MEETING MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISION BOARD
JUNE 11, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT
Robert Melosky, Chairman
Matthew Malozi, Vice Chairman
Joy Cohen
Ricard Pongracz
Eddie Burgos

MEMBERS ABSENT

VISITORS PRESENT
Kevin J. Horvath, P.E. Keystone Consulting Engineers
Joesph Piperato Esq. Eastburn and Gray, PC
Justin Massie, Terraform Engineering, LLC
Bryon Anstine, Linden Street Self Storage, LLC

STAFF PRESENT
Matthew Deschler, Solicitor
Cathy Fletcher, Bureau of Planning & Zoning
Craig Peiffer, Bureau of Planning & Zoning
Dylan Schlosser, Bureau of Engineering

The June 11, 2026, meeting of Planning Commission held at the City of Bethlehem Town Hall, was called to order by Chairperson, Robert Melosky at 5:00 PM.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES May 14, 2026

Motion #1: Ms. Cohen made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted.
Second: Mr. Burgos
Result of Vote: The motion carried 5-0.

AGENDA ITEM #2:

Property Location: 1801 Elliott Avenue
Property Owner: Kevin J. Horvath, Elliot Avenue, LLC
Developer/Engineer: Kevin J. Horvath, P.E. Keystone Consulting Engineers, Inc.
Proposed Work: The Applicant proposes developing the site into five sets of single-family semi-detached dwellings and one single-family detached dwelling, each on fee-simple lots. In the RR District, only single-family detached dwellings are permitted by right. Dimensional requirements for single-family detached dwellings include 100’ minimum lot width and 15,000 SF minimum lot area. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the parcel into eleven (11) lots. Lots 1-10 would front Elliott Avenue. Lot 1 would measure 45’ along the front lot line by 110’ in depth and total 4,950 SF or 0.1136 Acres. Lots 2-9 would measure 40’ along the front lot line by 110’ in depth and total 4,400 SF or 0.1010 Acres. Lot 10 would be irregular in shape and would measure 45’ along the front lot line by 110’ in depth; the area is unknown. Lot 11 would front Mt. Airy Avenue, would be irregular in shape and measure 124’ along the front lot line; the depth varies and the area is unknown. Lots 1-10 would each contain a single-family semi-detached dwelling

with driveway and single car garage. Lot 11 would to be developed into a single-family detached dwelling.

Discussion: Mr. Piperato and Mr. Horvath gave a brief overview of the proposed plan. The Applicant is seeking zoning relief from the Zoning Hearing Board for: a use variance for multi-family dwellings in the RR District where only single-family detached dwelling units are permitted, dimensional variances to use the RG District standards for lot width, setbacks and coverage and exemption from the steep slope regulations as it was previously determined the slopes were man made in 2009 and 2010. Mr. Horvath gave details of the surrounding neighborhood and presented their stance on the property being suited more for the RG District.

Mr. Melosky asked if Mr. Horvath could explain what relief is needed from the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Horvath explained the relief sought from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Peiffer referenced the relief that will be sought from the Zoning Hearing Board. The Law Bureau and the Zoning Officer have determined that the steep slopes provisions do apply; therefore, the Applicant would need to include that as part of their application or an interpretation request. Mr. Peiffer spoke of the City's review letter and stated there will be a stormwater tapping fee, stormwater report and Post-Construction Water Management plans shall be submitted as the impervious coverage has increased on the property. The Engineering Department requests a legal description of the proposed, deed of dedication and recording of the Lehigh County Recorder's office. Mount Airy Avenue is not improved to the full width of the cartway, the Applicant is proposing curb and sidewalk along Mount Airy Ave to a certain point because the street is unimproved and the sidewalk would lead into the adjacent house's front yard. To resolve this issue, the Applicant proposed a crosshatch that will allow vehicles to bottleneck down into the narrower cartway. The Traffic Superintendent stated in the review letter that they do not want to see an ADA compliant curb ramp at this location because there is no safe crossing and they would like to work with the Applicant to eliminate the possibility of vehicles driving in the southern direction and into the front yard of adjacent properties. Mr. Peiffer stated the City's Forester and Zoning Officer commented that removal of trees that qualify for preservation and subsequently their replacement in the RR District is a 2:1 replacement. The Fire Marshall's comments were concerning if the fire apparatus would be able to turn around at the bottom of Elliott Avenue and the Fire Marhsall would like to see a fire hydrant at the intersection of Elliott Avenue and Mount Airy Avenue. Lastly, Mr. Peiffer noted that if Elliott Avenue were to be reopened it would need to be improved to current City standards.

Mr. Horvath stated something does need to be done with Elliott Avenue in conjunction with the prior project that was already approved. Mr. Horvath suggested widening the roadway to standard width with curbing and sidewalk and mill and overlay the road.

Mr. Malozi asked if the Zoning Map provided was the most up to date, and if so, is the house just south of the proposed plan within the RR District as well. Mr. Peiffer stated that was correct. Mr. Malozi asked if the drainage easements were created by Mr. Horvath or if they were there prior. Mr. Horvath explained he created the easements as a precaution. The additional sidewalk and curbing that is proposed will create more stormwater runoff onto Mount Airy Avenue; Mr. Horvath created the easements to circumvent that situation. The stormwater management provided on the plan does not currently exist, Mr. Horvath plans to have stormwater management on site. Mr. Malozi asked if the drainage area along Norfolk Southern boundary is heavily wooded and steep. Mr. Horvath responded that the lower portion is not wooded. Currently, all water drains down to a single cross pipe and funnels through under the railroad tracks. Mr. Malozi asked if all parcels will be built upon. Mr. Horvath answered there is one parcel that is planned for stormwater management. Mr. Malozi asked if the area labeled drainage easement is buildable as it is today. Mr. Malozi also stated there is a potential special flood area on the plans. Mr. Horvath explained that it is not a floodplain, but it is subject to inundation. The area would be left alone and used as natural drainage. Mr. Malozi asked if the area near the railroad would be left open. Mr. Horvath stated that was correct. Mr. Malozi asked if there is any City stormwater management that can be tied into. Mr. Horvath stated all water runs onto his property and down to the cross pipe. The water from the pipe drains into the canal on the other side of the railroad tracks.

Mr. Malozi asked if access for vehicles would be from Elliot Avenue and a paved driveway. Mr. Horvath responded each dwelling will have a single car garage and parking spot in the front. Mr. Malozi asked for the square footage of the dwellings. Mr. Horvath answered 1,200 SF.

Ms. Cohen asked why the RG District requirement was used for the setback instead of the RR District. Mr. Horvath responded if the dwellings are pushed back more, they will be on the slop even more, will make construction more difficult and it will have more influence on the slopes and trees. Mr. Horvath was to limit the disturbance of land and keep the dwellings as close to the street as they can. Ms. Cohen asked for clarification on the side yard setbacks. Mr. Horvath stated the setbacks shown on the plan are consistent with RG District setback lines. Mr. Horvath stated they are not proposing a 6ft setback at this time, the size of the proposed dwellings may have a setback for 10ft. Ms. Cohen asked if the proposed development across the street does not develop Elliot Avenue first, what will happen. Mr. Horvath stated he will make road improvements for access to the dwellings. The road would be 15ft and 24ft long as required. Mr. Horvath will be meeting with the Fire Marshall to discuss the turnaround of a fire apparatus.

Mr. Malozi stated the plan was thoughtfully designed to push the density up to the existing infrastructure as Elliot Avenue is today and leaving open space in the back with the storm water drainage easement. Mr. Malozi stated he believes it is reasonable to use RG District setbacks given the history of the property and the surrounding area. If granted the relief from Zoning Hearing Board, no other relief will be needed as all dimensions are compliant with the RG District.

This is a Site Plan no motion was made.

<u>AGENDA ITEM #3</u>:

Property Location: 2955 Linden Street
Property Owner: Linden Street Self Storage, LLC
Developer/Engineer: Justin Massie, Terraform Engineering
Proposed Work: The Applicant proposes to remove the parking lot in its entirety and construct a Self-Storage Development containing five structures (20' x 50' or 1,000 SF, 15' x 65' or 975 SF, 20' x 90' or 1,800 SF, 15' x 80' or 1,200 SF and 40' x 120' or 4,800 SF), 8' high chain link fence and gate, lighting, landscaping and stormwater management facilities.

Discussion: Mr. Massie gave a brief history and overview of the proposed plan.

Mr. Melosky asked for more details on the fence and layout. Mr. Anstine stated the height of the buildings on the sides are 8'-6" in height and the building in the center will be 9'6"; the fence will be black chain link fence at 6ft high, and the gate will be at the entrance. No lights will bleed out into the neighborhood, and the facility will have security cameras. Mr. Melosky asked if Mr. Anstine had any experience in self-storage. Mr. Anstine replied he owns seven other facilities. Mr. Melosky asked if Mr. Anstine had any photos that are similar to what is being proposed. Mr. Anstine directed the Commission to look at their website. The side will be tan, and the garage doors will be a color that blends well in with the surrounding area. Mr. Melosky asked if the gate would match the surrounding fence. Mr. Anstine answered no, the fence will be the black chain link, and the gate is made of aluminum. Mr. Melosky asked for the height of the gate. Mr. Anstine responded 6ft high per the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Melosky asked if Mr. Anstine was open to the fence style bding aluminum picket to match the gate. Mr. Anstine stated they would look into that option and voiced his concerns about if the aluminum fence is damaged it is costly to repair.

Mr. Peiffer talked about the City's review letter and highlighted key points. The Fire Marshall made comments on the turning radius, that gate specs must meet fire code, and that the Applicant spoke with Fire Marshall to address these issues prior to Planning Commission. The Zoning Officer stated the two-way ingress, and egress shall be a minimum of 24ft wide and the applicant indicated that they could comply. The City understands this is a condo association arrangement and easements are not needed. The Applicant is encouraged to preserve trees when they can.

Mr. Melosky asked what landscaping is currently in the buffer. Mr. Massie replied on the south side there are arborvitae 15-20ft in height and the western side is evergreen. Mr. Melosky asked if the Applicant is willing to comply with all conditions in the City's review letter. Mr. Anstine stated yes.

Mr. Pongracz asked about the amount of traffic that would be flowing into the property. He raised his concerns about the neighboring daycare and homes close to the site. Mr. Anstine replied there are numerous studies and found around 8-12 vehicles a day was standard depending on the type of storage facility. Mr. Pongracz asked what type of vehicles would be coming in and out. Mr. Anstine replied that they are

mostly personal vehicles and U-Haul's, and that no 18-wheel trucks will be offloading at this location.
Mr. Melosky asked if there would be any overflow lighting into the neighborhood. Mr. Massie stated the lighting for the property is located on the center building that is 9ft in height, the lights will be directed down toward the facility, and all the landscaping is higher than the lighting will be.

Mr. Malozi asked if anyone would need to get behind the buildings. Mr. Anstine replied that the only people who would be back there are the landscapers who maintain the property. Mr. Malozi asked if all existing buffering will remain. Mr. Anstime replied yes that they are trying to minimize the removal of any current buffering. Mr. Malozi questioned the hours of operation. Mr. Anstine answered the hours of 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM. Mr. Malozi asked if that could be a condition for approval. Mr. Anstine agreed.

Mr. Melosky asked if there will be signage indicating one-way traffic through the facility. Mr. Anstine replied there will be signage for traffic and an advertisement sign like the daycare sign next door.

Ms. Cohen asked about the conversation with the Fire Marshall regarding the turnaround access for the fire apparatus. Mr. Massie replied during the conversation with the Fire Marshall he was given the specs and their plans are compliant with the specs. Ms. Cohen asked about the width of the entrance as the Zoning Ordinance requires 24ft. Mr. Massie replied that they are working on finalizing that plan. Ms. Cohen asked if there would be issue if a larger vehicle was parked on site, would there be enough room to navigate around. Mr. Anstine replied that this issue has not occurred in the past and he does not see it being an issue. Ms. Cohen suggested adding more greenery in the eastern side of the facility. Mr. Anstine and Mr. Massie answered they would be smaller and they are looking to preserve the tree currently there. Ms. Cohen spoke about her concern of the security cameras facing the daycare. Mr. Anstine understands her concern and will look further into the matter.

Mr. Melosky asked if the Applicant is willing to have the gate and fence match. Mr. Anstine agreed to have the gate and fence match in appearance.

Ms. Cohen asked if this lot is zoned for self-storage. Mr. Peiffer answered yes. Ms. Cohen asked if parking is sufficient. Mr. Peiffer answered it is for self-storage. Ms. Cohen asked if the plan is compliant with zoning. Mr. Peiffer answered yes, but for the two-way driveway.

Mr. Malozi asked as the parking is used for multiple businesses if parking is sufficient. Mr. Peiffer answered it is. Mr. Malozi commented they are trading impervious coverage to a low generator of traffic and Mr. Peiffer agreed.

Mr. Melosky asked if 18-wheel trucks are often used in storage facilities to offload. Mr. Anstine replied no. Mr. Melosky asked if a note can be made in the lease contracts not to have large vehicles unloading at the storage unit. Mr. Anstine agreed to this condition.

Mr. Pongracz asked if an issue ever occurred where a vehicle could not get in because a larger vehicle was blocking the way. Mr. Anstine replied that has not occurred at other facilities but there is always that risk. Mr. Pongracz asked about staff on site. Mr. Anstine explained most rentals are handled online and it will be minimally staffed to maintain landscaping, cleaners and people to ensure units have been cleared out. Mr. Pongracz asked if he would be notified of theft. Mr. Anstine stated the police should be called in that matter.

Mr. Melosky voiced his concerns of large vehicles going into the facility and asked if a condition of the size of the vehicles can be given for Land Development approval. Mr. Anstine agreed to the 24ft long vehicle allowance in the facility.

Mr. Burgos asked if signage can be posted for the vehicle size restriction. Mr. Anstine agreed to and stated it will also be in the lease.

Mr. Peiffer stated a truck with a 26ft bed can be up to 34ft in length which is greater than the fire truck that is able to maneuver around.

Public Comment: Jennifer Zullo, 540 Barclay Drive, spoke of her concerns with traffic going in and out of the property. Ms. Zullo is concerned people unknowingly will attempt to bring larger trucks and will need to park on the street to unload and people who are inexperienced with a box truck driving near a daycare.

Motion #3: Mr. Malozi made a motion to approve the Land Development with the following conditions; all of the conditions and comments of the May 27, 2026, letter shall be met to the satisfaction of the City, the largest vehicle to enter the facility shall be no larger than a 26ft commercial vehicle, .that the fencing around the perimeter of the property shall match the gate of the property in black aluminum or facsimile thereof [the top may be a unform cap or picket] and the hours of operation shall be limited to 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM.
Second: Mr. Burgos
Result of Vote: The motion carried 4.1.0 with Mr. Melosky objecting.

<u>AGENDA ITEM #4</u>: ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT

Proposed Work: Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Article 1302.13 modify definitions of hotel and boarding house, amend Article 1307, relating to workforce housing incentive to include CL District, and revise Article 1318.26 to prohibit multiple single-family detached dwellings on the same lot, among districts.

Discussion: Ms. Fletcher gave a brief overview of the proposed Zoning Text Amendments.

Mr. Malozi asked if they would be approved all together or separately. Ms. Fletcher stated they will be presented to the City Council collectively.

Mr. Pongracz asked if this could affect existing short-term rentals. Attorney Deschler replied if the dwelling is not abandoned they would be able to maintain their status.

Ms. Cohen asked if this text amendment references ADUs. Attorney Deshcler answered that is not addressed in these amendments. They will come to the Planning Commission later with different definitions.
Mr. Malozi asked if workforce housing is allowed in zones listed except CL. Mr. Peiffer responded that was correct and the City encourages workforce housing.

Motion #3: Ms. Cohen made a motion to pass on the Zoning Text Amendments in a favorable way to City Council.
Second: Mr. Pongracz
Result of Vote: The motion carried 5-0.

<u>AGENDA ITEM #5</u>: DISCUSSION ITEMS

Mr. Peiffer reviewed the upcoming Agenda items.

There being no further business, upon a Motion by Robert Melosky, a Second by Matthew Malozi, and a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 PM.

ATTEST:

____
Craig D. Peiffer, Commission Secretary