

**MINUTES**  
**EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 2004**

The rescheduled Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, January 8, 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. Littlehales, to approve the minutes of the December 2, 2003 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the agenda of the January 8, 2004 Planning Commission meeting with the addition of Reorganization. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

- A. **LIMEKILN HEIGHTS - SKETCH PLAN, WAHL SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD, BRICKEY PROPERTY – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD, ROYAL VIEW ESTATES – PRELIMINARY PLAN, PENN ADVERTISING – PRELIMINARY PLAN, KUBOVCSAK SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN, MEISTER SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to accept the preceding plans for review as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

- B. **PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN AND F R & S - PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN:** Did not have reviews and would be accepted by the Planning Commission at a later date.

The following business was discussed:

**4. REORGANIZATION**

The Planning Commission moved to appoint the following officers for the year 2004:

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to nominate Mr. Wilson as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2004. Mr. Schwartz moved to close the nominations. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to appoint Mr. Wilson as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2004. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to nominate Mr. Bittig as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2004. Mr. Littlehales moved to close the nominations. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to appoint Mr. Bittig as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for the 2004. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to nominate Mr. Ruff as Secretary of the Planning Commission for the year 2004. Mr. Littlehales moved to close the nominations. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to appoint Mr. Ruff as Secretary of the Planning Commission for the year 2004. The motion carried unanimously.

- 5. LIMEKILN HEIGHTS – SKETCH PLAN** - Andy Kent  
- Leon Burkhart

GVC reviewed the Limekiln Heights Sketch Plan (reference letter dated January 5, 2004).

Mr. Kent stated they have done a new design on the plan and would like to go over items listed in the GVC review letter and point out the changes in the plan and why they were done. On item #2 in the letter, Lot #4 was now 37 acres and they have a 200-ft setback. Would that be satisfactory? Mr. Peifer stated yes.

Limekiln Heights continued

Mr. Kent stated that with item #4 and the existing driveway for the dwelling on Lot 4 encroaching onto the eastern property corner of the adjacent Folk property, they checked that and they would move it over 5-ft and would not be on the neighbors property. Under Subdivision and Land Development item #1, that was a typo error and they would correct that on the plan. The next bold item #7 was concerning the proposed Curtis Drive, that the cartway should be centered within their right-of-way. They agreed with that. They would have a drainage easement next to Curtis Drive. Item #8 refers to the same thing and they were proposing to make it a private street. Mr. Wilson asked what was at the end of that street? Mr. Kent stated it was the Hetrich Farm. Mr. Wilson stated that they should plan on having that street available to extend into that area in case of future development. Mr. Kent replied that the Hetrick's have sold the development rights for that property. Mr. Peifer stated that the Houps have also sold the development rights for their property so there would be no further subdivision allowed in that area. They should place a note on the plan regarding the private street status and the conditions that would need to be met in order for the Township to take over the street in the future.

Mr. Wilson stated that his concern was with the site distance for the current driveway. Mr. Burkhart stated that the driveway was there forever. Mr. Wilson stated that with the changes on the plan they should address the issue. Mr. Bittig stated that there was ample view on that corner. Mr. Schwartz stated they should demonstrate the safety of the site distance. Mr. Kent stated they would check the clear site distance. Mr. Littlehales stated they come out in the middle of the curve so they can see in both directions quite clearly.

Mr. Kent stated that with item #9, it should be determined if the cartway width of 20-ft would be allowed by the Township. Mr. Schwartz stated that with a private street it was fine.

Mr. Kent stated that item #10 for curbing, in Section 6.203 it states that if you have 150-ft or more, curbing was not required. On item #11, they agreed that the site distance had to be adjusted. Item #15 for the radius of the cul-de-sac, they enlarged that. Item #16 for the drainage of the cul-de-sac, they turned the street to follow the contours and it would drain to the open land into a detention basin. On item #17 they would change the grading. Item #18 & #19 for Lots 1 & 4, with the changes they made and #4 being 37-acres it did not apply. The next item for discussion was item #25 for the easement being provided around the stream and both ponds, the width was to be determined by the Township. Mr. Bittig stated that in Zoning, Section 606.6 calls for a 12-ft buffer from the edge. Mr. Kent asked if that would be sufficient? Mr. Bittig stated that we would like more, but the current Zoning Ordinance calls for 12-ft. Mr. Kent stated that by the stream it should be 25-ft on each side. Mr. Bittig stated they could delineate that. Mr. Kent stated they understood doing a buffer by the stream, but what would the purpose be for the pond. Mr. Schwartz stated that the drainage easement and the buffer were for the purpose to preserve the unimpeded flow of drainage.

Limekiln Heights continued

Mr. Kent asked about item #34, whether it was more desirable to obtain recreational open space or pay the recreation impact fee? Mr. Schwartz stated that the Supervisors would determine that. Mr. Bittig stated that they have been taking the fee instead of open space.

Mr. Bittig stated there was one item missed on the GVC review letter, Section 4.280, they would need to establish permanent conservation easements on the steep slope areas. There were 25% slopes on some of the lots that would need to be delineated and marked as conservation easements. Mr. Kent stated they would do that. Would they need to put the meets and bounds on that? Mr. Peifer stated yes they should put them on the plan.

Mr. Kent thanked the Planning Commission.

**6. PALECEK COMMERCIAL OFFICE – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN - Greg Bogia**

GVC reviewed the Palecek Commercial Office Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan (reference letter dated January 5, 2004).

Mr. Bogia stated they had addressed the issues in the GVC review letter and they were looking for plan approval. Mr. Bittig asked if they had taken care of the legal issue with the Cross Access Agreement? Mr. Bogia stated they put the meets and bounds on the plan for the access easements. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she talked with Mrs. Palecek and let her know that they should offer a separate document to be reviewed by the Solicitor. Mr. Schwartz asked if they put the legal description for the easement on the plan? Mr. Bogia stated they have.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that for the sewer issue they haven't received a response but typically they would need to pay the EDU's at building permit stage.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Palecek Commercial Office Preliminary/Final Plan subject to preparation of a Cross Access Easement satisfactory to the Solicitor, submittal of the response letter from the Sewer Authority and the improvement agreement between the Township and the Paleceks' be acceptable. The Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bogia asked about getting the response letter from the Sewer Authority. Mrs. Franckowiak stated she would check on that.

Mr. Bogia thanked the Planning Commission.

**7. BURKHOLDER MINOR SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN**

- Stephen Bensinger

GVC reviewed the Burkholder Minor Subdivision Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated January 5, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that the GVC review letters did not have any items in bold but there were some items to be discussed. Under Zoning for the 20-foot wide landscaped buffer, they have added that along with the type of trees on the plan. Under Subdivision and Land Development it was requested that they check if there was any paperwork with the Township concerning the removal of the septic tank. They checked with the SEO and they could not find any paperwork for that. Their client did say that the Township did inspect it when it was removed. Monuments have been placed and lot corners have been set. They have the AutoCAD file. They have signed and sealed plans and were looking for final plan approval. The SEO had inspected the existing septic system and they have a letter from them requesting a Planning Waiver & Non-building Declaration. They brought the forms along with them and would like to have them signed. They have also placed a note on the plan that if the existing system fails they would connect to the public sewer system. The other item in the letter was that they plant the tree buffer prior to release of the Final Plan rather than the establishment of an escrow for the planting. Their client has contacted a landscaper to have them installed.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Burkholder Minor Subdivision Preliminary/Final Plan. They must plant the tree buffer area prior to releasing the plan. The motion carried unanimously.

**8. WAHL SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD** – Stephen Bensinger

GVC reviewed the Wahl Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated January 6, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger presented the Wahl Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record, which was located between Limekiln Road to the north and Hartman Road on the south and was east of Old State Road. Mr. Bensinger stated that the property consists of 32.8 acres. They propose to cut off a three-acre lot for a single-family residential home off of Hartman Road and to annex a lot of two acres to the person on the other side of the street, which were their sister and brother-in-law. The two-acre parcel was in Exeter Township and across the street it was Alsace Township. The GVC letter recommends getting an opinion from the Township Solicitor. Mr. Bittig stated he was concerned about the tax revenue switching to Lower Alsace.

Wahl Subdivision continued

Mr. Bittig stated that the 3-acre lot they were planning to subdivide has steep slopes located there. No structures were allowed to be built in steep slopes. Mr. Bensinger stated that they would do an E & S plan and they would show the proposed grading. They would meet the requirements of the SALDO. Mr. Bittig stated that the perks were on high ground and the well was low. Mr. Bensinger stated they would move the well.

Mrs. Geiger stated that the property was labeled Clean and Green. What were they planning to do about that? Mr. Bensinger stated they would pay the difference. Mr. Wilson stated that with Clean & Green, they were allowed to cut off three acres and with the annexation part it was only 2-acres. Mr. Bensinger stated that it would be annexed to another parcel; it cannot be sold as a building lot. The brother-in-law wanted that piece, but wasn't sure why. Mr. Ruff stated that it was called Finch Farm and they had pick-your-own strawberries planted there and across the street. Mr. Peifer stated that they contacted the Solicitor concerning the fact the annexation does not even touch the other person's property. Mr. Bensinger stated that by private deed their line goes down the center line of the road and the adjoiners goes down the centerline. Mr. Peifer stated that they would wait until they hear the opinion of the Solicitor. Mr. Schwartz stated that whenever there were issues with another Township because a property crosses a line they just become a headache for everyone involved. Why would we want to create one of those headaches? Mr. Peifer stated that in the future someone could come in and ask for a variance to build on it. Mr. Krafczek stated they could put a restriction there that they could not build on it. Mr. Bensinger stated that they would have a note placed on the plan that the 2-acre parcel was an annexation parcel and shall not be considered a separate building lot but shall be considered part of the parcel belonging to Donald and Fern Finch. Mr. Schwartz stated that they could do a 3-acre lot with a separate deed. Mr. Bensinger stated they were not aware of anything in the Ordinance that would prevent them from doing what they want to do. Mr. Wilson stated that it may be an annexation but he thought the 3-acre minimum would be needed due to being Clean and Green. Mr. Bittig stated yes, 3-acre and a separate parcel. Mr. Wilson asked why an annex instead of a separate deed? Mr. Bensinger stated he did not know the reason for that.

Mr. Bensinger stated that for item #12 concerning the wetlands could they place a note on the plan saying that the wetland delineation would be done prior to any earth moving activity. Mr. Bittig stated they needed to do a wetland delineation of the entire tract. Mr. Wilson stated he agreed.

Mr. Bensinger stated that for item #13, would an Environmental Assessment Statement be required? Mr. Bittig stated that it was a near vertical drop-off there. They were going to have a hard time trying to meet all the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Schwartz stated they would at least need to address the slopes.

Mr. Bensinger asked about item #18, should shoulders be required along Limekiln Road and Hartman Road? They were only proposing one residential lot. Mr. Ruff stated he would support a

Wahl Subdivision continued

waiver of that on Limekiln Road. Mr. Schwartz stated that on Limekiln it makes no sense at all. Mr. Ruff stated that on Hartman they would have to see what the driveway was like for the residential lot before making a decision there.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they had two items they wanted to discuss. For Item # 6, did they need to provide the contour lines over the entire tract? Mr. Bittig replied yes they did.

Mr. Bensinger asked about Item #21 for monuments and metal markers, would they need to be set on both streets? Mr. Bittig replied that they were cutting off of both sides, so yes they would.

Mr. Bensinger thanked the Planning Commission.

#### **9. BRICKEY SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD**

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

Mr. Brickey stated that the party that would be handling the plan was in the hospital and would not be there that evening. They did have some errors on the plan and would make the changes and submit the plans and return for another Planning Commission meeting.

#### **10. ROYAL VIEW ESTATES – PRELIMINARY PLAN** - C. Wesley Seitzinger

GVC reviewed the Royal View Estates Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated January 6, 2004).

Mr. Seitzinger stated that the first bold item on the GVC letter was under zoning item #2 for the Environmental Assessment Statement. Mr. Peifer stated that he couldn't find anything where that was addressed. Mr. Wilson stated that it was required. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would not be building anything in the steep slopes. Mr. Schwartz stated that they needed to do that for a previously discussed plan. It was required for the same reason. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would do that. Under Subdivision item #2, they would be joined with one common deed. It would be recorded within the next week. Mr. Peifer stated that they might want to point out the change they were making there on the plan. Mr. Seitzinger stated that they acquired lot #1 of the Himmelreich Subdivision, which now gives them access on Hartman Road. They would join the two properties with one common deed. There would then be 18 acres for that lot. For item #8, did they need to do an Environmental Assessment Statement? Mr. Schwartz replied that they do. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would also do a PNDI for the property and get a letter from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Concerning item # 9 for the existing cartway on Hartman Road,

Royal View Estates continued

currently it was 20-feet which was required for LDR district. Did they need to provide more? It was not required for the Himmelreich or the O'Brien Subdivisions. Would they need to provide shoulders there? Mrs. Geiger stated that it would be safer for pedestrians and people riding bikes if they provided shoulders. Mr. Schwartz asked what the right-of-way width was on Hartman? Mr. Seitzinger stated it was 54-feet. There were no speed limit signs on that road. Mr. Schwartz stated that it would be good to keep the cartway the same but to add the shoulders. With the additional traffic: trash haulers, mail, recycling, etc. they should add 2-foot shoulders. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would add the 2-foot shoulder on their side. They would like to dedicate the small piece on the other side of the road to the Township if they want additional right-of-way. Mr. Schwartz stated that they would need to take that up with the Supervisors. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would put the 2-foot shoulder on their side and would check with the Supervisors on the property for dedication or give it to the Wahl's. It did not do them any good.

Mr. Bittig stated that they have a building restriction line on the plan. Mr. Seitzinger stated that no building would be allowed beyond those lines. Mr. Bittig stated that they should place a permanent conservation easement to prevent building on steep slopes. They could find an example of that on the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would do whatever was needed. Mr. Bittig stated that GVC found several items missing for their Preliminary Plan submittal. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would address all other issues that were needed.

Mr. Wilson asked if they had the County review letter? Mr. Seitzinger stated they did. Mr. Wilson stated that they needed a written authorization from Met-Ed for disturbing the land. Mr. Seitzinger stated they would need that for the one driveway. Mr. Bittig asked if they received the letter from the Fire Marshal? Mr. Seitzinger stated they did and they read that they need to provide a cistern.

Mr. Seitzinger thanked the Planning Commission

**11. YEAKLEY SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAN** - Jana Eppihimer  
- Brian Boyer

GVC reviewed the Yeakley Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated January 5, 2004).

Ms. Eppihimer stated that they wanted to comment on the items in bold on the GVC letter. The first item in bold was under Zoning item #2 where it indicated that more than 20 percent of the existing woodland would be removed for the construction of improvements on lot 3 & 4. They could not get any percolation in the one area. They changed the lot lines of lot 3 and had to add a detention pond on lot 4. That was why they had to remove more trees. Mr. Schwartz stated they could not do that unless they wanted to go to the Zoning Hearing Board for a variance.

Yeakley Subdivision continued

Mr. Boyer stated that in the Ordinance it stated that they could remove trees for construction activity. Mr. Ruff replied yes, for construction of houses. Mr. Boyer stated that it did not specify what type of construction activity. The area they were looking at did not have any trees over 6" in size. It was not really a wooded area. Mr. Bittig stated if that was the case then they were covered. Mr. Boyer stated they have identified the trees over 6" on the plan. Mr. Schwartz asked if they were or were not removing over 20 percent of the woodland? Mr. Boyer replied that they couldn't remove more than 20% on residential lots; that was for the detention pond. That was part of the infrastructure of improvements. Mr. Schwartz asked what percent were they talking about? Mr. Boyer replied around 25%. If they took out the construction of the detention pond it would be less.

Ms. Eppihimer stated that with item #9 for the shared driveway, they were under the old SALDO. Mr. Bittig stated that under SALDO it states "Subdivisions shall be designed to minimize the number of driveway intersections with existing public roads. Wherever deemed feasible by the Township and required by the Township to minimize driveway intersections with existing Township roads thus reducing the interruptions to traffic flow and minimizing accident hazards and to minimize erosion, sedimentation and run-off problems onto existing public roads, subdivision shall be provided with internal streets on which proposed lots will front and to which the lots will have driveway access". That was the same for the old and the new SALDO. They discussed that at the March 13<sup>th</sup> meeting and felt that they needed internal streets for safety reasons. Mr. Boyer stated that in the GVC review letter the comment read "in order to use the 35-foot access width for Lots 3 and 4, it must be demonstrated that these lots cannot be further subdivided under the current zoning standards". At that meeting they were able to demonstrate that. They had come to the Board with a plan for seven lots but the Board nixed that, so they went with the four-lot subdivision and there was nothing prohibiting that by the standing of the old ordinance. Mr. Bittig stated that he wanted to read from the March minutes "Mr. Wilson stated that with the four-lot plan you need to design where there was a central road connecting all lots. Mr. Boyer stated they could probably make a design to do that. It looks as though the four-lot layout was basically acceptable other than the one common access drive for all four lots for safety reasons." Mr. Boyer stated that at one time they did not have a common access drive and that was what they were going with now. Mr. Schwartz stated that he did not see any frontage for lots 3 & 4. Mr. Peifer stated that they were flag lots. Mr. Boyer stated they would have common access agreements for the driveways. They would have agreements for shared maintenance. Mr. Schwartz asked what they were proposing to go out onto Schoffers Road. Mr. Boyer replied one driveway. Mr. Bittig asked if the stormwater wouldn't sheet off of the driveway toward the street? Mr. Boyer stated they had graded some of the property to take the stormwater to the back of the lot. Mr. Bittig stated that he had checked the current driveway and the rainwater migrates to the edge of the road and searches out the 8-inch pipe and jets underneath the street and heads out down the hill. Mr. Boyer stated they would re-grade and reduce the amount of water that would run

Yeakley Subdivision continued

through that pipe. Mr. Bittig stated that with the common drive they would have water sheeting along both sides of that driveway to the edge of the road. One side would have the pipe to release into, but where would the water from the other side go? Ms. Eppihimer stated there was a swale to take the water from the other side and into the detention pond. Mr. Peifer stated that they were also proposing to place all of the roof leaders to the rear of the property. Mr. Boyer stated that with a cul-de-sac they would have more impervious cover. They felt they were coming up with a better solution with the driveway and not have another street for the Township to take care of. Mr. Schwartz stated that they could have a problem five to ten years down the road where the people who live there would come into the Board to complain about the common driveway and would want to have a road. Mr. Boyer stated that it would be the same as the previous plan with the cul-de-sac. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was not the same. They had a three-lot subdivision and the cul-de-sac could be built to the Township standards. The Ordinance states that they can only have three lots on a private street to prevent situations like this. Mr. Boyer stated that in March they were told they should not have four driveways coming out onto Schoffers Road. Mr. Schwartz stated that we did not want the cul-de-sac or the four driveways and there were other alternatives that they were going to look at. Mr. Boyer read from the March minutes "Mr. Boyer states that it looks as though the four-lot layout is basically acceptable other than the one common access drive for all four lots for safety reasons". Mr. Schwartz stated that was still the showstopper. Mr. Boyer stated that they were at the standing point where they would have the attorneys figure out what to do. Mr. Schwartz stated that was not a legal issue. We told them what was acceptable and what was not acceptable. Mr. Boyer stated they would take it back to their client.

Mr. Boyer stated that the only other bold comment was under Stormwater item #5. Mr. Peifer stated that the ponding would place the water within 22-feet of the one of the homes. Mr. Boyer stated that they would have a lower pre-development number and that would then lower the post development numbers. That meant there would be less stormwater runoff.

Mr. Bittig stated that there was one other thing to discuss. For the street trees or shade trees, they modified the Street Ordinance, which includes a new tree species list. Mr. Schwartz stated they changed them to native trees.

**12. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – NOLAN GROUP FOR THE COHEN PROPERTIES**

- Brian Boyer

Mr. Boyer stated that they wanted to discuss the Cohen tract for the Nolan Group. The property was 22-acres in size with two small approximately 50-foot strips for access along Rugby Road and a private drive off of Shelbourne Road. The private drive from Shelbourne shows an area that might extend to Rugby Road. The access off of Shelbourne would be a possible emergency access. They were proposing a townhouse development and based on six units per acre they could

Informal Discussion continued

get up to 132 units. The layout was shown with 100 units. When they survey the slopes and trees that would determine what the number could be. Mr. Bittig asked what the size of the right-of-way strips on Rugby Road were? Mr. Boyer stated that they were between 50 to 60 feet. Mr. Bittig stated that 60 would be Ok. Mr. Boyer stated that the other issue they have was that the existing road on Rugby Road was close to the two strips. Mr. Schwartz asked what the ownership of the property between the two right-of-ways was? Mr. Boyer stated they were developed lots.

**Public Comment**

**Pat Vlasak**, 211 Rugby Road, asked how far apart could the two access roads be? Mr. Peifer replied 150-feet. They also have to take into consideration the one across the street. Mrs. Vlasak asked what could they do if the right-of-way was not large enough? They probably could not use the private drive. Mr. Boyer stated they needed to review the title report for the private access agreement. They may not be able to use the private drive. Another neighbor stated Penn DOT would not allow them to widen that private drive a few years ago. Ms. Vlasak stated that at one of those access points there was a creek that runs through that area and then under Rugby Road.

**Jerry Vlasak**, 211 Rugby Road, stated that the site distance on Rugby Road was bad in that area.

Neighbors who did not identify themselves raised other concerns. They were concerned with the overcrowding of schools. Would the development affect their well water? Mr. Boyer stated that they would need to do a Water Resource Study and they would need to recharge the groundwater. They could also do a well study test before and after the construction. The neighbors asked about the water runoff onto Shelbourne Road where recently there was a fatal accident, what did they propose to do to prevent more water runoff? Mr. Boyer replied that they would need to have swales and storm sewers. Mr. Peifer stated that the Ordinance would not allow stormwater runoff from the development. The neighbors asked about the increase in Traffic on Rugby and Shelbourne Road? Mr. Boyer stated they would need to do a Traffic Study. The neighbors asked if they could they have access to the plans? Mr. Boyer stated that they have not submitted a formal plan. This was an informal discussion. When a formal plan was submitted they would be able to have access to that at the Township. The neighbors then asked what the size of the townhouses were? Mr. Boyer replied they were approximately 20-ft wide, 50-ft deep and 2,000 sq. ft. with 1 or 2 car garage. They would cost approximately \$130,000 to \$150,000.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the access onto Rugby Road would make or break that development. They have three roads intersecting within a short distance and the Ordinance does not permit that. They may be wasting their time. Mr. Boyer stated that they knew that was one of the issues. Mr. Ruff stated that if one of the accesses were not 60-feet wide they would not get a waiver for that.

Informal Discussion continued

A neighbor asked about the letter they received from the Nolan Group looking to purchase their property, what were they looking for? Mr. Boyer stated that they were looking to see if anyone was interested in selling property surrounding that area.

Mrs. Geiger stated that a big issue would be all the traffic from the development onto Rugby, then onto Shelbourne Road. Mr. Boyer stated that was what the traffic study was for.

Mr. Krafczek stated it appeared they were trying to put a lot into a small space. Mr. Boyer stated they were following what was allowed in that zone according to the Zoning Ordinance. They met the open space requirement.

Mr. Wilson stated that they had to address the access, the slopes and traffic. Everyone at the meeting needed to realize that this was happening all over the Township. Anyone who had a few acres, they want to develop it. Mr. Schwartz stated that the property was zoned that way, town homes were permitted and we must provide a mix of housing types so that anyone who wants to live in Exeter Township could do so.

**13. PENN ADVERTISING – PRELIMINARY PLAN** - Craig M. Bonenberger  
- Todd Fiucci

GVC reviewed the Penn Advertising Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated January 7, 2004).

Mr. Bonenberger presented the Penn Advertising Preliminary Plan located on East Neversink Road. They were proposing the creation of one additional lot. Mr. Bonenberger stated they would comply with the items listed in the GVC review letter. The frontage was on East Neversink Road. They plan to subdivide to make one additional lot. They were not proposing land development just the subdivision. They planned to develop the site as an office, which was an allowable use for that zone. They would have an access, utility and stormwater easement in the front of the property. They presented a letter with a note they were proposing to add to the plan that they could not develop lot #2 until they had an approved Land Development Plan. Rather than ask for waivers and deferrals they wanted to put that on the plan. Mr. Ruff stated they have done that for other plans.

Mr. Bonenberger stated that they would show the driveway on the plan for construction purposes and it would meet the requirements for grading. Mr. Wilson asked if they would face the building to the By-Pass? Mr. Bonenberger stated they did not know what was planned for now. Mr. Wilson stated the reason he asked was that the Boscovs' warehouse did not look bad until they started to park trucks there. They would like to see the front of the office face the By-Pass. They could address that during the Land Development. Mr. Fiucci stated that it was in the concept stage now, but they were looking at a glass and stone building.

Penn Advertising continued

Mr. Peifer stated that the driveway access shows it leaving their site. Mr. Bonenberger stated that was correct, they had an existing easement there. Mr. Peifer asked if there were any conditions on that easement that would prohibit them from doing the plan. Mr. Bonenberger stated that they would check that.

Mr. Bonenberger stated that the last item # 16 concerning curb and sidewalk and also item #17 concerning shoulders. There was a drop off on the side of the road there that would make those items next to impossible to accomplish.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 6.203 for the installation of curbing and Section 6.204 for the installation of sidewalks along East Neversink Road for the Penn Advertising Subdivision. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.239 for shoulders due to the infeasibility to do so, for the Penn Advertising Subdivision. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bonenberger stated that the only other item was under Zoning #1 concerning an area of 0.238 acres. When they put in the ramp off of the by-pass, it cut that parcel off of the rest of the property. They were proposing to leave it as it was. Mr. Schwartz stated that eventually Penn DOT might just take it. Mr. Bonenberger stated that with item #2 they would add the note to the plan, they were not planning an electric power plant. That pretty much covers what they needed to discuss. They would make changes on the plan and come back next month.

Mr. Bittig stated that they should check with Cheryl on the verbiage needed for the plan for a conservation easement for the steep slope areas. Mr. Bonenberger stated they would and thanked the Planning Commission.

**14. PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAN**

- Jamal Abodalo
- Daniel  
Laudenslayer

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they did not have a review letter, but they wanted to explain why they needed to return with a revised Preliminary Plan. The Army Corp of Engineers checked the wetland disturbance and they basically did not like the plan. They needed to decrease the

Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 continued

environmental impact to meet the Army Corps requirements and they also needed something that would meet the Ordinance. Their goal was to minimize wetland impact. They would place a buffer between the wetlands. They eliminated a lot of the flag lots and added a cul-de-sac. Their impact was over 2.5 acres and they decreased it to around 1.5 acres. They narrowed the roads in the wetland crossing. Mr. Ruff stated that they could not make the crossing narrower than the roadway that approaches it. We know that DEP wants that but it was a Penn DOT “no-no”. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that was why they came in to get the opinion of the Board. Could they have sidewalk on one side? Mr. Wilson asked if they meant on the bridge? Mr. Laudenslayer replied yes. Mr. Schwartz stated they really didn’t have a lot of houses located there, so it shouldn’t be a problem.

Mr. Laudenslayer asked about the buffer between the wetlands, could they offer that to the Township for open space or to the Home Owners Association? Mr. Peifer stated that typically it would be taken care of by the Home Owners Association. The Township does not take dedication of ponds.

Mr. Wilson asked if they would build the wall by the Gun Club? Mr. Laudenslayer stated yes, they would annex that property to the Gun Club.

Mrs. Geiger asked how many homes would be built there? Mr. Laudenslayer stated 90, around the same number as the previous plan.

Mr. Peifer asked if they would widen Schoffers Road? Mr. Abodalo stated yes and the Township was completing the application for that but they would do the work. They also contacted the utility companies so they can relocate those.

Mr. Laudenslayer asked if they should show the meets and bounds on the Plan? Mr. Peifer replied yes.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated they did not want to take up anymore time and thanked the Planning Commission.

**15. KUBOVCSAK SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN**

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

No one was present to represent the plan so it was not discussed.

**16. MEISTER SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Dave Meister**

GVC reviewed the Meister Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated January 7, 2004).

Mr. Meister presented the Meister Subdivision Preliminary Plan, which was located on Oley Turnpike Road and proposed one new residential lot and an annexation parcel. There was a change they needed to make on the plan with the lot size and they would do that on the next plan they submit. They were annexing some land from their Mothers property to his lot and his Brother Bill would get the new lot. That way they could sell their Mothers house and not have someone build between them. Mr. Meister stated there was one item in bold in the review letter for an Environmental Assessment Statement. Would they need that?

**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). The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.285, determining whether the site contains any habitats of threatened and endangered species of special concern in Pennsylvania. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.286, determining whether any historical and archaeological resources exist on the site. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bittig asked about comment #9 for the Planning Module. Mr. Peifer stated they needed to get a Planning Waiver for the new lot from the Sewer Authority.

Mr. Meister thanked the Planning Commission.

**17. REVIEW SUBDIVISION & LAND DEVELOPMENT SUBMISSION CHECKLIST**

The Planning Commission reviewed the checklist forms and made corrections.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Ruff to adopt the forms as the Official Subdivision and Land Development Submission Application Checklist. The motion carried unanimously.

**18. AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF DOCUMENT FOR DEP PLANNING WAIVER & NON-BUILDING DECLARATION FOR THE KARPATI SUBDIVISION**

Three copies of DEP request for Planning Waiver & Non-building declaration forms were sent to the Township to be signed and dated by the Township Manager and the Planning Commission and be returned to DEP.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to sign the documents for DEP Planning Waiver and Non-building Declaration for the Karpati Subdivision. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ruff signed and dated the forms and they would be sent back to DEP.

**19. ZONING WORKSHOP**

The Planning Commission agreed to meet on Thursday, January 22, 2004 at 7:00 pm for the next Zoning Workshop.

**20. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mrs. Franckowiak asked if there were three or fewer Planning Commission members who would be willing to meet with the Reading Country Club to discuss the Zoning changes for their property. Mr. Bittig, Mr. Wilson and Mrs. Geiger agreed to meet with them on January 15, 2004 at 4:30pm.

Mr. Wilson stated that we received a letter from Robert R. Miller of Bursich Associates Inc. concerning the annexation of 1-acre of land previously subdivided and entitled Beaver Subdivision. There was a note on the subdivision plan which stated "Further subdivision from a tract approved under this section will require plans prepared in full accordance with the Major Subdivision procedures of the Land Subdivision Development Ordinance in effect at that time". Mr. Miller wrote, "There will be no improvements to this annexed parcel, therefore, the majority of the requirements under Major Subdivision seem unnecessary".

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the plans must be prepared in full accordance with Major Subdivision Procedures.

Mr. Wilson reminded the Planning Commission members of the date of the next Planning Commission meeting which would be held on February 3, 2004 at 7:30pm.

Planning Commission minutes  
January 8, 2004  
Page 17 of 17

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to adjourn the January 8, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:07 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Palecek Commercial Office Preliminary/Final Plan approval  
BOS: Burkholder Minor Subdivision Preliminary/Final Plan approval  
BOS: Penn Advertising Subdivision waiver requests  
BOS: Meister Subdivision waiver requests