

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2003

The Rescheduled Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, March 13, 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
Pattie Geise, Planning Commission Secretary
Linda Cusimano, Assistant Zoning Officer

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2003 Planning Commission Meeting as corrected:

Item 5. PIONEER CROSSING DISTRIBUTED GENERATING FACILITY – PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN – Michelle Kircher stated that a PA bulletin stated there would be no change in emissions. Emissions were not going to be decreasing but there would be an increase in emissions depending on the waste oil being burned. Mrs. Starr stated that Ingenco submitted an identical letter from the Bureau of State Parks to the Department of Agriculture. The D.E.P. will not interfere and allow the company to dump chemicals in the Schuylkill River. Mr. Bittig stated that based on his calculations the local emissions concentration is way off scale.

Item 4. HOLY CROSS UNITED METHODIST CHURCH - PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN– We move to recommend approval of Holy Cross United Methodist Church Preliminary Plan conditional upon the driveway over the sewer easement being paved, the locking mechanism on the gate and getting the approval for the access to the rear of the building.

The following business was discussed:

2. **YEAKLEY SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN** – Brian Boyer

GVC reviewed the Yeakley Subdivision Sketch Plan (reference letter dated February 28, 2003).

Mr. Boyer presented the Yeakley Subdivision Sketch Plan. Mr. Boyer stated it is a four-lot subdivision located on Schofers Road between Pathfinder Meadows Development and Rugby Road. The applicants' are looking to subdivide approximately three acres into four lots, primarily having two lots with access to Schofers Road and two flag lots to access the larger back area. We have public sewer in the lower left hand corner and there is an existing manhole there from the Kinsey Hill Development. Mr. Bittig states that the area is at a higher elevation there; how do you propose to pump to that area? Mr. Boyer states we have two choices, either to go to the back corner or to Schofers Road. Mr. Bittig stated if you go to the one on the lower left hand corner than you will have to pump up to it because it is at a higher elevation. Mr. Boyer stated they will look at that and then they will address this issue to the Sewer Authority. Mr. Bittig stated that any improvements to get sewer to this project are the responsibility of the developer.

Mrs. Geiger asks if the house currently existing on this lot will be torn down? Mr. Boyer replied it would be removed.

Mr. Boyer stated item #2 is the next Item they would like to address. Can the property be further subdivided, without combining lots 3 & 4 together? You could run a cul-de-sac back to lots 3 & 4 but that would not be feasible and you could not maintain the 18000 sq. ft. lot minimum.

Mr. Bittig questioned the driveways for the proposed lots. Mr. Boyer replied there would be two driveways one coming out of each flag. Mr. Bittig stated you would need to maintain the proper sight distance and there are safety concerns on the north side of the property, because of the hill. Mr. Wilson stated you would have to prove there is adequate site distance.

Mr. Boyer stated looking at item #4 discussion item, that Schoffers Road is a collector road and should have a cartway width of 36ft. with parking, 30ft. without. Craig has stated he would support a waiver of that requirement. Mr. Boyer said we are not formally asking for it tonight, we will submit a letter requesting it. Mr. Boyer was looking for a consensus so we can design it properly. Mr. Bittig stated knowing the situation we have on the upper end of Schoffers Road with the Pathfinder Meadows Development the Planning Commission insisted that Pathfinder widen the cartway not to far from here to 30 feet. Mr. Bittig thought 30 feet is appropriate even if it is a short chunk, eventually, we are going to have to connect them and I think the developer should bear the burden of the cost. Mr. Boyer asked if Pathfinder is widening to 30ft, so basically, we need to widen an additional 15foot on our side, is this what you are saying? Mr. Bittig stated yes, because you can't do anything across the way. Mr. Schwartz asked what is the width currently? Mr. Boyer states it is currently 20ft and we would be willing to give

Yeakley Subdivision continued

an additional 15 ft right of way to the Township. Mr. Bittig stated we need to address this issue now rather than put the burden of the cost on the township taxpayers.

Mr. Boyer states concerning Item #7 we will comply with that section. We plan on removing some arborvitae. There is one nice sycamore on the property that will definitely remain.

Mr. Boyer continued with Item #8, recreation fees, we would be looking to pay the fee.

Item # 9 concerning curbs and sidewalks. Mr. Boyer was asking for some direction from the board. Mr. Ruff asks if the property slopes downhill onto Schoffers Road. Mrs. Geiger states it is flat. Mr. Ruff asks if there will be water running down Schoffers Road. Mr. Boyer states he doesn't think so because it is flat from east to west and tilts back into the property not onto Schoffers Road. Mr. Bittig states there is a rise on the lower left corner up to Kinsey Hill. Mrs. Geiger asks if there would be a water runoff that would jeopardize the people on the corner because they have been there for years. Mr. Boyer states they will have to be sure that they comply with the Storm Water Ordinance. Concerning the curb, questions were raised if Pathfinder would be putting curb on Schoffers Road. Mr. Ruff states Pathfinder has curb, but not on Schoffers Road. Mr. Bittig says to check with Engineering to see if they have resolved that arrangement concerning Schoffers Road and Pathfinder Meadows. Mrs. Franckowiak states that they are working on it. Mr. Bittig states we have to do whatever the Pathfinder Meadows Development does. Mr. Wilson states there are no sidewalks in that area. Mr. Boyer asks if there is any idea when that will be resolved. Mrs. Franckowiak states we are trying to schedule a meeting between engineering and the developer, we haven't set a date yet, hopefully, by the end of the month. Mr. Boyer asks if he could be kept apprised of the situation so he would know what direction he should take.

Mr. Boyer states we basically have a four-lot subdivision. They have done a concept plan to see what kind of support we can get for this. They have public sewer and on lot water. Basically the problem we have is based on the elevations, we can't get public water to the site. If we would look at developing this with a cul-de-sac layout we would have on site water with 9000 sq. ft. lots. And this is something we would look for support from the Planning Commission for a zoning variance. Mr. Boyer asked is this something you would entertain or not? Mr. Ruff asks how would you supply water? Mr. Schwartz states there is too much draw down on the area and not enough recharge. This would be the worse situation in the area for the water supply.

Mr. Boyer states with 18000 sq. ft. lots, we could get 5 lots on the cul-de-sac but we don't think the township would want a cul-de-sac for one lot. This is why we derived the flag lot plan. However, if we go to the 9000 sq ft lots with on site wells you could get seven lots on a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Wilson states that if you are going to do this type of design, in the past, the Planning Commission has said that if you develop into more than four lots all access has to be inside the development, but previously you stated that you would want access directly onto Schoffers Road. Mr. Boyer states that this layout would have all seven lots access the cul-de-sac.

Yeakley Subdivision continued

Mr. Wilson states that we had turned down this type of situation previously behind Linstead where the developer wanted to put the houses in and we said no because you are putting four houses in and no other access but the one driveway. Mr. Wilson asked are we still in that mode? Mrs. Geiger asked how did four lots turn into seven? Mr. Boyer replied that this is with the lots being 9000 sq. ft. in size. Mr. Bittig stated that is not allowed by the ordinance. Mr. Boyer stated this is why we are here, to ask questions. Mr. Boyer stated this is basically all we have. Mr. Wilson stated that with the four-lot plan you need a design where there is a central road connecting all lots. Mr. Boyer stated we could probably make a design to do this. Mr. Schwartz asks if you would want a private street layout.

Mr. Wilson states you have to look at the left side, what is over there right now? Mr. Boyer states that it is Kinsey Hill Development. Mr. Wilson stated we need to look at where a street would connect. We have to look to the future to have further developments connect to each other.

Mr. Boyer states that it looks as though the four-lot layout is basically acceptable other than the one common access drive for all four lots for safety reasons. Mr. Wilson states that even with the larger developments down on Schoffers we did the same thing concerning driveways.

Mr. Wilson asks for any other comments. There were none. And thanked Mr. Boyer.
Mr. Boyer thanked the commission.

*J. D. Krafczek arrived at this time.

3. BRICKEY PROPERTY – SKETCH PLAN - Jim McCarthy

GVC reviewed the Brickey Property Sketch Plan (reference letter dated February 28, 2003)

Mr. McCarthy stated we are here tonight for an informal hearing of the sketch plan for the Brickey Property on Rugby Road. We prepared two sketch plans for Craig Peifer to review and comment on. We prepared a layout with the 10% roadway which makes the access from the roadway into the driveways next to impossible. Mr. McCarthy asked what if we presented a 12% roadway? Mr. McCarthy stated the 12% roadway works much better for the lots themselves and for the grading of the roadway. On the east side of the slope it would abut existing developed properties owned by Uhrig and there is a front lot and a flag lot. We have gone to the neighbors to see if they had a problem with what we are proposing and if they would grant them a temporary grading easement to do some minimal grading on their property to lesson the slope onto the roadway. In addition to the 12% needed to do this subdivision, we are also asking to have curbing on both sides of the roadway and sidewalk on the west side only. We are looking for feedback from the Planning Commission if this is something the applicants could proceed with.

Mr. Bittig asked what is the right-of-way width is on Rugby Road? Mr. McCarthy stated that currently Rugby is 33ft. legal right-of-way. Mr. Bittig stated to take note of the trees on the property because they may be on the township right-of-way. Mr. Bittig said you may need to cut

Brickey Property continued

them down for sight distance and they are mature trees. Mr. McCarthy stated he did notice this. Mr. Bittig asked, "You are looking for a 12% grade up to what point?" Mr. McCarthy stated there would be a 5% leveling area off of Rugby grading up to the 12% so we wouldn't be starting the 12% right off of Rugby road. Mrs. Geiger asks what provisions have been made for rainwater runoff coming down this hill. Mr. McCarthy replied we plan to put in a detention pond. There would be more than one inlet into the pond and then we would take the runoff out of the pond into the storm sewer system underneath Rugby Road. Mr. Bittig asked if they have made any provisions for the groundwater recharge. Mr. McCarthy replied that at this point we really haven't gotten into any of that design. We are just in our Sketch plan point of the development and at this time wanted to see what the recommendations of the Board would be as to the 12% grade of the roadway. Mr. Bittig questioned how they recommend the grading of the driveways for the homes? Mr. McCarthy replied that for some of the lots they are proposing basement garages that would make the driveways level. Mr. Belovich is here and says if you have any questions about that he would be happy to help you and to also let you know that he is able to build attractive looking house even with the basement garage design. Mr. Bittig asked if the grade off of the roadway is an uphill grade? Mr. McCarthy replied, "Yes, it is an uphill grade".

With Item #2 Mr. McCarthy stated that they would probably have to move the roadway over to maintain the proper separation distance of 40ft. and we wouldn't be looking for relief on that.

Concerning Item #3 for the grading of the driveways, Mr. McCarthy believed he touched on that subject with the 12% grading and the basement garages.

Mr. McCarthy stated that item #4 relates to the sight distance to the driveway. We have to secure formal permission from the owners to be able to remove any trees to provide proper sight distance.

In Item #5 Mr. McCarthy stated that with steep slope controls we would have to demonstrate that compliance. Mr. Ruff asked how steep are the slopes? Mr. McCarthy replied that the steep slope section is in the very rear of the tract and it really mostly affects the house on lot 12 we would need to grade it, it is 20-25% slopes. Mr. McCarthy stated they are very steep, and they know that we would have to comply with the township on this part. They do not want to create any water problems to anyone in this area. Mr. Ruff wanted clarification on the reason for the steep slope, is it because of getting to that cul-de-sac? Mr. McCarthy replied no, the natural grade of the land. As you approach the cul-de-sac, the road becomes flat. Our road will be slightly flatter than the driveways on the neighboring property.

Mrs. Geiger stated that the township trying to discourage the use of cul-de-sacs, because everything coming to us has a cul-de-sac. Mr. Wilson stated this is the point he was trying to make earlier where we can't connect any existing developments because of all the cul-de-sacs. We feel cul-de-sacs should run to the end of the property giving us the option to connect them at a later date. If you look at all of the adjoining properties, they have all these little cul-de-sacs that cannot be connected. Mr. McCarthy stated they looked at being able to connect their development to an existing roadway, which would have a second means of egress so the 12% grade wouldn't be a problem; however, they couldn't find one to connect it to.

Brickey Property continued

Mr. Wilson stated we recommend you run a cul-de-sac to the end of the property, either the upper end or the lower end. Mr. Peiffer suggests it should be a dedicated right-of-way. Mr. Ruff stated it should be connected onto the cul-de-sac. Mr. Schwartz stated it should be built now and run to the property line so it is completed for any later expansion. Mr. Peiffer stated that it is a great place to shovel snow and popular with the residents. Mrs. Geiger asks if they would be amendable to that? Mr. McCarthy responded that to build that road from the cul-de-sac to the property line and dedicate it to the township, they would be amendable to that.

Mr. McCarthy stated that Item #3 concerning the lot width to depth ratio, on lots 8 and 9 they are greater than 2 ½ times their width. And lots 12 and 14 are less than their widths all due to the configuration of the property. Mr. Schwartz asked how big is lot 12? Mr. McCarthy replied it is 1.85 acres. Mr. Schwartz asked what is the magic number we were looking at when we planned on dropping that requirement. Mr. Bittig replied it is three times the minimum required amount. Mr. Schwartz asked if this meets those requirements. Mr. Bittig replied he believed it does. Mr. Peifer asked what is your intention with lot 2, the one with the detention pond on it? Are you planning to dedicate it to the Township or to a Homeowners Association? Mr. McCarthy replied we hadn't really thought about that one too much; he thought their original intention was to put it with lot 3.

Mr. Peifer stated he believed another important issue is with the sidewalks and thought you were putting the sidewalks on both sides except for lot 18 down to Rugby where it got too steep. Mr. McCarthy replied that they could do it that way but, there would be sidewalk in front of all the houses except on the east side at lot 18 then they would have to cross over to the other side and they would put in a handicap cut in the sidewalk at that point.

Mr. Bittig asked how they proposed to trap the storm water on the lower end of the grade? Mr. Bittig said they are planning on putting the detention pond on lot 2, but once you hit that lower end you are still going to have water running down that surface right down to Rugby Road. Mr. McCarthy stated that they are going to put catch basins down there so there will not be water running onto Rugby Road. They will also be doing inlet efficiency calculations to be sure we are not doing that and will also put a handicap accessible drain grate on those. Mr. Bittig asked where they propose to put the cistern for fire protection? Mr. McCarthy replied they would work with the Fire Marshal to where he proposes the best place for it.

Mr. Wilson questioned the placement of the house on lot 12 with the steep slope of the property; how do you propose building this? Mr. McCarthy replied that the floor plan to that house would be in steps like a split-level to work with the grade. Mr. Wilson questioned if he would be grading that property to build? Mr. Wilson stated we want to prevent this. Mr. McCarthy replied that they will work with what the township needs to be done there and will be in compliance.

Mr. Peifer states that we should act now on the 10% or 12% grade before they take this plan any further; the 12% plan will require a waiver. Mr. Peifer said even though it is a sketch plan, you may want to see where you should go with this. Mr. McCarthy stated that the 10% grading doesn't work well with the construction of the homes and for the driveways and this is why we are asking for the 12%. Mr. Belovich has stated that he couldn't build a quality home with the

Brickey Property continued

10% grading. Mr. Bittig stated that the 12% grading would be hard for the township to maintain. Mr. Ruff stated that in the event of a winter storm there would be problem for emergency vehicles accessing this road. Mr. Bittig stated that he would be opposed to the 12% grading due to concerns for no other egress to the property and for emergency purposes. Mr. Schwartz stated that the idea that they may add a second access later is “iffy” at best and we don’t know if you can do that at 10% either. It is setting up for a bad situation for emergency problems and we wouldn’t want to be responsible for that.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to oppose a waiver to allow 12% grading for the Brickey Property Subdivision due to the lack of second egress to the property. The motion carried unanimously.

- 4. EXETER HIGH SCHOOL – PRELIMINARY PLAN** - Matt Davenport, ELA Group
- Hugh Cadville, ELA Group
 - Ken Levan
 - Ernie Werstler
 - Dr. Corbo

GVC reviewed Exeter High School Renovations & Additions Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated March 5, 2003).

Mr. Davenport presented the Preliminary Plan for the improvements to the Exeter High School stating that they want to address any comments from Great Valley and any questions from the Board. This is the full scope of the project for Improvements in Exeter and St. Lawrence. The purpose of this being, the Jr. High School is overcrowded. The plan of the School District is to move the 9th grade from the Jr. High into the High School. The difference in this plan from the previous plan’s that they have added the appropriate number of parking spaces to accommodate the waiver on the parking spaces. The 483 parking spaces will meet the decision rendered by the Zoning Hearing Board. To address one of Mr. Peifer’s comments they have provided the appropriate amount of handicapped spaces, which would be seen on subsequent plans. They are removing two of the lower tennis courts to add additional spaces. In the front of the school they have revised the parking area, which will be approximately the same number of spaces but in a reduced space. They are providing an additional 150 spaces with this plan. Mrs. Geiger asked about the additional parking space at the top of the hill? Mr. Davenport replied that this area would require earth moving and retaining walls to make an appropriate grade along with a staircase down to access the building and that is what the proposed design shows.

Mr. Peifer questioned the modification to the Stadium and if there be additional seats added to the proposed Stadium? Mr. Davenport stated that the stadium seating capacity would be increased to approximately 3000 seats. Mr. Peifer asked if they discussed this issue with the Zoning Hearing Board concerning recreation parking requirements due to the increase in seating in the proposed stadium. Mr. Davenport stated that this issue was not raised to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Peifer stated that the outdoor recreation facility requires one space per

Exeter High School continued

employee for a larger shift and one space per five seats of capacity. Mr. Davenport stated then we should either look to restrict the seating capacity or seek a waiver from the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Schwartz stated that the Jr. High uses the stadium also, so would their parking spaces be included in the count because that would give another 75 spaces. Mr. Bittig stated that they should consider that calculation along with the parking along the connector road between the Jr. High and the High School. Mr. Davenport asked if they should indicate the parking at the Jr. High and try to come up with a campus parking allowance? Mr. Peifer asked if Woodland Ave was a public street or if it belonged to the school? Mr. Davenport stated that he believed that the road between the Jr. High and the High School is the property of the school. Mr. Schwartz stated that the real question being is there a parking problem at the school? Mr. Schwartz asked when you have an event at the stadium will there be adequate parking there. Mr. Bittig asked what is the current seating capacity and what is the proposed capacity? Mr. Davenport stated it is currently 1500 and the proposed amount is 3000. Mrs. Geiger stated that you plan to double the amount. Mr. Bittig stated that then we are looking for a needed amount of spaces to cover these events. Mr. Davenport stated that he believed there are approximately 600 spaces but that is just a guess. He couldn't give a concrete number but he will certainly look into it. Mr. Krafczek asked if people park there along Woodland Ave. when there are events at the stadium? Mrs. Geiger stated that sometimes people from the opposing team who have been there before know to park at the Jr. High and walk over from there. Mr. Peifer asked if there are people who sit in the grass, bringing chairs or blankets to sit on or is it basically the bleachers being filled. Mr. Davenport stated that there are potentially more than 1500 people there and in subsequent submissions they will indicate all available parking on campus. Mr. Schwarz asked how much parking is down at the new Elementary School? Mr. Davenport stated approximately 120 spaces. Mr. Peifer stated it might be possible for people to park at the Community Park and then walk across the bridge. Mr. Davenport stated with parking in mind he didn't know what determination he could make this evening but knew it was a critical issue that would have to be addressed. Mr. Schwartz stated they need to see what they have and come back with it.

Mr. Davenport stated that due to the results of the zoning decision some minor layout changes have affected storm water and are currently in development. Mr. Davenport stated he would like to go through Mr. Peifer's comments and please feel free to stop him at any point. The first comment under zoning ordinance; they will be submitting a lighting plan with future submissions to indicate proper illumination of these areas and also provide landscape plans with future submissions showing the appropriate screening and buffer planting of parking areas from adjacent properties. The third comment refers to the Zoning Hearing Board decision and they have provided the appropriate number of parking spaces as well as the appropriate number of handicapped parking spaces. They are proposing the development of steep slope areas and they are planning to keep as much existing cover on those steep slopes as possible. In some instances, they are man made steep slope and they will not be putting habitable structures on those steep slope areas and will make all effort to establish slope controls and will provide the necessary calculations for retaining walls etc. as they are developed. Mr. Bittig asked if we would be receiving those at final plan stage. Mr. Davenport replied "yes".

Exeter High School continued

Mr. Davenport stated that they have provided overall site plans at 1": 80' scale and 1": 40' scale detail site plans and the ordinance calls for 50 so they wanted to see if that is fine. Mr. Schwartz stated a waiver should be granted. Mr. Peifer stated our plan is to revise the ordinance to "a minimum of" so if you want to go with the 80/40 it should not be a problem.

Mr. Davenport stated that the final plan will have the appropriate seals placed on them prior to execution of certificate and final submissions will have building setback lines, right-of-ways and all easements listed. He apologized for these plans not having this included. The existing pavement markings were not included, but will be included on the final plan submission.

Mr. Davenport stated that the next item they needed to address is concerning the right-of-way on 37th St. with the access to the upper parking lot, which goes beyond the existing 37th St. into Brumbach St. There is a concern from Great Valley, that on the plans it is shown as an existing 50ft right-of-way, but if there were no public street it would certainly affect access to that parking area and they are looking for additional information regarding this. Mr. Peifer stated that you would have to demonstrate the right to use it because over time if a road is not used the land reverts to the adjoining property owners. Mr. Davenport asked since Brumbach Street originates in the Boro and crosses the municipal boundary is that a problem? Mr. Peifer stated it doesn't really matter; the number of years is the important point, not where it is located and whether or not it is a right of way. Mr. Wilson stated you need to be concerned about the adjacent property owner. Mr. Schwartz stated it would be good to hear the viewpoint of the owner. Mr. Bittig stated this would be an item to be submitted to the School Board Solicitor. Mr. Wilson asked how far Brumbach St. goes into St. Lawrence Borough because we have to be concerned what happens in adjacent communities. We have to address the width of that area going into St. Lawrence Borough depending on what they may want to do on their end. Mr. Davenport stated that if it were a continuation of the existing 34ft. cart way there would be ample right-of-way to do that.

Mr. Davenport stated they would submit a plan to the Sewer Authority as well to begin a dialogue with the Water Company to see if they have the capacity to serve the site.

Mr. Davenport stated the next topic is the Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Krafczek asked if the Traffic Impact Study included the events that are going to occur with the 3000-seat stadium. Mr. Davenport stated they are currently revising the Traffic Impact Study to include the impact of events at the 3000 seating capacity stadium. Mr. Davenport stated the use of the stadium is after school hours so the parking lots would be empty except for the use of the events at the stadium and they would be looking into those numbers to submit. Mr. Krafczek asked where the location for the stadium entrance would be and if they had an entrance to the rear of the stadium that it might cut down on the parking on the streets. Mr. Davenport replied there would be a gathering place outside of the stadium and concession stands there also and there may be a third point of entrance to accommodate the people in the visiting stands.

Exeter High School continued

Mr. Davenport stated that he wanted to address Mr. Peifers' comment on the subject of the Flood Plain Ordinance. They will update the information on the plan for the FEMA Study.

Mr. Davenport stated that they would be adding to the Traffic Impact Study that was done for the Elementary School. They will add revisions to this and will be complete in the next week or so. Mr. Bittig asked that they keep in mind that there will be more buses traveling on Shelbourne Road with the new housing projects.

Mr. Davenport stated that with the Storm Water Management, a large part of the comments would be addressed with their revised submissions and he mentioned some inlets would be moved to accommodate additional parking. They are revising their pipe runs to address some of the comments that Mr. Peifer had provided regarding pipe slopes and change in elevation. They are making an effort to address those and provide proper engineering solutions for a difficult task. What they asked of the Planning Commission is they would like to be able to go before the Board of Supervisors seeking Preliminary Plan approval. Because of the short time frame, they would like some guidance to see if there is time available that would allow us to get back to you on April 1st so it would be acceptable to submit our final plans at the Board of Supervisors April 14th meeting. If the Planning Commission is willing to recommend conditional Preliminary Plan approval they could carry comments over to final plan. Mr. Davenport felt comfortable that they are going to address all the comments. They are really trying to proceed in a timely manner that would allow them to be under construction this summer. Mr. Krafczek asked if anyone here knows if there were any residents from Reiffon that spoke at the Zoning Hearing Board meeting? Mr. Schwartz stated that there were a few concerns over the parking issue.

Mr. Krafczek stated that their appeal date hasn't run out yet. They have 30 days to run from Feb 27th and anything you get from us will be conditional on that.

Mr. Davenport stated that unless the Planning Commission has additional things they would like to discuss, he would like to be so bold as to ask for a recommendation for a conditional approval that would allow them to carry these conditions forward with our Final Plan submission. Mrs. Geiger asked they had talked to the Fire Marshall? Mr. Davenport replied they have not. Mr. Wilson stated that we did receive our Fire Marshall review from Pattie yesterday. Mr. Davenport stated that they planned to sit down with the Fire Marshal to review this. Mr. Bittig stated that they would have to check on the Brumbach Street situation. Mr. Davenport stated that they have looked at an alternate route for parking access if the Brumbach Street becomes a problem.

Mr. Wilson stated that they should also look into the change in the baseball field due to the foul line near the street and that they may need to look into temporary netting to catch any foul balls that may go into the street into traffic. Mr. Wilson also wanted to express his concern about not having adult recreation facilities in the township. Dr. Corbo stated that just as a note on the St. Lawrence Boro improvements with the losing of two tennis courts on the High School site, they are improving the township courts and adding a tennis area.

Exeter High School continued

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the plan scale. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig that we recommend the Board of Supervisors grant Preliminary plan approval on the condition that all the items not dealt with at this point, shown in the Great Valleys' review letter be handled at Final Plan stage along with the calculations for stadium event parking, and the expiration of the 30 day appeal from the Zoning Hearing Board. The motion carried with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ruff, Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Krafczek and Mrs. Elliot voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

5. CHARLIE LEAZIER – INFORMAL DISCUSSION – Charlie Leazier

Mr. Leazier presented his plan for a 9-lot subdivision (three to six acre lots) on Hartman Rd. with 4 lots served by a cul-de-sac. Mr. Krafczek asked how many acres total? Mr. Leazier replied 37 acres. Mr. Leazier stated that listening to previous items in the meeting he has realized that cul-de-sacs are not desirable so that could be eliminated and now the lots would have to be reconfigured. Mr. Wilson stated that you heard about the cul-de-sacs and you understand that but we also do not like the multiple driveways on that type of road. Mr. Schwartz asked if would be possible to do a loop street. Mr. Leazier replied it would be impossible due to the lay of the land. Mr. Krafczek asked what the zoning is back there? Mr. Leazier replied R.C. Mr. Schwartz asked if there was water or sewer back there? Mr. Leazier replied no, there is not. Mr. Leazier stated that all the houses would have a 50' set back due to the slope. Mr. Schwartz stated that you do everything possible to minimize the number of driveways off of Hartman Road and suggested he possibly consider shared driveways. Mr. Wilson stated that shared driveways don't always work. Mr. Wilson asked for any comments. Mr. Wilson stated it would be best to eliminate cul-de-sac and try to eliminate as many driveways as possible and to work on a better configuration for the pie shape lots. Mr. Peifer states another big problem will be getting septic systems. Mr. Wilson stated you would need to be sure that all the lots perk because without public water and sewer these are things you will have to look for. Mr. Wilson asked for any other comments. There were none. Mr. Leazier thanked the Planning Commission.

6. GENERAL AMENDMENTS TO SALDO

Mr. Wilson stated that this was not on the agenda for tonight, but it needs to be discussed. Preliminary plan – He discussed 3.2 stating that at no time should enough members be together in discussion to be considered a quorum or this could be considered as an unadvertised public meeting. The Planning Commission all knew that, but he thought it should be in there. Mr. Wilson asked that all applications be placed on the agenda for the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission and a vote taken at said meeting to accept the plan for review and this will constitute the beginning of the 90-day period. We need to be sure it is on the agenda. Mr. Schwartz asked when we start the 90-day clock now? Mrs. Geiger replied at the first Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Peifer stated that the only time that isn't correct is if they brought it to

General Amendments to SALDO continued

you more than 30 days prior to the meeting. It has to start on the 30th day after it is brought into the Township. Mr. Wilson stated we need to make a point to get it on the agenda and formalize this.

Mr. Wilson stated that in 3.212 the application should be compared against the Township checklist for Preliminary plan requirements and if any items are missing the application should be returned to the applicant with an explanation of what items are missing and all checklists that are a part of the application package. Mr. Krafczek stated that he believed it should come before the Board and the Board says sorry you either give us an extension or you get us what we need or we will deny approval of your plan. Mr. Wilson stated that in the MPC it states that if you are given an incomplete package on preliminary submission you can reject it, not have a meeting, and give it back to the person. Mr. Krafczek stated it might come back to you with the argument that they had a complete package. Mrs. Franckowiak stated you're not talking about the technical aspects of the plan you need the correct number of copies of the plan, Traffic Impact Studies, Fire Marshall statement, etc. Mr. Wilson stated that is correct, just that the package is incomplete. Mr. Krafczek stated that he had to look at that again. We asked if the MPC says you can reject accepting the plan or reject it as though it never came into the office? Mr. Peifer stated that it means that the application was incomplete and therefore never accepted. Mr. Wilson stated that if you accept an incomplete plan and the thirty-day clock starts as far as you have to have it on the agenda for the meeting. It can be rejected out front so as to not waste the Planning Commission time. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that unless there is a legal reason that we can't do this, administratively it is just a nightmare with people bringing in things to check. They shouldn't even bother with it until they have the complete package, so we can start the administrative process. Mr. Krafczek stated that he didn't see anything in the MPC that states the office staff has the authority to accept or reject a package. Mr. Krafczek didn't believe anyone but the Board of Supervisors or the Planning Commission has the authority to accept or reject a plan. Mr. Wilson stated that the board has the right to designate an individual to act in their place. Mr. Krafczek asked that wouldn't it be better to have that person tell them that these are our requirements if you don't present a complete package, the Commission has the right to reject your plan before the ninety days are up or you will lose your filing fee and they will have to file it all over. Then they will think twice, well, maybe I don't want to start my time running because I don't have time to get my things together in 90 days. Mrs. Geiger stated then they can check everything right there. Mr. Krafczek stated that you could say, "Here is the copy of our ordinance and here is our checklist. You don't have everything together so if you don't have everything together in 90 days your plan will be rejected. Do you want to file it now? It is your choice." Mr. Wilson asked if we require seven copies of a plan and someone comes in with four copies. You are saying that we have to accept it and I am saying no we don't.

Mr. Wilson stated we need to discuss some other things. He would like to see a permission slip that the owner and his agent would sign giving the township permission to conduct on-site visits by the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, or the Consultants. We can't make it mandatory, but we can ask them. He would like to see that as a part of application procedure.

Mr. Wilson stated that there is an automatic extension for request of time extensions. Some townships are doing that; it's not mandatory, but it is there. Mr. Krafczek stated that it is our

General Amendments to SALDO continued

responsibility to ask the Developer for an extension, not for the developer to ask us for an extension, yet that is what everybody does. Mr. Wilson suggested that the checklist for the preliminary and final plans be placed in the application package.

Mr. Schwartz stated that we talked about the Sunshine act here. He was not clear on what we can and cannot do and where do we end up crossing that line? Mr. Bittig asked if we qualify under that act? Mr. Schwartz asked are we exempt from it? Mr. Krafczek stated we do qualify. Mr. Schwartz asked then where do we end up crossing the line? Mr. Krafczek stated that we would run into a problem when we have a quorum even if you are standing in the hall and you would have enough people for a quorum that is when we would have a problem, but if it were just one person talking to another it would not be a problem.

7. PROPOSED PLANNING MEETING AGENDA

Mr. Wilson stated that he would like to address the proposed Planning Meeting Agenda. The Planning Commission did one step tonight with the pledge to the Flag. It is a starting point to make the meeting more formal. This is a definite point of focus, the meeting is here and we are serious. Mr. Wilson recommended the Planning Commission then motion and second to accept the agenda which would stop someone from coming in with an informal discussion. We could then say, we are sorry; you are not on the agenda for tonight's meeting. Thirdly Mr. Wilson suggested the Planning Commission motion and second to accept listed application for reviews. Mr. Wilson also suggested that a package for new Planning Commission members be prepared so everyone would have the materials needed when they come in. He asked are there any other comments? Mr. Bittig stated that he had a legal question whether Mr. Wilson's changes to SALDO could be included in the current revisions since the clock is running due to the notice in today's paper. Mr. Bittig said the Supervisors are having a public hearing on Monday March 31st, and he wasn't sure he wanted to be mucking up that process with changes at this point. He was sure there would be other changes, based on what we are learning about the MPC. Mr. Wilson stated that public hearings are to allow feedback on possible modifications to SALDO. He also believe we should set up a workshop where we set up the Township maps and lay out the developments themselves to determine where the possible future growth developments may be and set them up ourselves. Mr. Bittig agreed that this is something we should take up in a workshop session.

Mr. Wilson stated that he would like to continue with the proposed planning meeting agenda. This is the pattern he would like to follow, if Pattie would lay out the next one this way.

8. EAC MEETING

Mr. Schwartz stated that he just wanted to mention that he attended his first EAC meeting; it was an interesting group. They didn't talk about a whole lot. One issue they wanted to get involved in, I wanted to just alert you, and they think it is important is the storm water runoff and aquifer recharge. The EAC thought the Township should look at is permeable paving. Mr. Ruff stated he has only seen it fail. Mr. Peifer stated if you want to find out if it works just call Penn State Berks Campus. Mr. Schwartz stated that he was told it was not the fault of the paving

EAC meeting continued

it was in the way it was installed. Mr. Bittig stated there is no durability. Mr. Peifer stated there are better ways to do it than with black top. Mr. Ruff stated that for their next meeting they should get the Delaware River Storm Water Management guide for there are a lot of things in there that have ways of creating what they call percolation beds on perimeters of parking lots and between grassy swales and foot curbs. Mr. Ruff suggested that it is a phenomenal resource for information. Mr. Peifer stated actually the Conservation District is making people do that now. Mr. Schwartz stated that he just wanted to inform them on where the EAC stands now and they plan on being very active on the issue. Mr. Peifer stated that this what we want to do with the Storm Water Management Ordinance too; we want to force people down that road.

Mr. Bittig asked where we stand on our ordinance with the Storm Water Management? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it is typed. Mr. Peifer stated we have to add things to it. Mrs. Franckowiak stated we would like to put it on the Board of Supervisors agenda for the 24th.

9. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Ruff seconded by Mr. Schwartz to adjourn the March 13, 2003 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:11 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

John F. Ruff, PE
Planning Commission Secretary

LRC