

**MINUTES  
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
AUGUST 3, 2004**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, August 3, 2004 at the Township Hall, 4975 DeMoss Road, Berks County, Pennsylvania. Donald R. Wilson, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30p.m. followed by the Pledge to the Flag.

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

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Craig Peifer, GVC Consulting Engineer  
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer  
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary  
Eric Gardecki, GIS Administrator

**1. MINUTES**

**MOTION BY** Mrs. Geiger, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the minutes of the July 6, 2004 Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion carried with Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Littlehales and Mr. Krafczek voting in favor and Mr. Bittig abstaining.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to approve the agenda of the August 3, 2004 Planning Commission meeting changing the Pease Subdivision to Preliminary Plan and Royal View Estates to Preliminary/Final Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

**A. PEASE SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN, SHAW BRIEF SUBDIVISION - SKETCH PLAN:**  
**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

**4. NGUYEN -CONDITIONAL USE**

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mrs. Nguyen was proposing to use her home kitchen at 41 Gibraltar Road, as a made-to-order bakery, focusing on designer birthday cakes, as a home occupation. They plan to do the bookkeeping in their home office. Mrs. Nguyen contacted the surrounding neighbors, there was one house that they could not contact and appeared to be vacant. They met all the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance; if there would be customers coming to her home there was ample off-street parking. Mr. Bittig stated that one neighbor was concerned about the amount of traffic on the shared driveway. The applicant stated one to three

Nguyen Conditional Use continued

visits per week. Mr. Bittig felt it should be put in the form of a limit not to exceed five and make it a condition of the permit. That would put a cap on the amount of traffic coming into the home. Mrs. Nguyen stated that their concern would be that when they had friends over, would the neighbors consider them customers?

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she understood their concern. We would then get phone calls asking us to check that out. Mrs. Geiger stated that we should wait until there was a complaint and then deal with it. Mr. Bittig stated that the applicant stated only one to three visits per week. That was part of their application and if they would exceed that it would be in violation. Mrs. Franckowiak stated she would disagree that Mrs. Nguyen would be in violation. As long as they met the requirements in the Zoning Ordinance with visits between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. they would be ok. Mr. Bittig stated that was what their application stated. Mrs. Franckowiak stated it was in their letter not the application. Mrs. Nguyen stated that it would not be a bakery like Wenger's or Schmoyer's and they did not understand why it was a big deal. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, which would ultimately approve or reject the application. If they had any concerns with what the Planning Commission recommended they would need to address the Board. Mr. Wilson stated that Section E in the application stated "Allow only two customers at a time; and conduct business between the hours of 8 a.m. and 8 p.m.". That was in respect to our ordinance, which supercedes anything they would write in their letter. The Planning Commission agreed with that.

**MOTION BY** Mrs. Geiger, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a conditional use for Kelly Nguyen provided all stipulations of the Zoning Ordinance were met and that the Dept. of Agriculture issued their permits. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. ROYAL VIEW ESTATES – PRELIMINARY PLAN** – C. Wesley Seitzinger  
Charles Leazier

GVC reviewed the Royal View Estates Preliminary/Final plan (reference letter dated July 28, 2004).

Mr. Seitzinger stated that most of the comments in the GVC letter have been addressed on the new plan.

Mr. Peifer stated that we could address all of the driveway comments together instead of individually.

Mr. Seitzinger stated that there was a note on the plan "all grading to obtain sight distance would be performed by the applicant, Charles Leazier, trading as Leazier Homes". Mr. Peifer asked if that would be done with the improvements agreement or would be done as the builder at the time of building permits. Mr. Leazier stated it would be done during the building process. Mr. Peifer stated that would be ok, but they should have some escrow set up. They needed the escrow for the widening of the road and should add that. Mr. Seitzinger stated they could do that. Mr. Peifer stated that the driveway for Lot 6 had a problem; looking to the right when you leave the driveway the sight line was cutting over the adjoining property. Mr. Seitzinger stated they could move the driveway up the road a little to meet the distance or have an agreement with the adjoining property owner.

Mr. Wilson asked if we needed to be concerned about the driveway being in the Met-Ed right-of-way?

Mr. Peifer stated they would need to get a permit for that. Mr. Wilson asked if the Engineering Department would insure that they had the permit from Met-Ed before issuing a building permit? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that at the time of application they had to fill out an affidavit and show all easements and right-of-ways.

Mr. Leazier provided a copy of the deed restrictions for the subdivision.

Royal View Estates continued

Mr. Bittig asked if we received the letter stating that the debris was removed from the property? Mr. Peifer stated that due to weather conditions they have not been able to get onto the property to do that. Mr. Leazier stated they would do that as soon as weather permitted. Mr. Seitzinger stated that the residue property beyond the northern right-of-way would be incorporated into the lots because the Township did not want the additional right-of-way. They had D.E.P. approval and the Berks County Conservation District approval. They brought in four sets of the erosion and sediment control plan. They needed the improvements agreement and a letter from the adjoining property owner if the driveway could not be moved. Could they get conditional approval?

Mr. Krafczek stated that other than the minor change for the driveway he didn't see any other issues.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the Royal View Estates Preliminary/Final Plan provided they meet all the conditions listed in the July 28, 2004 GVC review letter, in particular under SALDO, item #1 G: resolving the driveway sight distance issue on Lot 6. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **6. LIMEKILN HEIGHTS-PRELIMINARY PLAN**

GVC reviewed the Limekiln Heights Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 29, 2004).

Mr. Wilson stated that no one would be there to discuss the plan.

#### **7. PEASE SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN** – Lon Seitz - Barrie Pease

GVC reviewed the Pease Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 30, 2004).

Mr. Seitz stated that the Zoning Hearing Board granted relief for the land swap between two zoning districts. They granted the right to extend the cul-de-sac; the lots were not to exceed the area between LDR and AP for the switch. They also needed to restrict any development on the remaining parcel. Mr. Wilson asked if they would explain the difference between the plan shown to the Zoning Hearing Board and the one they were presenting. Mr. Seitz stated yes, there was a difference. The cul-de-sac was shortened and the lots decreased from 18 to 12 lots. Mr. Bittig stated that the first Zoning Hearing Board approval was to give access from Pineland Road. The second was when they got the land swap approval. Was that correct? Mr. Seitz replied yes. Mr. Bittig stated that the eastern boundary was different between the two plans. Mr. Seitz stated that when the property was surveyed they found that the boundary line was not up to the road. They also owned a portion across the street. Mr. Pease contacted the neighbor, Mr. Ziemba, and they have agreed to swap the land. Mr. Bittig stated that they would also need to bring that to us and they have not agreed to an extension of time. Mr. Seitz stated they would do that when it was needed.

Mr. Wilson stated they should go through the review letter from GVC. Mr. Peifer stated that items #1 & #2 under Zoning were just comments about the Zoning Hearing Board decision. Item #4 dealt with the restriction on the residue property and that was left to be worked out between them and the Board of Supervisors and would also need to be noted on the plan. Mr. Peifer stated that #6 was the Environmental Assessment Statement and on the submission checklist it was noted they would be requesting a waiver. Mr. Seitz stated they were requesting that because the development was only 12 lots with a short cul-de-sac. Mr. Bittig asked

Pease Subdivision continued

how many acres of undeveloped land were they consuming? Mr. Seitz replied 9-acres. Mr. Bittig stated currently it was wooded and wetlands. Mr. Schwartz stated that the EAC was concerned with the wetlands located in back yards and easily developed and ruined. We would like to know how they intend to preserve those areas. Mr. Bittig stated that Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 delineated the wetlands out of the lots and became property of the homeowners association. Mr. Seitz stated that they have done what was required with the wetlands. They have them delineated on the plan. If they intend to disturb the wetland areas, the property owner had to have the proper permits from DEP. Mrs. Geiger asked how we would know if the homeowner would disturb those areas? It was hard to control that if they remain on the lots. Mr. Seitz stated that they delineated them with meets and bounds on the plan so if someone would disturb those areas they could go back and re-create them. Mr. Littlehales stated that we do need the Environmental Assessment Statement. The Planning Commission agreed. Mr. Seitz stated they would do that.

Mr. Peifer stated that item #5 discussed preserving trees over 6" in caliper. Mr. Bittig stated that there were some mature Pine and Maple trees located there, a mix of hardwood and softwood. Mr. Seitz stated that there was a lot of second growth located there. Mr. Bittig stated they should mark the trees that would be removed and have them noted on the plan. Mr. Schwartz stated that when they mark the streets we could walk the area with them and show them which trees need to be marked.

Mr. Schwartz stated that item #8 for the parks was an item for the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Peifer stated that item #11 was also for the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Seitz asked if streetlights were needed? Mr. Littlehales replied yes. Mr. Schwartz stated they should be 250' apart. Mr. Seitz stated that they planned to put in low-level pedestrian lights on the driveways rather than streetlights, given the area and the rural nature of the lots. They would provide the details for the lights. Mr. Littlehales stated they should also have a light at the entrance.

Mr. Peifer stated that item #13 concerned the wetlands, they should provide the bearings and distances, which they said they would do. They should note that the proposed dwellings on lot #5 & #6 were close to the wetlands. Mr. Seitz stated that they would be flagged in the field and they would stay out of those areas. Mr. Bittig stated they needed to remove the wetlands from the lots. Mr. Seitz stated that they were allowed to have them on the lots, they were required by law to identify those areas and put a note on the plan that that it was the individual lot owners responsibility not to disturb those areas without proper permits. Mr. Bittig stated that for the Water Resource Study, they were asking for a waiver, however we would need that. Mr. Ruff stated that when they had wells and public sewer a Water Resource Study was needed. We were concerned about ground water recharge. Mr. Seitz stated they would do that. Mrs. Geiger asked about the water runoff from the development onto the homes that sit on Pine Ave. Mr. Seitz stated that they would intercept the water and they would not release any more water than previously ran there.

### **Public Comment**

**Dale Barnett**, 57 Pine Ave, stated that they were concerned with additional runoff coming down onto their property from the development. Would they slow down the acceleration of the stormwater? Mr. Seitz stated that they would intercept runoff and direct it into the wetlands; they would not increase the runoff amount.

Pease Subdivision continued

**Bob Venkler**, 60 Perry Street, stated that he was there to represent the four property owners that lived on Perry Street. It was all springs in that area where they were planning to put the subdivision. During the last rainfall the water was 2-ft deep in that area. He and the other property owners along Perry Street own the area where they planned to connect to the sewer system. How could they hook into that line? The Township owned the sewer line, but they could not dig on our property to hook up. Mr. Schwartz stated that concerning the runoff issue, the developer would have to address that. Mr. Venkler asked how would they stop the springs? Mr. Schwartz replied that they would not stop the springs. They were required to delineate and protect the wetland areas. Any runoff from the development could be no greater than it was before they developed the property. Mr. Venkler asked how they would stop it. Mr. Schwartz stated they would submit engineering plans for that at the appropriate time. We could not approve plans unless they meet the requirements. Mr. Venkler asked how they could put the sewer lines in without the property owner's permission? Mr. Schwartz stated that typically the sewer lines were in an easement or right-of-way that the Township had access to. Mr. Venkler stated that the engineering department said they did not have the right to do that. Mr. Wilson stated that we would look into that. Mr. Bittig asked what the sewer right-of-way would be? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that typically it was 20-ft., but we would have to check that. Mr. Barnett asked if the deeds have been researched to see if there were easements recorded on those properties? Mr. Seitz stated that the application had been made to the Sewer Authority. The Sewer Authority was reviewing the plans.

Mr. Wilson stated that in the review letter, on street parking would be required along both sides of the street. Mr. Seitz stated that they have shown a 34-ft. cartway and a 54-ft. right-of-way, which corresponds to Section 5.2343. The review letter stated it was a high-density development and they felt it was low-density. The average area of the lots was ½ acre or higher, there were only 12 lots and the particular zoning in the area was low-density. It was a marginal cul-de-sac and not a through street. They would consider that low-density development. Mr. Peifer stated that the definition in the SALDO for medium and high density was what was being referenced here. High-density definition was residential density of ½ acre per dwelling unit or more dense or development where median lot width at street line of the proposed residential lots were 80-ft. or less. Low-density was residential density of 2-acres per dwelling unit or lesser dense with no individual lots smaller than one acre. Mr. Seitz stated that there was a conflict between the Zoning and SALDO. Mr. Peifer stated that if they wanted parking on both sides they would need the road widths stated in the review letter. Mr. Seitz stated that if they were low-density they could go down to two 10-ft. travel lanes. Their view was that they would be low-density by the zoning ordinance. Mr. Peifer stated they would still need 8-ft. lanes for parking. Mr. Seitz stated that with a 34-ft. they would have less runoff. Mr. Pease stated that if they needed 36-ft. it would not be a problem as it was only 2-ft. more.

Mr. Seitz stated that for item #19, they would show the sight distance for the entrance. Mr. Bittig asked how they would make the sight distance? There was a telephone pole in the line of sight. Have they talked to the telephone company about moving the pole? Mr. Pease stated that they would remove the underbrush behind the pole and cut the grade.

Mr. Wilson stated for item #25, he felt they needed to put in sidewalks for a sense of community and to be able to walk to Pineland Park. Mr. Ruff asked how far away the park was? Mrs. Geiger replied about two to three blocks away. Mr. Schwartz stated that he felt we should keep down impervious cover and sidewalk would be good on one side. Mr. Wilson stated that would be good. Mr. Bittig stated that for 12 homes in an

Pease Subdivision continued

isolated area, he felt it was not needed. Mrs. Geiger stated she felt it was a rural area and did not need them. Mr. Seitz stated that when there was some place for the sidewalk to go to, it would be needed, but not here. Mr. Wilson stated the Boards consensus was they did not need sidewalk. Mr. Peifer stated they would need a written waiver request.

Mr. Seitz asked about the first item under Stormwater Management, they did not understand that. Mr. Peifer stated that referred to the Zoning Hearing Board decision, which stated that there should be no development on the residue tract, and the plan shows the detention pond located there. Mr. Seitz stated that the development was discussed as pertaining to the houses. Mr. Peifer stated that the exhibit that they presented showed the detention pond located on the residue tract. Mr. Ruff stated that it would not be an issue. Mr. Bittig stated that lot #9 & #10 do not appear to meet the width to depth ratio of the Township ordinance. They may want to move the lines, so they do not have to ask for waivers. Mr. Seitz stated they would try to do that or apply for the waivers. Mr. Bittig asked about the sewer service for lots #1 & #12, how were they planning to provide that? Mr. Seitz replied that they would have low-pressure pumps there. Mr. Wilson asked if there were any other comments? There were none.

#### **8. SHAW BRIEF SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN – Kevin Bensinger**

GVC reviewed the Shaw Brief Subdivision Sketch Plan (reference letter dated July 29, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that they were planning to annex two portions of land and create one subdivision line. Mr. Peifer stated that the tax maps do not show a separate parcel. Mr. Bensinger stated that it did not have a separate parcel ID number. Mr. Peifer stated that there was an old subdivision that showed three lots. Mr. Bittig stated that the plan was not properly scaled. Mr. Bensinger stated that they would correct that.

Mr. Wilson asked about item #3, did the proposed annexation aggravate the situation with the structures on lot #1? Mr. Bensinger replied no, it did not.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they would be asking for a waiver of the Environmental Assessment statement. Mr. Ruff stated that he would support a waiver, but they would need to submit that in writing.

Mr. Peifer stated that item #7, dealt with the right-of-way of Huyett Street and whether or not it was a Township street. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it was a dedicated road from the 50's with a right-of-way of 15-ft. Mr. Bittig stated that the cartway width was less. Mr. Schwartz asked how many houses were located on Huyett Street. Mr. Gardecki printed out a location map of Huyett Street and it showed five houses located there. Mr. Wilson stated since Huyett Street was a Township street it would not be an issue.

Mr. Peifer stated that item #1, under SALDO, dealt with the fact that since it was a brief subdivision, the Planning Commission could allow the plan to go from Sketch to Final. Mr. Bensinger asked if they would be allowed to submit the next plan as a Final Plan.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to permit the Shaw Brief Subdivision to move from Sketch Plan to Final Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

Shaw Brief Subdivision continued

Mr. Schwartz stated that item #6, regarding whether sidewalk would be required along the frontages of Gibraltar Road and Huyett Street, there would be nothing to be gained by putting sidewalk on Gibraltar Road. Mr. Peifer stated they could do the same thing here that was done for the Exeter Automotive plan, defer the requirement of sidewalks until such time the Township want them to be installed. Mr. Schwartz stated just along Gibraltar Road, not Huyett Street. Mr. Peifer stated that item #10 was concerning the right-of way of Huyett Street. Did we want to have it at 15-ft? Mr. Bensinger stated that 15-ft was dedicated to the Township. Mr. Wilson asked if were possible to widen that street? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that part of the Valley Ridge Subdivision there was an area that was reserved for access, so it would be possible to widen that. Mr. Bittig stated that they could widen the right-of-way. Mr. Peifer stated that they should widen the right-of-way to 16 ½-ft from the centerline.

**9. KARPATI SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD - Stephen Bensinger**

GVC reviewed the Karpati Subdivision Sketch Plan for Record (reference letter dated July 27, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that the only outstanding issue was the location of the driveway for the lot along Shelbourne Road. They have decided to take the residue tract and combine it into lot #2. There would be two lots with existing houses on them. They were looking for plan approval. Mr. Peifer stated that he asked them to put a note on the plan that the intent was to merge parcel b to lot 2 and to note the old deed lines were to be removed. They did that.

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

**10. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE VI – INFORMAL DISCUSSION – Stephen Bensinger**

Mr. Bensinger stated that the previous plan showed a 6-acre tract of land being divided into 12 lots. Mr. Philippini decided against that because of the issue of the clear sight triangle on Scotland Drive. They were now proposing to create two new building lots with access to Scotland Drive. They have two existing houses. The existing houses would continue to have access through Spatz Lane down to Schoffers Road. They would construct a new driveway for those. They would like to propose a common driveway coming back to the two new lots. Rather than two driveways side-by-side, they would like to have a 16-ft wide shared driveway. They would have cross access agreements. Mr. Schwartz asked where the frontage was for the two lots? Mr. Bensinger replied that there was a little triangle of property that needed to be annexed to these properties, which would take place with the subdivision. They would then have frontage along Scotland Drive. Mr. Bittig asked what the size of the two new lots would be? Mr. Bensinger replied they were each over an acre. Mr. Peifer asked if they would be able to get sight distance? Mr. Bensinger replied that they could get driveway sight distance. It was a three-lot subdivision with an adjoining lot. If that would be acceptable they would submit plans for next months meeting.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there were any issues for the other lot? Mr. Peifer stated that they have no frontage, the existing dwellings were pre-existing, non-conforming. Mr. Bittig stated this plan was better than the previous plan.

**11. KUBOVCSAK SUBDIVISION – INFORMAL DISCUSSION - Mark Koch**

Mr. Koch stated that he was there on behalf of Mr. Kubovcsak for the three-lot subdivision located on Butter Lane and Prospect Street. They wanted to discuss the expenses and improvements that the Board had imposed on Mr. Kubovcsak, specifically sidewalks and curbs. These costs were not anticipated or expected. The Board had approved other plans without the requirement of curbs or sidewalks, leaving them with the feeling of inconsistency. The plan by Omega Builders located on Oak Parkway & 47<sup>th</sup> Street did not need to put in curbs and sidewalks. Mr. Schwartz stated that there were no curbs or sidewalks in that neighborhood. That was not a consistency issue. Mr. Koch stated that there was a prior Plan of Record on the parcel. There were three lots previously. Mr. Wilson asked what their point would be? Mr. Koch stated that there was a previous subdivision with three lots of record. They would like to step away from the subdivision process and ask for the blessing that the three lots could be built on without the subdivision requirements. Mr. Bittig stated they would need to meet sight distance and the requirements of health and safety. Mr. Koch stated there was a plan of record with three lots. Mr. Peifer stated that the deeds were merged at some point. Mr. Koch stated that was correct. They were asking for the Board to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they did not have an issue with recognizing the previous plan. Mr. Bittig stated that we did have issues specifically the problem with the sight distance for the driveway intersection. They also needed sidewalks and curbs. Regardless of what the plot plan showed, if they would build there, they have to preserve public health and safety. Mr. Koch stated that the Omega Builders plan had the same situation with the location of the driveway. Mr. Bittig stated that one was an existing driveway where the house had previously burned down. Mr. Koch stated that the subdivision was not a complicated subdivision. Mr. Bittig stated that there were sidewalks on Butter Lane and on Prospect Street that terminate at Mr. Kubovcsak's property. They needed the sidewalks to complete that. Mr. Koch stated that they do not currently exist on that property. Mr. Ruff stated that was a condition of the development, sidewalks and curbing must be added. Mr. Wilson stated that previously it was an undeveloped lot. Mr. Koch stated that there were two culverts located there and it would be hard to put sidewalks over those. Mr. Wilson stated that we did not ask them to do that. Just to make the continuation of the sidewalk and curb, excluding the culverts. Mr. Koch stated that they would walk up to the culvert and then would need to step out onto the road. Mr. Wilson stated that we could ask them to improve the culverts to include the sidewalk. Mr. Koch asked if it was the position of the Board that if they would continue with the development, did they need to put in new curb and sidewalks? Mr. Ruff replied that was correct. Mr. Koch asked what was wrong with the existing curbing? Why would they need to do that? Mr. Peifer replied that with the sidewalk going in they would need to put in new curbing because the existing curbing does not have reveal. Mr. Koch asked about the sight distance for the lot on the corner, could they reconsider the sight distance and request a waiver? Mr. Bittig stated that it was a true crossover at that intersection and was very difficult to pull out of a driveway located there. Mr. Schwartz stated that the streets were at odd angles there. Mr. Koch stated that the property had a stream crossing it. That could be treated as a natural subdivision for two lots as opposed to three. Mr. Bittig stated that two lots would eliminate some of the concerns, but they would still need to go through the subdivision procedures. Mr. Koch asked if they would change the subdivision to two lots, would they still need curbs and sidewalks. Mr. Wilson stated that at one point there was a plan to put in a nursing home across the street from the Kubovcsak Subdivision on that undeveloped lot and we were going to require them to put in sidewalks and curbing along Butter Lane and Prospect Street. The Planning Commission agreed that they would still need the curbs and sidewalks.

## **12. ZONING WORKSHOP**

The Planning Commission agreed to hold the next Zoning Workshop on Wednesday, September 22<sup>nd</sup> at 7:00 p.m.

## **13. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Ms. Cusimano stated that on Wednesday, September 29, 2004, the Center for Community Leadership of Berks County was sponsoring a “Renew PA Dinner-Back to Prosperity: A Competitive Agenda for Renewing Pennsylvania” (with emphasis on Berks County). She needed to know who was interested in attending in order to send in the registration information. Mrs. Geiger, Mrs. Franckowiak, Mr. Gardecki, Ms. Cusimano, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig, and Mr. Krafczek would be attending.

Mr. Schwartz asked if at the beginning of the meeting an announcement could be made to please turn off all cell phones and pagers.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that previously we discussed looking at other areas with cluster development, specifically Chester County. That was something we wanted to look into now that we were working on changing our Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Peifer stated that another Township did that and they had all the maps and sites to visit in Chester County. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that we would check into getting a bus from the school district to take along the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Peifer stated we should check to see if we needed to advertise it. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she would check with the Board of Supervisors and set up possible dates and get back to the Planning Commission.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to adjourn the August 3, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:06 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Correspondence to:

BOS: Kelly Nguyen conditional use  
BOS: Royal View Estates Preliminary/Final Plan approval  
BOS: Karpati Subdivision Sketch Plan for Record approval