

**MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2004**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, February 3, 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

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the February 3, 2004 Planning Commission meeting with the addition of discussing the General NPDES Permit Application for Keystone Homes. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

- A. **EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – FINAL PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to accept the plan for review. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. **PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to accept the plan for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

4. KELLY – CONDITIONAL USE

Mrs. Kelly was proposing a home occupation to operate a dog and cat grooming business at 1201 Stonehenge Drive.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mrs. Kelly had met all the requirements to allow the conditional use in her home. Mr. Bittig asked if they had enough parking for the customers? Mrs. Kelly replied that they were planning on the customers dropping their pets off curbside for the appointments. Mr. Wilson asked if it would be all drop off? Mrs. Kelly replied yes, it would be all drop off. Mr. Littlehales asked how they would be disposing of the filtered water? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mrs. Kelly was looking for the conditional use and then they would apply for the plumbing permit and would add additional traps for that.

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

5. PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN

- Daniel Laudenslayer

GVC reviewed the Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 Revised Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated January 26, 2004).

Mr. Laudenslayer presented the Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 Revised Preliminary Plan located on the northeastern side of Schoffers Road opposite Pennsylvania Avenue. They wanted to review the items in the GVC letter that were in bold letters. They would do a Water Resource Study. Mr. Bittig asked if they were aware of Best Practices Management where they need to put the water back into the ground. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that with the NPDES permit they would be doing infiltration and would impact the wetlands as little as possible.

Mrs. Geiger asked about item #4 concerning the trees to remain? Mr. Laudenslayer replied that there was an error on the landscaping plan that used the same shading that was used for open space. They would correct the plans. Mr. Bittig stated that all trees that were 6 inches or greater needed to be delineated on the plan. Mr. Laudenslayer asked if that was by survey? Mr. Bittig replied yes. Mr. Laudenslayer stated they would do that.

Mrs. Geiger asked about item #5 concerning the floodplain, how did they plan on going around that? Mr. Laudenslayer stated that when they overlaid the plan the lines were not correct; they would have to fix that. The floodplain line that GVC was referencing was not actually studied so they would do a HEC study for that. Mr. Peifer stated they did not know if they would use the 50ft rule. They wondered where they got their calculations. Mr. Bittig stated that on that side of Schoffers Road it was an AE Zone.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that with item #7 for the slopes, they would provide conservation easements

Pathfinder Meadows continued

there. They would provide bearings and distances on the plan. Mr. Bittig stated that they had significant rises there. Mr. Laudenslayer stated they show some grading in there. Mr. Bittig stated that no grading would be allowed. Mr. Laudenslayer stated they would look into that.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that concerning item #25 for the streets and sidewalks, they did those items on the previous plan. Would they need to redo those? Mr. Peifer stated that the street, curb, sidewalk ordinance had changed since the last plan and would have to be revised to meet that ordinance. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they would get that and make the changes. Concerning items #26 & 27, they would provide that data on the next plan.

Mr. Bittig stated that they have a Traffic Study and Environmental Assessment Statement that was done two years ago and we would have to check to see if they were acceptable for today. One other thing was concerning the Fire Marshal's report; lot 18 does not meet the maximum allowable distance to the fire hydrant. Mr. Laudenslayer stated they discussed that the last time and would be making the necessary changes. Mr. Bittig stated they needed to have the head pressure for the fire hydrant at 45 PSI for fire fighting. If the water company could not provide that they would have a problem. Mr. Laudenslayer stated they would work on that. Mr. Bittig stated that on the plan they have 17 lots that were non-conforming with the width to depth ratio. Six were exempt because of the large lots. With the last plan the Township gave waivers for some of the lots, but there were too many non-conforming lots on the new plan. He would not recommend waivers on that many.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he wanted to bring up one issue he was concerned about. Was the plan being reviewed under the current or the old ordinance? Mr. Bittig stated that the plan before us was submitted on December 16, 2003. He asked the solicitor (Rob Levengood) for his opinion on January 5th and the solicitor stated since it was a new submittal it should be reviewed under the new ordinance. Mr. Peifer stated that the stormwater comments might change as far as release rates would go.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they would get together with Mr. Peifer on some of the issues. They have one question with the other side of the street; there was no room for a detention basin. They only have 1% going through the detention basin. They have a problem with a bypass. They would like to put in a 1% slope on the basin, not 2%. Mr. Peifer stated that might be different in the new ordinance, they would have to check that. Mr. Wilson asked how close the detention basin was to the 100-year flood plain? Mr. Laudenslayer stated it would be around 300-ft.

Mr. Wilson asked if there were any other comments?

Mr. Laudenslayer replied no and thanked the Planning Commission.

6. MILLER COMMERCIAL – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Pat Austin

GVC reviewed the Miller Commercial Subdivision Preliminary Plan (letter dated January 14, 2004).

Mr. Austin stated that they had new plans that should have been dropped off to the Township. They were informed that the township did not have the plans. Mr. Austin asked if they could address the new plans? Mr. Wilson stated that they could comment on the plan, but until we have a review on the new plan they could go no further. Mr. Austin stated that on comment #3 in the GVC review letter concerning an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan for the entire tract shall be submitted with the Preliminary Plan if it was anticipated the land disturbance and/or construction activities will begin under Preliminary Plan approval. They were not doing that so it would not be needed. Mr. Littlehales asked about the complete clear cutting on lot 1 and part of lot 2. When were they given permission to do that? Mr. Austin asked if that was done already? Mr. Littlehales stated yes and they had re-graded a large area. Mr. Austin stated that they had not been at the site in over two months and they had a note on the plan that no trees over 6 inches would be removed. Mr. Littlehales stated that they were already gone. Mr. Austin asked what they needed to do? Mr. Schwartz replied that if they removed trees and re-graded, then they would need to re-do the plan and explain what they would do to rectify the situation. Mr. Bittig stated that Mr. Miller should be prepared to come in to the Township and explain why they did the earth and tree removal without an E & S plan.

Mr. Austin stated that they would check into that and then re-do the plans.

7. BRICKEY SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD - Roger Fry

GVC reviewed the Hubert A. Brickey Subdivision Sketch Plan for Record (reference letter dated January 8, 2004).

Mr. Fry presented the Brickey Subdivision located on the north side of Rugby Road and east of Kinsey Hill Drive. The plan proposes the creation of two (2) new residential building lots and two (2) annexation parcels to adjoining properties and a residue tract containing an existing dwelling. Mr. Fry stated that in the GVC letter under zoning item #2 concerning the site distance for the shared driveway, there were trees and some brush located on a neighboring property. They contacted the neighbor and he would allow them to remove the brush to allow the proper site distance for the driveway. For item #4 concerning an Environmental Assessment Statement, they were requesting a waiver of that because the impact would be minimal. Concerning item #5 with the one annexation being an odd configuration, the property owners there were asking for that so they would have a buffer zone between them and the neighboring lot. Under Subdivision item #2 concerning who would be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed storm sewer facilities, they have added ownership and maintenance notes on the plan. Then item #11 for the grading for the shared driveway, to create a reasonable driveway slope for access to the proposed lots, it is impossible to grade slopes between the proposed driveway and the adjoining properties to the east at a 3:1 slope as required. The site plan showed 2:1 slopes. They were looking for a waiver of Section 5.517. Mr. Schwartz stated that they required that for stability. Mr. Fry stated they would provide calculations to show that the bank would be stable. Mrs. Geiger asked what would happen to the

Brickey Subdivision continued

stormwater runoff? Mr. Fry replied that they had a collection system with a catch basin and detention pond. The last item in the GVC letter was concerning the Water Resource Study being required. They were asking for a waiver for that requirement based on the limited impact of the proposed development. Mr. Bittig asked if it was public water and sewer? Mr. Fry replied public sewer and on-lot water. They have three waivers they were looking for.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.99, Water Resource Study for the Hubert A. Brickey Subdivision, due to the limited impact of the proposed development. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.517, the maximum slope utilized when grading the lots or streets along an adjoining tract of land not owned by the subdivider. The consultant must show calculations and prove the slopes would be stabilized. The motion failed to carry with all voting opposed. The Planning Commission agreed they would need to see the calculations from the consultant prior to waiving that requirement.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement for an Environmental Assessment Statement (SALDO Section 4.283 as defined in the Exeter Township Zoning Ordinance #500 Section 633) for the Hubert A. Brickey Subdivision, due to the fact they were proposing 2 lots on an 8 acre tract and would be preserving the natural environment. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Fry thanked the Planning Commission.

* J. D. Krafczek arrived at this time.

8. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – FINAL PLAN – Stephen Bensinger

GVC reviewed the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Final Plan (reference letter dated January 30, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that the first bold item in the GVC review letter was #17 on page 5 concerning the right-of-way. They had sent the agreement and the Township's Solicitor was reviewing it.

Mr. Bensinger stated that concerning item #20, they submitted the plan to the water company and they did receive a response. They were working with the water company trying to resolve the problem with water pressure. Mr. Bittig stated that they needed to have 45 PSI on the hydrants. They would need that to fight fires.

Mr. Bensinger asked what they should do with item #21 for the recreation fee in-lieu-of-land. Mr. Schwartz stated that was something they needed to check with the Board of Supervisors whether they would accept fee in-lieu-of-land.

Exeter Golf Club Estates continued

Mr. Bensinger stated that the next bolded item was on page 7, item #2 under Stormwater management. The Board of Supervisors did not grant the waiver allowing the increase in post-development. They had submitted a revised waiver request letter regarding the post-development discharges from drainage areas 3, 4, 5A, 5C and 7B. They believe the intent of the ordinance has been met and the pre- and post-development discharges from those watersheds would remain virtually the same. Mr. Schwartz stated that it sounded reasonable. Mr. Bittig stated that it would not increase the flow. Mr. Schwartz stated that if they decreased the flow too much they could harm someone's water supply. Mr. Peifer stated that the plan showed the roof water had been changed to discharge to the front of the properties. Mr. Bensinger stated that lot 38 was the only lot that did not discharge at the front because it sat below the line of the street.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive SALDO Appendix V.II. Post-Development Site Discharges for Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V in areas of no disturbance to the drainage system and the area of conservation easement, specifically areas 3, 4, 5A, 5C and 7B. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they brought in the Planning Module Approval letter from DEP, the PNDI letter, the letter from the post office and the letter from the Historical Commission. They also had a Stage one Environmental Site Assessment to give to the EAC. Mr. Schwartz stated he would take that to the EAC.

Public Comment

Peter Barbis, 91 Linree Ave, stated they were concerned with the amount of stormwater that ran down the hill in the back of their property. There was a tumbling waterfall in the back of 95 Linree and then it completely flooded the back of 99 Linree. They were concerned that it would turn into a lot of mud when the construction began. They had pictures they wanted to share with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission looked at the pictures and copied them for the file.

Mr. Bensinger stated that when construction began they would follow the E & S plan from the Conservation District and have silt fence constructed to take care of that problem. Mr. Peifer stated that the outfall was in the location of the old logging road that created the wetlands. Mr. Bensinger stated that the road would cut a lot of that water from running into their properties and there would be a detention pond in the rear that would also help. Mr. Bittig stated there was an existing wetland in that area.

Wendy Nguyen, 99 Linree Ave, stated that there was a retention basin on their property. They were concerned that the water from the retention basin on Phase V would run into their retention basin and cause an overflow. They already have an overflow into their yard from their retention basin. It always stays wet and was only six inches deep. When there was a heavy rain it backed up into their yard.

Mr. Bittig stated that it might not be better, but it would not be worse than it was today. Mr. Schwartz stated that wouldn't there be an opportunity to correct the problem. Mr. Bittig stated that the waiver they were looking for tonight was not in that area. They should see a reduction in the flow of water with the

Exeter Golf Club Estates continued

construction planned there. Mr. Schwartz stated that if there was a known problem they should try to correct it. Mr. Wilson stated that it might be a good idea to make the retention basin for Phase V larger to help the problem. Mr. Peifer stated it was drainage area six and they showed a significant decrease in stormwater flows there. Mr. Bensinger stated they would look into that. Mr. Peifer stated they might need to look at the outlet structure for the existing retention wetland to see if there was something wrong with it that it was not letting the water out like it should.

Cynthia Nesbitt, 87 Linree Ave, stated that they were located behind the high point for the development and were concerned that if they built behind them they would get more water. Currently the water ran between the two homes like a river down to 99 Linree Ave. It was an ongoing problem.

Mr. Bittig stated that the street that would be built up behind their property should make a reduction in the amount of water there. Mr. Bensinger agreed that with construction of the new intersection they should see less water there. They would check into their concerns.

Mr. Bensinger thanked the Planning Commission.

9. KUBOVCSAK SUBDIVISION - SKETCH PLAN - Curtis L. Frantz

GVC reviewed the Kubovcsak Subdivision Sketch Plan (reference letter dated January 7, 2004).

Mr. Frantz presented the Kubovcsak Subdivision located at the northeast corner of Butter Lane and Prospect Street. They brought a letter with waiver requests for the subdivision.

Mr. Frantz stated that they made changes based on comments in the GVC review letter. They previously requested a waiver for sidewalks. They had pictures to show the reason they were asking for that waiver. There was an existing storm sewer pipe with guardrails around it that would block the sidewalk and a culvert on the other side. The sidewalk would go nowhere. Mr. Schwartz asked if there were sidewalks in that area? Mr. Frantz replied there were sidewalks along Prospect Ave. Mr. Bittig stated there were sidewalks on the other side of the culvert and the storm sewer pipe.

Mr. Bittig asked if they delineated the floodplain on the plan? Mr. Frantz replied that they did and that GVC requested that a HEC study be done on the property and they haven't had the chance to do that.

Mr. Bittig asked if the tract was in the flood plain? Mr. Frantz replied that the back portion of the properties were in the flood plain. Mr. Bittig stated that the flood plain maps show the entire tract was in the flood plain. Mr. Frantz stated that they would do the study and delineate that.

Mr. Bittig asked what right-of-way were they showing on the plan? Mr. Frantz replied it was 27-ft on Butter Lane. Mr. Bittig stated that the ordinance requires a 30-ft right-of-way from the centerline, so they would need to show an additional 3-ft on the plan.

Kubovcsak Subdivision continued

Mr. Frantz stated they had a few more waiver requests written in the letter presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Wilson stated the Kubovcsak Subdivision was requesting waivers of Section 5.514, 5.558 and 6.214

Mr. Schwartz stated that they would first need to do the floodplain analysis to see if they would be able to place houses there. They would need to do that before we could grant any waivers.

Mr. Wilson stated we should consider the waiver for sidewalks now so they would know whether or not to include them the next time they bring in a plan. Mr. Bittig stated that although people need to walk around the bridge and the storm sewer pipe he felt that sidewalks would be needed for the subdivision. Mr. Schwartz stated that at a later date they could replace the bridge and add a sidewalk, so sidewalk should be added.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors deny a waiver of the requirement of SALDO Section 6.204 for the installation of sidewalks. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to table the other requested waivers until the Floodplain Study was completed. The motion carried unanimously.

10. HUFF/ENCHANTED ACRES – VARIANCE, SPECIAL EXCEPTION, APPEAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

Mr. Schwartz stated that we were looking for a recommendation from the Planning Commission concerning the variance, special exception and appeal petition of administrative decision. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they were previously granted a special exception for recreational uses at the Enchanted Acres Property. As specified in the certification of order the recreation uses were for outdoor activities. The property is located in the Rural Zone, which allows for outdoor recreation as a special exception. They now wanted to have parties in the barn, which would not constitute outdoor use. What they are proposing is a nice idea, but does not comply with the district or the certification of order. Neighbors had come in to speak against a commercial use in this area because they did not want a commercial use in their rural neighborhood. The Planning Commission reviewed the information available to them. Mr. Schwartz stated that we were supportive of the original intent to provide family oriented outdoor recreational uses on the site. Mr. Ruff stated that it would not be good to have commercial traffic on a property next to the volunteer fire company.

Huff/Enchanted Acres continued

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Zoning Hearing Board not grant relief for Huff/Enchanted Acres. The Planning Commission agreed with and fully supports the Zoning Officer's decision. The certification of order allows for outdoor recreational uses; not indoor. The motion carried with Mr. Ruff, Mr. Wilson, Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Krafczek voting in favor and Mr. Bittig abstaining. Mr. Bittig abstained due to the fact his wife had a legal issue with the Huffs', which had since been resolved.

11. ZONING WORKSHOP

The Planning Commission agreed to meet on Thursday, February 12, 2004 at 7:00pm for the next Zoning Workshop.

12. JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the Reading Country Club came in for a meeting to discuss the zoning change for their property. They did not want to become Conference/Institution; they preferred Highway Commercial or Shopping Center Commercial. The Township would not want to keep it in the MDR Zone and have all that housing added, we would prefer Highway Commercial. The Country Club had some ideas as to what should be added into the Highway Commercial Zone. The Planning Commission should decide if a time limit should be set for the ideas they would like to submit. Mr. Schwartz stated they should set a time limit, just let the Country Club know when it was needed.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that there were a lot of inconsistencies between our Zoning Map and the Joint Comprehensive Map. We would be meeting with Glen Neuhs on Wednesday, February 4th at 4:00pm to discuss this issue.

13. LEGAL REPRESENTATION AT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DURING FR&S /INGENCO DISCUSSIONS

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she and Craig Peifer feel it would be good to have legal representation sit with the Planning Commission for any scheduled discussions of the F R & S plan. There were a lot of issues binding the Township, such as the Host Community Agreement. Mr. Bittig stated that we would need someone who knows the "ins and outs" of the issues. Mrs. Geiger stated that we should also have the Environmental Council. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that we would need the approval of the Board of Supervisors because we cannot pass on the legal fees to the developer. Mr. Bittig stated that they also have the legal issue of the air quality permit from DEP. Mr. Wilson stated that it was the consensus of the board to have legal representation. There were other Townships that have a solicitor at their meetings.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to recommend the Board of Supervisors authorize legal representation for the Planning Commission when the F R & S/Ingenco plan was on the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

Legal Representation continued

Mr. Schwartz stated that he would let the EAC know about those issues and see if anyone would want to sit in on the meetings.

14. GENERAL NPDES PERMIT APPLICATION FOR KEYSTONE HOMES

The Planning Commission discussed the NPDES permit application for Keystone Homes and decided they had no comments concerning our Zoning Ordinance for the project.

15. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Bittig stated that he wanted to mention the memo concerning the proposed Wahl Subdivision.

Mr. Hoffert addressed the issue of natural subdivision, but did not address our other concerns.

Mr. Schwartz stated that we should send a letter to him asking him specific questions concerning the subdivision.

Mr. Bittig stated that we have a letter from the solicitor for the Karpati Subdivision. The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors were asking for a Highway Occupancy Permit issued by PennDOT. Their Solicitor felt it was not needed with a separately deeded parcel, but they were annexing a portion off of that parcel so it became a part of the subdivision. A Highway Occupancy Permit would be needed. Mr. Hoffert sent a letter to Mr. Bingaman asking for a meeting between Engineering and the solicitor for the Karpati Subdivision. They should address the issues needed to have the plans approved.

Mr. Bittig stated that there was an item on the unapproved subdivision list that was coming up on the 90-day limit, Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase VI. Ms. Cusimano stated that they would be receiving a time extension or a letter of withdrawal.

Mr. Wilson stated that the Planning Commission received two letters concerning the proposed townhouses on Rugby Road. We understand their concerns and would do what we could to help to alleviate their concerns.

Public Comment

Anthony Donato, Jr., 27 Longview Drive, stated that they were concerned with the amount of traffic that would be generated onto Shelbourne Road. They hadn't been to the previous meeting and would like some information on the proposed development. Mr. Wilson stated that last month they came in with an informal discussion. One of the issues we had was the number of units being placed in that area. The major issue was that the entrances to the property did not meet Township standards. That was the reason they had sent letters to adjoining properties to see if they wanted to sell. Our zoning at that location would allow townhouses. Mr. Bittig stated that they had to meet all the requirements to do that. They had the issue of steep slopes, along with the access to the property. Mr. Donato asked if the Township could buy that property and build a park there? Their children did not have any parks close by for them to play. Mr. Wilson stated that it was up to the Board of Supervisors. Every development

General Discussion continued

was required to designate open space for recreation or recreational fee-in-lieu of land. We have Trout Run, Pineland, Community Park, Lorane and Farming Ridge. We do have existing parks; they just might not be in your area. Mr. Bittig stated that the area on Rugby Road had the issue of steep slopes and might not be desirable for a park.

Tracy Scheirer, 26 Longview Drive, asked if there was any way they could be notified when that plan would be on the agenda? Mr. Wilson stated that they could check the Exeter Township website for the Planning Commission agenda the Friday before the meeting.

Thomas Gombar, 1 Longview Drive, asked what type of development they were talking about, similar to Laurel Springs or Wingspread and was there any mention to the infrastructure of the development? Mr. Schwartz replied that it would have to be public water and public sewer. Mr. Bittig stated they would need to do a water resource study. Mrs. Geiger stated they also needed to do a traffic study. Mr. Littlehales stated that they would have a hard time with the intersection being too close to an existing road across from them on Rugby Road. Mr. Gombar asked how close could they build the townhouse to a property line? Mr. Schwartz replied that it was 30-ft and the ordinance had a lot of restrictions on townhouses.

16. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to adjourn the February 3, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 9:50pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Susan Kelly Conditional Use
BOS: Request for Legal Representation
BOS: Hubert A. Brickey Subdivision Waiver Requests
BOS: Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Waiver Request
BOS: Kubovcsak Subdivision Waiver Request
ZHB: Huff/Enchanted Acres-Variance, Special Exception, Appeal Administrative Decision

