

**PALMER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
PUBLIC MEETING - TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2023 - 7:00 PM  
PALMER TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL MEETING ROOM, LOWER LEVEL, 3 WELLER  
PLACE, PALMER PA 18045

Blanchfield led the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Election of Secretary

Blanchfield asked for nominations for Secretary for the Planning Commission for 2023.

Wilkins nominated Planning Director Kent Baird

Blanchfield asked for any other nominations and there were none.

Diefenderfer seconded the nomination.

All voted in favor of Baird for Secretary 2023.

Motion: Approve, Moved by Richard Wilkins, Seconded by Chuck Diefenderfer. Passed. 6-0. Commission Members voting Ayes: Aydelotte, Blanchfield, Diefenderfer, Kicska, Walker, Wilkins  
Commission Members Absent: Lammi

OLD BUSINESS

2. Approval of Minutes of December 13th 2022 Meeting

DISCUSSION

Blanchfield asked for approval of the December 13, 2022 meeting minutes.

Motion: Approve, Moved by Chuck Diefenderfer, Seconded by Robert Walker. Passed. 6-0. Commission Members voting Ayes: Aydelotte, Blanchfield, Diefenderfer, Kicska, Walker, Wilkins  
Commission Members Absent: Lammi

3. Approval of Minutes from January 6, 2023 meeting

DISCUSSION

Aydelotte mentioned that a comment was attributed to wrong person. Minutes were approved with the condition the sentence was updated to be attributed to Attorney Piperato.

Aydelotte motioned to approve. Walker seconded the motion.

Motion: Approve w/ Conditions, Moved by Robin Aydelotte, Seconded by Robert Walker. Passed. 6-0. Commission Members voting Ayes: Aydelotte, Blanchfield, Diefenderfer, Kicska, Walker, Wilkins  
Commission Members Absent: Lammi

4. Carson Lot 100-200 Final Land Development Plan  
Proposed Project: Carson 100/200 Five (5) Distribution/Manufacturing Buildings  
Applicant: Carson Van Buren LLC  
Request: Final Land Development  
Address: 1571 Van Buren Road & Main Street  
Parcel: J8-27-1 & J8-271A

## DISCUSSION

Blanchfield read into record that the preliminary plan was before us on March 8, 2022, and August 9, 2022. The previous reviews involve the removal of a lot line between two existing lots and the subdivision of the resulting 95-acre tract into two lots. The overall tract was part of the previous Chrin southwest quadrant lot line consolidation new lot one. New lot one contains 77 acres and proposes the development of five limited distribution/manufacturing buildings. Lot one development proposed in two phases; three buildings in Phase One and two buildings in Phase two. Lot two will contain 18 acres and it's not proposed for development at this time. New lot 2 should have a concept plan and we will discuss that in our section here as a sketch plan for formal review. That was discussed in previous meetings. Lot 2 must comply with the zoning ordinances that are in place at the time. The property south of Main Street and east of Van Buren Road within the North End business and Main Street commercial zoning district. The proposed use is permitted by right in this NEV district. The applicant was successful in obtaining a positive decision from the zoning hearing board on November 29, 2021, concerning the calculation of floor area as per 190-276 V8 warehouse used for limited distribution. On August 9, the planning commission reviewed a preliminary plan for this site.

Present for the applicant was Chris Hermance from Carson companies. Chris Mclean from Fitzpatrick, Lentz and Bubba, and Shaun Haas from Langan Engineering and Dan Deserio, traffic engineer from Langan Engineering. Haas said this was last before the planning commission on August 9, 2022. They did receive conditional preliminary approval from the board of supervisors on October 25 with some requested changes. A final recommendation is requested at this meeting. He added that there were some modifications to the plan that had been discussed at the Board of Supervisors meeting. The modifications were the dedication of open space, which is now lot 3 on the plan.

Haas showed the plan and explained Lot 1 is the 5 buildings and associated improvements. Lot 2-3 are properties along Main St. Lot 3 is at the intersection of Van Buren and Main St.

Lot 3 is open space. The acreage is 5.03 acres, which means the code requirements for the area being dedicated for open space. Lot 2 is 1308 and that area that's reserved for future retail development.

In addition to the open space, another key modification to the plan was a waiver request for street trees. That waiver request was removed and the required amount of trees will be provided internally within the site. Deferrals have been removed from the application. Specifically, a deferral for what would now be frontage improvements associated with the retail development. The caveat with the Board of Supervisors is that either those frontage improvements are installed with the development of Lot 2 or by 2027.

Blanchfield asked that they go through the waivers.

Briglia said that they have satisfied the requirements regarding the orifice sizing for the managed release concept basin.

Regarding the waiver for the emergency spillway, Briglia asked why they did not want concrete.

Haas responded that it's more aesthetically pleasing to have a vegetated spillway than to have rock or mortar concrete look for all the basins. Since there are seven above ground basins you'd be seeing, seven different areas of riprap on site and the functionality is the same.

Blanchfield said that they have allowed this waiver for synthetic fabric and the installation many times. He said they haven't had any problems he is aware of.

Aydelotte said she is in favor of synthetic fabric with the vegetation.

The next waiver was regarding internal slope. It was proposed as 4:1 and it is requested 3:1. Briglia agreed 3:1 was acceptable and mowing and maintenance could still be done.

Haas added that Carson has 7 buildings in the area with the same design and there have not been any issues with accessing the bottom or mowing.

Blanchfield said the next waiver is regarding slope. A 2% bottom slope was proposed. The waiver requests a zero % slope, which is basically flat bottom.

Briglia asked for a 1% pitch. He questioned how it would drain out without puddling. There is a concern for problems caused by standing water and the sinkhole problem in the Township.

Haas added the original concept for the project was infiltration basins which would have a flat bottom so the infiltration spreads out through the entire BMP. After the reviewed recommendations in August, the design was tweaked to a managed released concept basin. The DEP regulations state that the MRC basins should be flat bottom.

The MRC basins are designed with a perforated underdrain so that perforated underdrain will help to facilitate discharge from the basin.

Briglia said that was acceptable.

Blanchfield asked if the Planning Commission was ok with that, and they all agreed.

Blanchfield addressed the waiver regarding the alignment of pipe tops. He said that the requested waiver made sense. Briglia agreed.

Blanchfield introduced the waiver regarding street trees and asked Haas to explain to them what they were requesting.

Haas said this request is specific to the street trees that are long Van Buren Rd.

He said that with Van Buren roadway improvements project, there's a 48-inch pipe that runs parallel to the sidewalk. If trees are put in within the right of way, there will be issues with that pipe system level in the sidewalk. Haas said they are proposing is to push the trees internal to our site and grant an access easement to Palmer township to maintain those trees over time.

Briglia agreed that moving the trees internally makes sense.

Baird asked for clarification if the expectation was for Palmer Township to maintain the trees on the site. He asked if it would be in the developer's interest to maintain the trees instead.

Hermance stated they would be happy to.

Oetinger asked how far into the site would the trees be moved.

Haas showed the final master landscape plan. He explained the trees go from about 10 ft outside the roadway to about 25-30 ft adjacent to building 4.

Oetinger asked if it was only as much as necessary to avoid the hazards. Haas said yes.

Blanchfield introduced the waiver regarding driveway aprons. The proposal is to have driveway aprons. The director of Public Works Scott Kistler provided his comment earlier in the day.

Baird said he's concerned and thinks there should be aprons. There are aprons on projects across the street and on other nearby projects. Kistler would prefer to have the aprons.

Haas asked if it was just the concrete apron for the first 50 feet of the driveway.

Baird responded yes

Haas said if it is just the concrete apron, they do not oppose that.

Baird said he and Kistler reviewed against their previous projects, and they were looking for basically the same.

Haas said ok.

Blanchfield said that that the commission was looking to Kistler for input and would defer to his preference.

Hermance asked if it was only for the two truck driveways not the car driveway.

Haas clarified that they were not talking about the code section geared more towards residential driveways, only the concrete aprons where the trucks would pull in.

Baird deferred to Briglia. Briglia said that just the truck driveways were acceptable. Baird clarified that he and Kistler did not reference the residential driveways, just the concrete aprons for durability where trucks would pull in.

Blanchfield asked Oetinger to help with the zoning district boundaries and proposed zoning realignment.

Oetinger asked if they could talk about what the comment from the Pidcock letter was and what the understanding was regarding the comment.

Haas explained the line between what is now lots 1, 2, and 3 is the basically the separation between the NAB zoning district and the Main Street commercial zoning district. The proposed zoning realignment will not affect the zoning district they are currently in.

Baird added that in discussions of the new zoning ordinance this is not one of the properties that have been discussed.

Blanchfield added the next point on the review letter discussion of a previous

concept plan for lot two.

Mclean added that they are not retail developers. They are looking to partner with one to develop the site. They do not have a concept plan but are glad they didn't do one since they have to give up acreage to open space. Once they have a developer, they would be happy to provide concept plans.

Blanchfield asked until you identify some potential users of that property users and developers, you really can't develop a concept plan?

Hermance added that they could, but it wouldn't be accurate to what might be there.

Blanchfield asked what would be there and Mclean responded that it would be retail. It could possibly be a strip mall or pad sites.

Blanchfield asked Briglia if it would be adequate just to put some basic information in block such as an outline of buildings or something similar.

Briglia said if it is something that you are pursuing and is anticipated, then we should probably take a look at something. However, it doesn't sound that way.

Hermance said at this point they are not submitting an application. They are not close to the point.

Briglia said to just hold off on submitting anything then.

Baird added that the Board of Supervisors may be interested in seeing a very basic sketch plan, possibly just setbacks from your lot lines or basic drawings showing one building or two.

Haas said based on conversations with Pidcock it was understood that Carson or any future partner of Carson would be required to go through the same land development processes for lot. He recommended that on a record plan, either on the cover over sheet or the Master Site Plan, a note is added that dictates that any development of lot 2 shall be submitted to the township as preliminary final development application.

Blanchfield asked if Baird felt that was sufficient based on what the Board of Supervisors is looking for.

Baird said the most important things would be the setbacks and how much space there is.

Oetinger added that he feels a sketch plan or a concept plan is not very significant at this point.

Blanchfield added that he agrees a sketch plan is not needed at this point but they are ready for the concept plan, which is basically what they've already submitted showing the setbacks to see the developer space limits.

Blanchfield said he did not see a proposed access for lot 3. He asked how you would get onto lot 3.

Haas said the way the open space section of the Saldo is stated is that only access for maintenance and pedestrian access is required. No actual improvements are required in the open space lot. Lot 3 has frontage on Van Buren and Main Street. Lot 3 would have pedestrian access based on the sidewalk connection from the proposed development. There would be maintenance access from the frontage along Van Buren.

Blanchfield said the preference would be accessibility off Van Buren for maintenance. He asked if there was enough setback.

Desario said they can get a curve cut.

Wilkins asked how much frontage from the end of lot one to Main St.

Baird said that there is a right-hand turn lane that MRP industrial and Carson are sharing and it's a longer one than either one individually put out to put together. So, the corner will have a hefty right turn lane.

Haas responded the answer to Mr. Wilkins' questions is 268 ft.

Wilkins said there doesn't seem to be a lot you can do with that.

Baird added that the area is Gateway experience of beautification of both sides coming onto Van Buren.

Blanchfield asked Oetinger to explain the open space discussion of what happened to lot 3, how it developed, going back to the attorney's letter back in February.

Oetinger said the last time this plan was before the Planning Commission; the recommendation was to take the fee in lieu of open space. That was not the direction the Board of Supervisors wanted to go. Open Space was shown on the plan that was preliminarily approved by the Board of Supervisors. That's the plan that's before the planning commission now.

Aydelotte added that Carson had said that lot would be unimproved. She asked if it was right now.

The young house was south of that point and has since been moved to the Chrin retain parcel which is the far-right corner of the property at the southern end.

Baird asked how the township access without a curb cut, as Dan was saying, off of Main Street if that right hand turn lane is right there at that corner.

Blanchfield said that it doesn't need to be off Main Street. It's safer to be on Van Buren but it ends up to be on Main Street but he is not opposed since it is maintenance access.

Oetinger asked if there were any internal roads near Lot 3.

Haas said since Lot 3 is not being developed there's no there's no proposed roadway is there. There is a shared drive aisle to the north of buildings four and five.

Blanchfield said that wherever is safest and most efficient for maintenance access is best.

Blanchfield asked for comments about the required improvements along Lots 2 and 3, like pedestrian accommodations, where Lanta will put their bus stop, etc.

Haas added that the last correspondence they had was that it was in Lanta's long-term planning to have a bus stop. In further discussion, it was stated that there are 2 bus stops in the area already.

Blanchfield said that any approvals would have the condition of continuing work with Lanta.

Blanchfield asked what the plans were for pedestrian walkways.

Haas said the way the development is situated, we have the frontage improvements associated with lot one. He said they are putting the sidewalk cutting across three driveways connecting the Chrin retained parcel to lot three. The sidewalk from that point forward would be the Township's responsibility based on the way the code read. For Lot 2, either the developer of Lot 2 would put frontage improvements in place or they must be constructed by Carson Van Buren LLC by the end of 2027.

Blanchfield asked what the safe connection between Van Buren Rd. sidewalk coming across Lot 3 to be able to get into the developed area of 2 will be?

Hermance said that there was no proposal.

Haas said with the dedication of the land, it would be up to the Township. Oetinger added there should be something in writing regarding security regarding the 2027 date in case things changed hands or they went out of business.

They said that was fine.

Wilkins asked if there was going to be a sidewalk for Lot 3.

Haas said that is correct. There are no frontage improvements currently proposed for Lot 3. There are crosswalks going across Van Buren. Access could be along Lot 1, along the MRP development to the intersection of Main St. and Van Buren and going across that way.

Wilkins added that it is a busy area and there is likelihood of people walking to go buy a sandwich at lunch and they would have to walk along the side of the road.

Blanchfield clarified that Lot 3 is to be given to the Township. It will be up to the Township to develop what they want there. There is a plan for beautification of lot 3 and that may include walkways.

Diefenderfer asked if there was a pathway along the backside of the buildings. After reviewing placement on the maps, Haas responded that it was never proposed as part of this.

Haas said there are internal walk paths interconnecting Van Buren Rd to each of the five buildings, but there's no sidewalk interconnection between Lot 1 and 2.

Blanchfield said that Lammi has previously discussed internal walkways to get people around buildings without walking in roadways.

Haas responded yes and that there were sidewalks around all perimeters of the building and ADA accessible path from Van Buren to each of the 5 buildings.

Blanchfield asked if there were any general comments on landscaping.

Haas said Gilmore had one remaining comment where there was a slight conflict with the proposed landscaping versus a drainage pipe. He said that they will address that.

Blanchfield said there were some questions regarding the water tank(s). Fire Commissioner Steve Gallagher wanted to address some issues regarding water supply.

Gallagher said it's more of a concern than an issue of what exists compared to what we need. He said he understands a 500,000-gallon tank to supply 4 buildings and a 21,000-gallon tank to supply 1 building are being put in.

Haas said 500,000-gallon tank is for the public. He said they are connecting their fire service line for the 4 northern buildings off that system. but it's a public mean that will be owned by PA American Water Company and the tank will as well. It will benefit the public not just the development.

Blanchfield asked where the tank would be located.

Haas said the northeast corner of building 3.

Gallagher said these systems are designed to take care of life safety first. It doesn't take account for the firefighters afterwards that come in to extinguish a fire that may have occurred or is occurring. The board should understand the response time to this area is approximately 10 minutes from dispatch. These tanks are proposed to last 10 minutes to allow the life safety factors to escape. That would leave them with no water if the fire pump fails. He said they don't

have water supplies substantial enough for these properties unless they call in tenders and there are no tenders in our area other than upper Nazareth. To alleviate the problem, when a public water supply comes into the tank, there'll be a hydrant coming off that. Then there is a fire pump connection that bypasses the fire pump that goes and relays to the fire hydrants as well as the sprinkler system.

Reviewing the drawings, it looks as if you have in the fire department connection on the public water supply. We want that to be changed to a hydrant, so that if the pump does fail, we can alternatively supply the water service and the sprinkler system still do our job safely.

Haas said there isn't any opposition here to doing whatever Gallagher thinks is best. His job is incredibly important, and we want to provide him with whatever makes his job easier. We can coordinate a redline to our plan that makes sense to address the comments that you have. Secondary from that the actual tank design itself will be submitted by PA American as a separate land development application. It is showing it as a placeholder. PA American will be coming in with their own land development application.

Gallagher said that does alleviate the problem.

Haas said he thinks PA American is likely coming with a land development application within the next three months.

While reviewing the plans, Gallagher asked if the public FTC can go off the internal connect. Haas said they could.

Blanchfield went on to review item 6B on the Engineering Review letter regarding Right of Way. He added that coordination should continue with the right turn lane with MRP.

Blanchfield said one retaining wall is about four feet which kicks in a certain amount of engineering review.

Haas said Carson is working with our construction team that determined the designer for the retaining walls.

Blanchfield asked if there is more than one wall.

Haas said based on one of the comments that we had from from CMT, the geotechnical engineer for the township they are working through addressing a stormwater comment. There may be additional retaining walls associated with addressing that comment. One is in the NW corner and the other is in basin 7.

Blanchfield said the 4 feet is important because it level of design engineer review and inspection. .

Haas added he thinks the wall in the basin is less than four feet. He said he thinks that the cut off for requiring design is 30 inches. The wall at the northwest corner of building 1 is around 5 ft. The necessary parties will be prepared for what is necessary and submit to the township for review.

Briglia asked what the timing for that is?

Haas said before construction. He thinks Carson will get somebody on board within the next few months. Probably submitted for review about the same time they'd hope to get final approval.

Blanchfield said regarding Stormwater, he would like to skip over the section of work that needs to be done by others. He said there's a letter from the NCCD dated January 25, 2023. They determined the submission was incomplete.



Haas said that was a completeness review. There were incompleteness comments. He said those have been addressed since it was resubmitted. They now have a complete letter. Looking at notes here, we received the completeness approval on January 25. The project is currently in technical review with the NCCD.

Blanchfield said the LVPC letter says there's inconsistency with act 167

Haas said there approximately 7 minor stormwater comments that they are working through. He said they are just waiting on either a clearance or consistency letter from Jeffries and LVPC. Any remaining from Pidcock or Carroll they plan to address at the next review.

Blanchfield moved onto Traffic in the Carroll review letter. He asked where they were with PennDOT and Lower Nazareth.

Haas said there is an approval email from lower Nazareth that's been forwarded to Baird. The project does not require HOP, so there's been no formal submission to PennDOT. There are no additional comments from the Township or Lower Nazareth, so the TIS is complete.

Blanchfield asked if they wanted to comment on anything about internal traffic.

Haas said they are amenable to adding signage and directing traffic in specific ways that, address any concerns that the township has.

Blanchfield asked if they could review all of your points to be able to get trucks internal as they're waiting for loading docks.

Haas said building one has its own dedicated driveway. The driveway has a width of 30 feet. It has availability for trucks to queue in that driveway if they need to wait for an open dock space or trailer space. If they don't need to wait there are plenty of dock spaces and trailer spaces, and spaces associated with that specific building. For buildings 2,3,4 and 5, the four buildings that are playing North a similar situation where there's the boulevard entrance, which has additional width where trucks could queue if they couldn't find a dock space or a trailer space. Each building has its own system of dock space and name trailer spaces where trucks can park. In summary there's plenty of space available on site there. There should be no trucks queuing off site.

Wilkins added his concerns regarding truckers who may need a place to keep the truck until they can drive again since they are only allowed to drive a certain number of hours.

Hermance said based on the other buildings we have of this size in Palmer Township, we can accommodate the trucker here or there that needs to park for a while. These are not high throughput buildings. You have the space to load, space to park and enough space to accommodate the truckers.

Blanchfield asked what is planned regarding roadway milling and resurfacing.

Haas said came up with a game plan with MRP, to have both paving analysis be consistent and use the same calculations coefficients. He said they were working on a revised paving analysis that will be submitted to the township. Based on the comments received from the township, they are looking at a half an inch overlay for Van Buren Road. There will be an effort to prepare roadway improvement plans that will go in. In association with their development there'll be a restriping plan for the areas needing additional pavement.

Blanchfield said, so what you're saying is it's you're working between the two different engineers to come up with a consensus exactly to be able to come up with a plan that will be submitted and reviewed by our staff.

Haas said that there is there's a joint plan now and that's how it would be resubmitted. Earlier on in the project there was a little bit of a disconnect between the two parties. And there's been a significant effort by Chris and Carson and Matt Climber in MRP to be on the same page and do whatever we can work together.

Aydelotte mentioned to Briglia that in his letters he did not recommend approval. She said it seems some issues have been worked out and asked if that changed Briglia's opinion.

Briglia said I didn't recommend approval engineering approval at this time because there were a lot of outstanding items such as waivers that have not been granted, the two frontage lots and what was going to happen to them. Briglia said if the board decided to make a decision to approve the project, based on satisfying items in my report or any of the other professionals, he could support that.

Baird said that over the years a lot of professionals have really tried to, to put the message out there that applications get the recommendation of approval and then work hard to get their details working. We don't want to pass along something that needs a lot of work to the Board of Supervisors.

Blanchfield agreed that some items still need clarification.

Baird asked if Haas had addressed Sean Casey's comments on dewatering.

Haas said there are some limitations they have to work through but they have a plan of attack. They plan to send some calculations to Sean Casey this week.

#### Motion

Oetinger gave a recommended motion to grant conditional final approval subject to compliance with the February 10, 2023, Carroll Engineering letter as well as the February 6, 2023, Gilmore & Associates letter with respect to waivers. With reference to the Carol letter

A1a - be granted to this to the extent necessary.

A1b - be granted.

A1c - be granted up to a three to one ratio.

A1d - be granted.

A1e - be granted.

A1f be granted subject to the condition that Carson maintained the trees that are being moved out of the right of way.

A1g - as withdrawn except for the car entrance apron where the waiver is recommended to be granted.

Conditions:

B3 - the applicant continues to work with Lanta for a bus stop.

Lot 2 deferral to post a bond to secure the purpose of frontage and purpose.

Revise the plan consistent with the fire department review.

The retaining wall design will be provided prior to the final plan.

Wilkins made the motion to approve based on Oetinger's recommended motion.

Diefenderfer seconded the motion.

Blanchfield asked if there were comments from the Commission members.

Aydelotte said there is a lot follow up stuff and she felt we should table it.

Blanchfield asked for comments from the floor.

Harry Graack 1380 Van Buren Rd. His concern is traffic. Van Buren Road is a

nightmare. This project is going to dump a lot more employee traffic onto Van Buren Rd and other local roads. He suggests they should contribute to signaling the intersections at least a mile from the project. He feels that this project should make some type of contribution to traffic control.

Oetinger added that part of the preliminary plan approval is a \$273,000 contribution to township traffic.

Graack said that is not enough money.

He also there doesn't seem to be anything in the plan to stop truck stacking. He suggests more signage to prevent trucks standing or stacking along with enforcement.

Blanchfield asked who was in favor of passing the motion as given by Oetinger.

Voting for were Kicska, Diefenderfer, Blanchfield, and Wilkins

Against – Walker and Aydelotte.

Motion: Approve w/ Conditions, Moved by Richard Wilkins, Seconded by Chuck Diefenderfer. Passed. 4-2. Commission Members voting Ayes: Blanchfield, Diefenderfer, Kicska, Wilkins

Commission Members voting Nays: Aydelotte, Walker Commission Members Absent: Lammi

## NEW BUSINESS

### 5. 48 Kunkle Drive

#### Summary Site

Proposed Project: 48 Kunkle Drive Carwash  
Applicant: 48 Kunkle Dr Realty LLC  
Request: Preliminary/Final Land Development  
Address: 48 Kunkle Drive  
Parcel: L8 17 1P 0324

#### DISCUSSION

Blanchfield introduced the proposed Carwash at 48 Kunkle Drive and the intersection of Corporate Dr. This project has an existing parking pad onsite. It is proposed for a 5940 square foot building to be used as a carwash. It will have two different driveways connected to Kunkle drive. The development is in a planned office business district.

Blanchfield asked for a presentation, and they would go through the Carroll letter.

Present for the Applicant were Erion Lenas and Jason Atkas Engineer.

Atkas introduced the application for the proposed carwash application at 48 Kunkle Dr. The Carwash would be located within the planned office business zone in which a carwash is a permitted use. Currently there is just a parking lot there and grass area. We will be demo-ing everything and proposing all new pavement, grasses and curb cuts. Atkas showed the site plan. He said they did appear in front of the zoning board in June of 2022, where they received seven different variances, five of which were related to signage, and two of which were related to location about parking. He said this is going to be a Soaring car wash.

Soaring is a modern Express carwash that really emphasizes customer efficiency. The carwash does run from 7am to 9pm seven days a week. Seven to nine employees will be on site at any given time.

Atkas gave a presentation explaining the flow of traffic, number of employees, parking availability and explanation and efficiency of services offered.

Blanchfield asked what the percentage of people leaving after the main carwash versus going immediately into the detail.

Atkas responded 80% of the trip generation here is for the carwash only and about 20% of that is for the detailing service.

Blanchfield asked if there is a backup waiting to go into the detailing tunnel with the people trying to exit the carwash.

Lenas said they have a current location that has a detailing service. Since the service is optional if the customer sees there is a line, they choose not to opt for that service. If there is a backup it can be controlled by staff, or they can stop selling the service until it is cleared. It is a 10–12-minute service.

Blanchfield asked if the customer needs to get out.

Lenas responded that the customer would wait in the lobby or patio. Lenas said we have a system that pushes them through efficiently.

Atkas went on to explain the layout of the detailing area, parking spaces, vacuum etc.

Kicska asked where the employees park

Atkas said there are no dedicated employee spaces. They would use the parking spaces by the vacuums.

Lenas said we have about 7 to 10 employees on the busiest shift. They are planning on taking some of those vacuum spots and utilize them as employee parking as needed.

Wilkins said that they could basically take a whole side for employee parking. He asked if they were allowed to park on the street.

Blanchfield said he didn't think there were any restrictions on street parking.

Gallagher said tacos and tequila use the cul de sac for employees.

Atkas said two of the variances that were approved were for the parking locations.

Oetinger asked if they were complying with the number of parking spaces.

Atkas said they were.

Atkas said about 50% of customers use the vacuums, so it leaves many spaces open for employees.

The car wash has a four series system that recycles about 50% of the water.

They are looking into potentially providing a system to reuse the water into the carwash. Currently they are showing connections to public water and public sewer but are looking into potentially providing an option for retaining some of the water from the actual building itself.

Blanchfield asked if there is a state requirement for the amount of recycled water from carwash in Pennsylvania.

Atkas said he wasn't sure but would look into it.

Blanchfield said he thought there was, based on review of another carwash.

Briglia said there is recycling water and there's also the collection of rooftop water.

Blanchfield asked if there is treatment for some of the recycled water?

Atkas said there is a water separator.

Blanchfield asked if it is just grit and dirt or is it reverse osmosis ?

Atkas said he believes it's just grit and dirt.

Blanchfield said at some point they will want to know some more information on that.

Lenas said the separation unit is just for grit and dirt and injects ozone to help with the odors. There are four reclaim holding tanks that are underground oil water separators to separate solids.

Atkas said they submitted a trip generation memo. This carwash has under 100 proposed trips. He believes 78 peak hour trips, and anything under 100 trips won't really affect an existing roadway network.

Baird said we received it, but our comment was that we needed more detail.

Atkas touched on stormwater. They are proposing less than acre of disturbance so they don't have to meet any kind of water quality or groundwater recharge requirements, but they do have to meet town and county as well as DEP requirements in terms of water quality. The 70% reduction for the two year and then maintaining at the minimum the same reductions for the 10 year and 100 year storm. They are doing this by providing an underground chamber system which detains most of the stormwater on the site and then essentially sends it to an existing culvert that runs along Corporate Drive. Some of the stormwater does, as it does today, under existing conditions, bypasses the adjoining properties but does not disturb the areas in the perimeter, so they don't account for that in our system.

They did receive a review letter on lighting. They meet all the town's requirements for lighting.

They meet all the town requirements for landscaping but there have been comments on street trees.

Blanchfield asked what the plan was for street trees was.

Atkas said there is one street tree on Kunkle that will have to be relocated. He said they are proposing all the trees on the interior of the parcel. One comment was to propose these on the roadway as street trees and they don't see any concerns with that.

Atkas showed a truck turning exhibit. The largest emergency vehicle is able to get through the site without any of the wheels going over the curbing. The vehicle may show as overhanging the curb, but the wheels do not.

Gallagher said he was not concerned with the truck turning radius for on property because they would use Corporate and Kunkle drive for any fire activity. His concern would be hazardous material spills. He asked what chemical would be used in the detailing area and where they would be stored.

Lenas said the central area of the building has an equipment room. That is where all of the detergents and cleaning agents are stored. He said everything is biodegradable and nonhazardous. Nothing is combustible.

Gallagher asked if there any bulk storage of any chemicals.

Lenas asked for further explanation of what they are asking for.

Gallagher said some cleaning solvents may not be hazardous but are combustible.

Lenas said he could get some safety data sheets together for him. Gallagher said to also provide information on the quantities that they plan on storing. Depending on the combustibility of the product, the International Fire Code restricts how much you can store without having a secondary container.

Lenas based on the sites they generally receive small 2.5-gallon containers bi-weekly. They are concentrated agents which get diluted for use. He said he could provide Gallagher a list of the products used.

Gallagher asked if the exit from the vacuums is restricted for entry. Is there barrier to prevent people from entering there.

Lenas said there were no gates.

Gallagher said if they would add a barrier, the fire department would need an access point.

Lenas said all areas are open during normal business hours. At night they just put small removeable barriers.

Blanchfield asked if Lenas could provide size of the containers, the amount of material stored at any given time, and a picture of what a typical storage area look like.

Atkas said one of the variances that we got was for the monument sign area. The height of the mountain side

Blanchfield asked if that's the one that's on the building,

Atkas said no, that is something different. The proposed monument sign is along Corporate Drive. They did receive the variance for the area of it which is 80 square feet, the height which is eight feet, and then the location of the sign to Corporate Drive property line. He said there was a revision so they don't need the variance. The sign is at seven and a half feet, but they did get that approval for it. Another variance for the signage was having the digital letters for the freestanding signs. That variance for having maximum 16 square feet.

Blanchfield said Palmer has some very strict requirements for digital signage. He asked if the signage is facing any of the nearby residents?

Atkas said it's facing the residents who said along Sales street over here. It's fairly low to the ground and turned off at night.

They showed where the sign would be located.

Wilkins commented that it would really just be seen when you drive in.

Atkas said they got a variance for the wall signage for having 53.75 square feet here. It's above that 10 feet requirement for the township.

Wilkins asked if that was a lit sign.

Atkas responded it was. It is externally illuminated.

Diefenderfer asked what the hours of operation are going to be.

Atkas responded 7am To 9pm. Signage and lighting will be off overnight. It's only on during actual operations.

Oetinger asked if they had a copy of the Zoning Hearing Board summary.

Baird provided the letter and said it was in Novus.

Atkas showed the design and explained where the signage would be and architectural design.

Blanchfield said they would now go through the review comments in the review letter.

Blanchfield said that they had requested this to be a preliminary and final site plan review. The waiver request is for relief from Saldo 165 – 36.A.(2) which

states the final plan should be submitted after a preliminary plan. The planning commission here believes that we should be reviewing this as a preliminary plan due to some outstanding issues.

Based on the attorney review, a note that we found on the plan the application is located on an existing subdivision plan from 1992 that was entitled The Palmer Business Plan Phase 1.

Oetinger said he found the record plan. He asked if there were any notes on that plan anywhere in the approval of that plan that might bear on the use of this property?

Atkas said not to their knowledge, but they will look into it. It's not aligning what is shown on their plan.

Oetinger said looking at the layout of the surrounding properties, it's clear it was part of a subdivision at some point.

Atkas said we did see an older possible retail user proposed here. He's not sure how it got to the point of being all grass and a couple of parking spaces.

Blanchfield said the parking spaces may go back to when the LoneStar restaurant used it as overflow parking. Are we taking parking spaces away from any existing restaurant that are there.

Baird asked if it was something that came up as a discussion point for a deeper title search whether there was some agreement or deed restriction or sharing or other items lingering.

Atkas said they could provide the title report.

Blanchfield said there is a small triangle 580 square feet of land that may have been dedicated to the township.

Oetinger said the plan says dedicated to the township. He asked if the dedication has taken place or is it a proposed dedication.

They showed the place on the plan that was in question.

Atkas said we need to figure out where that came from

Blanchfield said it didn't need to be done tonight. He said the question is if it has been dedicated to the Township, what about the signage proposed there.

Also, has the 582 ft, been calculated in for stormwater etc.

Atkas said he did not know the dedication was there, but they will look into it.

Blanchfield asked if their plan was to develop and operate this themselves or get the approvals and sell the project.

Lenas said they were operating it themselves.

Blanchfield asked about the type of water recycling they're going to do, percentages of water and water usage. He said in the research he did, it is approximately 35 gallons per car.

Lenas said it is only about 10 gallons of fresh water per car. This is strictly just freshwater supply versus freshwater supply and reclaimed water being used. He said they are using anywhere from eight to 11 gallons per vehicle.

He added the water after the wash process is pretty much 100% recaptured and collected into reclaimed tanks. The Reclaim systems have the capability of reclaiming up to 100% on a closed loop system.

Blanchfield asked how you separate soap in reclaiming the water.

Lenas said the reclaimed water that is reintroduces into the wash is pretty much being used for rinses and high-power high-pressure sprays. The water that goes into the soap and detergents is freshwater. The reclaimed water is free of grid and dirt, but it's not clear water.

Blanchfield said that different waters are being used at different parts of the wash.

Lenas responded that was correct.

Blanchfield asked how much they would be discharging to the sanitary sewer system.

Lenas said it's at the rate of approximately 10 gallons per vehicle.

Blanchfield asked if they could calculate how much in a 24-hour period of time.

Wilkins said that area has been a problem area for Palmer township water because a lot of the township water drains from both from the south where the high school is and from the north where there is a swale that goes all the way down 13th Street into Bushkill Creek. It is historically a problem area.

Blanchfield said there were concerns whether they were building over the culvert

Atkas said they were not. They show the culvert on the plans, but all of their structures are out of the culvert.

Blanchfield said it is important to clearly signify where things will be on the plans, such as driveways, planting of trees etc.

He also said that the Geotech is suggesting a Carbonate Study in the February 2023 letter.

Atkas said that in their initial design the stormwater system wasn't providing infiltration and they were able to meet the reductions required. He said they did get Geotech testing that provides some infiltrations rates. At this time, they would need to further discuss whether or not they wanted to remove the infiltration and revise the design or provide the carbonate study.

Blanchfield that the Township consultant will need to be satisfied with whatever they decide because the Township is extremely prevalent to developing sinkholes.

Blanchfield said the open space policy will need to be discussed with Township prior to another meeting.

They discussed the footage for the separation of the building.

Aydelotte was concerned there was not enough parking for the employees.

Wilkins felt there was a lot of things to still be resolved.

Baird added that the applicant voluntarily sought an extension of the project timeline, so they've got some time to tighten things up.

Kicska asked how the process would work from the carwash to the detailing area. He asked if they would be getting out of their car.

Lenas said they would drive to the detailing area and then get out of their car. They could then go into the waiting area.

Aydelotte asked for further explanation on the plan as to the flow of the cars and to see if there was a safe path for patrons to exit their car to enter the detailing area. This was explained on the plan by Atkas and Lenas and determined there was a safe place for patrons to get out.

Walker asked where the other locations were.

Lenas said in New Jersey about an hour away.

Diefenderfer said he noticed there was heated pavement. He asked what the safety requirements are.

Lenas said they have it at the other sites, and it helps with snow management and freezing. He said it is a glycol-based system. The specs will be submitted



with the building plans.

Diefenderfer asked if the vacuums would be able to meet township noise ordinance which is most restrictive on Sundays.

Lenas said they would.

Blanchfield asked if they information from the existing carwashes on the decibel level.

Lenas said yes.

Diefenderfer asked based on peak times, how many parking spaces are needed. He asked them to provide information on any choke points at peak times. He said his concern that traffic will end up in the street if there are not enough spaces.

Atkas said they can get those numbers doing some calculations off the projected peak hour trips. They believe what they are showing on the plan is adequate.

The motion was made to table for more information by Kicska and seconded by Walker. All were in favor.

Motion: Tabled, Moved by Jeff Kicska, Seconded by Robert Walker. Passed. 6-0. Commission Members voting Ayes: Aydelotte, Blanchfield, Diefenderfer, Kicska, Walker, Wilkins  
Commission Members Absent: Lammi

#### PLANNING DIRECTOR COMMENTS

Blanchfield and Kent discussed conflicts on the date of the next scheduled meeting. Kent said there are seven conditional use applications that are time sensitive. However, there could be extensions requested. Currently there would be 4 people in attendance at the next meeting, so they would need to be notified of that.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Blanchfield asked if anyone had Public Comment. There was none.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Wilkins.  
Diefenderfer seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 pm.

Commission Members Absent: Lammi