

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

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

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Craig Peifer, GVC Consulting Engineer
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary

ABSENT: John F. Ruff, Secretary
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mrs. Geiger, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the minutes of the August 5, 2003 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to approve the agenda of the September 2, 2003 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

1. **TOBOLSKI PROPERTY – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD: MOTION BY** Mr. Krafczek, seconded by Mrs. Elliott, to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

Approve applications for review continued

2. **SHELBOURNE SQUARE SHOPPING CENTER – FINAL PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Krafczek, seconded by Mrs. Elliott, to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.
3. **EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Krafczek, seconded by Mrs. Elliott, to accept the plan for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

Mr. Wilson stated that before we start the agenda he wanted to bring to everyone's attention a letter he received from Laurie Elliott, which read, "It is with a note of sadness that I must inform you that I will be relocating out of the township and therefore must resign from the Planning Commission effective October 15, 2003. It has been my pleasure serving our community for the past two years. I have learned much about community planning and local government as well. All of you who work so hard for the community should be commended. You are an inspiration to me and exemplify all that is right during these times when so much seems so wrong. I will truly miss participating with my colleagues on the commission." Mr. Wilson stated he was sorry to see her go and it was a pleasure working with her.

4. **4640 DUNHAM DRIVE – DRIVEWAY WAIVER REQUEST** - John Smith
- Fran Richards

Mr. Smith stated that he worked for the Forino Company and was directed by the Board of Supervisors to come before the Planning Commission to request a waiver for the grade of the driveway at 4640 Dunham Drive. The driveway ordinance states the driveway grade cannot exceed 12%, the grade on 4640 Dunham varies, but it was approximately 24%. The Solicitor of the Township suggested that they have something in recordable form showing they would alleviate the township responsibility for any liability.

Mr. Bittig stated that they were also in violation of the ordinance where it states the first 20-feet can not exceed 5%. Mr. Smith stated that they didn't know if they exceed that or not. Mr. Bittig stated that he took a look at the driveway and it they had built a goat trail. Why did they do that? Mr. Smith stated because of the site conditions and the drainage for that lot, that was why they set the grade of the house where it stands. Mr. Bittig asked why they did not follow the signed, sealed and approved grading plan for that lot? Mr. Smith stated that he could not answer that question. Mr. Bittig stated that 10 years ago the plan was signed, sealed and approved with the lot cut down and the rise from street level to first floor level being 4-feet. Where it stands now it was around 12-feet. Mr. Smith stated that although the grading plan does exist, sometimes the grading plan

4640 Dunham Drive continued

does not work. The conditions of the site were much different than what it was on paper. Mr. Bittig stated that now the company was excavating all the lots that they had taken off the market, to take them down to about four foot above grade. Mr. Smith stated that they didn't want to create the situation intentionally, so they took those lots off the market. They were looking at redeveloping specific house plans to accommodate those lots. They also had drainage issues they were trying to deal with and storm water that need to be resolved. They were working on that. They would not sell those lots until they were in compliance.

Mr. Bittig stated that they had more than just the driveway as a problem. They were in violation of the clean stream act because of mud running off of that property and the adjoining properties where they were digging and it was going into the storm sewer. Mr. Smith stated that it was going into a retention basin; it was not leaving the site itself. Mr. Bittig stated that the mud in the street, if not a D.E.P. violation, was certainly a violation of Township ordinance. They created a monster by not grading that lot. Mr. Smith stated that the lot was stabilized. Mr. Bittig stated they had erosion down the front embankment. They had extenders on the downspouts directing the water onto lot 30. Mr. Smith stated that they had those there until the lot stabilized. They would cut property swales to contain the storm water.

Mr. Bittig stated they did not follow the approved plan. If they had they would not have the problem. Mr. Smith stated they bought the plans from the previous developer and they know that they have the responsibility, which was why they took those lots off the market. Looking around the municipality there were quite a few driveways that were just as steep and they do exist. He apologized for his ignorance, that was no excuse, but they were trying to rectify the current situation that exists and make sure that it does not happen again. Mr. Bittig asked what their options were? Mr. Smith stated that they have some grading alternatives, but the homeowners were there and they did not want the grade of the lot changed. They like the driveway the way it was.

Mrs. Elliott asked how long they have lived in their home? Mr. Smith stated he believed they received temporary occupancy at the end of July. Mrs. Elliott asked when the building on the house started? Mr. Richards stated in March. Mrs. Elliott asked if the building started in March, why didn't they go to the Board for a Waiver before the home was built? Mr. Smith stated that they didn't know that would be an issue. Mrs. Elliott stated that at that time they should have known they were creating a property that was not in compliance with the ordinance. Mr. Smith stated that they didn't know that at the time. Mr. Krafczek asked if that didn't come up when they applied for the building permit? Didn't someone say, look you have 24% grading on the driveway? Mr. Smith stated that no, no one did. They did not want to place the blame on any one person, but it was brought to their attention at the Final inspection. Mr. Krafczek asked if the current driveway was finished. Mr. Smith stated that the driveway was finished except for the

4640 Dunham Drive continued

Topcoat, which they would do in one year. Mr. Smith stated that the property owners were there, John and Robin Hivner. Mr. Krafczek asked if they had any comments on the condition of the driveway? Does it cause a problem? Mrs. Hivner stated that they love the house, they love the driveway and in the wintertime they would just park on the street if the weather conditions were bad.

Mr. Bittig asked what they could do to fix the problem with the driveway? Mr. Smith stated they thought they could make it better, however they did not believe they would be in compliance with the ordinance. The house sits 18-feet above the road and 77-feet back from the curb. No matter how creative he got he could not get it to 12%. Mr. Bittig asked if they put fill on the lot? Mr. Richards stated that no, they actually cut from the lot. They still have a rear elevation of 20 to 22-feet. They also added an extra area aside of the driveway where people who would come to visit could park. Mrs. Elliott asked if there was on street parking there? Mr. Richards replied, yes, on both sides. Mr. Bittig stated that the situation was entirely the Forino Company's responsibility. There have been waivers granted on driveways greater than 12%, maybe 15%, but not 24%.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to recommend the Board of Supervisors do not grant the waiver to the Forino Company for the 24% driveway grade at 4640 Dunham Drive and the Forino Company should be directed to remediate the problem at their expense. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Smith asked if they would be able to bring the driveway into the 15% range would that be acceptable. Mr. Bittig stated that the Supervisors were flexible, if they made a good faith attempt to do something that gets them down to the 15% range, they should not have a problem.

Mr. Smith thanked the Planning Commission for their time.

5. TOBOLSKI PROPERTY – SKETCH PLAN - Thomas Ludgate

GVC reviewed the Tobolski Property Sketch Plan (reference letter dated August 29, 2003).

Mr. Ludgate presented the Tobolski Property Sketch Plan. The proposed land development was located along Route U.S. 422 on the southern side, east of Exeter Square Shopping Center, on a 2 ½ to 3-acre property down from Wal-Mart. Mr. Tobolski purchased the property in June. They were proposing a two-story retail building with associated parking. The proposed building would be the same elevation as 422. They were looking to build an entrance in and an entrance out. The building width would have to conform to the ordinance and they would do that. The first floor would have retail and then the access drive to the rear of the building would drop down to the

Tobolski property continued

lower basement floor. The basement floor would have multiple uses. Mr. Tobolski owns a plumbing business, that would be part of it, around 2000 sq. ft; the rest of it would be a mixture of some retail and also Mr. Tobolski's mail order business. They have to figure out all the different uses in detail to come up with the proper amount of parking spaces for the Zoning Ordinances. Then they could come back with the proper plan. They wanted to get some initial comments to see what direction they need to take. They have public sewer, they will need to run water lines in order to put in the sprinkler system. They would have truck access to the back and front of the building. The building may have to be moved back to put in more parking.

Mr. Bittig asked what the width of the property was? Mr. Ludgate stated 200-ft. Mr. Bittig stated they would need to get the permit from Penn Dot for the two driveways. Mr. Ludgate stated that they might have to do the traditional driveway on one side with a right in and right out. Two driveways would flow much easier for truck traffic. Mr. Bittig asked if this was zoned Highway Commercial. Mr. Ludgate replied yes, Highway Commercial with the back third being SR-2. Mrs. Elliott asked how much retail space they were looking at? Mr. Ludgate stated around 14,000 sq. ft. of retail on the first floor and maybe another 5,000 sq ft in the basement.

Mr. Bittig stated that they would need to be careful with the spring, or natural waterway, that showed on the plan. That would have to be preserved. Mr. Ludgate stated that was an Environmental feature that they would need to address. Mr. Bittig stated that we would ask that they do it by the book.

Mrs. Elliott asked about signs, what are they proposing? Mr. Ludgate stated they were looking at separate signs on one pylon sign.

Mrs. Geiger asked if they addressed the E.A.C. comments on storm water? Mr. Ludgate stated they hadn't seen that letter, but they would address storm water. Probably underground detention because they have such limited space on the lot. They would also address all the comments on the GVC letter. Mrs. Elliott asked if they would be putting blacktop near the spring? Mr. Ludgate stated they would need to get a general permit to pipe it. Mr. Bittig stated that as far as storm water goes we are pushing towards using the Pennsylvania Best Management Practice and ideally on-site injection is used. Mr. Ludgate stated that the underground detention system pipe would be perforated.

Mr. Wilson asked what the distance from the exit of the shopping center to their proposed driveway would be? Mr. Ludgate stated that it was at least 250-feet.

Mr. Wilson stated that his concern was with the two driveways. The speed limit was 45 on the highway, however, he did not believe anyone followed that and was concerned with the amount of traffic that may be generated from the business. Not knowing exactly what the intended use was

Tobolski Property continued

for the building it would be hard to project the amount of traffic. It was an awful narrow lot to accommodate high volume. Mr. Ludgate stated that there was potential for 15,000 square feet of retail and they could have a high volume user. That may force the driveway to be moved. Mr. Bittig stated it was a traffic safety issue.

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

Mr. Ludgate thanked the Planning Commission.

6. MILLER SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD - Pat Austin

GVC reviewed the Miller Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated August 28, 2003).

Mr. Austin presented the Miller Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record. The proposed subdivision was located on the south side of S.R. 422 west of its intersection with Fairview Chapel Road. The intent of the plan was to sell the house on the parcel and then annex approximately 9.058 acres from lands currently owned by the Marvin Miller Family Limited Partnership to other lands owned by the Marvin Miller Family Limited Partnership. They were requesting a waiver for the minimum lot depth to width ratio.

Mr. Krafczek stated that they were looking for a waiver for the depth to width ratio, when all they really needed to do was move the lot line a little to accommodate to the correct ratio. Mr. Bittig stated they could extend the property line to the trees.

Mr. Bittig asked if the site had public water and public sewer. Mr. Austin stated they had well water and public sewer.

Mrs. Geiger asked if they planned to develop this area. Mr. Austin stated they didn't know at the present time.

Mr. Wilson asked what the relationship was of John Hoffert to John Hoffert, Jr.? Mr. Austin replied that John Hoffert, Jr. was the lawyer and John Hoffert was the son. Mr. Wilson stated he wanted it to be in the records that to be above Board in the Township he didn't think that John Hoffert the attorney should make a ruling on a request by his son. That may be leaving the Township open to some questions. For an opinion on a waiver like this they should have gone to an outside firm.

Miller Subdivision continued

Mr. Bittig stated that cutting off that small property, they have a nonconforming use there now and by making it smaller that becomes almost impractical to convert that into Highway Commercial use later. Mr. Austin stated that they believed that was the intent, so that does not become Highway Commercial.

MOTION BY Mr. Krafczek, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of the minimum lot depth to width ratio for the Miller Subdivision. No one seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilson stated that with no one seconding the motion the waiver request was denied.

Mr. Austin stated he wanted to address the comment on the driveway. They did not feel a Cross Easement Agreement was necessary. They have added a note to the plan, which creates a 20 ft. wide access easement to the adjoiners, whoever they may be. Mr. Wilson stated that according to the letter from Sept 2nd, it states that would not be needed. Mr. Krafczek stated they would just need that noted on the plan.

Mr. Austin thanked the Planning Commission.

7. READING PEDIATRICS – PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- Jana Eppihimer
- J. Kitridge Fegley

GVC reviewed the Reading Pediatrics Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (reference letter dated August 29, 2003).

Ms. Eppihimer presented the Reading Pediatrics Preliminary/Final Plan for a medical office building located on Lorane Road just behind the Commerce Bank. Ms. Eppihimer asked if we had received the hydrant flow letter and the memo from the Fire Marshal? Mr. Wilson replied, yes, we have.

Mr. Bittig asked if they had taken care of the handicapped parking? Ms. Eppihimer stated that they had.

Mr. Wilson asked above the letter from Brumback, Mancuso & Fegley concerning Hafer Place, does that mean they do not need the public improvements for the street because that was in compliance to what was done for National Properties? Mr. Fegley replied, yes. Mr. Wilson stated

Reading Pediatrics continued

that at the time that was an access street for National Properties for emergency only. There was also a plumber at the end of the street. Would that suffice for a business at that location? Mr. Peifer stated that when the National Properties Plan and the Hafer Commercial Lot Plan came in at the same time, the Hafer plan had the plumbing supply shop as a potential user, and the subdividing lot as a second lot to use Hafer Place. What we have today was the land development plan for the lot that fronts on Lorane Road. The intent was to put something on the lot at some point. Mr. Fegley stated that the subdivision plan was approved with Hafer Place as the access and complied with the ordinance at that time. We have a land development plan, which was not a new subdivision plan and would be in the procession period. So they did not believe that was a major issue.

Mr. Bittig asked if Hafer Place was determined to be a private street? Ms. Eppihimer stated that Hafer Place was a private street. Mr. Peifer stated that last month we discussed the cross section of Hafer Place and about doing coring to see what the cross section was. But going back to the National Properties plan, the cross section was less than what was needed for the ordinance today. Looking at the Township records on when that was installed, we could not find anything concerning that. Mr. Wilson stated that with Hafer Place being a private street that was a mute point for us until such time they would want to dedicate it to the Township, and then it would have to be brought up to standards. Mr. Fegley stated it was a good street.

Mr. Wilson asked if there were any other outstanding issues? Mr. Peifer stated they just needed the signatures on the plan. Mr. Krafczek asked if they had the fire hydrant issues resolved. Ms. Eppihimer stated they had.

Mrs. Geiger asked if they would be planting a buffer? Ms. Eppihimer stated they would be on the residential border.

Mrs. Elliott asked who actually owned Hafer place. Ms. Eppihimer stated National Properties. Mrs. Elliott asked that if there would be damage to the road would National Properties take care of that? Mr. Fegley stated that, yes; they would be maintaining the road.

MOTION BY Mr. Krafczek, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Reading Pediatrics Preliminary Land Development Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Krafczek, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Reading Pediatrics Final Land Development Plan after the proper signatures are placed on the plan. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Eppihimer thanked the Planning Commission.

8. **47th & OAK PARKWAY SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD**

- Daniel Laudenslayer
- Gus Kotsakis

GVC reviewed the 47th & Oak Parkway Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated August 28, 2003).

Mr. Laudenslayer presented the 47th & Oak Parkway Subdivision Sketch Plan located on the southeast corner of 47th St and Oak Parkway.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that the plan reflects everything that was written in the GVC review letter.

Mr. Bittig asked if they would have the easement agreement? Mr. Kotsakis stated that they talked to Attorney Hoffert and he would be giving them the wording needed for fulfilling the easement agreement.

Mr. Krafczek asked if they resolved the zoning issues? Mr. Kotsakis stated that the building envelope changed to conform to the ordinance and they would be building a smaller home. All zoning issues have been resolved.

Mr. Bittig stated they put in the 30-foot right-of-way, thank you very much. There may come a time that the Township may need to widen that road.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the 47th & Oak Parkway Sketch Plan of Record. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kotsakis thanked the Planning Commission

9. **SHELBOURNE SQUARE SHOPPING CENTER – PRELIMINARY PLAN**

- Amit Mukherjee
- Robert Bauer

GVC reviewed the Shelbourne Square Shopping Center Final Subdivision Plan (reference letter dated August 29, 2003).

Mr. Mukherjee presented the Shelbourne Square Shopping Center Preliminary Plan located at the intersection of S.R. 422 and Shelbourne Road.

Shelbourne Square continued

Mr. Wilson asked if they had the DEP Sewage Facility Planning Modules? Mr. Peifer stated they still needed to go to the Sewer Authority for that. Mr. Bauer stated they felt that they would need to do that when they would come in with the land development plan, but they would confirm that with the Sanitary Engineer.

Mr. Wilson asked about Comment #4, did they get written permission from Met-Ed to construct the access drive within the Met-Ed right-of-way? Mr. Bauer stated they have been in contact with Met-Ed all along. They did not have the letter, but would be getting one.

Mr. Wilson stated that in the BCPC letter they recommend that the minimum width be 14-ft per lane, 28-ft total. "Staff notes that the cartway narrows significantly at the point at which the plan notes "End of Curb" and the proposed center median begins and recommends that this portion of the section be examined and widened." What were their comments on that? Mr. Peifer asked what the width was at that point? Mr. Bauer stated 24-ft. Mr. Peifer asked if the BCPC wanted it to be 28-ft all the way. Mr. Wilson stated that was how he read the letter. Mr. Mukherjee stated they would maintain the cartway as it was approved on the Penn Dot plan. Mr. Bauer stated that we agreed we would provide the pavement all the way through. If they would need it wider they would do that. Mr. Wilson stated that his concern was that it would become a major truck route. Any of the trucks from the shopping center would come out there instead of the light. Mrs. Geiger asked why we couldn't designate no trucks allowed. Mr. Bittig stated we could not do that on private property. Mr. Peifer stated the police could not enforce that.

Mr. Peifer asked if they received the Berks County Conservation District approval letter for construction of the access drive? Mr. Bauer stated they got drainage comments today. The drainage area will remain undisturbed. They were trying to recognize their original goal, which was to go before the Board of Supervisors having met all the comments except the letter from the Berks County Conservation District for erosion control. They would not record the plan until they received that letter. We were hoping to be able to complete the Penn Dot segment this fall. They wanted to see if the Planning Commission would entertain them getting conditional approval for the plan. All of the GVC comments were going to be able to be met. They were confident they would receive the letter from Met-Ed within 10 days. Mr. Bittig asked what about the BCCD approval letter? Mr. Bauer stated that was the one that would take longer. They felt they could meet all the comments within the next two weeks. With the conditional approval then they would not have to wait until October's Planning Commission meeting to move forward with the plan. Possibly they could go to the Board of Supervisors for conditional approval without the BCCD approval letter and not record the plan until they have the letter. They were just asking for the conditional approval so they could get the stub in on 422 before October because the asphalt plants close in November. Mr. Krafczek asked when their Penn Dot permit expires and do they have to have it completed by that time? Mr. Bauer replied that it expired March 2004 and yes, basically it needed to be completed by that time.

Shelbourne Square continued

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to recommend conditional approval for the Shelbourne Square Shopping Center Final Subdivision Plan contingent upon receipt of the signed permission letter from Met-Ed regarding the construction of the access drive within the Met-Ed right-of-way, closure of the SALDO and Stormwater Management items listed in the GVC letter dated August 29, 2003 which are attached and made a part of these minutes. The motion carried with Mr. Bittig, Mr. Krafczek, Mrs. Elliott, Mrs. Geiger voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

Mr. Bauer thanked the Planning Commission for their time.

10. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Lon Seitz
- Henry Filippini

GVC was unable to review the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Preliminary Plan in time for the meeting.

Mr. Seitz presented the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Preliminary Plan. He was there to represent Henry Filippini. The sketch plan had 60 lots. They struggled to adhere to as many of the GVC comments on that plan to present the new plan. The new plans show 45 lots. The street configuration was not like before due to the comments about the steep slopes and to preserve as much of the wooded area as possible. Mr. Filippini's attempt in creating Phase V was to continue to maintain the same quality of the homes as in the previous phases. Quite a few of the lots are large. They needed to continue Constitution Ave and Scotland Drive. They have done that, the previous streets were much narrower streets before and they needed to bring the streets to 34-foot wide. They could not continue Scotland Drive into Constitution Ave as in the previous plan because there were wetlands in that area, so they changed the area where it would come into. Mr. Bittig asked if they could circle the wetlands. Mr. Seitz replied no, the area was too steep.

Mr. Seitz stated the area at the top was flat, so they created 4 and 5 acres lots up there. They were able to get the driveways in at the township grade. They would place a detention pond in the one area that will meter the flow out into an existing detention pond. They would have a supporting storm sewer system. Mr. Bittig stated that there was already an existing problem in some areas so they may need to look at an injection system to get the rainwater back into the ground.

Mr. Seitz stated that they need to maintain the grade onto Constitution Ave. Mr. Bittig stated that with Constitution as it sits now; they may need to punch the grade there. There was a right-of-way there, can they do that? Mr. Seitz stated that the right-of-way there was set up for a 34-foot wide street, which was what Constitution Ave was now. Along with a 54-foot right-of-way that was

Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V continued

extended from the plan of record, on paper only. We need to get around the curve and excavate to get the grade.

Mr. Wilson asked about the house on the plateau, would these be reminiscent of the Country Club Estates or would they be hidden pretty well. Mr. Filippini stated that they would be on wooded lots and they would maintain as many trees as they could. Mr. Wilson asked if they would have shared driveways there? Mr. Seitz stated no, they would not.

Mr. Bittig stated that they were maintaining the 30-foot right-of-way on Schoffers Road, thank you very much. Then, if the Township needs to widen that road, then they would have the right-of-way.

Mrs. Geiger asked about the EAC comment that “wetlands should not be maintained by a property owner, lot 28 should be open space”, what are their feelings on that? Mr. Seitz stated they were open to suggestions. The property owners can maintain the wetlands probably far better than the Township can. If the Township wants the wetlands they can certainly have them. Mr. Wilson stated that the idea was not that the Township wants the wetlands; the Township wants to preserve the wetlands as they were in their natural state. Some of the planning seminars state they should take them away from the property owners and leave them as open space area that belongs to the whole community. It would have to be dedicated back to the Township to be open space and remain natural. Mr. Seitz stated that would be in their deeds that the wetlands would need to remain in their natural state. Mr. Bittig stated there have been times where property owners move in and then drain the wetlands and put in a garden. Mr. Seitz stated that he did not have a solution for that, but if the Township wants the wetlands he would be more than happy to put that on the plan.

Mr. Krafczek asked where they planned to tie into the sewers? Mr. Seitz stated they would be able to tie in at two places.

Mr. Seitz stated that to conform to the width of the street they did a transition of the cartway width of the existing street of 28-foot into a 34-foot on Scotland Drive. Since there was not an intersection there he felt that, engineering wise, it would be best to do a smooth transition in the change in width.

Mr. Seitz asked that GVC finish the review of the subdivision and submit that to him so he would have time to do revisions in order to hand in plans in time for the next Planning Commission meeting.

Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V continued

Mrs. Elliott asked about the Berks County Planning Commission letter, they mention that they need to contact the Berks County Assessment Office for clarification of the Clean & Green requirements for the subdivision, what were their comments on that? Mr. Bittig stated that it was a tax issue that the developer would owe tax on the property. Mr. Seitz stated that they were aware of that.

*Paul Schwartz arrived at this time.

Mrs. Elliott asked if they did a traffic study there? Mr. Filippini stated that when they complete the subdivision they would be providing a much needed second access for the development. It would be the easiest way in and out. Mr. Bittig stated that people who want to avoid the Shelbourne and Scotland intersection would want to take that route. Mr. Seitz stated the roadway would be wider and they do need that road there. Mrs. Geiger asked if they were planning a road onto Schoffers Road? Mr. Seitz stated that the area there was too steep to put one in.

Mr. Bittig asked if they did a water resources study on the tract? Mr. Seitz stated that he submitted a report to Mr. Peifer. They were in the process of doing the infiltration probes and perk tests. We would need to put in infiltration systems in the back area. Mr. Bittig stated that was what we were looking for. We want to make sure they would not cause a problem for future homeowners. Mr. Filippini stated they would not enhance the problem. Mr. Peifer stated that they should put conservation easements on the back lots. Mr. Bittig stated that they would need that for the steep slopes.

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

Mr. Seitz thanked the Planning Commission.

**11. INFORMAL DISCUSSION ON LIBRARY - Michelle Kircher
- Shane Maier**

Mrs. Kircher stated that she was there to help speed up the process for building the library for Exeter Township and their Land Development Plan. They had received a Keystone Grant for the project, however they only had 18 months to complete the building of the library under the rules for the grant. Their start date was September 1st. They plan to build on the property above the location of the existing library. They wanted to see if they needed a traffic study done or if they could get a waiver for that. Mr. Wilson asked what amount of traffic did they expect compared to the traffic they had today? Mrs. Kircher stated that they have around 7,500 people a month and did not expect that drastic of an increase. They open at 10am and close at 8pm. Most of their traffic was with mothers and children and at 5 o'clock they were usually home preparing dinner. The

Informal Discussion on Library continued

peak time for traffic was not the peak time for people at the library. They were open 6 days a week. Mr. Schwartz asked how it compares in size with the existing library? Mr. Maier stated it would be 22,000 sq. ft. and the existing library was 1,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Krafczek asked how many employees they had? Mr. Kircher stated they had around 10 employees and volunteers. Mr. Krafczek asked if they worked with the School District? Mrs. Kircher stated that they did work in conjunction with the School district. The Honors classes had to read 30 books in the summer. They provide the books for that program. The Children's wing would be 2,500 feet larger than what they originally planned. They had young adults, adults, and conference areas with two rooms on the end. They were applying for an \$80,000 grant to provide 30 computers for the library. They had a summer reading program. Last year they had over 1,000 kids in the summer reading program. They did not have the numbers for this year's program as of yet. They had two book sales a year. They were the second largest library in circulation, in the county with only 1,000 sq. ft. They need the new library for the children.

Mr. Krafczek asked what the lot size was? Mrs. Kircher stated it was three acres.

Mrs. Kircher stated they had 76 parking spaces, more than enough for the zoning. They were in the correct zoning district for a library. They just really needed to know how to proceed to complete that in the least amount of time. Mr. Bittig stated that they could start with Preliminary Plan and skip the Sketch plan to save time, especially with their tight schedule.

Mrs. Geiger asked what they planned to do with the existing library? Mrs. Kircher stated they would possibly have meeting rooms and offices.

Mrs. Geiger stated that they should check with the nursery back near Forest Hills. They would probably be happy to make some contributions for their shrubs and trees. They would also like to help make an outdoor reading area.

Mrs. Kircher stated they would be sure to do the outdoor lighting properly. They would also sprinkle the building. With the historical study, could they use the study from the Dunn farm, or would they need to go back to the beginning? Mr. Bittig stated that they would be good with those studies. Mr. Schwartz stated they would need to do a PNED study, threatened and endangered species study. Just a letter would cover that.

Mrs. Kircher asked if there was anything else they would need, since it was the first time for her on this side? Mr. Bittig stated they would need to start with Preliminary Land Development Plan. Mrs. Kircher asked if a letter was good for the Environmental Impact? Mr. Bittig stated that for the size of the site a letter would suffice.

Informal Discussion on Library continued

Mr. Maier asked if it would be possible to come in with a Preliminary/Final plan to speed up the process. Mr. Krafczek stated that they could throw in as much as possible on the plan and if they don't complete the preliminary, just come back the next month with everything cleaned up and ready to go. Mr. Bittig stated they should be sure to include the driveway access and grading on the plan.

Mr. Wilson stated they would need to show the Handicapped parking on the plan and a letter from the Water Company.

Mr. Peifer stated they could do the landscaping as a community project. Mrs. Kircher stated they had 20 trees now, as donations from Exeter Residents. Mr. Schwartz stated they could ask the E.A.C. to do a project like they did here at the Municipal Building.

Mr. Krafczek asked if they had any restrictions on membership? Mrs. Kircher stated that anyone in the county might use the library. In order to check out a book you needed a membership card. They had issued 11,000 cards.

Mrs. Kircher stated that they were the best-kept secret in Exeter Township. Mr. Krafczek stated they have a great idea and he appreciated the time they were putting into it.

Mrs. Kircher and Mr. Maier thanked the Planning Commission for their time.

12. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – Leon Burkhart

Mr. Burkhart stated that he was the owner of 60 acres between Wegman & Moyer Roads. There was an old home along Wegman Road, then he and his wife built a new home in the rear of the property. He would like to subdivide a couple of lots on the property, one where the old house sat; two lots around 4 acres and then another one around 3-½ acres. There were some wetlands there so the lots may turn out to be 5 or 6 acres. The property was zoned Rural Conservation District. Mr. Wilson stated that in that zone they would need at least a 3-acre minimum lot size.

Mr. Bittig asked where the proposed access would be to Wegman Road? Mr. Burkhart stated there was an already existing lane. Mr. Burkhart stated there would be three lots on a private driveway. There would be a driveway that would come off of the lots onto the private lane. The already existing farmhouse sits on and had access to Wegman Road.

Mr. Burkhart informal discussion continued

Mr. Burkhart stated that all of the water runoff would go into the creek in the back. Where the houses would sit would all be level. He may have to adjust the lines somewhat to accommodate

the setbacks for the homes. Mr. Bittig stated they would need to do perks and probes. Mr. Burkhart stated that they would be sure to have that completed.

Mr. Burkhart asked if there would be a problem with 4 lots if they kept the old farmhouse on the one lot, it would be four lots including the lot with the Farmhouse. Mr. Bittig stated as long as they follow all the rules.

Mr. Peifer stated they would need to have a 60-foot radius on the end of the private drive for a turn around. They would need to demonstrate the grading for the driveway; anything over 10% would need to be paved. Also they may need to put in pullover spaces depending on the width of the private drive.

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

Mr. Burkhart thanked the Planning Commission.

13. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Wilson stated that he wanted to remind everyone of the Joint Planning Commission meeting September 23rd at 7 pm at the Municipal building.

Mr. Krafczek stated that he received a newsletter in the mail about a Joint Stormwater meeting with Mt. Penn and Lower Alsace. Did anyone know anything about this? Mr. Peifer stated that it was concerning bridge and culvert failure. Because of the failure of the culvert on Exeter Road which was on the line of Exeter and Lower Alsace. Mr. Wilson stated that during the last rain the culvert collapsed. That was what the newsletter was about.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to adjourn the September 2, 2003 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:17 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Dunham Drive Waiver request
BOS: Miller Subdivision Waiver request
BOS: Shelbourne Square Final Plan Approval
BOS: Reading Pediatrics Preliminary/Final Plan Approval
BOS: 47TH & Oak Parkway Sketch Plan of Record Approval