2017.

Mike Beuke stated that from a zoning perspective, manmade steep slopes are not excluded for the requirements. There is not a specific exclusion for manmade steep slopes. This is how we handled it across the board.

Mike Russek stated that under the definition of resource protection that refers to the section that steep slopes are within the protection standards, the definition of resource protection are natural features. You have to go into the definition of resource protection in the definitions to get to the fact that it is only natural resources that are regulated by that section. That definition refers to the section where all the standards are at.

Linc Treadwell stated that from a practical standpoint, we all know what the property looks like. Are there any steep slopes out there that we think are natural resources that need protection? It's pretty clear that it's commercial, manmade something. There's no environmental resources out there that need to be protected. So, if they got a grading permit before, Jim find the grading permit and talk to Mike Beuke. The purpose of the whole thing is to protect environmental features.

Mike Russek stated that this covers all of 3 A and B as everything of what we went through with the grading permit application. Items C and D will be complied with. Item C is the carbonate geology report, we already had John Kortively, when we did the grading permit application, do the testing for that application. I don't remember an actual carbonate geology report. If we have to generate something to satisfy that section we will. The neighborhood protection requirements, we will comply with that. Ben, can you explain what you do as far as anything that would generate noise?

Ben Harmony stated that the compressor will be inside a separate room inside the building. It will be a hydraulic screw compressor which will be less than 60 decibels. The compressor is really only used for detailing which I don't do much of.

Mike Russek stated that would be the only item in the protection requirements that would be of concern. We will provide a lighting plan which will be minimal, just enough to provide illumination to the parking area. This building is recessed down 14 feet below Old Philadelphia Pike, so everything will be virtually below eye level from Old Philadelphia Pike. We'll provide compliance with all the other little nuances of the ordinance. Item 4 A, B and C, we will comply with; it's not a problem. One of those is for emergency services, we will be getting in contact with the fire marshal to have them review the site access to say that they have no issues with accessing the property with fire fighting equipment.

Linc Treadwell asked if you received a copy of the Police Chief's memo? It's talking about a stop sign on 378 where the driveway comes out. Mike Russek stated that that's one of the SALDO comments that we'll comply with. Jim Young stated that the Police Chief's memo also suggests no left turn out of this facility. Linc Treadwell clarified that it's on 378. John Noble asked is this an HOP and PennDOT that you have to deal with? Linc Treadwell asked do you have a PennDOT HOP for 378?

Mike Russek stated that I intuitively don't think there's one that's on file with PennDOT. So, we'll have to go to PennDOT if it's a requirement to secure an HOP for that entrance. All of his traffic is expected to come in off of Old Philadelphia Pike because there isn't a hard transition from the street to the site. And, if he has low profile sports cars coming in, that's the way you're going to want to bring them in. You're not going to want to bring them in from 378. The only people that would really be using the 378 entrance would be the residential aspect that will continue to use that as it has been.

Ken Harmony stated that at one time when you came under the bridge, it used to be two lanes coming down the highway. Now that was shut down and it's a dead lane. There's not traffic in that dead lane anymore, so it is used when turning.

Tom Carocci stated you're not going to have a lot of in and out traffic any way. Even if they are coming in from 378, the cars will sit there for a couple of hours or overnight.

Ben Harmony stated that it is low intensity. It's not like the car wash on 378 where you have a hundred cars going in and out a day.

Mike Russek asked is that a recommendation that we need to look at?

Linc Treadwell stated just take a look at the traffic stuff and put a note on the plan that the main entrance for the paint wrapping business is the other on Old Philadelphia Pike.

Ben Harmony stated that one way we may be able to address that is one of our comments in our letter is about a street address. Maybe we can give that use a street address off of Old Philadelphia Pike rather than a 378 address.

John Noble asked are you going to have a street sign on 378?

Tom Carocci asked a sign advertising the business on 378?

Ben Harmony stated that I would like to because that would be the draw for traffic; but, it is safer to bring everyone in the back.

Sandy Yerger stated that at the intersection of 412 and 611, they put in a natural product store and they have their sign out front but it says entry is via the back and they take them around to the back.

Mike Russek stated that he doesn't have a sign rendering at this point; but, his sign could incorporate entry from Old Philadelphia Pike.

Mike Russek stated that Item 5, we can comply with A solves the parking problem with the five spaces total. And B is we'll comply with that which is widening the 25 feet for two way uses is from the driveway into the parking lot. There is another item with respect to the actual width of the driveway itself out to Old Philadelphia Pike. Item 5 C is okay which is illumination and we will provide a lighting plan to be very low intensity. Item 5 D has to do with buffering of the parking area from the rear and side property lines. The property to the north is vacant commercial which Ken owns. There is residential, but the actual homes are up against Old Philadelphia Pike. One of the comments was to have a site meeting to review in the field the necessity of buffering.

Mike Beuke stated not for necessity, but the only buffer that's required is to separate non-compatible land uses and that would be the residential use that's to the south of the site and the proposed use of the personal service shop. So, there would only be a buffer that's required to separate those two uses. It doesn't even need to be along the entire side of that entire property line. It's not needed for the northern property because it's those are not conflicting land uses.

Mike Russek stated that we're proposing to provide a buffer in the front yard and the building is recessed down 14 feet at the north end on Old Philadelphia Pike; so, regardless we're going to plant a row of evergreens and will wrap those around the corner of the building.

Mike Beuke stated that if you want to meet the buffer requirement with proposed trees only, then a site meeting would not be recommended. A site meeting is only recommended if you want to use existing vegetation so we can see what you're actually proposing to retain in order to meet the requirement.

Mike Russek stated that Item 6 B is a note and we will add that. Item C is a comment and under C I 1 and 2 we will comply with that. That's where the recommendation for in the event that we wanted to count anything existing. All of page 6 is a will do or comments that we will comply with. Some of it's drafting clarification on the plans. Item 7 is a will do, the existing legal right-of-way is 40 feet from center line on Route 378 and the ordinance actually requires 50 feet, so we will have an additional 10 feet shown for the ultimate right-of-way for Route 378. Page 7, D is when he comes up with the sign for the project, of course he has to get a zoning permit for the sign that would have to be compliant with the zoning requirements. Item C is a will do, we will adjust the back wall

portion of it is 9 feet and I will make the necessary adjustments to get it to 8 feet. And D and E are will complies.

Mike Russek stated that I'll go through the Hanover letter and the only things I want to touch on are some of the additional items that we would be requesting waivers from and get the Board's reaction as to how you may view those requests. Item A 1 on page is a will do and that has to do with the carbonate geology report. Item 2 A through R are will do's, they are drafting items. What happened was when they converted this from a grading plan to a land development plan, we kind of modified the parking area in front of the building and that generated a whole bunch of smaller details that I didn't look at when I did that layout and that's what generated these details. The only thing with respect to requirements when we get to the third page, Item S and T with respect to stormsewer requirements. What we have on the project is for stormsewer is I basically have a small leader system that's behind the building that just drains the water between the retaining wall and the building itself. We will request a waiver from the 15 inch pipe and also a waiver from these structures having to be full sized PennDOT storm inlets.

Mike Russek stated that the roof has a separate 8 inch leader line that's picking up the entire north half. So all the down spouts from this half are being picked up and taken down to an infiltration pit. The south half is where we have these two structures here. The roof down spouts are tied into the system. It was stated that the back is 15 feet from the wall to the building.

John Noble stated that he described the back system as only handling that 15 feet; now we're handling the entire roof system of the building. He should just provide calculations that a smaller inlet can capture the amount of run-off flowing through and the pipe has the capacity to handle the flow.

Kevin Chimics stated that the 15 inch is more of a pipe that was going to be in the Township right-of-way and is a little easier to clean. A 12 inch pipe and it's going to be on private property and it will be his responsibility to maintain it.

Linc Treadwell stated that if you're looking for a waiver on that then it's going to be prove that the calculations work.

Mike Russek stated that this was a public right-of-way and a public system. It was going from the street into a public detention facility. Ken Harmony stated that this is what I do for a living, water and sewer and stuff like that, I would never make it to small.

Mike Russek stated that there is a requirement in the ordinance that we have to go to the Northampton County Conservation District. The total disturbance that we're going to have here is less than an acre, it's seven-tenths of an acre. Technically, per chapter 102 of the PA code, there is no requirement there for it to go to the County under an acre. Under an acre, you're required to have a plan in place so that in the event there's a complaint or the County comes out. We actually have this part as part of the grading permit, the erosion control that's established for it, we have a plan that would be in place. The question is whether or not because we consider this low impact, less than an acre only seven-tenths of disturbance, if you're actually going to make us go to the County Conservation District for that. It's only a requirement to go if the Township requires us to go.

Mike Russek stated that discharges 100 feet from adjacent property line or right-of-way line shall discharge into a drainage channel swale or pipe within a drainage easement that has been designed, constructed and/or analyzed to receive water from the outlet. This goes to the discharge and we're

bringing it around to get it to the natural swale that cuts across the front corner of the house. We would be requesting a waiver from the 100 feet by the fact that we're still maintaining natural drainage conditions.

Kevin Chimics stated that the one thing that I really didn't look at was when the water gets down to 378, is there any drainage system along 378 that it will eventually tie into? Ken Harmony stated that there is an inlet in front of the big lot. Kevin Chimics stated that maybe you can investigate the drainage path and where it ultimately goes to. Ken Harmony stated that it goes down and runs along the shoulder and runs into the catch basin in front of the big lot. Mike Russek stated that we can id it and then if that brings up any further comments, we can address them.

Kevin Chimics stated that the way they ran their calculations, they basically said with the existing conditions I think they're only adding around 3000 square feet of new impervious cover. Mike Russek stated that basically what we're adding is because of the parking area and it was an equivalent roof area that we're picking up. Kevin Chimics stated that by adding the infiltration basin, they're basically showing that there's no increase in run-off from the site.

Mike Russek stated that is it as far as waivers from stormwater. Everything else is a will comply. Item Z, as far as easements, would there be any objection to a blanket easement on the property instead of trying to establish easement boundaries around the stormwater facility? Basically just giving the Township a blanket easement to access the property.

Linc Treadwell stated that he didn't think that would be a problem.

Mike Russek stated that Item Y, we'll comply with as far as any agreements that have to be recorded on the land or against the land for ownership maintenance repair and program for the system. Items B, 1, 2 and 3, outside agency approvals, did the Board receive anything from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission?

Kathy McGovern stated that she saw something from the City of Bethlehem for the water. Mike Russek stated that Ken has letters from the City of Bethlehem and Lower Saucon; but, I don't know if I've seen anything from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission yet. Kevin Chimics stated that we haven't gotten the LVPC yet; but, we did get a letter from the sewer authority that says that they can supply service.

Mike Russek stated that on the next page, everything is a will do. On Page 4, the improvements agreement is standard, identifying the floor elevations of the buildings, I will get that from Jay Musselman and a copy of the current deed from Jay Musselman.

Kathy McGovern asked about Item 7 b, the location of all existing features within 500 feet of any part of the land to be developed shall be identified on the plan. The applicant is requesting a waiver from this requirement.

Mike Russek stated that we do have the aerial that was required for the submission. To actually do a flight in an aerial survey would be extensive for what we're doing. Therefore, we would request a waiver from that requirement based on the fact that we have the aerals.

Kathy McGovern stated so you met A, names of the adjoining property owners.

Mike Russek stated that we'll label that on the plan. Item B would be something we would a waiver from. Same thing with the existing contour lines within 250 feet of the property, we'll be requesting a waiver from. I actually did a USGS map overlay for that; but, I don't know to what extent and there's nothing happening here that requires coordination with the adjoining properties.

Tom Carocci stated you're just really building the building back where it was.

Mike Russek stated that we're putting the building back where it was. The only thing that we're really doing is we will comply with the drainage pattern, the drainage path from where we're discharging to an inlet on 378.

Kevin Chimics stated that the only other impacts offsite are the water and sewer; and, they do show those lines on Old Philadelphia Pike where they're connecting to.

Kathy McGovern asked how far is this home from this property? Ben Harmony stated that it's sits right across the upper property corner by about 20 feet. So, it's about 20 feet from the property line from the actual building.

Mike Beuke asked what's the proposed building height? Mike Russek stated that it's 18 feet to the eave and then another 6 to the peak. So, on the south side of the property, the building would only be 4 feet higher than the street.

Linc Treadwell asked what's the notification, was everyone notified across the street and adjacent on the land development submission? Jim Young stated that it's not required for the land development. Linc Treadwell asked did you contact any of the neighbors or get any feedback? Mike Russek stated that there were notifications that we sent for the adjoining. The rest of everything else is a will do.

Dennis Benner asked if the Township has a sample or model agreement for a land development? Linc Treadwell stated that he has a couple of different ones depending on what type of project it is. But, I'm not sure that this needs one. What kind of public improvements are we talking about? Property corners, pins, monuments, that type of stuff? Do this stuff before we record the plans so you won't be charged for agreements when they're not needed.

Mike Russek asked what about the operation and maintenance of the system? Linc Treadwell stated that's something different; that's a stormwater management agreement. Mike Russek asked if the Township going to look for a right-of-way dedication of Old Philadelphia Pike for the additional right-of-way? Linc Treadwell asked do we own it or is it a PennDOT road? Kevin Chimics stated that Old Philadelphia is a Township road. Linc Treadwell stated that we will need the right-of-way easement. Mike Russek asked what about the additional 10 feet on 378? Linc Treadwell stated that it's a PennDOT thing. If they want the easement they can get it.

Mike Russek stated that all of Page 5 is comments or will do's other than the fact that Item 20 we will get in contact with the Fire Marshall on site accessibility and whether or not there are issues with fire zones or not parking regulations. Item 16, we'll get an easement drawn up for that.

Linc Treadwell stated that Dennis can draw up an easement agreement between the two properties that you can record; so, that if it ever gets sold you still have the right to access Old Philly.

Mike Russek stated that all of Page 6 is a will do. Page 7, we talked about the street address which will solve possible the issue of – who assigns the number? It was stated that zoning assigns the addresses.

Mike Russek stated that Item 37, because it's public sewer, we'll file a post card exemption. Is that acceptable? Kevin Cimics stated that you will need to submit a request to Council, because they're the ones who ultimately approve that.

Kathy McGovern stated that she is confused on Item 38, the PennDOT highway occupancy permit, the existing driveway to Route 378 is adequate to service. Didn't we just say no? We said the driveway was going to come from Old Philadelphia Pike.

Mike Russek stated that the new business is coming off of Old Philadelphia Pike. Is the Township going to require the applicant to go to PennDOT for a driveway for what's currently being used. So, this would just resolve itself with the address?

Linc Treadwell answered yes.

Mike Russek stated that Item 39 is an O&M agreement which is standard for the responsibilities for stormwater management. Item 40 would be a copy of the agreement security which we touched on earlier. But getting into the actual improvements, that would be required by the ordinance. And, there's also the 18 month maintenance agreement that would be followed as part of the security agreement. The requirements for improvements are in Items 42, 43 and 44. Item 42 is just a statement that's saying when the existing road to the property is being developed, it does not meet the standards of the chapter, then the improvements are required. Item 43 has to do with, and this is a SALDO requirement, there is an additional 20 feet wide, with a 10 feet wide planting screen buffer and elevated berm required along the front of the property. I don't know what we'll be buffering from; so, we're requesting a waiver from this requirement.

Item 45 goes into requirements for the driveway width being 24 feet for access roads into the property. Right now the driveway width varies from 15 to 17 feet. This isn't a high volume business where you're going to have a lot of traffic coming in and out. Ken's concern is that if you widen it to 24 feet, you're just going to encourage people to start trying to use it as a shortcut and you're adding more impervious. The main concern is making it look enticing as a shortcut especially for someone coming from 378 when it is backed up. Item c with respect to access grades, it's all pre-existing and we're at the mercy of the topography. There's no way I can regrade and comply because somewhere along the lines it's not going to comply no matter what is done. Coming in off of Old Philadelphia Pike, within the right-of-way, it rolls and is not an abrupt drop, it's 11.4% and then it goes for a short distance to 17% which is 2% over the maximum of 15%. It's all pre-existing conditions and there is nothing that we can do.

John Noble stated that with the driveway issues that you're going to have, is it a possibility that you might want to have a sign there that says do not enter toward 378 or a directional sign for your customers.

Mike Russek stated that Item 46 outlines the actual required improvements by ordinance would be impossible to do because we're right up against the bridge that we would be required to have 2 twelve foot wide traffic lanes. So, we would have to add another lane going southbound along the front of our property for the short distance and then an additional pull off shoulder. Everything else is will do. On Page 9, Item c, they will be providing an oil water grit separator for pre-treatment.

Kathy McGovern asked before we approve, do we go through the variances? Linc Treadwell stated that the plans should be cleaned up and come back with a new waiver request letter.

MOTION BY: NO motion was made

SECOND BY: NO second was made

ROLL CALL:

IV. MICELLANEOUS BUSINESS ITEMS

A. REVIEW OF FORESTRY ORDINANCE

Linc Treadwell stated the Attorney General told us awhile ago that our forestry ordinance was to restrictive. This meets the Attorney General's requirements; so, I would suggest that you don't mess with it. If we change it, then we have to go back to the Attorney General.

MOTION BY: A motion was made by Tom Carocci to recommend approval of the Forestry Ordinance #2019-04 amendment to the Code of the Township of Lower Saucon.

SECOND BY: Haz Hijazi

ROLL CALL: 5-0 (Absent: Craig Kologie & Scott Kennedy)

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 23, 2019

MOTION BY: Sandy Yerger moved for approval of the May 23, 2019 Planning Commission minutes.

SECOND BY: Kathy McGovern

ROLL CALL: 5-0 (Absent: Craig Kologie & Scott Kennedy)

V. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

VI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY: Haz Hijazi motioned to adjourn the meeting at ?.

SECOND BY: Tom Carocci

ROLL CALL: 5-0 (Absent: Craig Kologie & Scott Kennedy)

Submitted by:

Tom Carocci, Vice Chair