

**MINUTES  
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
DECEMBER 7, 2004**

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

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

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

**1. MINUTES**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the minutes of the November 1, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the agenda of the December 7, 2004 Planning Commission meeting with the exception of F R & S Gas to Electric Power Plant as they would not be present for the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

**A. CRESTWOOD SOUTH LOT 71 - SKETCH PLAN, EXETER VILLAGE – REVISION TO PLAN OF RECORD - FINAL: 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. LORD – CONDITIONAL USE**

Kelly Lord was proposing a home occupation to operate an errand and delivery service at 207 Coral Lane.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that no clients would be coming to the home. There would be no signs in their yard but they would like to place a sign on their car, which would be addressed by the Board of Supervisors. They met the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. There were no objections by the neighbors.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Kelly Lord. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. SZURGOT – CONDITIONAL USE**

Robert and Tricia Szurgot were proposing a home occupation to operate an in-home bakery at 4 Pickwick Place.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that no customers would be coming to the home. They would purchase their supplies at the grocery store. There were no objections by the neighbors.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Robert and Tricia Szurgot. The motion carried unanimously.

**6. ROVAGGI – CONDITIONAL USE**

Josephine Rovaggi was proposing a home occupation to do seamstress work at 560 Lincoln Road.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that there would be customers coming to the home, but they had specific hours. No customers would be coming on Sunday or Monday. They had already erected a sign, subject to Board of Supervisors approval. There were no objections by the neighbors.

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

**7. WEILACHER – CONDITIONAL USE**

Richard Weilacher was proposing a home office for their contracting business as a home occupation at 201 Schoffers Road.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that there would be no customers coming to the home. There would be an occasional delivery from Fed Ex or UPS. There were no objections by the neighbors. There would be no equipment stored at the property.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Richard Weilacher. The motion carried unanimously.

**8. R.M. PALMER WAREHOUSE 2004 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN – David Silverman**

GVC reviewed the R.M.Palmer Warehouse Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated December 1, 2004).

Mr. Peifer stated that they had taken care of some of the items in the review letter. The plans had been signed and sealed. The legal descriptions were reviewed and corrections were made, they submitted the 8 ½ by 11 format plans. They added a note to the plan that the streetlights should be the same type that were already in the development and if that style was not available they would come back for approval. Under stormwater all the notes were added to the plan. Mr. Bittig asked if they received the letter from the Conservation District for the E & S approval? Mr. Silverman replied that they were waiting for that. The improvements agreement was being worked on and would be ready next Tuesday. They would submit the electronic format. They were looking for conditional approval. Mr. Schwartz asked if they got the PNDI letter? Mr. Silverman stated they were waiting for that. Mr. Schwartz asked about the comment concerning the easement agreements? Mr. Peifer replied that they would need to record sheets 1 and 5, showing the easement agreements.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for R. M. Palmer Warehouse 2004 Preliminary/Final Plan subject to receipt of the PNDI letter and Berks County Conservation District E & S approval. The motion carried unanimously.

**9. DUTCH COLONY – REVISED FINAL PLAN – Thomas Ludgate**

GVC reviewed the Dutch Colony revised Final Plan (reference letter dated December 1, 2004).

Mr. Ludgate stated that they would comply with the lighting on the plans. Comment #2, concerning the amount of employees, they were reducing the amount of seats so the parking would be adequate. They would have Great Valley review that. There would be a designated dumpster area for Lot 2. Items # 1, 2 and 3 under SALDO would be done.

Mr. Peifer stated that we had the letters from the water company and the Fire Marshal issued a letter stating that they should retest the flow. Mr. Ludgate stated that they would do that.

Mr. Ludgate stated that the driveway locations would remain the same. All the changes would be internal. They would do the developers agreement. They would add the additional plan notes. They have extended the HOP permit. Concerning the Stormwater Management, they would comply with items # 1 thru 12. They had two waivers they wanted to present. There were two proposed detention basins. The first waiver would be for the side slopes of the basin. They would be using landscaped blocks for retaining walls instead of vertical earth wall. The requirement in the SALDO are 3:1, they were going beyond 3:1 but not leaving an exposed earth wall. They would provide the shop drawings. They were requesting a waiver because of the landscaped block walls. In order to preserve the garage and parking areas, they would need the block walls. Mr. Bittig asked how they would access the basins for maintenance? Mr. Ludgate replied that for basin #1 they would grade a drive that would be grass. For basin #2, they would place an access road in front of the parking area. They could get a pick-up truck and a weed wacker to that area. The second waiver they were requesting would be for the bottom slope. They would have a 1% instead of the 2% required. They were private basins that they would maintain. Mr. Bittig stated they should place that note on the plan.

Dutch Colony continued

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.8280 for the slopes of the detention ponds subject to approved review by GVC. The pond would be owned and maintained privately and therefore would not impose difficulty on Township personnel or contractors. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ludgate stated that they would comply with all the comments in the GVC letter. They would do the improvements agreement, water pressure test and lighting plans. Could they get conditional approval?

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant conditional approval for the Dutch Colony Site revised Final plan subject to meeting the conditions listed in the December 1, 2004 GVC review letter, specifically; completed lighting plans and pressure testing of the fire hydrants. The motion carried unanimously.

**10. MCGINNIS/BEAVER – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN - Robert Miller**

GVC reviewed the McGinnis/Beaver Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated November 30, 2004).

Mr. Miller stated that they were looking for Preliminary/Final Plan approval. They were requesting waivers for the plan. The majority of the waivers they were asking for were because there would be no building done on the lots. There would be no improvements. They had taken care of the legal descriptions. Tract 2-deed description would include the non-building note. Concerning item #10, that was completed. They would provide the electronic format. They had the form for DEP that would need to be signed by the Township. Concerning item #14, the turnaround for Ogden Drive, the Township Roadmaster found the turnaround acceptable, so they were requesting a waiver for that.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.283, for an Environmental Assessment Statement (SALDO Section 4.283 as defined in the Exeter Township Zoning Ordinance #500 Section 633). The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he did not have a problem with granting a waiver of the delineation of the wetlands as long as they would place a note on the plan that the area would not be disturbed. Mr. Peifer stated that they should put a note on the plan that a wetland delineation had not been performed and before any disturbance if would need to be done.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.281; wetland delineation. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.285; Habitats of Threatened and Endangered Species of Special Concern in Pennsylvania. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz stated that should be subject to the same note.

McGinnis/Beaver continued

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.286; Historic and Archaeological Resources. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.514; width to depth ratio. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.305; 50-ft radius paved turnaround and 60-ft radius right-of-way. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.238; curbs. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz stated that most of the items were data items that needed to be completed.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant conditional approval for McGinnis/Beaver Preliminary/Final plan, subject to meeting the conditions listed in the November 30, 2004 GVC review letter. The motion carried unanimously.

**11. PAULEY ANNEXATION PLAN – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD – Greg Bogia**

GVC reviewed the Pauley Annexation Sketch Plan for Record (reference letter dated November 29, 2004).

Mr. Bogia stated that they provided the document for executors of the estate. The access agreement would be forwarded to Mr. Hoffert's office for review. They had contacted the SEO and they were told to send a plan. They did that. They called a week later and Mr. Madeira said he would look at the property. They haven't heard back from him. They did everything that was asked of them. Could they get plan approval? Mr. Bittig stated that they should not hold up the plan because of the SEO

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for Pauley Annexation Sketch Plan of Record subject to the easement agreement being approved and the letter from the SEO being received. The motion carried unanimously.

The Planning Commission agreed that if we do not receive a letter from the SEO within three days they would not hold up the plan to wait for that.

**12. CRESTWOOD SOUTH LOT 71 – SKETCH PLAN – Stephen Bensinger**

GVC reviewed the Crestwood South Lot 71 Sketch Plan (reference letter dated December 3, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that the project was located at the end of Colin Court. It contained 8.16 acres. They were planning to put 49 upscale townhouses there. In the GVC letter there were two issues they wanted to discuss. The letter stated that they could only put 20 dwellings on a cul-de-sac. They would place an

Crestwood South Lot 71 continued

emergency access towards the front of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Peifer stated that the comment was directed towards the fact that all their lots were on that cul-de-sac in addition to all the lots already located there. Mr. Bensinger stated that at the time of the original subdivision, lot 71 was created to be able to further subdivide at a later date. One thing they had looked at to relieve the issue of two accesses, was to ask the Township to build an emergency access through property, owned by the Township, out onto West Neversink. It was originally dedicated as open space. Mr. Schwartz stated that was the soccer field. Mr. Bensinger stated that they were proposing to add the emergency access at the end of their cul-de-sac. It would be for emergency only with breakaway chains. It would help not only their development, but also Rimby Way and Outlook point. Mr. Bittig stated that there would be too much additional traffic onto Hearthstone. Mrs. Geiger asked why they would put in town homes instead of single family? Mr. Bensinger replied that townhouses were a permitted use. Mrs. Geiger stated that she would be against town homes in the nicely designed community. Mr. Wilson asked what was the property located to the east? Mr. Bensinger replied that it was open space area and a detention pond. They would be proposing an emergency access through the open space, but if the Township would like it to be an open road, they would do that. Mr. Krafczek asked if it would be paved? Mr. Bensinger replied yes, with no curbs. Mr. Schwartz stated that we have had a number of projects that had problems with access. We have allowed secondary accesses with single-family dwellings. There were more concerns with town homes because of the potential for fire problems. Secondary access was more critical with town houses. Mr. Bensinger asked if they should make the secondary access a public street? Mr. Schwartz replied that he believed the chances of the Township allowing them to build a street through the soccer field would be astronomical. They would have a better chance of getting approval for 20 town houses. They could do 20 dwellings without the 2<sup>nd</sup> access. Mr. Wilson stated that would be acceptable to the Ordinance. Dumping more traffic onto West Neversink would not be good. Mr. Bensinger asked if they could go in front of the Board of Supervisors to ask if they would consider the access through the open space? Mr. Schwartz replied it was their right to do that.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to advise the Board of Supervisors that, upon review of the plan, we would be opposed to any development greater than 20 dwelling units off of that cul-de-sac. Any greater level of development would require a full through street, not an emergency access road. We would not want to see the destruction of the sports field. Adding traffic onto West Neversink Road at that point would not be a good idea. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bensinger asked if the developer would change to 20 units could they come back with a Preliminary Plan? Mr. Wilson replied we would like to see a Sketch Plan of the 20 units.

**13. EXETER VILLAGE – REVISION TO PLAN OF RECORD – FINAL - Stephen Bensinger**

GVC reviewed the Exeter Village Final plan (reference letter dated December 6, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that the plan was in the Exeter Village development near the intersection of Colonial Drive and Pennsylvania Ave. Currently the tract was 2.8 acres. There was a detention pond on the corner. Their client owned the detention pond. The ponds were proposed to be dedicated to the Township and the Township changed their policy and did not accept them. They proposed creating two single-family dwelling lots and still have the detention pond on the residue lot. They would dedicate the pond to the Township.

Exeter Village continued

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that for clarification the Township did not change their policy. The pond was never constructed in accordance with the plans and the Ordinance. Our previous engineer sent letters to tell them how to fix the ponds so the Township could take them over. They ignored the letters and they were still deficient. Mr. Bensinger stated that they were unaware of that and asked for copies of the letters. Mr. Bittig asked where the access would be located? Mr. Bensinger stated that they were just off of the street. They could perhaps grade a driveway to access them. Mr. Schwartz asked if it was part of the original open space? Mr. Bensinger replied that the original plan stated open space/detention pond. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was part of the open space calculations. Mr. Bittig asked if they contacted DEP about the potential for wetlands? Mr. Bensinger replied that they had not, but they believed they were exempt.

Mr. Schwartz stated for the record, October 28, 1994 they tried to subdivide the lot and the Board of Supervisors rejected the subdivision. Mr. Schwartz read from the letter “the Board of Supervisors rule that the existing plan of record calls for open space area in conformity with Section 5.96 of the Exeter Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and that the proposed revision would violate those requirements”. Mr. Bensinger stated they would go back to their client. Mr. Schwartz stated that ten years ago the plan violated the Open Space requirements and he would not vote to subdivide under those conditions. Copies of the letters were given to Mr. Bensinger.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors reject the Exeter Village Revision to Open Space Final Plan because it violates SALDO Section 5.96: Recreation and Open Space Areas and Fees. We should also send the Board of Supervisors copies of the old correspondence to the developer. The Planning Commission opposed the plan because it violated the open space requirements, as it did ten years ago. The current two detention ponds have never been brought up to the Township standards. The developer had been told numerous times to correct that and was in default of the original plans. The motion carried unanimously.

**14. FOREST HILLS /SCI SERVICES MINOR SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD**

GVC reviewed the Forest Hills Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated December 1, 2004).

The Forest Hills plan previously received conditional approval but needed a waiver for plan size.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.214; plan size, and allow them to use 30 by 42 inches. The motion carried unanimously.

**15. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – HERMAN DEVELOPMENT** - Matt Davenport  
- Steve Williamson  
- Rick Longacre

Mr. Davenport stated that they were proposing to develop the corner of Perkiomen Ave and Neversink Road with a restaurant and a pad site, which were permitted uses. They had worked on a plan that would make the

Informal Discussion continued

grade work and have access to the property. Mr. Williamson stated that there would be a full access on Circle Drive and a right in and right out onto Neversink. Mr. Longacre stated that Ruby Tuesdays looked at the site as a favorable location. It was a high profile corner and they would be cleaning up the sumac and make it an asset to the Township. Mr. Littlehales stated that the site had geological and topographical problems. Mr. Longacre stated that they were aware of the topographical problem and they had some preliminary investigation concerning the rock located there. Mr. Bittig stated that the access onto Circle might be a problem for visibility. Mr. Davenport stated that they had done some grading studies and they planned to meet all the requirements of the Ordinance. Mr. Longacre stated that they found that a 9-ft parking space was what they favor. Mr. Bittig stated that 10 x 20 was required. Mr. Wilson stated that the entrance on Neversink should be designed so no one could try to do a left turn. Mrs. Geiger stated that she would love see more businesses coming into the Township but was concerned with traffic backing up to wait to make the left turn into Ruby Tuesdays. There was no left turn lane available at that light. Mr. Longacre stated that Neversink was a state road and when they apply for the HOP they would find out the requirements from Penn DOT for the traffic light. They did not want to put anyone in harms way. Mr. Wilson asked what was planned for the retail pad? Mr. Williamson replied that they talked to a national retailer and was not at liberty to say whom they were. They were a low volume retailer with 2400 sq. ft and would require 12 parking spaces.

**16. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – TOM DIBELLO**

Mr. Dibello was not present.

**17. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – CHIP LUTZ**

Mr. Lutz stated that they were in to talk about the lot across the street from the Municipal building. It was a 1.8-acre lot and they were potentially putting up a Wingate Hotel. Currently the zoning has a height requirement of 35-ft and the new zoning would have a 50-ft height restriction. When the new zoning was approved it would allow for a four-story structure instead of a three story. They had a sketch plan to look at but when they came back with a submission they would meet the parking requirements and other issues would be dealt with so they were in compliance. Their question was should they move forward with the 50-ft height and propose a plan with that? Should they propose a three story or four story building? Mr. Wilson asked if that was something we could waiver? Mr. Ruff replied that was in zoning, they would need a variance. Mr. Krafczek asked if 50-ft was what we were recommending. Mr. Ruff replied that was correct. Mr. Wilson stated that was a building that would need to be sprinklered. Mr. Ruff stated that even if the ordinance wasn't changed when they came in he did not see that they would have a problem getting a variance. They may want to look at submitting a plan with the four-story building. Mr. Wilson stated that the Commission would send a letter to the Zoning Hearing Board in favor of the building. Mr. Bittig asked what kind of time frame were they looking at? Mr. Lutz replied that they did not have one. Wingate Hotels was a franchise and they catered to the business traveler with high-speed internet access. Mr. Lutz stated they would like to have signage on the Turkey Hill sign along with the Medi-cap Pharmacy. Mr. Peifer stated they might want to check with the Building Code Official to see if a frame building was permitted as apposed to block.

Mr. Lutz stated that they were also there to discuss a property on Hearthstone Court. They were proposing a two-story structure with a financial institution on the lower level and office on the upper level. It was Lots 1

Chip Lutz informal continued

& 2 on a subdivision done years ago. There was a note on the plan that stated that as long as there were no more than 50% coverage on that lot the detention basin would take the runoff from Lots 1 & 2. Their concern was now that the zoning for the lots was Shopping Center Commercial it required a three-acre minimum and a 100-ft setback. With respect to the development when it was approved, it was a 50-ft setback. They would look for some relief because the lots were actually a total 1.8 between the two. They do have some steep slopes in the back of the lot. They desire a 50-ft setback as the plan was approved initially. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they had a good chance to receive relief because of the zoning change. They would need to apply for a variance. Mr. Schwartz stated they would apply for the variance and then we would discuss the application and make a recommendation to the Zoning Hearing Board who may grant relief.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they have an excellent hardship to present to the Zoning Hearing Board.

#### **18. KUBOVCSAK – APPEAL OF INCORRECT DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL**

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that initially Mr. Kubovcsak applied for two additional building permits and they were denied because the subdivision had not been approved. Mr. Kubovcsak went into the Courthouse and had new deeds filed and said that they had a subdivision. He then came in and reapplied for the building permits. When she denied them, the second time, he appealed to the Zoning Hearing Board. Our issue was that when Mr. Gardecki researched all the deeds in the courthouse from 1988 and they only show two per-parts. One for 34,707.83 sq-ft and the other for 1,813 sq-ft. Mr. Kubovcsak maintained that he wanted to go back to the 1942 subdivision that showed three lots. While he was working with the Planning Commission to get the subdivision approved on the other hand he was saying that he did not need to do that because he had the 1942 subdivision. At some point the three lots were merged into one parcel. The hearing with the Zoning Hearing Board was set for December 21<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Krafczek stated that at some point the County would bounce the deeds. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they didn't. She called the Courthouse and was told that if someone brings in something that looks official they record it. When they took that to mapping, that was when a flag goes up, but that did not happen. When Mr. Gardecki downloaded the latest information from the County, their new tax maps now reflect his deeds. She talked to Bill Kochan in mapping and asked him for guidance and was told that Township would need to prosecute.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Zoning Hearing Board take into consideration the basis for which the Zoning Officer rejected the building permit – that at some point a merger of the properties occurred. Brief deed research going back to 1988 indicated the merger of the three properties onto one deed. The Planning Commission further agreed with the Zoning Officers position that the 1943 subdivision cannot be given consideration because of the merger issue and in order to acknowledge three (3) properties formal subdivision was required. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **19. SET DATE FOR JANUARY 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

The Planning Commission agreed to set the date for the January 2005 meeting on Thursday, January 6<sup>th</sup>.

**20. PINEVIEW RIDGE – PRELIMINARY PLAN- Barrie Pease**

GVC reviewed the Pineview Ridge Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated December 3, 2004).

Mr. Peifer asked if progress had been made with the frontage issue? Mr. Pease replied yes, the deeds were filed doing a property exchange. Mr. Seitz asked Mr. Hoffert if an annexation would need to be done and was told that the problem occurred because of the meandering of Pineland road. Mr. Hoffert felt that an annexation did not need to be done. They could do a deed swap. They checked into the sewer easement and on a prior deed to their property there was an assessment of a per-foot charge for 663-ft of frontage to the sewer line on the property they owned. Mr. Reigles' office did not find any problem with getting an easement for the sewer to their property. Perry Street was supposed to be a dedicated street to the Township. Unfortunately it was never dedicated. Mr. Bittig stated that it reverted back to the property owner. There was a right-of-way located there. Mr. Peifer stated that the Sewer Authority had rights to access the area. Mr. Pease stated that with the site distance problem, Mr. Seitz figured on grading to get the additional site distance. They would put a note on the deed for Lot 1 to keep that area open.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to adjourn the December 7, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:00 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Lord - conditional use  
BOS: Szurgot - conditional use  
BOS: Rovaggi conditional use  
BOS: Weilacher – conditional use  
BOS: Dutch Colony Site – waiver & approval  
BOS: McGinnis/Beaver - waivers & approval  
BOS: Pauley Annexation - approval  
BOS: Exeter Village- open space – plan rejection  
BOS: Forest Hills – waiver & approval  
BOS: R. M. Palmer Warehouse 2004 – plan approval  
BOS: Crestwood South Lot 71 - access  
ZHB: Kubovcsak appeal