BOROUGH OF ALBURTIS PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes of February 18, 2025

The Alburtis Planning Commission was called to order by Robyn Petrie on February 18, 2025 at 7:01 p.m. The meeting was held at Alburtis Borough Hall and also via a Zoom link. The meeting was open to the public where participants could attend in person or by using an assigned link and access code.

Members in attendance: Steve Mehl, Jason Douglas, Robyn Petrie, Ray Ricketts, Stephen Nemeth, Michael Wambaugh

Associates of Alburtis in attendance via Zoom: David Knerr, Borough Solicitor

Visitors in attendance:

Joe Zator- Zator Law, Nicole Galio- Jaindl, John McRoberts-Pidcock company

Approval of Meeting Minutes – January 21, 2025

No comment, Steve Mehl made a motion to approve the Minutes of January 21, 2025, Jason Mike Wambaugh 2nd and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

No public comment

Ordinance No. 594- AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE BOROUGH'S OFFICIAL ZONING MAP UNDER CHAPTER 21 OF THE ALBURTIS CODIFIED ORDINANCES (RELATING TO ZONING) SO THAT THE PROPERTIES NOW KNOWN AS 380 CHURCH STREET (LEHIGH COUNTY TAX ASSESSMENT PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 546386451494-1), 381 CHURCH STREET (PIN 546386274914-1), AND 386 SCENIC VIEW DRIVE (PIN 546386427194-1) ARE LOCATED WITHIN THE R-2 MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT RATHER THAN THE L-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL-OFFICE RESEARCH ZONING DISTRICT; AND AMENDING CHAPTER 21, ARTICLE V OF THE ALBURTIS **CODIFIED ORDINANCES (RELATING TO ZONING—REGULTIONS FOR R-2 MEDIUM** DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT) TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING RESTRICTIONS ON LOTS WITHIN THE ONE HUNDRED (100) YEAR FLOODPLAIN OR WITHIN THREE HUNDRED (300) FEET OF THE ONE HUNDRED (100) YEAR FLOODPLAIN: (1) TWO-FAMILY DETACHED DWELLINGS ARE NOT PERMITTED BY RIGHT; (2) CERTAIN **RESIDENTIAL USES, BED AND BREAKFAST FACILITIES, AND RECREATIONAL AND** EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES OR INSTITUTIONS ARE NOT ALLOWED AS CONDITIONAL USES; (3) THE MINIMUM LOT AREA FOR SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED DWELLINGS, INCLUDING SECTIONAL OR MODULAR DWELLINGS, IS 6,500 SQUARE FEET; AND (4) THE MAXIMUM DENSITY OF RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS SHALL **BE TWO (2.0) UNITS PER ACRE**

David Knerr mentioned reason why we're here tonight is because there was an amendment that we made to the ordinance that you recommended approval to last month and it's really just a small change. But the concern was that the general developers had presented to you a sketch plan of what they wanted to do, and the ordinance was designed to permit them to be able to do that sketch plan, but pretty much not do much beyond that and that was the intention of council in making the proposal, too, in the 1st place, and in putting the ordinance together, we used measurements that we had available from the sketch plan of various areas. As the as the approval

process went through with the Council and they reviewed some comments made by our engineer, Jeff Ott. The developer realized that in the event that there would be an increase in the amount of right of way given to Church Street on this project that it would not be able to build the 10 units they proposed, but only 9 units. If you went all the way to the 60-foot ultimate right of way that's provided for in the subdivision and land development ordinance. Now, while that is unlikely that you would do that because the road is now going to be a cul-de-sac because of the bridge not being repaired and so there would be little reason that you would want to add more impervious cover, and out in that area for the number of lots that would be served by it. Nonetheless, I understand why there was concern on the part of the developers that this could, you know, influence their ability to develop the plan with the 10 units that they proposed. The council agrees that that was the intention for the 10 units. So, what we did is revise the ordinance that you saw last month to clarify that in deciding how much right of way to take into account, we're only going to look at the right of way that existed before the development, not the right of way after the development. So that means that we're working from a static number, and they can do what they were planning to do. The only other change that was made was in response to a comment made by the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission, where they requested that we drop a footnote or a cross reference to another section of the zoning ordinance, which was not a problem, and we did that. So other than that, this is the same basic ordinance that you recommended approval for last month. Ray Ricketts mentioned I understand right now that the country is not planning on opening up that or doing the repairs. But is that going to be permanent as of now? Steve Nemeth mentioned that It's probably going to be permanent. Well. Dave, you said, it's going to be a cul-de-sac that's just in practicality. They're not actually going to develop it into a dead end. And cul-de-sac. There's not a plan that afoot that you know of. David Knerr mentioned well, I let's put it this way. I think from the township's perspective; they're going to probably have to put a bulb in there if they're going to be closing that bridge permanently. Ray Ricketts mentioned I just thought, okay, is it either just going to be closed and a dead end? Or are they going to actually formally have to engineer something and make it with the amendment? Joe Zator mentioned It gives us flexibility where it right additional right away is required for a turnaround. It wouldn't affect the density. Ray mentioned my only reason for the question was that although the Lower Macungie had decided not to repair it wasn't that it would never get there and that was my, that 10 years from now, 5 years from now 8 years. They decide they have the resources. That so that's what that was. David Knerr mentioned that what's going to happen with that is, the railroad is going to go out of its way to give incentives to the township, and perhaps the borough, as well, to officially close that crossing.

The Alburtis Planning Commission has no issue with what is being proposed and Ray Ricketts made a motion to recommend that Borough Council grant the approval of Ordinance No. 594. The motion was 2nd by Jason Douglas and a unanimous vote followed.

A motion to adjourn was made at 7:10 by Mike Wambaugh, 2nd by Steve Mehl and a unanimous vote followed.

Meeting minutes were prepared and submitted by

Stephen Nemeth, Secretary, Planning Commission.