

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2003

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, December 2, 2003 at the Township Hall, 4975 DeMoss Road, Berks County, Pennsylvania. Donald R. Wilson, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by the Pledge to the Flag.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Donald R. Wilson, Chairman
John W. Bittig, Vice Chairman
John F. Ruff, Secretary
Richard Littlehales
J.D. Krafczek
Dottie Geiger
Paul L. Schwartz

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Craig Peifer, GVC Consulting Engineer
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2003 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the agenda of the December 2, 2003 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

- A. BURKHOLDER MINOR SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Krafczek, Mrs. Geiger voting in favor and Mr. Bittig voting opposed.
- B. FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF BIRDSBORO – PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Krafczek, Mrs. Geiger voting in favor and Mr. Bittig voting opposed.

The following business was discussed:

4. HALLIGAN – CONDITIONAL USE

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mr. Halligan submitted an application to have an office in his home located at 6111 Long Pond Drive. Mr. Halligan offered assurance that they would comply with all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. They did hear from the neighbors and only two had concerns if there would be parking on the street and if there would be any noise from that business, but they can't create noise under the Zoning requirements and they would not have any customers coming to the house.

Mr. Littlehales asked if Mr. Halligan had any major equipment that they kept somewhere else. Mr. Halligan replied that the business did not require major equipment since they did small repair work on houses.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Mr. Halligan. The motion carried unanimously.

5. SCHACH – CONDITIONAL USE

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mrs. Schach was planning on baking pies in her home located at 5370 Boyertown Pike. They would not be doing any sales from their home. They would be transporting the pies to the locations that would be selling them. They were offering assurances to the Planning Commission and to the Board that in the event the business would take off they would then move to a commercial site. There would be no parking. Mr. Bittig asked if there would be delivery of supplies? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that Mrs. Schach would be purchasing the supplies from the grocery store. They did hear from the neighbors and the only concern was the erection of a sign and Mrs. Schach had offered assurance to both the Township and the neighbors that before they would erect any signs (which they were not planning at this time) they would seek pre-approval blessing from the neighbors.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Mrs. Schach. The motion carried unanimously.

6. KUBOVCSAK - VARIANCE

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mr. Kubovcsak was not there this evening. The variance had been granted before but had since expired. They were seeking relief of Section 404.4, requesting that the setback line along Butter Lane and Prospect Street be reduced from 30' to 20'. The reason for the request was because of the configuration of the plot of ground and the fact that it was traversed

Kubovcsak Variance continued

from east to west by a creek and the existence of a flood plain which prevented the utilization of the land for its permitted use, unless a variance was granted.

Mr. Bittig asked if the variance was granted, would the intended use be to construct some homes? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that was correct. Mr. Bittig stated that it would be a 3-lot subdivision in the flood plain. They were currently constructing a home on the one lot.

Mr. Ruff asked if the plan they were reviewing was an approved subdivision plan? Mrs. Franckowiak stated no, the plan was part of the submission for the variance. Mr. Ruff stated concerns that if the Planning Commission lent approval to the Zoning Hearing Board for the variance that it might lend a note that we approve the subdivision plan. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they wanted to seek relief before they came before the Planning Commission with the Subdivision plan so they would know if they could count on the 20' setback for planning purposes. They would need to be in compliance in order to have the plan approved.

Mr. Bittig stated that he could not understand how they could approve someone building in a flood plain. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that before they could build they had to follow all the requirements in the Flood Plain Ordinance. They had to have the certification reviewed and approved by GVC before doing so.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Zoning Hearing Board not grant relief for the variance of Section 404.4, to allow setback requirements of 20' for two reasons: (1) the setback would be inconsistent with the other houses on Butter Lane and (2) granting the relief would imply approval of the anticipated subdivision plan, which we believe is unworkable due to the flood plain requirements and would be difficult to implement if we enforce the Subdivision Ordinance. The motion carried unanimously.

7. KARPATI SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD – Stephen H. Bensinger, PLS

GVC reviewed the Karpati Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated November 25, 2003).

Mr. Bensinger stated that the only outstanding item was the Penn DOT approval and some drafting items. They were still waiting on the letter from Penn DOT. They had no other items to comment on so they would return after receiving the letter from Penn DOT.

8. FOWLER MINOR SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD - John Wentzel

GVC reviewed the Fowler Minor Subdivision Sketch Plan for Record (reference letter dated November 25, 2003).

Mr. Wentzel stated they revised the plan to include the 30-ft right-of-way. All of the comments on the GVC review letter have been addressed.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Fowler Minor Subdivision Sketch Plan for Record. The motion carried unanimously.

9. BURKHOLDER MINOR SUBDIVISION– PRELIMINARY/FINAL

Stephen H. Bensinger, PLS

GVC reviewed the Burkholder Minor Subdivision Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated November 25, 2003).

Mr. Bensinger stated that the subdivision had existing buildings and a house and the purpose of the plan was to cut off the back portion of the property behind the house and annex it to the warehouse. He wanted to address the comments in the GVC review letter. Under Zoning, comment #1 where part of the warehouse sits in LDR District, it should be demonstrated that it was pre-existing nonconforming; they have owned it since 1962. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that with the new Zoning Map where we were matching the lines of the zones to the property line, the property would then be all in the Highway Commercial District so that would not be a problem.

Mr. Bensinger stated that with item #4, the dwelling was a pre-existing nonconforming structure. Concerning item #8 for the landscape buffer, they were asking for relief from doing the buffer. The family owns the business and the house was being given to the daughter. Mr. Bittig stated that it was a zoning issue. They would have to go to the Zoning Hearing Board for that. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that for other items such as the Environmental Performance Standards, the Planning Commission grants relief for that item, so wouldn't the buffering be considered the same? Mr. Bensinger stated that it was pre-existing, nonconforming. Mr. Littlehales asked that other than to force compliance, what would be the purpose of putting a buffer in at that location? There was no real intent to expand the business. Mr. Wilson stated there was no intent today, but that did not mean they would not expand in the future. With the change of the property lines we would like to have them be less nonconforming and add the buffer between the residence and the business. Mr. Ruff stated that we should require the buffer. Mr. Wilson stated that it would not be a good idea to waive that here and then down the street someone else would say "they did not have to do it, why do we"?

Burkholder Minor Subdivision continued

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to not grant a waiver of Zoning Section 501.5.a, the requirement for a 20-ft wide landscaped buffer strip. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Krafczek, Mrs. Geiger voting in favor and Mr. Littlehales voting opposed.

Mr. Bensinger stated that with item #11 that states proposed lighting be in accordance with Section 605, it was a pre-existing nonconforming condition and everything was there and they were not proposing any new development.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver for the requirement of Zoning Section 605 for lighting because they were not changing the existing conditions, Section 605 applies to new design. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bensinger stated that with item # 12 for compliance with Environmental Standards, again it was a pre-existing nonconforming condition and everything was there and they were not proposing any new development.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of Zoning Section 609 to demonstrate that the tract was in compliance with the Environmental Standards for Commercial and Industrial uses due to the fact the tract was pre-existing. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bensinger stated that with item # 14, the Township should determine if it desires that the existing parking areas and access drive be paved instead of gravel. Again, it was pre-existing nonconforming condition. Mr. Wilson asked if that was concerning the warehouse area and were they on the highest point there? Mr. Bensinger replied yes. Mr. Wilson stated that there was not a drainage problem there now. Mr. Bittig stated that with paving that would produce a larger impervious area. Mrs. Geiger stated that paving could cause a problem in that area.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of Zoning Section 612.6 for paving. They should not require the parking areas to be paved since it already existed and did not cause drainage problems. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bensinger stated that with item # 17, the Environmental Assessment Statement needed to be prepared by the developer. He felt the same thing applied to that. Mr. Ruff stated that they just needed to write a one-page letter and that would suffice for the E.A.S.

Mr. Bensinger stated that under SALDO comment #3 concerning lot monumentation. They found all of the property pins along 422. Could they just set the pins on the two corners? Mr. Bittig

Burkholder Minor Subdivision continued

asked if the ones along the highway were still pins? Mr. Bensinger stated yes. Mr. Peifer stated they should not remove what they had found. Mr. Schwartz stated that should be good.

Mr. Bensinger stated that under comment #7 all the historical and archeological resources that have been identified by the Township, the County, the Berks County Planning Commission, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and/or were listed in a National Register of Historic Buildings or Places located within the tract or within 50-feet of the tract, should be referenced as such on the Plan. Did they need to do that? Mr. Wilson stated that the Red Lion Inn was on that tract. That used to be a stagecoach stop. Mr. Littlehales stated that at the time of the 1976 celebration they might have added that on the National Register. Mr. Schwartz stated it should be noted on the plan.

Mr. Bensinger stated that item #13 for inspection of existing on-lot septic systems to confirm that they were functioning properly. The house had public sewer and the Warehouse was on septic system. They contacted the SEO and they would be coming out for an inspection.

Mr. Bensinger stated that was everything they needed to go over that evening and thanked the Planning Commission.

10. LITTLE VIEW HILL BRIEF SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN - Andrew Kent

GVC reviewed the Little View Hill Brief Subdivision (reference letter dated November 26, 2003).

Mr. Kent stated they were returning with a new plan that had 4 lots on Hafer Road. They would attempt to install infiltration systems so the stormwater would be returned into the ground. In the GVC review letter comment #2 concerning Kent Drive, was it a private drive, or a private street? They had dropped off the paper from Judge Schmehl that stated Kent Drive was a private drive. With comment #2 for the right-of-way for Hafer Road, at the last meeting someone was going to look at Hafer Road and would let them know about the right-of-way width. They wanted to know what they decided on that. Mr. Bittig stated that we handled that at a previous meeting. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they were going to have the Highway Superintendent look at Hafer Road to give his opinion on curbing and sidewalk. Mr. Hamm had stated that curbing and sidewalk would not cause stormwater problems in that area. Mr. Bittig asked to see the minutes of the meeting where that was discussed. The minutes from the August 5th Planning Commission meeting were reviewed and it was found that the right-of-way was to be 30-ft from centerline and that curbing and sidewalk were to be placed there. Mr. Kent asked Mr. Peifer if, in his opinion, curbing would not cause stormwater problems in that area? Mr. Peifer stated he would have to review that.

Mr. Kent stated that they would go back to the drawing board and return at a later date.

11. FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF BIRDSBORO – PRELIMINARY PLAN

- Bill Fox - Bill Steiner
- David Brown

GVC reviewed the First Baptist Church of Birdsboro Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated November 26, 2003).

Mr. Fox presented the First Baptist Church of Birdsboro Preliminary Plan, which is located along South Center Road (Route 82). Mr. Fox stated they were planning a subdivision and a land development project. The subdivision involved taking a piece off of two lots and creating a third lot. It would be the home of the First Baptist Church. They have secured a special exception zoning approval from the Zoning Hearing Board in order to build the church at that location. The new lot being created for the First Baptist Church was 2.25-acres and was being created from lots 1 & 2. Lot 2 was an existing lot of 11.29-acres being reduced to 9.95-acres. Lot 1 was an existing lot of 1.4-acres being reduced to .51-acres and all the lots would meet the minimum lot size for that zone. They received the GVC review letter. Mr. Brown had prepared a response letter on all the items. All of the items concerning the Land Development plan would be addressed for the next meeting. There were a couple of items they would like to look for waivers. One item was for comment #10 concerning the Environmental Assessment Statement. They were looking for a waiver of the requirement due to the nature of the use. There should be no environmental impact. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was not the use that determines the impact. Mr. Fox stated that the property was currently residential in use. Mr. Schwartz stated that was correct, and now they would be developing there with building and parking lots on steep slopes. Mr. Fox asked if that meant they needed to do the Environmental Assessment statement? Mr. Bittig stated that was correct.

Mr. Fox stated the next item was #13 for curbing and sidewalks. There currently were none on S. Center Road and they were asking for a waiver.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 6.203 for curbing and Section 6.204 for sidewalks. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Fox stated they were also asking of a waiver of comment #15 for a Water Resource Study. Mr. Bittig stated that he believed he spoke for the Commission; we have a concern that here the Church would be drawing water out of the aquifer and the waste would be going into the public sewer system and nothing would be going back into the ground. The answer was yes, we want to see a Water Resource Study to see what the loss would be and what can be done to mitigate the loss. Mr. Schwartz asked how realistic was public water in that area? Mr. Brown stated that their opinion was it was extremely realistic; they have it across Lincoln Road. They were waiting for a determination to proceed with the development for the office space on Rt. 422 and Rt. 82. One of the requirements from the Water Company was to get the fire flows, and to do that they need to put

First Baptist Church of Birdsboro continued

in a storage tank in around the old school building on Rt. 422. They would possibly put in a half million-gallon storage tank. They were in the preliminary stage. They felt confident that the water service would be in that area in 2-3 years.

Mr. Wilson asked what was the size of the building? Mr. Stein replied 5,700 sq-ft. Mr. Bittig stated that the Fire Marshal would require the building to be sprinklered, and they would need adequate pressure for that. Mr. Wilson stated that he would be concerned if they would have adequate pressure off of a well water supply. Mr. Bittig stated that the Fire Marshal also would need access to the rear of the building in order to fight fires.

Mr. Fox stated that there were two comments on which the drawings had already been revised. Comment #1 for the setbacks, they had corrected the setback lines, and comment #2 they corrected on the revised drawings.

Mr. Fox stated that they had another item for consideration. They had the application for a subdivision plan and there was also a preliminary plan for land development. The First Baptist Church was very concerned that the Subdivision be approved. Until they were able to get a piece of property deeded to them they were restricted on their fund raising and financing for the project. The Land Development aspect of the plan would not be approved until they correct all the items. Could they separate the Subdivision from the Land Development and do an approval of the Subdivision only? They believe they met all of the requirements for the subdivision. They would return with the Land Development Plan at a later date. Mr. Peifer stated they would have to remove all of the Land Development aspects from the plan. Mr. Schwartz stated that actually what they have presented to the Planning Commission was not a Subdivision Plan that could be recorded. The question was what plan would they sign? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they could remove the Land Development from the plan, we would get a copy to Mr. Peifer and he could review that for the Planning Commission to sign. Mr. Peifer stated that would not be a problem. Mr. Fox stated they would take off all of the aspects of the Land Development. Could the Planning Commission vote on approval for the Subdivision? Mr. Ruff stated that he did not see any problem with that; we often have subdivision separate from the Land Development. They should place on the Subdivision plan that prior to any Land Development a Land Development Plan should be submitted.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend conditional approval for the revised Subdivision Plan of the First Baptist Church of Birdsboro, after all aspects of the Land Development were removed from the plan and approved by the engineer. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Fox thanked the Planning Commission.

12. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – PRELIMINARY PLAN

- Stephen Bensinger - Henry Filippini

GVC reviewed the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated December 2, 2003).

Mr. Bensinger stated that they revised the plan from the previous one that had the Cul-de-sac with 19 lots and they reduced it to 12 lots. They reduced the width of the street from 46-ft down to a 24-ft cartway with curbs on both sides of the street. They were proposing no sidewalk on that street. Those were the major changes from the previous plan. Two members of the EAC and Mr. Bittig of the Planning Commission walked the property and identified trees that they wanted to save. There were five large trees that were marked to save and were now identified on the plan. They saved four of the five large trees. Mr. Bittig stated that they should also note on the plan that there would be no timbering or foresting in the area of the natural woodland.

Mr. Krafczek stated that originally they were planning on a 47-lot subdivision. He then asked what the new total was for the lots there? Mr. Filippini replied 38-lots. Mr. Krafczek asked what the size of the smallest lot was? Mr. Bensinger stated around 15,000 sq. ft. Mr. Krafczek stated he was concerned about the stormwater runoff from the lots. Mr. Filippini stated that they would have conservation easements to the rear of the properties that were more restrictive than usual. Mr. Peifer stated that any private deed restrictions should be given to the Township so we know what they are.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they wanted to run down the GVC review letter and comment on the items. Concerning item #1 under Zoning Ordinance, the following lots show proposed grading in areas with existing slope equal to or greater than 25%: 1, 2, 3, 7 through 12, 25 through 30, 32 through 38, they do encroach into areas greater than 25%, but all of those areas are minor. Mr. Bittig stated they could shift the placement of the building on lot #7 to bring it out of the encroachment. Mr. Bensinger stated they could do that. Mr. Peifer stated that on #38 they should straighten out the line on the conservation easement.

Mr. Bensinger stated that under SALDO comment #1 concerning the trees, they addressed that in the field. Mr. Bittig stated that he appreciated the EAC members for taking the time to do the walk on the property and their comments.

Mr. Bensinger stated that item #2 had been satisfied. They would have parking allowed on one side only. For comment #3 they would have approval from the Township and the Postal Service for the street name of Linkside Court. #4 would be addressed with the Final Plan. #5 for the Conservation Easement, they would revise that. Mr. Peifer stated that they had some areas that needed to be touched up in the conservation easement; areas that they show highlighted or shaded

Exeter Golf Club continued

were outside of the actual easement. Mr. Bittig stated that the verbiage for the easement should be stated on the plan. Mr. Peifer stated that they should state what was allowed in that area.

Mr. Wilson asked about the steep slopes, would they be having the problem with the driveways like they did on Dunham Drive? Mr. Peifer stated that there were a few at 12%, but they have a note on the plan that the driveways cannot exceed 12%.

Mr. Bensinger stated that with comment #6 for the Habitats of Threatened and Endangered Species, they have received the report and they will submit a copy to Exeter Township. For comment #7, Historic and Archaeological Resource they were waiting for receipt of that. With Comment #8, the Water Resource Study, they had just dropped that off to the Township.

Mr. Bensinger asked about comment #9 concerning the cul-de-sac, was that satisfactory? Mr. Schwartz asked if they were reducing the cul-de-sac diameter? Mr. Bensinger stated that no, they were not. Just the width of the street and the lots were reduced from 19 to 12. Mr. Schwartz stated that was fine.

Mr. Bensinger stated that for comment #10, they gave the Township the agreement and were waiting for response from the Township Solicitor. With comment #11 concerning the intersection of Madison Drive and Constitution Boulevard, they thought they had gotten a waiver for the whole aspect of the intersection because it was pre-existing and it was physically impossible to fix. Mr. Peifer stated that he needed to determine what exactly was waived for that. The letter to the Board of Supervisors was reviewed and it was found that they received the waiver for the entire intersection.

Mr. Bensinger stated that comment #13 for the new lot configuration and lot areas, they received a waiver for the lot depth to width ratio, was that Ok for lot 27? Mr. Schwartz stated that was fine. For #14, the Township Authority would be reviewing that. With Comment #15, they were waiting for the letter from the Water Company.

Mr. Bensinger stated comment #16, where they would provide either land or a recreation fee in-lieu-of-land dedication. They have two areas of open space, one containing the detention basin. They were showing those two areas as land dedication to the Township. Mrs. Franckowiak stated the Township would not take open space with detention ponds on it. Mr. Peifer stated that should be managed by the Homeowners Association. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that on 0-39 lot subdivision there was no additional land needed to be dedicated or fee in-lieu-of-land for that size of subdivision. Mr. Peifer stated that by reducing the number of lots they just saved \$30,000. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they would need to pay the recreation fee at the time of building permit. Mr. Bensinger stated that on comment #17 there would be no sidewalk along Linkside Court. Mr. Bittig stated that with the lot frontage of 150-ft they would not need sidewalks.

Exeter Golf Club continued

On Comment #18 for the retaining wall, they would have that design at final plan. Comment #21 concerning the old dump, a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment had been submitted. Mr. Peifer stated he would do a review of that. With Item #22, they would add the label to that.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they needed to discuss the Stormwater Management comment #2. There were three areas that Mr. Peifer had concerns with: 5a, 5b, and 5c. They couldn't quite meet the Stormwater Ordinance, but they had less than 1 cfs additional flow. They thought the amount was acceptable. It was not a concentrated flow and Exeter Township was working on a new ordinance. Mr. Peifer stated that the new Stormwater Ordinance would not make any difference; the peak rate flow part would be the same. In the other areas, the water would be in the tract boundary. Mr. Peifer suggested that they get a waiver for those areas demonstrating it was not a concentrated flow; the highest cfs was in the 100-year storm area with 1 cfs, in area 5a. They were going to do infiltration trenches in those areas, but they did preliminary test probes and found rock. Mr. Peifer stated that one suggestion was to put on the plan that the roof drains must discharge to the back of the properties and terminate before the conservation easement.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive SALDO Appendix V.B and accept the note on the plan that the roof drains must discharge to the back of the properties and terminate before the conservation easement. The motion carried unanimously.

A copy of the note to be placed on the plan concerning the University Rifle Club was given to Mr. Bensinger. Mr. Filippini asked if that was for a waiver? Mr. Bittig stated that it was a note to be placed on the plan and on every deed for the lots that would make all homeowners aware of the proximity of the University Rifle Club and its grandfathered use. Mr. Filippini asked if they were asking for relief of liability. Mr. Wilson replied no. Mr. Robert Nye, University Rifle Club, stated that he had a correction to the note. The correction was made.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they had already agreed the Traffic Impact Study was not a problem. Comment #1, the two landscaped areas would be maintained by the Homeowners Association. They were asking for Preliminary Plan Approval. They would address all other items in the GVC letter at Final Plan Stage.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Preliminary Plan with the understanding that the developer would address the following items from the GVC review dated December 2nd (copy attached and made a part of the minutes) at the Final Plan stage. Under SALDO, Items #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, Review of the Water Resource Study which was received, #10, #12, #14, #15, #16, #18, #19, #20, #21 and under Stormwater Management item #2. A note is to be placed on the plan that the Homeowners Association will manage open space. The motion carried unanimously.

Exeter Golf Club continued

13. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

The Stormwater Management Ordinance was reviewed and changes were discussed for spelling errors and wording. The corrections would be done and sent back to GVC for review.

14. CHECKLIST FOR SUBMISSION OF SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Bittig stated that he wanted to discuss the submission package for Subdivision and Land Development. If someone brought in an incomplete package how should that be handled? That evening when we voted on the First Baptist Church submission, he voted not to accept the plan for review because they did not have all the required items. When we vote on that, it starts the time clock and it would be better to have a complete package before doing so.

Mr. Peifer stated he would review the checklist to see if it had all the required items on it. The checklist should also show that if something were missing, the reason would need to be explained (waiver request, etc.) The Planning Commission agreed that when someone brought in a plan, it would be compared to the checklist. Then if there were items missing, they would be listed on the agenda so everyone would know what they were and they could proceed from there.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to include the checklist in the application package and also if there were missing items they needed to explain why it was not included. The motion carried unanimously.

10. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Wilson stated that he wanted to remind everyone about the Zoning Workshop on Tuesday, December 16th at 7:00. Also, at the first Planning Commission meeting for the year, the first item for discussion would be re-organization.

Mr. Wilson also wanted to say congratulations to Mr. Krafczek for his re-appointment to the Planning Commission for another 4 years.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he was re-appointed to the EAC. The Planning Commission congratulated everyone on their re-appointments to the various commissions.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to adjourn the December 2, 2003 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:25 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

John F. Ruff, Jr., PE
Planning Commission Secretary

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Fowler Minor Subdivision Sketch Plan for Record Approval
BOS: Medi-Cap Pharmacy Preliminary/Final Approval
BOS: Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Preliminary Plan Approval
BOS: Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Preliminary Plan Waiver
BOS: Burkholder Preliminary/Final Plan waiver requests
BOS: First Baptist Church of Birdsboro waiver request
BOS: First Baptist Church of Birdsboro Subdivision Plan Approval
BOS: Thomas Halligan Conditional Use
BOS: Jessica Schach Conditional Use
ZHB: Kubovcsak Variance request