

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2003

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 3, 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
J. D. Krafczek
Laurie Elliott
Dottie Geiger
Paul L. Schwartz

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

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the minutes of the April 1, 2003 Planning Commission Meeting as corrected:

Item 9. HOLY CROSS UNITED METHODIST CHURCH – FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN – Mr. Robert Nye of University Rifle Club was repeating Mr. Bittig’s statement “good neighbor, love thy neighbor” and to please strike the quotations from this remark.

Item 13. ZONING MAP CHANGES Mrs. Elliott spelled incorrectly, please correct spelling.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the June 3, 2003 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

1. **CRESTMONT LAND DEVELOPMENT–SKETCH PLAN:** **MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

Approve applications for review continued

2. **EXETER ARTESIAN WELL TREATMENT FACILITY–PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.
3. **ROYAL VIEW ESTATES-SKETCH PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.
4. **EXETER HIGH SCHOOL-FINAL PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

4. MATT BRENNAN – INFORMAL DISCUSSION – Matt Brennan

Mr. Brennan presented a plan for subdividing and annexing the Brickey Property on Rugby Road. He currently resides at 8 Stacey Court, which adjoins the Brickey Property. They were proposing to annex property to their lot, their neighbors lot and subdivide the remaining property into two building lots. Mr. Brennan would be working with Roger Fry to work an acceptable plan for the property. When they approached Engineers with the plan they were told they would need cleaner lines in regards to the annexation. In the Exeter Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance on page 23 concerning Minor and Brief Subdivision, Mr. Brennan needed feedback on which direction they should take with the plan. There was an existing driveway onto the property. They were willing to improve the grade of the existing driveway to extend all the way up to the two proposed building lots. They were aware of the grade problem and would work on improving that. The existing grade is 12 %. They weren't planning on doing any work immediately upon approval and they did understand the time limit. They were planning on annexing all but 4 ½ acres. They did not plan on making this property into more than two lots. They were looking into making the plan into a Minor Subdivision with the approval of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the properties adjoining the Brickey property. Were there three properties there? Mr. Brennan stated yes.

Mr. Brennan stated they had two questions for the board. Could they have two lots at this location and could they treat it as a Minor subdivision if they made a commitment on improving on the grade of the driveway? Mr. Wilson stated he believed that would be dividing it into five lots. Mr. Brennan stated that they were told with the annexation to the properties they would only be considered a two-lot subdivision. Mr. Schwartz stated that with the annexation they would be a two-lot subdivision. Mr. Peifer asked if Mr. Brickey had access off of Rugby Road? Mr. Brennan stated yes, he did. Mrs. Geiger asked if Mr. Brennan lived in Kinsey Hill? Mr. Brennan stated yes, the rear of their property adjoined the Brickey property. They knew that this land was in a

Matt Brennan informal discussion continued

few times before and the previous plans did not work out.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there were other properties coming off of that same driveway? Mr. Brennan stated they did not. The three properties next to their proposed driveway had their own access off of Rugby Road. Mr. Schwartz asked if those driveways looked like one driveway that was wide? Mr. Brennan stated that there were two separate distinct driveways, one services two lots. The other was for the one lot only. Mr. Schwartz asked what was between the two driveways? Mr. Brennan stated that there was land at that location. Mr. Schwartz asked if it would be possible to improve that entrance to serve the two existing properties? It would be better to have one nice entrance rather than three in a row. Mr. Brennan stated he would be willing to work with the other property owners, if that was possible. Mr. Bittig stated that from a safety perspective it would be nice to hold the driveways at two or even better, just one. Mrs. Geiger stated that with Kinsey Hill they had five driveways there. Mr. Brennan stated they could talk to the property owners and see how they felt about working together to join their driveways into one. So they had two options, either to tie all the driveways into one or work on improving the already existing driveway. Mr. Wilson asked what the distance was between their driveway and number three driveway. Mr. Brennan stated they weren't sure, they could get that information. Mrs. Elliott stated that driveways may be 12% grade except within 20 feet of the roadway. Mr. Brennan stated they would have to grade that off at the roadway. They would still like to improve on the 12%.

Mr. Wilson stated that we would agree with their engineers with the idea of squaring off the property lines. Both houses would need to have deeded access for right-of-way. Mr. Schwartz stated that the two lots they are proposing are large enough to subdivide, so we would ask that they place a note on the plan restricting further subdivision. Mr. Bittig stated that their proposal is something he would support. Mr. Brennan stated that the SALDO states they needed 30-foot road frontage for each property. They had 40 feet of frontage for both properties. Could they get leniency for this? Mr. Schwartz stated that they would need a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board for frontage on the subdivision. Mr. Brennan asked what they needed to proceed with this plan? Mr. Wilson stated that they would need a lot of monumentation for their subdivision, deed restrictions on all properties involved and the zoning variance. Mr. Peifer stated they would need storm water runoff for the driveway onto Rugby Road. Mr. Brennan stated they would see to that also.

Mr. Brennan stated that they would like to submit this proposal as a Minor Subdivision with a Sketch Plan and along with the Planning Commission approval, Sketch Plan only. Would they be ok with one more final review of a professional Sketch Plan? Mr. Wilson stated that according to our definition it was Minor, it was only two lots.

Mr. Brennan thanked the Planning Commission for their time.

5. CRESTMONT LAND DEVELOPMENT– SKETCH PLAN -Rick Longacre-Schlouch, Inc.
-Tim Maue-Carlino Group
-Steve Najarian-Carlino Group

GVC reviewed the Crestmont Land Development Sketch Plan (reference letter dated May 30, 2003).

Mr. Longacre presented the Crestmont Land Development Sketch Plan. Mr. Longacre stated it was a 52 lot Townhouse Development on the east side of West Neversink Road, located behind the Auman Funeral Home. Access has been proposed off of West Neversink Road and Clayborne Road, which currently was a paper road, undeveloped. They were showing a link out the back on that street. The project was Urban Residential Zoning, high-density zoning. The entire tract was 20-acres. They are proposing a subdivision around the Funeral Home, to the left of the Funeral Home was wooded and rocky terrain.

Mr. Longacre stated that there was public sewer and water. Public water was available off of West Neversink Road. There were also water and sewer options available on Clayborne. They would be dealing with storm water on site directly behind the units and there were existing drainage easements along the back of the previously recorded lots. Mrs. Geiger asked for guidance on the location of this property in conjunction with Forest Hills Cemetery. Mr. Longacre showed Mrs. Geiger the location of the cemetery on the map.

Mr. Najarian stated that he was the President for the Carlino Development Group and their focus has been mostly on the western side of town with the Spring Ridge Properties. The type of housing they were looking to build in Exeter was most similar to their current Oak Hill Town Home Community off of Broadcasting Road. He passed out brochures to the Planning Commission to give them an idea of the type of developments they produce. Mr. Najarian stated they would be building 25-foot wide homes with first floor master bedrooms and maintenance free options. They have an agreement with the SCI Funeral Group to purchase the entire 17-acre parcel, which includes the open space.

Mr. Bittig stated that they did have a challenge looking at the terrain in there and the slopes. Our latest Ordinance states that less than 25% of your open space can be a grade of 6% and more. They also have the issue of water with new rules to place the water back into the ground. Mr. Longacre stated they had already started drilling the rock.

Mr. Bittig asked about the status of Clayborne. When we saw the plan with one access and a cul-de-sac we knew it was a health and safety issue waiting to plague us all. Mr. Najarian stated that Clayborne was the most direct access. Mr. Longacre stated Clayborne was approved and proposed to be a public street at the time that subdivision was done. They have discussed that road

Crestmont Sketch Plan continued

with the developer in that area and they were moving forward with it and it was in keeping with the time frame for their goals for Crestmont. They were moving on the basis that the road would be available. Mr. Bittig stated that they would really need that second access. Mr. Maue stated that there was one home on Clayborne Road right now and the rest were sitting on an approved plan for Janet Place. Mr. Longacre stated they were aware of the fact they needed to link the two roads. Something they would like to get the Planning Commissions feeling on would be the sequencing of construction on the project. In the Ordinance up to 20 residences are permitted, on a cul-de-sac. Could that concept apply to a portion of these units? Each of the buildings has four units. Basically five of the buildings would represent 20 units. Would it be reasonable to build as a first phase, five buildings on a cul-de-sac? Mr. Schwartz stated that would make sense, the ordinance said they could do that. The question would be if the access on West Neversink Road was safe and what the sight distance was at that location. Mr. Longacre stated they did not have the measurements. It would appear they would be ok at the point they currently were located. They couldn't shift the entrance down or up. There was a large knob there that they would have to remove as a part of the drilling that would have to take place. Once that was out of the way, nothing would impede the approach. The development actually lays with the land. Mr. Wilson asked if there would be any way they could provide an access through the back from the other side? Mr. Longacre stated that on the other side the topography would not allow that.

Mr. Wilson asked if there would be any pedestrian circulation within the development, any sidewalks? Mr. Longacre stated they needed to look at the units, but most likely there would be a system around the development. Mr. Wilson asked would there be sidewalks on Clayborne Street? If there were sidewalks on Clayborne then they would need to extend the sidewalks into their development, we don't want to see people walking in the streets. Even when a development was in the middle of nowhere, eventually that would not be the case so sidewalks need to be provided.

Mr. Longacre stated there would be 137 parking spaces provided within the development. Each unit would have two spaces, one space in the garage and one on the driveway.

Mrs. Elliott asked if they would be providing landscaping along the perimeter? Mr. Longacre stated they would be looking at that on later plans and would be providing a buffer between the funeral home and the development.

Mr. Wilson asked if they would like to go through the review letter from GVC? Mr. Wilson stated we would like to address #2 under the zoning, would this be something we need to be concerned about? Mr. Peifer stated that looking at the plan for the funeral home it looked as though it was one tract. Mr. Longacre stated it looked as though it was plotted out as Forest Hills Memorial Park and almost seemed the parcel adjoined the parcel on the other side. They would check it out with the surveyor. They are both the same owner.

Crestmont Sketch Plan continued

Mr. Longacre asked about comments #3 & 4, concerning West Neversink Road and improvements at that location. Could they have some guidance for that? Mr. Peifer stated they haven't done a traffic study there as of yet. When that was completed they could give them guidance at that point. Mr. Bittig asked what was the cartway width for West Neversink Road? Mr. Longacre stated it was 25 feet.

Mrs. Elliott asked about the open space for the development. Mr. Longacre stated that there would be some adjusting for lot one, but they would still be exceeding the requirements even with the change of lot one. Mr. Najarian stated they wanted to clarify the point on why they would be changing the size of lot one. They have a contract which allows them to purchase the property for the development, however the company which owns the property came back to them requesting a larger portion for lot one, because it would look better on the companies books in reference to the price per acre. They might agree for the company's internal purposes. There might be some adjusting because of that. Mr. Wilson asked how much open space are they allowing now? Mr. Longacre stated that the whole lot area was 17 acres, so about 10% of that. Mr. Bittig stated the open space would be wild terrain. Mr. Longacre stated that the area was a very steep slope and very rocky with mammoth boulders. Mr. Wilson asked if that space would be dedicated to the Township or part of the Homeowners Association? Mr. Najarian stated they would follow the Township lead concerning the parcel, whatever the Township would prefer. Mr. Wilson stated that if they were dedicating the open land to the township they would need to provide access to the property. They needed to keep that in mind when they changed the area for lot one. Do not cut off access at that area.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the only comments from the EAC would be to take notice of the wildlife in that area. Mr. Bittig stated that they would have to do endangered species survey and environmental impact. Mr. Schwartz stated that a member of the EAC lived in that area and they saw just about everything in that area including deer and coyote.

Mrs. Elliott asked about the turnaround or cul-de-sac they were proposing? Mr. Wilson stated that after the 5th unit they would have to provide a temporary cul-de-sac. Mr. Longacre stated that the street would not be dedicated to the Township. There would be a Homeowners Association in the development.

Mr. Wilson asked if there were any other comments or questions? There were none.

Mr. Longacre thanked the Planning Commission for their time.

6. EXETER ARTESIAN WELL TREATMENT FACILITY – PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- Jim Pilkerton
- Donald Kuser-Kuser, Inc.

GVC reviewed the Exeter Artesian Well Treatment Facility Preliminary Land Development Plan (reference letter dated May 30, 2003)

Mr. Pilkerton presented the Exeter Artesian Well Treatment Facility Preliminary Land Development Plan located on the east side of Church Lane, owned by PA American Water Company. They were proposing to build a 20 x 40 foot Water Treatment Building using the existing gravel roadways to create a parking area. The purpose of the development was to tie existing wells and reservoirs to a central treatment facility and transmitted out to the existing water supply system. Mr. Peifer stated they received a letter from Mrs. Franckowiak concerning the zoning. Mr. Peifer felt they would need to go to the Zoning Hearing Board for approval to expand the pre-existing non-conformity. Mr. Peifer stated that in section five it does not over ride section three, which states that they would need to go to the Zoning Hearing Board for an expansion of a non-conforming use. Section five was simply stating how that use could be expanded. Mr. Peifer would check with Mrs. Franckowiak to clarify that matter.

Mr. Schwartz asked what was currently at that location? Mr. Pilkerton stated that there were two reservoirs, five existing wells and a small treatment building. They were proposing a larger water treatment building and basically tie all the piping together.

Mr. Schwartz asked if they were a public utility? Mr. Pilkerton stated yes. Mr. Schwartz asked if they needed to go through the PUC? Mr. Pilkerton replied that Mrs. Franckowiak stated they needed to go through Land Development. Mr. Schwartz asked why? Mr. Pilkerton replied because Mrs. Franckowiak deemed it necessary. Mr. Peifer stated that section 1000 stated they needed to go through the PUC first and then the PUC would rule that what they were doing was necessary. Mr. Schwartz stated that they would need PUC approval for the plan. Mr. Pilkerton stated they did not need PUC approval. Mr. Peifer stated that a few years ago they had that issue with a cell tower. They had to either get PUC approval or follow the ordinance.

Mr. Wilson asked if the project would eliminate the need for the smaller building already existing on the property. Mr. Pilkerton stated that the smaller building would remain. They didn't believe they would tear that building down.

Mr. Pilkerton stated that there were some issues in the zoning concerning parking and off street loading. They didn't know how they would handle that issue. That was not a public concern. Also due to Home Land Security the public was not allowed onto that property. Mr. Wilson asked were there employees working there? Mr. Pilkerton stated that they had one employee there to do a daily maintenance check. The only time there was more than one employee there at the same time

Exeter Artesian Well Water Treatment Facility continued

would be in an emergency situation. Mr. Wilson asked if they had enough parking there to cover that? Mr. Pilkerton stated that they would have enough to handle their own employee parking. Mr. Wilson stated that the ordinance calls for off street parking and that was not a street but a driveway. Mr. Bittig stated that was a non-issue.

Mr. Pilkerton stated that they would provide an Environmental Assessment Statement and asked if there was anything else the Planning Commission would like to discuss? Mr. Wilson asked about the tree removal. Was it limited to .75 acres? Mr. Pilkerton stated that was correct.

Mr. Kuser stated they were asking for a waiver for delineation of the wetlands on the plan. The limit to the work in the area of the stream was minimal. Mr. Bittig stated that the county had some concerns about the stream. Mr. Kuser stated they would be crossing the stream at one point with one-inch conduit, with minor permitting. Mr. Wilson stated we would need copies of that.

Mr. Kuser stated that the engineer had questions in terms of two exhibits, the Environmental Assessment and the Environmental performance standards. They would meet with him and answer any questions he had. Mr. Peifer stated that they should provide a note on the plan that there was no wetland delineation or any further development there.

Mr. Schwartz asked what the actual process was that they had there? Mr. Kuser stated that one process was they injected chlorination into the reservoirs there. They were replacing piping from the existing wells. The electronic station was totally automated. They did a visual inspection of the station daily. They also control the PH in the system. Mr. Schwartz asked what type of reservoir system they had there. Mr. Kuser stated that they have concrete in-ground reservoir and they are currently not planning on replacing that.

Mr. Wilson asked if there were any other questions or comments.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to waive the requirement for wetland delineation as stated in SALDO section 4.3592. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Peifer stated that they should come back next month with a Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan. Mr. Pilkerton stated they would be back next month with a Preliminary/Final Plan.

7. ROYAL VIEW ESTATES – SKETCH PLAN - C. Wesley Seitzinger
- Charlie Leazier

GVC reviewed the Royal View Estates Sketch Plan (reference letter dated May 29, 2003).

Royal View Estates sketch plan continued

Mr. Seitzinger presented the Royal View Estates Sketch Plan located on the southern side of Hartman Road, west of its intersection with Limekiln Road. They are proposing eight single-family home lots with on site water and sewer. One flag lot #1, which contains 15 acres, the remaining lots have 3 acres or more. Originally in their letter they stated they would be acquiring land from the O'Brien Subdivision but the price went from one price to ten times higher. They adjusted the lot lines and lot 7 now has over 100 feet of lot frontage. So they meet the requirements for lot frontage. They would not disturb the woodlands. They would do a wetland study and storm water management. The key map was drawn to 1/800. On the GVC letter it mentioned the need for a 27-foot right-of-way. The Himmelreich subdivision has a 27-foot right-of-way and they have continued that along Hartman road until they got back to the O'Brien Subdivision, which only has a 25-foot right-of-way and was a recorded plan. They tied into that right-of-way. Mr. Peifer stated that they would have to get a waiver for that. Mr. Wilson stated that they would need to take a broader look at the development of roads in the Township. There may not be traffic now, but that does not mean there won't be in the future.

Mr. Peifer asked about a piece of property located across the road, did that belong to the O'Brien Subdivision or was that a part of their development? Mr. Seitzinger stated it belonged to them. Mr. Peifer stated that would have to be part of one of the lots. Mr. Seitzinger stated that they could offer it to the adjoining property owner across the street. Mr. Peifer stated that if it were accepted then they would have to show a signature block on the plan. Mr. Seitzinger asked what they would need to do if it was not accepted? Mr. Peifer stated he would check with the Township and see if they would want to acquire that piece of property. Mr. Schwartz stated that if the property owner across the street did not want it, then the Township should take it.

Mr. Bittig stated that looking at the lots, 5 of the 8 lots are outside the established width to depth ratios of the ordinance, five out of eight is excessive. Mr. Seitzinger stated that was the way the land was there. Mr. Bittig stated that they were trying to maximize the lots. The majority of the lots were barely three acres. Mr. Wilson stated that we normally grant waivers for lot width to depth ratio when hardship was demonstrated for that. Mr. Bittig stated that five of the eight are non-conforming. Mr. Wilson stated that what we were pointing out was that we do not grant exception because they are trying to maximize the number of lots out of a piece of property. If they would change the number of lots they would not have to get those waivers. Mr. Seitzinger stated that they have steep slopes in the rear. Mrs. Elliott stated that they could go with larger lots and then it would have a more rural look to the area. Mr. Bittig stated that they could go for two fewer lots and remove the need for a waiver. He wanted to go on record that he would not be in support of a waiver for lot dimensions.

Mr. Schwartz stated that by the time they got done with their setbacks and their slopes, did they have enough room to even build a house with a well and septic system on those lots. Mr. Leazier

Royal View Sketch Plan continued

stated that they could build a nice house on those lots. Mr. Seitzinger stated that they could visit the site and see that it wouldn't be bad. Mr. Bittig stated that with the ordinance now stating you couldn't cut and build on slopes greater than 25% they have a problem to conform with the ordinance. Mr. Schwartz stated that the next step would be to show a plan that delineates all those steep slope areas. Mr. Bittig stated that it would be hard for them to do that within the framework of the Ordinance. Mr. Seitzinger stated that they felt they could do it. Mr. Leazier stated that they could do exposed basements on the lots that have the steep slopes, like in Pathfinder. Mr. Schwartz stated that the difference was that Pathfinder had public sewer. They needed to get a septic system on those lots also.

Mr. Wilson stated that wherever possible show 27-feet from the centerline for the right-of-way on the plan. If the Township would want to come in to widen the road then, they would be covered.

Mr. Schwartz stated we would need to see contours on Preliminary Plans and possibly fewer lots.

Mr. Peifer asked if they had the soil tested yet? Mr. Seitzinger stated that they did not.

Mr. Schwartz stated that one of the lots had 15 acres, which would mean someone could come in at a later date and want to subdivide his or her property. Mr. Seitzinger stated they could put that on the plan stating no further subdivision was allowed.

Mr. Bittig stated that as a point of reference, in the Himmelreich Development the reason the lots were shaped odd as they were was because they could not get the lots to perk at the points they wanted. If they had problems there, we can anticipate the same problem on this property.

Mr. Wilson asked if there were any other comments?

Mr. Michael O'Brien stated that he had a couple of issues he wanted to discuss. He owned a property at the bottom of the hill on Hartman Road. First, his concern was the amount of driveways proposed for the development. The Township had come out a number of times to put stone in due to water runoff problems and would that development add to the problem with the greater number of driveways and water runoff? The other thing was he had a well and the flow from his well was only 1 and ½ gallons a minute. Would putting in more homes there cause a problem with his well? Also the aesthetics of the building lots of the development concerned him. The lots for the development were close and the other lots in the area were much bigger. He did not want to get away from development but felt that it should be done in a manner in keeping with the area. Plus the he had concerns for safety in the area. He did not want his well affected. His well was 500 feet deep and it was very hard to get perks on his property.

Royal View Sketch Plan continued

Mr. Wilson stated that they have 8 lots laid out on this plan, if they would have 5 lots they may not need a waiver for the plan. Also as Mrs. Elliott pointed out with less lots they would be in keeping with the community surrounding the development. With runoff, their development should not have any more runoff than it already has today. That was also a concern with more driveways coming off of that road. Mr. Wilson thanked Mr. O'Brien for his comments.

Mr. Wilson stated that since we were discussing a Sketch plan a couple of the comments for the development were that Mr. Bittig stated he would not be in favor of the waivers they would be asking for and he had a habit of not voting for those either. We think this does not fit in with the rest of the community there. Most of the other lots there are wide. We could require that the driveways turn inside to the property, but that would make it hard to develop the property.

Mr. Ruff stated that the subdivision presented was not in keeping with the RC zoning district, and he would not support the waivers either. Mr. Seitzinger asked if they would support any waivers for lot size? Mr. Ruff stated he might entertain some, but not those.

Mrs. Elliott stated that she also would not support a waiver.

Mr. Wilson asked for any other comments or questions. There were none.

Mr. Seitzinger thanked the Planning Commission.

8. EXETER HIGH SCHOOL – FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Matt Davenport

GVC reviewed the Exeter High School Renovations & Additions Final Land Development Plan (reference letter dated May 30, 2003).

Matt Davenport presented the final plans for the improvements to the Exeter High School. They wanted to thank Great Valley for their work on reviewing the Plan. Mr. Davenport stated they wanted to discuss the parking situation and plan sheet FP-1, Future Parking Alternatives, Woodland Avenue-Alternative Parking. They investigated 52 parking spaces along Woodland Avenue and layout was possible in that area. GVC recommended that the plan be made a part of the final development package. Mr. Davenport stated that they wanted to discuss the future parking plan and some language would need to be worked out between the Township and the School District to indicate when the need would arise for that parking to be constructed. They attempted to estimate the cost of that construction to provide 20-23 parallel parking spaces along Woodland Avenue along with provisions for 53 spaces, which would be a net gain of 25 to 30 parking spaces. The estimated construction cost was 300+ thousand dollars due to the retaining wall for the necessary grading required for the project. That did not seem cost effective means of providing

Exeter High School continued

additional parking when the plan we currently have meets the decision rendered by Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Wilson asked if the plan meets the requirements without the Woodland Avenue parking? Mr. Peifer stated that today, yes. Mr. Wilson asked could we approve the Plan today, without the Woodland Avenue parking? Mr. Peifer stated it meets the Zoning Hearing Boards decision and he believed it also met the needs for the stadium parking. Mr. Hugh Cadzow stated they felt that to add additional parallel parking on Woodland Avenue may cause a conflict with the Bus traffic. Mr. Krafczek asked where the proposed 53 spaces would be located and would that be a future plan? Mr. Cadzow stated it would be angle parking along Woodland Avenue and yes, it was for the future. Mr. Davenport stated that they were asked to label on the plans where the Senior/Junior High School parking would be. Mr. Wilson stated that we really just need it marked as student parking.

Mr. Davenport stated that they were in negotiations with the adjoining property owner's daughter, Miss Cotner, and their attorneys to enter into an agreement concerning the deed of easement on Brumbach Street. Mr. Jon Malsnee stated they have an agreement drawn up and are just awaiting signatures. They were looking for a 20-foot wide easement running 58.27 feet deep. If a different dimension was needed, please let them know. The adjoining property owner's driveway was actually on the School District property.

Mr. Davenport asked for clarification on item #7 concerning approval for improvements to the adjacent park. The School District owns the property for the park; do they still need to write a letter to themselves?

Mr. Bittig asked about item #8 and the approval letter for the Erosion and Sediment Pollution Control Plan. Mr. Davenport stated they would have a clean letter in 7 to 10 days. The issues were the County was looking for clarity of the plan, and the scale for the improvements in St Lawrence Boro were 60 scale and they wanted 40 scale.

Mr. Davenport stated they wanted to address item #9 concerning the retaining wall. The elevations will be drawn up by an Engineer registered in Pennsylvania. Mr. Peifer stated the elevations are not for the retaining wall itself. The scale does not have individual elevations for their lines on the plan. Mr. Davenport stated they have since added map lines.

Mr. Davenport asked if the Planning Commission had received the information from Terry Francis, the Fire Marshall? Mr. Peifer stated they had a good letter now. Mr. Bittig stated that on the review it calls for a 30,000-gallon water tank and fire pump. Was it there? Mr. Davenport stated that it was on the plan.

Exeter High School continued

Mr. Davenport stated that concerning the June 3rd letter on Storm Water Management Report, item #2 Double Inlet along Reiff Place, they would indicate that symbol on the plan. Mr. Davenport stated they were changing the plan from bio-retention areas to infiltration trenches and underground water retention areas that they would need for the area. They were making an attempt to improve on the plan.

Mr. Davenport stated that they would be in compliance with ADA requirements for pedestrian ramps at street or drive crossing locations.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Krafczek to recommend conditional approval for the Exeter High School Renovations & Additions Final Plan contingent upon receipt of signed easement agreement, closure of the issues listed in the GVC letter dated May 30, 2003 and Storm Water Management letter dated June 3, 2003 which are attached and made a part of these minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

12. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Wilson asked if there was anything else to be discussed?

Mr. Wilson stated he wanted to get the feelings from the rest of the Board about approval of applications. At the top of the agenda, where we have the motion to approve the applications for review. In theory, the way it was supposed to work, we approve the application for review but we do not discuss it at that meeting. Could we just approve the applications and then discuss it at the next meeting? Is it ok to put them on the agenda to discuss it? He wanted to clarify that for Ms. Cusimano, as she came on after we started that procedure and wanted to let her know how to proceed. Mr. Peifer stated that as long as he had the time to review the plan they could be on the agenda for discussion. As long as the package was complete and on time there would not be a problem. If the package was not complete and/or was not received in time for review then they could accept the plan at that meeting but discuss it at the following meeting.

Mr. Bittig stated he would not be present at the July 1st Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Schwartz stated that he would also not be present at the July 1st Planning Commission.

Mr. Schwartz stated that now that Fegely's was closed was there any value to the Township to acquiring some of that land. We would not be violating the "Sacred Cow" of Exeter. Mrs. Elliott asked what could be done with that? Mr. Wilson stated the land could be used for a turn lane. Now would be an ideal time to do something. Mr. Schwartz stated that now would be a good time to go on record as to acquiring some of that land. His recommendation was to write a letter to the Board of Supervisors to check into the need to acquire some of that land. Mrs. Geiger asked what if it was already sold? Mr. Wilson stated that we could do this before someone would come in

General Discussion continued

with a plan for that location. Mr. Peifer stated that if another restaurant came in to use the existing building then the Township would have to do a condemnation.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to write a letter to the Board of Supervisors recommending they investigate acquiring any or all of the Fegelys property for intersection improvements, including any necessary turn lanes. The motion carried unanimously.

Mrs. Elliott asked what day they were meeting with Eric Gardecki for their field trip for the Zoning Map changes? Mr. Bittig stated next Thursday, June 12th. We needed to agree on a time and just get back to Eric to let him know. Mr. Bittig, Mrs. Elliott and Mr. Wilson agreed to meet at 8:30am On Thursday, June 12th with Mr. Gardecki.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to adjourn the June 3, 2003 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:15 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

LRC

Correspondence to:

BOS: Fegleys
BOS: Exeter Artesian Well Water Treatment Facility Waiver request
BOS: Exeter High School Final Plan Conditional Approval