

# LEHIGH TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of August 11, 2025

Present: Todd Rousenberger, Vice Chairman  
Bill Jones, Secretary  
Tim Bartlett  
Cynthia Miller  
Michael Corriere, Solicitor  
Lori Lambert, Planning & Zoning Secretary  
Mike Muffley, Township Engineer

Absent: David Shulman, Chairman

## CALL TO ORDER

## READING OF THE MINUTES

Cindy Miller made a motion to approve the minutes and waive the reading of the minutes from July 14, 2025, Planning Commission meeting. Tim Bartlett seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

## TIME EXTENSION

***Top of the Mountain Estates, Preliminary/Final Plan: Expires: August 31, 2025, Extension request until: October 30, 2025***

Brian Gasda from Lehigh Engineering was present to represent this time extension request. Bill Jones made a motion to grant the time extension until October 30, 2025. Cindy Miller seconded the motion. Cindy Miller stated that the Board of Supervisors has a new policy; if no one shows up as a representative for the time extension request at their meeting, they are not approving the requests. This is why this extension is back to the Planning Commission. Brian Gasda stated that he had a zoning hearing and totally forgot to send someone to the meeting. All voted aye. Motion carried.

## PLAN REVIEW

***Top of the Mountain Estates, 32 Lot Revised Preliminary/Final Plan, Quince Road, Cornerstone Road & Arrowhead Lane***

Brian Gasda from Lehigh Engineering was present to represent this plan.

A review letter has been received from the Township Engineer, Mike Muffley of Hanover Engineering, dated August 11, 2025. Mike Muffley stated that there are some things to get wrapped up with the changes to the stormwater, with the existing surfaces. He will work with Lehigh Engineering on these. Zoning: 1.a., driveways on Quince Road for Lots 8 and 9 the stormwater detail needs to be added. 1.b., the Lot 8 driveway may conflict with the grading for the rain garden and shall be addressed. Item 2, driveway grades

of 10% shall be met. Item 3, earth moving activities, see SALDO comment 10. SALDO: Item 4, deed reference on Sheet 4 shall be updated. Item 5, standard signatures, approvals, covenants, notaries and wetland certification shall be provided prior to plan recording. Item 6.a., closure reports shall be submitted for the revised lots. Item 6.b., clarification on the monuments is requested. Item 7, issues remain with the existing topography and tie-in to proposed grading and features, the topography information shall be updated. Item 8, updates to the drainage plan/PCSM plan shall be revised to reflect the changes to the site layout. Modifications shall be required to current Chapter 102/NPDES permit. Item 8.a., the Lot 10 ownership/maintenance responsibilities shall be clarified. Brian Gasda stated that it would be the responsibility of the owner of Lot 10 to maintain the pipes. All the stormwater requirements are covered in the stormwater operation maintenance agreements. Item 9, the SEO should review and provide comments on the modifications to the plan. Item 10, the ESPC plan shall be revised to reflect the changes to the site. Modifications may be required to the current Chapter 102/NPDES permit. Item 11, pertains to the setting of the monuments and providing financial security if not set prior to plan recording. Item 12, amendments will be required to the developer's agreements after plan recording. Item 13, a list of noted grading and utility inconsistencies has been provided. Item 14, drafting/presentation mark-ups will be sent directly to the applicant's engineer.

Todd Rousenberger voiced his concerns with the intersection; this is not being designed to a standard. He did a quick sketch on the plan; providing a 150' radius and questioned why the lines for Lots 8, 10, 9 and 32 cannot be adjusted. The septic area of concern and wetland areas would not be an issue. Brian Gasda was instructed by the developer to leave the intersection as proposed; he understands that it looks awkward but feels that it works. Todd Rousenberger stated that he is still a no vote for approving this plan; there is the potential for incidents and accidents there. We are close to having self-driving cars and a self-driving car will stop at that intersection. A person driving a regular car will not stop and he can see some rearend accidents happening there. Brian Gasda feels that the technology is further off than what people think, we can't keep playing the what if game. Todd Rousenberger stated that this intersection does not meet the standards for erecting a stop sign. He would prefer a radius that meets the Township standards. The site distance is very limited around the corner. Brian Gasda stated that this supports the use of the stop signs. Tim Bartlett questioned if this proposal could be discussed with the developer. Cindy Miller stated he was at the last meeting, and he stated that he would look at it and that he probably could do it. Now they are coming back and saying no. Tim Bartlett stated that the Township has a lot of MVA's, the line of site is a safety concern, he is trying to keep the Township safe. Brian Gasda stated that the 75' standard clear site triangle is shown on the plan. Todd Rousenberger

makes the case that the stop signs don't belong there, and the road could be fixed. Brian Gasda stated that this design was discussed at length, and the plan was previously approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors; the owner did not anticipate revisiting the geometry of the road, it is not proposed to be changed. Todd Rousenberger stated that placing stop signs in the configuration that they are, does not meet the MUTCD standards for placing stop signs. Nor is there anything in PennDOT's book that says that you would put stop signs there. It would be better to put this in accordance with some type of standard, even if it would be substandard.

Cindy Miller questioned what will happen if the Planning Commission denies this plan. Michael Corriere stated that it can be denied if a specific SALDO section is not being complied with. The Board of Supervisors would then discuss and vote on the plan. Brian Gasda did request conditional approval of the plan. If there is a legitimate SALDO Section that says that they must go with the curve and what is proposed is unacceptable, they will change the plan. He is not authorized to change the intersection without approval from the owner. Todd Rousenberger feels that this is not an intersection. Mike Muffley stated that the intent was not to call this an intersection, the stop signs were put there as a traffic control measure because there was not adequate geometry or site distance.

Mike Muffley read the SALDO Section this plan is not in compliance with: SALDO Section 147-18.B(1)(b), all design elements of all streets, including horizontal and vertical alignment, sight distance and superelevation, are subject to review and approval by the Township. When reviewing the design of streets, in addition to the standards in this chapter, the Rural Design Criteria in the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Design Manual Part 2. Highway Design, latest edition, and A Policy On Geometric Design of Rural Highways, AASHTO, latest revision, shall be consulted to assure that the road design is in accordance with acceptable engineering practice. Refer to § 147-32.

Cindy Miller made a motion to deny this plan; the developer cannot meet the final SALDO condition cited as Section 147-18-B(1)(b). The developer shall comply with all of the comments in the Township Engineer's review letter dated August 11, 2025, provide owner signatures, notarizations, improvements agreement with posting of adequate security and comply with SALDO Section 147-18.B(1)(b), to revise Arrowhead Lane to include a curve @ 8+69.82. Tim Barlett seconded the motion. The Board felt that there is a valid concern with the layout; since this plan is back before them, it is recommended to have the developer correct the roadway. Todd Rousenberger stated that he will attend the Board of Supervisors meeting to raise his concerns. The Board requested that Mike Muffley look into the

requirements of PennDOT and AASHTO; specific sections shall be cited for the Board of Supervisors to review. Tim Bartlett, Todd Rousenberger, Cindy Miller and Bill Jones voted yay. Motion carried.

#### GENERAL BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion at this time.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment at this time.

#### ADJOURN

Cindy Miller made a motion to adjourn. Bill Jones seconded the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.