

**PLAINFIELD TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
October 17, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Plainfield Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, October 17, 2022 at the Plainfield Township Volunteer Fire Company located at 6480 Sullivan Trail, Wind Gap, PA 18091

Chairman, Paul Levits, called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

The Pledge of Allegiance was performed.

ROLL CALL:

The following Commissioners answered roll call: Paul Levits, Terry Kleintop, Robin Dingle, Robert Simpson and Glenn Geissinger.

Also present were Secretary and Zoning Officer, Sharon Pletchan; Solicitor, David Backenstoe; Township Engineer, Jeffrey Ott; Township Traffic Engineer, Peter Terry; Township Environmental Consultant: Jason Smith

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the September 19, 2022 Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

ACTION: Motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Glenn Geissinger to approve the September 19, 2022 regular meeting minutes; *Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.* No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

CURRENT BUSINESS:

ACTION: Motion was made by Robin Dingle and seconded by Robert Simpson and to table the following applications: PC-2021-015, PC-2022-009, PC-2022-010, PC-2022-011, PC-2022-012. *Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.* No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

1. PC-2022-009- Posh Properties (6669-75 Sullivan Trail, Wind Gap, PA 18091)- Land Development Application:

ACTION: Motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Robin Dingle to agree to the January 31, 2023 extension for PC-2022-009. *Prior to the vote,*

Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. **Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

2. PC-2022-010- RPM Metals Recycling (701 N. Broadway, Wind Gap, PA 18091)- Special Exception/Site Plan

ACTION: Motion was made by Glenn Gessinger and seconded by Robert Simpson to agree to the January 31, 2023 extension for PC-2022-010. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. **Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

3. PC-2022-012- WTDWG, LLC (271 E. 1st St. and 1564 Church Rd.)- Minor Subdivision

ACTION: Motion was made by Robin Dingle and seconded by Glenn Gessinger to agree to the January 31, 2023 extension for PC-2022-010. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. **Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

CURRENT BUSINESS:

David Backenstoe, Township Solicitor announced the “Public Information Table” in the back of the room which provides a copy of the applications for public view during the meeting. It was stated that this would be something new that Secretary Pletchan would provide during Planning Commission meetings to assist with public questions.

4. PC-2021-009- CRG Services Management, LLC. (905 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072)- Waiver Requests and Land Development / Subdivision Application

Applicant’s Attorney Blake Marles made a statement that they wish to provide a follow-up presentation on traffic and discuss the remaining requested waivers. Robert Hoffman of Traffic Planning and design presented a traffic overview to the group, summarizing that the proposed warehouses will not be a high traffic generator. Terry and Robin requested copy of presentation and expressed concerns for adequate public presentation on the traffic study. Conversation ensued which addressed the question whether the presentation has been updated from last year. Mr. Hoffman confirmed that the presentation has been updated based on the revised traffic plan (9/26/22). Mr. Hoffman, went on to discuss Wind Gap Borough comments which now creates a possibility of a closure of the intersection of Alpha Rd. and Rte. 512 with a new connection to the proposed private Industrial Drive, a widening of Rte. 512 to accommodate turn lanes and Saturday data showing that the proposal generates a fraction (10%) of trips on Saturdays. Conversation ensued concerning PennDOT approval procedures; August 19, 2022 was the latest review from PennDOT which basically showed no comments on the traffic study. Mr. Hoffman stated that they are anticipating resubmission to PennDOT within the next few weeks. Mr. Hoffman stated that he has no concerns for the most recent traffic engineer review letter from the Township and feels that all issues can be addressed. The Commission shared concerns for the current low ratings of the roadways, the possibility of changes to a public road (Alpha Rd.) exiting onto a private drive and that the proposed

tenant may need a revision to the PennDOT permit if the trip limits presented will be exceeded. Traffic engineer, Peter Terry commented that it is unusual for a public road to exit onto a private drive but it is possible with agreements in place for snow removal and maintenance. Peter Terry confirmed that the municipality can still provide comments to PennDOT related to traffic review and approvals as confirmed to be in PennDOT's review letter.

Discussion was opened for Public Comment:

Linda Asthemier asked if traffic surveys were performed last week as she saw study activity; Mr. Hoffman confirmed that it was not part of their study. She also mentioned that Thursdays and Fridays (between 3 and 6:30PM) are the worst on Rte. 512, she feels that the driveways for residents and business will be impeded and a light is needed on Rte. 512 for the proposed 200 trucks per day. Rob stated he has been on the roadways and does not feel the traffic is bad in this area; the analysis shows factual information.

Jay Asthemier requested to know the proposed tenants of the warehouse which are related to the cars presented in the study; he stated that there was discussion that Jaindl is moving in there with turkeys. Rob confirmed that the tenant is not known. Mr. Asthemier went on to ask whether Alpha Rd. residences been contacted about the cul-de-sac, expressed that air pollution concerns still have not been addressed with increased truck traffic; school buses and teacher commutes will be affected on Constitution Ave. by this development, and there is already a speeding concern.

Donald Moore asked for the time of peak traffic generation from the proposed facility which was previously requested. Rob stated that he would need to look into the information to provide an answer. Don expressed concerned that trucks waiting to enter the facility will be stopped could be rear ended; Rob stated that the dedicated left turn lane assists with this issue. He clarified that this would also occur on the private drive, Rob clarified that traffic study takes this into account. The question was then stated whether the small Alpha Rd. connection portion of Industrial Drive located in Wind Gap can be made public; Rob stated that Wind Gap still does not want take the road. Don asked whether there was only a few trips short of need for traffic light; Rob confirmed that the study is now updated with 25 trips difference and is therefore not close to the requirement for signalization.

Sadie Macatura asked where trucks would be detoured if there is an accident on Rte 512, as no trucks are permitted on Constitution Ave. Rob stated that detours are not part of the traffic study and are handled by emergency responders. She confirmed that traffic is bad on Thursday and Fridays. She than brought up concerns for RPM expansion and the need for fire hydrants and fire truck access.

Pat Sutter asked whether more warehouses proposed in the future; Rob confirmed that two warehouses are proposed without plan for additional. She asked why Alpha Rd. is being changed; Rob confirmed that Wind Gap Borough expressed concerns for the intersection of North Broadway and Alpha Rd. and inquired whether it is possible for closure and redirection. They are currently presenting it to PennDOT and the Borough still needs to present this to the residents. Rob stated that it has nothing to do with traffic generation from this project, it is just a request of the Borough. Chairman Levits stated that she should discuss her concerns to the Borough; Pat expressed concern that Wind Gap Council is not at this meeting.

Bill Shenkel asked if RPM is still going to be closed and if a buffer zone would be donated to the Township. Blake confirmed that the purchase of the property is conditioned upon closure of RPM. He also confirmed that the wooded space is still contingent Township Board but will be open space and deed restricted against development. Paul clarified that the buffer zone does not involve the RPM site. Scott Sandt asked if the short entrance ramp onto Rte. 33 North was studied for trucks in succession. Rob stated that it was studied, is being used by trucks currently and there is no crash history so there is nothing to preclude the project. Scott stated that with increased trucks there will be a backup over the mountain.

The Commission then as the Township Traffic engineer, Peter Terry, to go over his review letter. He clarified the standard methodology for traffic studies is generated by the National Science Foundation and presented their Highway Capacity Manual (A-F rating). He clarified that an unsignalized intersection is the average level of service which has zero delays factored into studies; side streets would have the most delay in an unsignalized intersection by standards. Rob stated that the unsignalized East-West Street intersection in Pen Argyl Borough had highest delay possibility, but only had about 15 trips an hour which does not warrant a signal. Mr. Terry asked about the intersection of Industrial Drive and Rte. 512 which was confirmed to have a 36 second delay with a level of service of 'E'. Peter stated that new driveways are typically not permitted under level 'D' and his letter asked how this can be approved by PennDOT. Peter then confirmed turn lanes and asked how the project proposes to alleviate truck staging on Rte. 512. Rob stated that a portion of Broadway will be posted as 'no parking' at a length of 400 ft. in each direction. He then discussed that the intersection of Pennsylvania Ave and East Main street truck templates provided shows that there is an existing problem condition. Rob stated that he will need to overlay the templates to support no overlap of east and west paths to PennDOT, but it is an existing situation. Next issue that Peter discussed was the increase in left turn lane length requested by PennDOT on Pennsylvania Ave. and asked if left turn lane on Broadway would be the same 200 ft. length; Rob stated that PennDOT did not make this length request. Peter stated that the Township will be discussing with PennDOT and would make this recommendation. He identified that two of the four standards are met for no signal at the Industrial Drive and Rte. 512. Mr. Terry stated that this a very general analysis right now and discussed the possibility of a recommendation that the developers agreement include a trigger for update to traffic study once a tenant is declared. Rob stated that PennDOT will not issue permit for signalization if it is not warranted, they are assuming that PennDOT will not be requiring a signal as no comments were provided. Rob went onto state that underground infrastructure can be installed in case tenant would need a signal in the future, he understands that PennDOT has issued permits for this in the past for other projects.

The Discussion was opened for Commission comment:

Commissioner Kleintop feels that there is no justification for PennDOT denying of signalization in light of unknown tenants. Terry stated that traffic is very important to the Township's decision, to which Attorney Marles agreed, stating they have complied with the requests of the three impacted municipalities and feels they have gone above and

beyond ordinance requirements reminding the group that PennDOT is the ultimate decider.

Discussion was again opened for public comment:

Millie Bean expressed concerns about all intersections; stating that this is a small community which will be greatly impacted by this large development which is based on hypothetical information and studies. She asked the Chairman if a conversation has been held with Wind Gap Borough concerning the impacts of this project on the Borough. Atty Marles stated that the Applicant has been before the Borough Commission and Board. Paul responded that members of Wind Gap Borough have not attended our public meetings and Plainfield has not attended Borough meetings, Paul referenced 10/14/22 Wind Gap Borough review letter. Pen Argyl has been represented by their solicitor and is present tonight.

Donald Moore expressed concern for accuracy of east or west bound truck percentages based on the unknown tenant. Rob stated that assumptions are based on four warehouse based on revised scoping which helps correct for this unknown. Don then wanted to confirm the condition that RPM will close and Lot 1 would then be open space. Blake corrected Don and stated that CRG is not acquiring Lot 1 (RPM property). Attorney Backenstoe then questioned how the Applicant can be sure RPM will close if they are not acquiring parcel. Blake stated that RPM will be required to remove operation from Industrial Drive area and he feels that they will not be able to function. This area is considered Lot 1 of this development; CRG has been told by the current owner that RPM will be closing. Commissioner Kleintop reminded the group that RPM has an application before the Planning Commission which has been delayed; conflict of this development and operation expansion is apparent. Blake confirmed that CRG understands a conflict exists and stated that he has had conversations with the previous attorney of RPM; which resulted in confirmation that each are pursuing their own interests. Blake stated that two plans can be presented but only one can gain approval.

Attorney Marles stated that they previously agreed to install a signal if PennDOT required such, so they would be amenable to install infrastructure for signal design which would be permitted by PennDOT to cover possible tenants however they would need to know configuration of intersection in reference to the allowable driveway width. A discussion ensued from the Commission stating that assumption design is dangerous, an entire traffic study may be needed for the tenant, once named. Commissioner Dingle stated that she is not in support of signal infrastructure being installed as increased traffic of a future tenant can then be denied. Robin then went on to address environmental concerns of noise, infrastructure impacts, requested to support pollution control and emergency services. It was stated that the Commission has requested an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and will continue to be requested as public concerns have been expressed without a response from the Applicant. Blake stated that they will not provide an EIS as the ordinance does not require this level of analysis; they cannot speculate environmental impacts as the tenant is unknown. Robin stated that assumptions are needed to address these issues similar to the traffic study presented and previous projects in this area have provided this study. Robin pointed out that our ordinance states that we have to be concerned for the public health, safety and welfare of our citizens. Blake stated the study is not required for land development approval.

Attorney Marles then moved the conversation to the three remaining waivers according to the September 23, 2022 request letter revision. He first made the statement that the right of way will be shown so they are no longer requesting that particular waiver. The first waiver that would like discuss is from 22-1013.4.(1) which is increase above of the 30 ft. maximum entrance drive to accommodate safety of truck turning at all three driveways, they would agree to provide striping to 30 ft. wide to support the code. The second waiver they wish to present is related to enlargement of the proposed sidewalk to accommodate the proposed trail connection. The would agreed to defer until additional design can be provided, however with the trail location now being shown as requested, it would require relief from 22-1015.1.F requirement of 4 ft. concrete sidewalk to allow for the county requested 10 ft asphalt path for the trail. Lastly, they continue to seek relief from features to be shown within 100 ft. per 22-503.4.C, as a revised aerial has been provided with more detail

Discussion was then opened for public comment:

Jay Asthemier provided comment referencing that Township codes 22-103.1.A, E and H include environmental concerns which have not yet been addressed.

Pat Sutter asked if it would be possible that the two warehouses would be made bigger at any time; it was confirmed that they would not be enlarged. She then asked for the proposed size of the warehouses, in which Atty Marles directed her to the public information table and provided her the dimensions.

The Commission then asked the Township Engineer, Jeff Ott, to review his 10/10/22 review letter. He stated that it was not full review as a full site plan was not provided, so there is no additional comments he wishes to discuss.

Attorney Marles then turned the discussion to the proposed waiver from a 4 ft. wide concrete sidewalk. Blake stated that the concrete sidewalk can be shown according to code and can be discussed later as related to the trail. Applicant's engineer, Matt Chartrand, stated that the trail location is now shown as requested and they will need relief 4 ft sidewalk to allow for 10 ft asphalt path for 911 memorial trail per their meeting with County and federal officials. Paul asked for the standards of the asphalt build; Matt responded that the County did not provide specifications but they would be happy to accommodate. Paul stressed the concern for maintenance with an asphalt trail and requested design on both to be able to generate a cost estimate. Conversation ensued making the statement that too much is unknown about the trail to make a waiver decision, the Planning Commission needs to be more in the loop on the design to better understand where it is going. Commissioner Kleintop, also stressed concern for tree removal related to the project and trail. Matt clarified that there is no tree replacement requirement and they are meeting zoning and providing open space. Conversation again ensued concerning the environmental impacts to the community which have not yet been addressed in the applications. It was claimed that the submissions have been piecemeal and the Commission wants a full plan re-submittal that addresses all concerns. Supervisor, Don Moore confirmed that it was the Northampton County planners who preferred macadam and wanted a 20 ft. easement; confirmed that southside of the road would be the travel way for trail. He feels that they need to get back in communication with the planners and County to determine location and materials before it is brought

back before the Commission. Supervisor, Jane Mellert stated that the County governs specifications of the trail, Sherry Acevedo is the contact for the specifications. Matt clarified that over 100 sheet plan set has already been submitted and they not trying piecemeal this application, they only provided sections needed for this submission. A full land development plan is on record with the Township to clarify Commissioner Kleintop's concern. The Chairman then brought the conversation back to the waiver from 22-1013.4.A(1). Matt gave a presentation of the need for the wider entrances for safety of truck ingress and egress and less impacts to the public road. He confirmed conversations with the Township Engineer and Traffic Engineer which stated they would support the waiver. Driveway widths of 163 ft., 142 ft. and 270 ft. are being requested, however the driveway width will be painted in support of the ordinance. Paul brought the attention to the 10/3/22 Zoning review letter which stated that zoning relief from 27-703.4.A will also required for a wider driveway width; Atty Marles concurred that relief would be sought if waiver is approved. The Commission again stated concerns for Alpha Rd. exiting onto a private road, Blake stated that this is a Wind Gap request and a PennDOT call, however they would prefer not to propose impact to Alpha Rd.

ACTION: Motion was made by Robin Dingle and seconded by Robert Simpson to deny a waiver of SALDO Section 22-1013.4.A(1) to permit entrance drive widths of greater than 30 ft. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.

Donald Moore confirmed that if waiver is not received, a very instrumental change to the plan will be required. Commission Glenn Geissinger stated that this is a private road and a safety issue which could cause traffic issues if trucks cannot make the turn, he would support recommendation of the waiver request. Robin stated that the ordinance was probably put in place for our rural community which is not designed to accommodate semi-trucks. Vote called. **Motion approved. Vote 4-1** (Glenn voted 'no').

The conversation then turned to the last waiver for discussion concerning features to be shown within 100 ft. from the site line. Blake stated that an aerial has now been provided with more detail in reference to 22-503.4.C and they feel that is alleviates the needs for survey work on properties which they do not own. The Township engineer stated that the waiver was requested previously at the 10/15/22 meeting and was denied but with the aerial exhibit now provided, he now feels he has enough information and he would recommend the waiver with the provision that if the Township requires additional information that the Applicant must provide.

ACTION: Motion was made by Robin Dingle and seconded by Glenn Geissinger to approve a conditional waiver of the requirements of SALDO Sections 22-503.4.C, 22-703.3, and 22-703.5 to provide the location of existing natural and man-made features within 100 ft. from the site with the provision that if the Township requires additional information, the Applicant must provide it. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

Chairman Levits asked the applicant if there were any other matters to be brought before the commission related to this application. It was confirmed that the applicant is satisfied with the discussion.

5. PC-2022-014 - Crossroads OXO, LLC (5664 Sullivan Trail) - *Special Exception Application*

Applicant approached the Commission to grant an extension, therefore this application was moved up on the agenda.

ACTION: Motion was made by Glenn Geissinger and seconded by Robert Simpson to approve an extension to January 31, 2023 with the condition that it be signed and returned to the Township by Wednesday, October 16, 2022. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

Solicitor suggested a motion by the Commission in the event that the extension is not received by October 16, 2022 that the application for Special Exception would be denied.

ACTION: Motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Glenn Geissinger to deny the Special Exception if the signed extension to January 31, 2023 is not returned to the Township by Wednesday, October 16, 2022. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

ACTION: Motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Terry Kleintop and to table Application PC-2022-014. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

6. PC-2022-005- Grand Central Sanitary Landfill- 910 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072- *Land Development Application*

Applicant's attorney Erich Schock presented the revised plan and stated that only minor adjustments were made to accommodate the Township's review letters. He would like to direct questions to reviewers to reduce comments. He started first with the October 6, 2022 zoning letter asking for clarification that the outdoor storage will be reduced from previous land development approval. Zoning Officer Pletchan summarized that the revised plan must meet all aspects of the 2004 Special Exception / Land Development approval if the project intends to fall under the previous approval. Engineer Matthew Chartrand showed an aerial photo to confirm that the previous approved truck maintenance facility was constructed and that the labeled "recycling drop off area" has not yet been constructed. This facility is proposed to be moved to the area noted as "Container Storage" and enclosed in a building. Sharon questioned the existing "public recycling drop-off facility" and an explanation whether this facility was installed in lieu of the area labeled "recycling drop off area". The Applicant does not believe that the public recycling drop-off was part of the 2004 approval. The Zoning Officer pointed out

that the previous approval was for an “accessory recycling-use” which was not clearly identified; an interpretation from the zoning hearing board may be required if the resubmission cannot clear up the proposal. Sharon asked for the plans to be revised to more clearly represent how the 2004 plan is being modified to support locations of the proposal. The zoning review letter could then be revised if new information is presented and interpretation may not be required. Commissioner Kleintop asked for the use of this building once the landfill closes in 2028. The Applicant responded that this recycling transload-use will remain. Terry followed up with a question whether this would continue separate from approval a second landfill or landfill expansion which could not be confirmed by the Applicant as the future economic needs are unknown.

The Commission then requested to review of the October 10, 2022 Township Engineer review letter. Jeff Ott brought up concerns whether the existing access road would be considered a “public street”, stormwater management questions and the existence of a “hot spot”. Jeff noted that a waiver for street classification per 22-202 and 22-1004.16 is being requested. The Applicant’s engineer, Matt Chartrand, stated that a revised waiver request letter dated 10/17/22 was submitted out of an abundance of caution as five of the seven new waivers added are related to the roadway classification, so direction on whether the road would be classified as a street is needed to move forward. Jeff summarized that this existing road is a private access road leading to numerous industrial uses on one lot. Chairman stated that since the waiver requests were received so late, that this discussion would need to held at a future meeting. The Applicant understood that the Commission needs time to be able to take action but felt they should discuss the reason for seven additional waivers. Matt then turned the conversation to the statement of “Hot Spot Use” which would be related to a “recycling facility” which is not what is being proposed here which is a transload of recyclable materials which would not be considered a “hot spot use”. Jeff Ott recommended talking to PADEP to ensure that they would not make that determination. No recycling or oils or gasoline are proposed, so Ott feels that it would be possible that this use would not be considered a “hot spot” since the operation is entirely enclosed, but revised information is needed to support this in the resubmission.

Chairman Levits called for questions from the Commission and stated that the waivers would not be acted on tonight due to late submission. Commissioner Kleintop asked where this operation is located currently. The Applicant, Scott Perin, responded that the previous recycling facility on-site shut down over 25 years ago and moved indoors in the old Grand Central recycling Building west of site 15 years ago. Peter Terry stated that he has better understanding of project after this meeting and requested response to his review letter. Jason Smith, Township Environmental Consultant, stated that he was out to site yesterday to confirm stream location and a stormwater channel was confirmed. He pointed out that a capping location with an environmental covenant is on property where grading activity beyond 3-ft. in depth at northern corner of the property would not be permitted. The Applicant confirmed that the area in question is located outside of the work area; Zoning Officer Pletchan asked for an update to the aerial map to support the location. The Applicant clarified that the subject area is located in the CI district and has been removed from the PADEP solid waste permit boundary in 2008. Chairman asked for public comment, none received.

ACTION: Motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Robin Dingle to approve an extension to December 31, 2022. *Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.* No comments. **Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

ACTION: Motion was made by Terry Kleintop and seconded by Glenn Geissinger to table Application PC-2022-005. *Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.* No comments. **Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

Jeffrey Ott announced that the Township will now be enforcing the revised ordinance requiring submission for the Planning Commission agenda 28 days prior to the meeting.

7. PC-2022-015 - JVI, LLC/Green Knight Economic Development Corporation (45-65 Beers Way)- Land Development Application

Applicant's Engineer, Laura Eberly, provided overview of project which is now a land development plan; the previous sketch plan application was withdrawn by the applicant due to time constraints. The project is located within the Green Knight Industrial Park and proposes the consolidation of three lots at the end of cul-de-sac of Beers Way located in Plainfield and Bushkill Townships, although the improvements are entirely located within Plainfield Township. The proposal is a spec. warehouse for which the tenant is unknown; truck storage is proposed in front with associated car parking and a driveway coming off of Beers Way. A portion of the lot extends into Bushkill Township where several wetlands are present which are under conservation easement and no development is proposed. The review letters were recognized but the Applicant and the plan is able to be revised to comply with most comments however they wish to ask a few questions of the reviewers.

Jeff Ott was asked to go over his letter of October 10, 2022. The main item discussed was the separation distance between the driveway and the intersection which is not met in the current proposal. Conversation ensued as to the classification of Beers Way which is unclear. Beers Way is classified as a collector road, however, a major or minor designation is not specifically defined in the ordinance. It was stated that if the road is classified as is major, a waiver is needed however if it is a minor, a waiver would not be required. Based on Jeff's discussion with Peter Terry it was stated that it seems that a minor collector determination would be recommended as the development is not being served by a medium volume driveway or greater and has less than 730 ADT, however the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors would need to make the decision since the definition not covered in the ordinance. Laura pointed out that this is not a through-road and it is unlikely to change due to the residential zoning north of the park. The history of the industrial park road configuration was then discussed.

Peter Terry asked for truck turning templates in response to his letter. Laura stated that a 30 ft. wide driveway requirement will also be an issue for truck turning similar to the previous warehouse project discussed. The truck turning templates will be provided

with the resubmission and she acknowledged that a variance and waiver will be requested for the an increase in driveway width.

Commissioner Kleintop asked for an update for the requirement of the tire quarry reclamation project which is required to be completed by 2024 and questioned whether the Township would be able to approve this project without this obligation being met. The Applicant responded that the quarry is not located on their property. The Zoning Officer stated that she confirmed with the Conservation District that the quarry pit reclamation is a condition of NPDES permit and will be addressed during NCCD review of this permit amendment. Sharon confirmed that the Township can move forward without liability concern as plan revision to the Township would be required if NPDES Permit conditions change the sequence of development. It was confirmed that this application has not yet been submitted to NCCD. Terry also stated concerns about wetlands and wants to hear from the Township Environmental Consultant as his letter indicates that the existing wetlands are now larger than the old delineation and the previous mitigation plan may no longer work. Laura stated that a new wetland determination has been performed and DEP confirmed that the wetlands are not classified as Exceptional Value as they are hydrologically connected to the stream. A Jurisdictional Determination is being requested from Army Corps of Engineers and they believe that DEP now wants to enter into a wetland banking program or replacement of the wetlands at another location as deemed by DEP as opposed to the mitigation plan in place. Jason Smith commented on a discussion with Matt Miller of DEP and he confirmed that these wetland would not be EV as a significant berm exists. Sharon reminded the group that agreements exists with the Township and may need to be revised accordingly as this is related to a recorded subdivision. The Applicant agreed that the agreements would need to be updated. David Backenstoe brought up that one of the notifications to the surrounding properties had not yet been supported and asked the Applicant to provide that information prior to the next Planning Commission meeting on this application. Jason asked a question concerning stormwater management to address stream impacts. Laura stated that infiltration testing came back with low rates and they will need to set-up a pre-application meeting with NCCD; Managed Release concept may be proposed due to these rates and the presence of hot spot land uses adjacent to the site. White roofs were suggested by Jason to assist with heat impacts to the watershed; the Applicant agreed to look into that option and report back.

The discussion was opened for public comment:

Sandy Shiver lives directly behind development and wanted to understand buffer requirements and noise production. She stated that wetland impacts and traffic are also a concern as Rte. 512 and Male Rd. left turn lane not wide enough to accommodate trucks. It was questioned as to whether this property would be served by public sewer system. The Applicant's engineer responded that there will be a wooded buffer of several 100 feet and noise would not be an issued due to the conservation easement and wooded buffer. Trucks will not be permitted behind warehouse; this would be emergency personnel only. It was stated that traffic would be turning left onto Broadway from Beers Way. A Traffic study being developed to concur that no trips will be added, Benchmark will assist with the resolution. The weight limit for the existing bridge was

brought up as a concern. The Chairman confirmed that the bridge was taken over by Wind Gap Borough and would need to be addressed to the Borough and PennDOT. Alex Cortezzo expressed concerns for his Campground which was provided with a 50 ft. buffer previously and now only a 25 ft. buffer is proposed. Paul asked for the minutes to be checked to confirm what was approved as part of the Industrial Park development. His address is 495 Old Allentown Rd. which is a Bushkill Township address. Paul assigned Jeff to research the matter further.

Dale Sandt questioned the ability of a 100 ft. buffer to address traffic noise. Laura confirmed a 400 ft wooded buffer is proposed which is well in excess of the Township requirement. It was questioned whether the property owners would be notified again of the next meeting. The Solicitor went through that the meetings are a standard schedule and the agenda is publicly posted.

The Chairman expressed concerns that the Green Knights previously stated that this development would be predominantly manufacturing space and not warehouse space which no longer appear to be the case. The land development plan allows for this use, but the public can express concerns to the developer as well.

ACTION: Motion was made by Glenn Geissinger and seconded by Terry Kleintop to table Application PC-2022-015. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

8. PC-2022-013- Plainfield Township Community Park (1280 Gap View Road) –Land Development Application

ACTION: Motion was made by Terry Kleintop and seconded by Robert Simpson to table Application PC-2022-015. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

ACTION: Motion was made by Terry Kleintop and seconded by Robert Simpson to table application PC-2022-013 (Plainfield Township Community Park Pavilion), and discussion of Proposed Act 537 Plan Update, Clean-fill Ordinance and Winery definition revision. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. No comments. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT – AGENDA/NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Requested by Paul. No comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

Having no further business to come before the Planning Commission, motion was made by Glenn Geissinger and seconded by Robert Simpson to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 10:08 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Shauplet", written in dark ink.

Sharon Pletchan
Planning Commission Secretary
& Zoning Officer
Plainfield Township

