

PLAN SLATE BELT



- Bangor • East Bangor • Lower Mount Bethel • Pen Argyl •
- Plainfield • Portland • Roseto • Upper Mount Bethel •
- Washington • Wind Gap •

SLATE BELT MULTI-MUNICIPAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, August 3, 2023, 7:00 PM
Pen Argyl Borough Hall, 11 North Robinson Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072

AGENDA

Open Meeting

1. Roll Call
2. Minutes
 - July 6, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Old Business

1. Update on Plainfield Township Correspondence
2. Comparison of Southwest Lehigh Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Plan Map and Slate Belt Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Plan Map
3. How to use the Slate Belt Future Land Use Plan Map
4. Possible Adoption Schedule Discussion
5. Intermunicipal Agreement Discussion

New Business

1. Next Meeting:
 - September 7, 2023, 7:00 PM, Location To Be Determined

Next Steps

Courtesy of the Floor (For items not covered on the rest of the agenda)

1. General Issues and Opportunities Discussion
 - a. Known "Plan Activity" in Slate Belt Communities
 - i. July 2023
2. Municipal Updates

Adjourn

Next Meeting: _____

The Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan for the SLATE BELT

July 6, 2023 – 7 PM, Steering Committee Meeting

Steering Committee Attendees:

Bangor: Steve Reider
East Bangor: Jason Huggan
Lower Mount Bethel: Jen Smethers, Sandra Newman
Pen Argyl: Robin Zmoda, Tyler Kemp
Plainfield: Terry Kleintop, Jane Mellert, Don Moore
Portland: Lance Prator
Roseto:
Upper Mount Bethel: David Friedman
Washington:
Wind Gap:

Members of the Public in Attendance:

Judy Henckel – Upper Mount Bethel Township
Millie Beahn – Plainfield Township

Planning Partners in Attendance:

Becky Bradley – Lehigh Valley Planning Commission
Dean Severson – Lehigh Valley Planning Commission
Sue Rockwell – Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

Roll Call

Ms. Rockwell called roll. Roseto, Washington and Wind Gap were not in attendance.

Minutes from the June 1, 2023 Meeting

Ms. Zmoda called for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 1, 2023 meeting. Mr. Prator asked for a correction to the minutes under the discussion of Trail Towns under Old Business. He said the proposed text should reflect all trails. Mr. Prator made the motion to approve the minutes with the correction as noted. Mr. Reider seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Old Business

1. Portland Borough Council Update

Mr. Prator said Borough Council voted to rejoin the Slate Belt planning effort at their June 5, 2023 meeting. The meeting was also attended by LVPC staff and steering committee members.

2. Discussion of Correspondence from Plainfield Township

Copies of the correspondence from the Township solicitor and the Township Committee for the Slate Belt Plan were previously provided with the meeting notice. Ms. Zmoda asked who is on the Township Committee. Mr. Moore replied that it consists of the three representatives on the Steering Committee. Ms. Zmoda said a Comprehensive Plan provides recommendations for land use. Zoning is adopted to implement them. She asked if it was better to address the details with zoning. Ms. Bradley said the details are in the zoning code. For a general land use plan, it is not normal to include the details.

**Slate Belt Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
July 6, 2023**

Ms. Smethers said the Lower Mount Bethel Township Supervisors thought it was not right for just the one land use (landfill) being called out. Ms. Bradley said there is no requirement for infinite land for all uses. Legally, just two parcels are required for a land use. Ms. Mellert asked if the other municipalities take solid waste out of their zoning, how do they provide for it. Ms. Bradley said they already have a landfill. Mr. Moore said that was not their Township solicitor's opinion. Ms. Bradley said she will follow up with the solicitor. Ms. Zmoda said no one can tell Plainfield Township they have to keep having a landfill and asked if this was a deal breaker for the Township. Ms. Smethers said the consultant for their zoning ordinance agrees that if one municipality has a landfill, no one else needs to provide for that use and asked why it should be called out in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Moore said other comprehensive plans have detailed land use categories. Ms. Bradley said he had asked for what exists for land use. Mr. Moore also said the map insets are not compatible with the General Land Use Plan. Ms. Bradley said the detailed uses in the inset maps are aggregated in the General Land Use Plan. Mr. Moore said the inset maps were supposed to be renamed Future Land Use Plan. Ms. Bradley said that was not correct. Mr. Severson said the maps were titled Existing Land Use Detailed View. Mr. Moore said he talked to the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) and was told they do not know of any other communities with a plan like this. Ms. Bradley said Denny Puko, a former state planner now retired from DCED, provided training to planning commissions on implementable comprehensive plans, many of which went on to win awards. Mr. Moore displayed the Southwest Lehigh Future Land Use Plan and said he thought they were going to get that type of plan. Their solicitor said the maps didn't make sense to him.

Ms. Zmoda said all communities need to be represented equally and asked how they move forward. She said the LVPC knows the PA Municipalities Planning Code requirements. Ms. Bradley said she would call the Township solicitor.

3. Adoption Timeline

Ms. Bradley said we need to push the adoption timeline out a little. Updated timeline scenarios were provided to the committee with approval by the steering committee during the August, September or October meetings. Mr. Prator made a motion to push it out a month. Ms. Smethers seconded the motion. Ms. Mellert said they have to be careful of the timing due to upcoming elections. Ms. Bradley said probably the September 7th meeting scenario is the more likely scenario. She said it is a risk the later the timeline, but they have the flexibility now. Mr. Kleintop said he doesn't know what might happen with the landfill. He thinks their solicitor was thinking of that issue. Mr. Prator amended the motion for the September meeting. Ms. Zmoda called for the vote, which passed unanimously. Ms. Newman said it might be beneficial for the committee to receive a summary of Ms. Bradley's conversation with the Plainfield solicitor before the August meeting. Ms. Bradley agreed to send a summary.

New Business

1. Intermunicipal Agreement Discussion

Mr. Severson handed out examples of agreements from the Nazareth Area and Northern Lehigh committees. Digital versions of the agreements were emailed out on May 12th. He said he did not have a copy of the final Southwest Lehigh agreement. Mr. Moore asked if he could get a copy. Mr. Severson said he would call the municipalities. Ms. Bradley asked the group if they wanted to start the conversation on the agreement now. She said the municipal councils and

**Slate Belt Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
July 6, 2023**

supervisors will need to review the examples. Ms. Zmoda asked if the homework for the August meeting is to review the examples. Ms. Bradley said yes.

Courtesy of the Floor

1. General Issues and Opportunities Discussion

- Known Plan Activity in Slate Belt Communities (June 2023)

Ms. Rockwell discussed the activity log provided in the meeting packet.

2. Municipal Update

Mr. Friedman said a conditional use application was submitted by RPL for a 1.5 million square foot building on lots 4, 5A and 5B.

Mr. Kleintop said CRG is coming back in and will be at the July Planning Commission meeting. They received a will serve letter for sewer from Wind Gap.

Adjourn

Ms. Zmoda called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Reider made the motion. Mr. Prator seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.

Attachments

- June 1, 2023 Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
- Correspondence from Plainfield Township Board of Supervisors
- Correspondence from Plainfield Township Solicitor, David Backenstoe
- Revised Adoption Timeline
- Slate Belt Communities' Activity Log (June 2023)

Minutes prepared and respectfully transmitted by the LVPC.



Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

STEVEN GLICKMAN
Chair

CHRISTOPHER AMATO
Vice Chair

KEVIN SCHMIDT
Treasurer

BECKY A. BRADLEY, AICP
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 20, 2023
TO: Plan Slate Belt Steering Committee
FROM: Becky Bradley, AICP, Executive Director
CC: David Backenstoe, Plainfield Township Solicitor
REGARDING: Follow-Up on Plainfield Letters

At the July 6th Plan Slate Belt Steering Committee meeting the June 9, 2023, letter from David Backenstoe, Plainfield Township Solicitor to the Plainfield Township Board of Supervisors and the June 20, 2023, letter from the Plainfield Township Plan Slate Belt Committee to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) were discussed and it was determined that the LVPC would:

1. Contact Attorney Backenstoe related to the letter, comprehensive plans and future zoning ordinance amendments and report back to the Plan Slate Belt Steering Committee
2. Look at the current draft of the Slate Belt Multimunicipal Comprehensive Plan and see where additional guidance on the plan map interrelationships and next steps for potential zoning changes could be added to the plan.

As follow-up I contacted Attorney Backenstoe and we had the opportunity to speak on Thursday, July 20th. During that discussion we discussed the concerns outline in Attorney Backenstoe' s letter and the future potential coordination of zoning after the plan is adopted by the Slate Belt communities. Specifically, we discussed how it is atypical to call out a single land use in a general plan which is charged by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Code as being "comprehensive" in name and nature. We also, discussed the scale and significance of the land use referenced in Attorney Backenstoe' s letter which is certainly recognized by the members of the Plan Steering Committee. I shared the concern of the Steering Committee from the last meeting about only one land use being called out when there are others, such as warehousing, that are concerns in other communities in the Plan. We discussed how to take the suggested language from his letter and generalize it to address the more global concerns that intensive uses can create with individual communities and the Plan Slate Belt area. I worked on this and included the proposed addition to Plan included in the attachment to this memorandum. I propose three locations in the Plan:

- As part of amended land use definitions on current page 42 of the Plan
- As part of a new inset on how to use the future land use plan on current Plan page 43; and
- As part of the Short-Term Actions subsection on Zoning Actions on current page 176 [this also, helps address item 2 in this memorandum]

The second item included looking at the current draft Plan to see where it may be possible to describe plan map interrelationships. This can support the corresponding short-term action of municipal zoning amendments. I propose that the additional text be added to the Short-Term Actions subsection on Zoning Actions on current page 176.

Enclosed is a list of the proposed revisions.

*** *Italicized text reflects proposed additions to the Plan*

DEVELOPMENT

These areas have most, or all of the factors needed to support growth, such as sewer and transportation infrastructure capacity and contiguity to existing development and are capable of accommodating additional development. These areas are appropriate for a variety of uses, including major commercial, residential and industrial development. *The scale, intensity, citing, infrastructure availability and capacity, natural features, emergency services and other critical components of the public health, safety and welfare must be accounted for to determine the acceptability of individual land use changes.*

EXURBAN

These areas have few or none of the factors necessary for development and should remain in rural uses, including agriculture and related businesses, and parks and open space. Housing in or adjacent to rural crossroads villages or at low densities is also compatible. *Where more intensive land uses, such as solid waste facilities, mineral extraction or distribution and logistics facilities, exist within exurban areas, any changes in the scale, intensity, expansion of use should be discouraged.*

PRESERVATION BUFFER

These are areas where factors may be present and capable of accommodating additional development. Conversely, these are areas where farming may be the existing land use, and it may be appropriate to preserve these areas for agriculture or to maintain rural uses. The most appropriate future land use for these areas should be based on a planning analysis of the development criteria. Natural resources conservation and farmland preservation are strongly preferred in these areas. *The scale, intensity, citing, infrastructure availability and capacity, natural features, emergency services and other critical components of the public health, safety and welfare must be accounted for to determine the acceptability of individual land use changes.*

CENTERS

Centers are a wide range of place types that include crossroads villages, neighborhoods, urban or highway centers, among others, each with a unique character and combination of appropriate land uses, infrastructure and connecting transportation Corridors. The character of the varied Center types is supported by the Plan's goals, policies and actions and should be incorporated in municipal ordinances. *While Centers have the unique value of providing for a variety of uses, the scale, intensity, citing, infrastructure availability and capacity, natural features, emergency services and other critical components of the public health, safety and welfare must be accounted for to determine the acceptability of individual land use changes. Compatibility of individual land uses should be additive to the overall utility and function of the Center.*

CORRIDORS

Corridors are a wide range of road types, from local to commercial and limited access, among others, each with a unique character and each supporting a unique combination of purpose, traffic volume, mobility, access potential for mixed-transportation options. *Changes in land uses along Corridors will impact the functioning of these critical connectors within and between communities. Ensuring that individual land use changes are compatible with the infrastructure carrying capacity, whether roadway, bridge, sidewalk or trail, is critical to maintaining and enhancing the utility and function of the transportation network and protecting the public health, safety and welfare.*

CHARACTER-DEFINING AREA

These areas represent the natural and scenic character of the region as a simplified version of the Natural Resources Plan, with the highest elevation areas representing scenic resources. *Every effort to protect and enhance these critical features should be made to support clean air and water, climate, hazard mitigation and emergency response in the interest of the public, health, safety and welfare.*

FARMLAND PRESERVATION

These areas are predominantly agriculture and are recommended to remain agriculture. This category includes agricultural land parcels, agricultural easements, and Agricultural Security Areas. The types of uses recommended include agriculture and related housing and businesses, parks and open spaces, and housing not related to agriculture on a very limited scale. *The scale, intensity, citing, infrastructure availability and capacity, natural features, emergency services and other critical components of the public health, safety and welfare must be accounted for to determine the acceptability of individual land use changes. Expansion of incongruous existing land uses should be discouraged.*

RURAL RESIDENTIAL WITHIN FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS

These areas are the intersection of the Rural Residential existing land use category and the Farmland Preservation category. Rural Residential is an existing land use category of any parcel over 10 acres within the Farmland Preservation land use category that contains a residence. The most appropriate future land use for these areas is residential that is accessory to, and supportive of, agriculture. *The scale, intensity, citing, infrastructure availability and capacity, natural features, emergency services and other critical components of the public health, safety and welfare must be accounted for to determine the acceptability of individual land use changes. Expansion of incongruous existing land uses should be discouraged.*

FUTURE LAND USE PLAN TEXT ADDITION

Infrastructure availability and capacity, natural features, emergency services and other critical components of the public health, safety and welfare must be accounted for when considering changes in the use of land that are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Additional burdens to the community related to land use reduce the probability of the Slate Belt communities achieving individual and collective goals. Alignment of municipal zoning codes must correspond to the Future Land Use, Centers and Corridors, Farmland Preservation, Natural Resources, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan, as well as, the goals, policies and recommended actions that support achievement of desired outcomes.

How to Use

The Slate Belt Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan

Future Land Use Plan

Step 1

The Future Land Use Plan map on pages 44-45 shows areas recommended for Development, Farmland Preservation and Rural Residential within Farmland, Preservation Buffer, Exurban and Character Defining Areas. It also contains Centers and Corridors that are identified on pages 40-41, and 126-129. It also encompasses recommendations identified on the Farmland Preservation Plan (p.66-67), Natural Resources Plan (p. 70-71), and the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (p. 92-93).

This map recognizes that future land use in the region will consist of both those existing land uses that define the character of the region, such as farmland, open spaces, and vibrant downtowns, as well as future land use recommendations.

The Future Land Use Plan is intended to guide development and preservation efforts by private and non-profit organizations, government agencies and individuals. The Future Land Use Plan mirrors the land use categories used for FutureLV's General Land Use Plan. It is intended to provide consistency in land use planning between the entire Lehigh Valley region and the more localized Slate Belt region.

Step 2

The land use categories utilized in *FutureLV*, and the Plan Slate Belt Future Land Use Plan are generalized in nature and encompass a range of land uses appropriate for that land use category. Because of the map scale needed to depict the entire planning region, the Future Land Use Plan is not intended to provide a detailed look at specific areas in the region.

To provide greater specificity, the plan includes Future Land Use-Detailed View maps for each of the 10 municipalities in the region. Again, these plans start with the existing land uses that define the character of the region such as the scenic farmlands, historic downtowns, and outstanding natural areas. These maps also include a more detailed look at the existing land use patterns as well as guidance for redevelopment and reinvestment, open space preservation, and development of a regional trail system. Also included are more detailed views of transitions in land use. Many of these recommendations may not be clearly visible at the larger scale of the region-wide Future Land Use Plan.

These recommendations are a compilation of recommendations included elsewhere in the Plan, including the Centers and Corridors Plan, the Natural Resources Plan, the Farmland Preservation Plan, and others.

These Detailed View maps, along with the goals, policies, and actions, are intended to assist the region's municipalities in the creation of revised zoning ordinances and maps and other regulatory tools. (See Step 3).

Step 3

After the multi-municipal plan has been adopted, the participating municipalities will implement the recommendations of the plan. This will include revising municipal zoning ordinances as well as possibly other tools such as official maps, transfer of development rights programs, and Main Street programs, among others. Actions are outlined in the Plan Implementation section beginning on page 173.

However, it must be stressed that the Future Land Use Plan map and the Detailed View maps are not zoning maps. The Future Land Use Plan and the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations are intended to be the starting point for the region's municipalities in amending their ordinances. As an example, if a specific borough wishes to implement the Plan's recommendations for a Main Street redevelopment and infill project it would look at its zoning ordinance to ensure that the intended range of uses are permitted in that area. Parking and loading standards could be revised to support economic development. Public infrastructure such as benches and street trees could be targeted by the borough for the area.

To assess if zoning should be amended after the adoption of the Plan a community should compare the Future Land Use Plan, details of the Existing Land Use maps, Centers and Corridors Plan, the Natural Resources Plan, and the Farmland Preservation Plan to the existing municipal ordinance. Next an assessment of where there are differences between the comprehensive plan maps, existing land uses, and municipal zoning code should be identified. If a community has an official map and/or specific plans such as a capital or parks, recreation, and open space plan, or assesses traffic impact or parks and recreation fees associated with new development, comparison of these must also be considered. After the list of differences between documents and laws is determined, referring to the Place Types guidance in the Plan will help determine how to resolve any land use conflicts as each community prepares any zoning code amendments. The Place Types guidance organizes intensity of development with infrastructure.

It is recommended that the all communities in the Slate Belt work together simultaneously as comparison of plans and laws between communities and coordination of individual municipal zoning ordinance amendments will lead to achieving the maximum potential of the Plan's goals. Simultaneous zoning ordinance dialogues support the overall growth management strategy. This is especially relevant to land uses of extremely high impact such as landfills and warehousing. Furthermore, cooperation among the Plan's communities in assessing the need for zoning changes, allows for the preservation, protection and elevation of region-defining land uses like farmland, historic commercial districts, the Appalachian Mountain, Delaware River, and its tributaries, as well as, housing locations and even car-oriented commercial areas critical to the Slate Belt economy.

It is further recommended that each Slate Belt community retain individual municipal zoning ordinances and authorities and that coordination occur through the Intermunicipal Cooperative Agreement resulting from the adoption of this Plan. New multimunicipal comprehensive planning efforts require significant coordination and commitment and building the deep, rich partnerships needed to implement the Plan is a step-by-step process that requires patience, deliberation, and trust. This can only be achieved over time.

Comparison of Future Land Uses Between Southwest Lehigh Comprehensive Plan (SWL) and Plan Slate Belt Multimunicipal Comprehensive Plan (PSB)

Objectives

Agriculture (SWL)	"To support farming activities and mechanisms to meet local food production needs and to support farming as a sustainable economic activity and valuable asset and industry to the region."
Farmland Pres. (PSB)	"These areas are predominantly agriculture and are recommended to remain agriculture."
Rural Resid. Within Farmland Pres. (PSB)	"These areas are the intersection of the Rural Residential existing land use category and the Farmland Preservation category. Rural Residential is an existing land use category of any parcel over 10 acres within the Farmland Preservation land use category that contains a residence. "
Natural Features (SWL)	"To preserve and protect the region's valuable natural and scenic resources and open space."
Restricted/Preserved (SWL)	"To indicate private- or public-owned land that cannot be developed. "
Character Defining Areas (PSB)	"These areas represent the natural and scenic character of the region as a simplified version of the Natural Resources Plan, with the highest elevation areas representing scenic resources. Character-Defining Areas on the map represent the natural and scenic character of the region as a simplified version of the Natural Resources Plan, with highest elevation areas representing scenic resources."
Rural (SWL)	"To provide development opportunities consistent in the context of rural land use patterns and capabilities."
Preservation Buffer (PSB)	"These are areas where factors may be present and capable of accommodating additional development. Conversely, these are areas where farming may be the existing land use, and it may be appropriate to preserve these areas for agriculture or to maintain rural uses. "
Residential (SWL)	Inspired by sentence 1 of County Comp Plan objective for Urban Development: "To provide areas where residential development can occur, coordinated with the provision of infrastructure."
Commercial (SWL)	"To meet the needs for commercial development and its supporting uses, when scaled and positioned effectively to buffer the most intense uses (industrial) from the most sensitive (residential, agriculture, natural features). "
Industrial (SWL)	"To meet the needs of goods manufacturing, wholesaling and other activities that involve particularly intensive use of the land, with a high tendency for impacts. "
Development (PSB)	"These areas have most or all of the factors needed to support growth, such as sewer and transportation infrastructure capacity and contiguity to existing development, and are capable of accommodating additional development."
Mixed (SWL)	"To harmonize or to promote the continued co-existence of residences, stores and low-impact services in an arrangement most conducive to non-motorized vehicles and pedestrians. "
Exurban (PSB)	"These areas have few or none of the factors necessary for development and should remain in rural uses, including agriculture and related businesses, and parks and open space. "

Recommended Land Uses

Agriculture (SWL)	Crop farming, businesses related to agriculture, parks/open spaces, housing related to agriculture, housing not related to agriculture on a very limited scale.
Farmland Pres. (PSB)	Agricultural land parcels, agriculture and related housing and businesses, parks and open spaces, housing not related to agriculture on a very limited scale.
Rural Resid. Within Farmland Pres. (PSB)	The most appropriate future land uses for these areas is residential that is accessory to, and supportive of agriculture.
Natural Features (SWL)	Parks/open space uses, woodlands, singlefamily detached housing on a very limited scale.
Restricted/Preserved (SWL)	Parks/open spaces, recreation facilities, crop farming, deed-restricted lands.
Character Defining Areas (PSB)	Typical land uses include core habitat areas, the Blue Ridge/Kittatiny Ridge Natural Areas, woodlands, steep slopes, floodplains, riparian buffers, and hydric soils.
Rural (SWL)	Single-family detached dwellings, agriculture, crop farming, businesses related to agriculture, parks/open space uses, businesses and community facilities to serve the surrounding rural areas.
Preservation Buffer (PSB)	The most appropriate future land use for these areas should be based on a planning analysis of the development criteria. Natural resources conservation and farmland preservation are strongly preferred in these areas. Centers and Corridors located in Preservation Buffer areas or Exurban areas are only recommended for denser, mixed-use, mixed-transportation development if they meet the development criteria.
Residential (SWL)	Residential Medium Density Areas: single-family detached dwellings with a density of 4 units per acre or less, community facilities, recreation facilities, parks/open spaces, crop farming. Residential High Density Areas: single-family detached dwellings with a density of 5 units per acre or more, twins, townhouses, condominiums, apartments, mobile home parks, mobile homes, community facilities, recreation facilities, parks/open space, crop farming
Commercial (SWL)	Stores, businesses, services, offices, community facilities, recreation facilities, parks/open spaces, crop farming light manufacturing (artisanal).
Industrial (SWL)	Light Industrial: industries, manufacturing, processing (includes food processing), warehouse, wholesaling, community facilities, transportation facilities, parks/open space, crop farming General Industrial: industries, manufacturing, processing (includes food processing), warehouse, wholesaling, community facilities, transportation facilities, parks/open space, crop farming, mining or public uses needing buffers such as but not limited to quarries, sanitary landfills, and power plants
Development (PSB)	These areas are appropriate for a variety of uses, including major commercial, residential, and industrial development. Centers and Corridors located within Development areas are recommended for denser, mixed-use, mixed-transportation development.
Mixed (SWL)	Single-family detached dwellings, twins, townhouses, condominiums, apartments and mobile home parks. Stores, businesses, services and offices. Community facilities, recreation facilities, parks/open space, crop farming.
Exurban (PSB)	Housing in or adjacent to rural crossroads villages or at low densities is also compatible. Centers and Corridors located in Preservation Buffer areas or Exurban areas are only recommended for denser, mixed-use, mixed-transportation development if they meet the development criteria.

Recommended sewer and water systems

Agriculture (SWL)	On-lot systems
Farmland Pres. (PSB)	On-lot systems
Rural Resid. Within Farmland Pres. (PSB)	On-lot systems
Natural Features (SWL)	On-lot systems
Restricted/Preserved (SWL)	Whatever systems are currently in place.
Character Defining Areas (PSB)	Whatever systems are currently in place.
Rural (SWL)	On-lot systems
Preservation Buffer (PSB)	Adequate sewage conveyance capacity, allocation and treatment capacity are available for public sewage disposal , if appropriate adequate on-lot sewage disposal is provided.
Residential (SWL)	Public sewer and community water systems for all housing with a density of less than or equal to 4 dwelling units per acre. Pre-existing residences served by on-lot water/ sewer should be at a density lower than 1 dwelling unit per acre.
Commercial (SWL)	Public sewer and community water systems
Industrial (SWL)	Public sewer and community water systems
Development (PSB)	Public sewer and water infrastructure
Mixed (SWL)	Public sewer and either community or on-lot water systems
Exurban (PSB)	Adequate sewage conveyance capacity, allocation and treatment capacity are available for public sewage disposal , if appropriate adequate on-lot sewage disposal is provided.

Strategies

Agriculture (SWL)	Transfer of Development Rights, Agricultural Security Areas followed by Agricultural Conservation Easements.
Farmland Pres. (PSB)	High, Medium and Low Priority areas from the Farmland Preservation are included on the Future Land Use plan as recommended for Farmland Preservation or certain Preservation Buffer areas. Agricultural easements, Agricultural Security Areas, Centers and Corridors located within Farmland Preservation areas are not generally recommended for denser development.
Rural Resid. Within Farmland Pres. (PSB)	Same as Farmland Preservation areas
Natural Features (SWL)	Conservation easements (LVPC model ordinance). Riparian buffers, floodplains, steep slopes, woodlands.
Restricted/Preserved (SWL)	Strategic expansion of preserved lands, articulated through Official Map.
Character Defining Areas (PSB)	High-Priority Areas from the Natural Resources Plan are recommended to be conserved regardless of the Future Land Use recommendation.
Rural (SWL)	Land Use Assumptions Reports, followed by Roadway Sufficiency Analyses and Impact Fees.
Preservation Buffer (PSB)	Conduct a planning analysis of the development criteria for these areas. Natural resource conservation and farmland preservation are strongly preferred in these areas.
Residential (SWL)	Transfer of Development Rights. LVPC Model Ordinances- Cottage Housing, Street Connectivity, Inclusionary Zoning, Density Bonuses, Traditional Neighborhood Development.
Commercial (SWL)	Land Use Assumption Reports, followed by Roadway Sufficiency Analyses and Impact Fees.
Industrial (SWL)	none listed
Development (PSB)	Provision of the factors needed to support growth, such as sewer and transportation infrastructure.
Mixed (SWL)	LVPC Model Ordinances- Traditional Neighborhood Development, Mixed Use Zoning and Development, Street Connectivity.
Exurban (PSB)	Conduct a planning analysis of the development criteria for these areas which should remain in rural uses, including agriculture and related businesses, and park/open space.

PLAN SLATE BELT



- Bangor • East Bangor • Lower Mount Bethel • Pen Argyl •
- Plainfield • Portland • Roseto • Upper Mount Bethel •
- Washington • Wind Gap •

Steps for Adoption of the Plan Slate Belt Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan and Intergovernmental Cooperative Implementation Agreement

The Plan, once approved by the Steering Committee, must be distributed for review to each of the municipalities adjacent to the Slate Belt Region, the school districts, the Governor’s Center for Local Government Services, and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission as the County Planning Agency. Per Section 302(a) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), these bodies have 45 days upon receipt to review the Draft Plan, and these comments must be considered by the governing bodies of the Plan Slate Belt communities. The LVPC will distribute all plan materials to the reviewing bodies. The MPC does not require the Intergovernmental Cooperative Implementation Agreement to be reviewed by other bodies.

In accordance with Section 302(b) of the MPC, the governing bodies of the Plan Slate Belt communities shall hold at least one public hearing pursuant to public notice prior to adoption of the Draft Plan. The LVPC will advertise all the public hearings. These public hearings can be during the regular monthly meeting of the Governing Body, with adoption to follow.

The following table identifies alternative adoption timelines with approval by the Steering Committee at its August, September or October meetings:

<u>Steering Committee meeting date</u>	<u>Receipt by contiguous municipalities</u>	<u>45-day review period</u>	<u>Municipal hearings/action</u>
August 3	August 7	September 21	October
September 7	September 11	October 26	November
October 5	October 10	November 24	December