

UPPER SAUCON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Held April 5, 2016

Township Municipal Building
6:30PM

Members present: Samantha Falcone, Brian Macfarlane, Antonio Roman, George Bloeser & Al Cancellieri
Absent: Rod Chirumbolo, Gerry Anthony
Also present: Trent Sear, Upper Saucon Township Staff
Tom Dinkelacker - Upper Saucon Township Solicitor
Kevin Chimics - Upper Saucon Township Engineer

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM with recital of The Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Minutes:

The minutes from March 1, 2016 were reviewed, Mr. Roman made a motion to approve the minutes as prepared and Mr. Cancellieri provided a second. The motion passed 5-0.

2. Subdivision and Land Development

A. None

3. Public Comment:

None

4. Discussion:

A. Traditions of America AQC

Dave Biddison of TOA gave an overview of the proposed development of the Locust Valley Golf Course, which would require a map amendment to change the course to AQC Overlay. Mr. Biddison indicated that resolution of some public sewer conveyance issues has provided to a path to develop the course. The concept has been reviewed in some capacity by the Sewer Authority, Planning & Zoning Sub Committee and the neighboring property owners. There has been positive feedback from the neighbors and Mr. Biddison is confident that support for the AQC designations exists.

Rob Ashford presented a history of his involvement in the course and the general decline of the golfing industry and declining use of Locust Valley course. Mr. Ashford has had to make significant investments just to keep the up basic operations and the course continues to lose money.

Dave Biddison gave an overview of the previous plans submitted by McGrath, which called for much higher density and use than the proposed AQC plan by TOA. Tom Dinkelacker took over, reminding the Planning Commission of the McGrath litigation, centered on the non-compliance with Township Act 537 plan for providing public sewer service to the site. Several factors are contributing to the 125 units being able to be provided public sewer service including I/I removal in Coopersburg, coordination of service to Brinley Court facilitating a Coopersburg bypass interceptor and the reduced per unit flows expected for AQC type housing. Attorney Dinkelacker described in detail the cooperation occurring between the developer of Brinley Court, who is hoping to avoid construction of an off-line flow equalization tank to handle peak interceptor flows during periods of high I/I.

Dave Biddison summarized the benefits of AQC development of the parcel including use of existing greens to screen development from Locust Valley Road, less public sewer flows, less peak hour commuting trips, favorable tax generation with no additional demands on the public schools etc.

Regarding specific questions raised by the Planning Commission, Mr. Biddison indicated that TOA would own all the Locust Valley properties but no decisions are made regarding the future use of the existing course buildings on the north side of the road. Also, the Springfield portion would rely strictly upon on-site sewage disposal. In addition, the stream and ponds visible from the road would be preserved as open space.

Mr. Bloeser raised the issue of the excessive traffic on Locust Valley Road and the prospect of connecting to Blue Church Road South instead. Mr. Biddison indicated a willingness to evaluate this idea but the property to the west is not part of the course and that he would continue working with PA DOT to create the best access along Locust Valley Road. Ms. Falcone read a letter from John Gilda indicating objection to the proposed access road location. Ms. Falcone raised some discussion items regarding the low density design of the Springfield Township portion of the proposal. There were no public comments on the issue.

Upon further discussion of sewer service issues involving TOA and Brinley Court, the Planning Commission reached a consensus that given the low community impact and the opportunity for cooperation for sewer service, that the presented plan seemed like a good option for the development of the course. There was no opposition of the presented plan.

B. Main Street

While the Main Street land Development Plan was moved to the May agenda, representatives wanted to provide the Planning Commission with an introductory overview of the project. Representatives from Ott Consulting, Attorney Durso and a representative from main Street gave an overview of the planned project.

C. There was no report from the Environmental Advisory Council

5. Adjournment: With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Trent Sear,
Acting Secretary