

**MINUTES  
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JULY 6, 2004**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, July 6, 2004 at the Township Hall, 4975 DeMoss Road, Berks County, Pennsylvania. Donald R. Wilson, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30p.m. followed by the Pledge to the Flag.

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

**ABSENT:** John W. Bittig, Vice Chairman

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

**1. MINUTES**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2004 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 July 6, 2004 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

- A. **EXETER CAR CARE II – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN, FAIRVIEW PARK II – PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to accept the preceding plans for review.  
The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

**4. ZOOK -CONDITIONAL USE**

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mr. Zook wanted to have a construction business office located in his home at 8 E. 34<sup>th</sup> St. Some of the neighbors concerns were the storage of equipment outside of a residential property. Since he has lived there the neighbors claim that they have had outdoor construction equipment. We could handle that under enforcement. Mrs. Geiger stated that they were valid concerns. Mr. Ruff asked about the percent of floor

Zook Conditional Use continued

area to be utilized, they have it listed as 100%, was that correct? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that was a mistake and would be corrected. Mr. Littlehales stated that it was alleged that they were putting an addition on their home without a building permit. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that was correct. When they came in to apply for the permit and asked what other permits were needed because they did construction on the side, we asked him to go through the conditional use proceedings. Mr. Wilson asked if they obtained the necessary permits? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that they filed the application and were waiting for approval.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Mr. Zook subject to obtaining the necessary permits as well as meeting the concerns of the neighbors regarding outdoor storage of building materials and related equipment. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. HUBERT A. BRICKEY PROPERTY – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD – Matt Brennan**

GVC reviewed the Hubert A. Brickey Property Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated June 30, 2004).

Mr. Brennan asked if they could get conditional approval for their plan. They needed the approval letter from the Berks County Conservation District and the improvements agreement with the Township.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend conditional approval to the Board of Supervisors for the Hubert A. Brickey Property Sketch Plan of Record subject to meeting all five comments listed under Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and the one comment under Stormwater Management in the June 30, 2004 GVC review letter. The motion carried unanimously.

**6. R. M. PALMER WAREHOUSE 2004 – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Barry Weaver**

GVC reviewed the R.M. Palmer Warehouse 2004 Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 2, 2004).

Mr. Weaver stated that the environmental reports have been submitted. In the review letter under Zoning, the issue of the ultimate right-of-way had been adjusted. Under Subdivision and Land Development item #1 & #2 those issues would be taken care of. The Traffic Study would be revised and submitted next week. They were waiting for the endangered species report.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the Historical and Archeological report, which stated that there was a high probability that something may exist there, what do they do about that? Mr. Peifer stated that they can go ahead with the project but if they find something during the course of excavation, it was their responsibility to call.

Mr. Weaver stated that the planning module had been approved. The Water Resource Study was attached. The right-of-way of Dennis Drive has been taken care of. Item #8 for the depressed curb had been removed. Mr. Herb had signed the planning module and they were waiting for the letter from the authority. They were also waiting for the letter of serviceability from the water company. The street monuments were noted on the new plan. Under Stormwater Management, item #2 for the detention pond, there were two elevations that were in error and they have been corrected.

R. M. Palmer continued

They would submit the improvements agreement. They were waiting for the E & S approval, the water company letter, the letter from the Sewer Authority and the Traffic Study.

Mr. Littlehales stated that the lighting showed type 4 forward distribution. That was inappropriate for the lights located along the roadway, they should be type 3.

Mr. Weaver stated that they would return next month with a Preliminary/Final Plan.

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

GVC reviewed the Royal View Estates Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 1, 2004).

Mr. Seitzinger stated that they had the review letter from Great Valley and there were just a few items of concern. One was the two-foot shoulder and that they should be built to PennDOT specs. They received a letter from Mr. Peifer that showed the specs for a four-foot shoulder. Mr. Peifer stated that they want them to use the specs of the four-foot for the two-foot shoulder; we did not have the detail for a two-foot shoulder.

Mr. Seitzinger stated that they have E & S approval from the Berks County Conservation District. The small strip of land that was on the other side of Hartman Road, that was either to be dedicated to the Township for right-of-way or annexed to the Wahl property. No agreement had been reached. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she would ask Clarence Hamm if they would want to take that piece of land for the right-of-way and let them know.

Mr. Seitzinger stated that item #2 under Subdivision and Land Development concerned the driveway locations. There was no speed limit posted for Hartman Road and the letter states a default speed of 55 mph. There was no way someone could travel safely on that road at 55 mph and no driveway would be permitted if the speed limit were 55 mph. They wanted to go to the Board of Supervisors and ask for the police to do a study and have the speed limit posted at 30 mph. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that there was a number of streets in the Township that are not posted and have studies done and limits posted. Mr. Peifer stated that the speed limit gets set at the 85 percentile of the travel speed that was done on the road at that time. There was a chance it could be higher than 30 mph. Mr. Seitzinger stated that then they would have to change the location of the driveways. Mr. Leazier asked how the driveways could have been approved for the Himmelreich subdivision? All they were asking for was the same consideration that the Himmelreich Subdivision got. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was under the current ordinance. Mr. Seitzinger stated that driveways were not changed. Mrs. Franckowiak stated we could check that out.

Mr. Seitzinger stated that they were cleaning up the area of debris located on the property. Mr. Leazier stated that they inherited that with the land. There were no batteries found there. They found sewing boxes, tires, etc. there. There were snakes located there and they do not live in hazardous soil. It would be cleaned up. They left it open in case someone from the Township would like to come out and look at it. Mr. Peifer stated that when it was cleaned up, we just ask for a letter to be sent in from the consultant that did the assessment statement, stating that it had been cleaned up.

Royal View Estates continued

Mr. Seitzinger asked if they could come back with a Preliminary/Final Plan? Mr. Ruff stated that we have no problem with that. The Planning Commission agreed.

**8. GIESSUEBEL SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN – David Giessuebel**

GVC reviewed the Giessuebel Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 1, 2004).

Mr. Giessuebel stated that they received the Berks County Conservation District approval for the GP7 wetland crossing. Item #2 under Zoning Ordinance, for straightening out the lines with the water company property so they would have the entire frontage along Butter Lane, they contacted Doug Dearment in May and were told that the water company no longer owned the property or may have sold a portion of it.

Mr. Radar contacted the Court of Records and they showed that it was still owned by the water company. Would that hold up the subdivision? Mr. Peifer replied that it depended on how the Planning Commission felt. Mr. Wilson asked if it affected the build ability of the lots? Mr. Peifer stated that it was not a problem.

Mr. Schwartz stated that they could keep pursuing it, but it would not hold up the plan. Mr. Giessuebel stated that they would do that. Item #3 concerned the residue lot driveway, the driveway would be paved. For Item #4 for the Environmental Assessment Statement, they were asking for a waiver. Mr. Peifer stated that they should also submit a written waiver request for that.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.283 for an Environmental Assessment Statement, due to the fact that only one residential unit was being proposed for construction, there was an existing driveway staying and there was a large area with a permanent conservation easement and wetland area that would not be disturbed. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Giessuebel stated that under Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance item #2, they showed that on the plan. Mr. Peifer stated that the FEMA map showed a floodway and that should be shown on the plan. They should match the FEMA map. Mr. Giessuebel stated that with item #4, Lot 1 does not have any trees over 6". The lot just had scrub trees there. For item #5, they received the approval for the GP7. Mr. Peifer asked if they would send along a copy. Mr. Giessuebel stated that in areas showing slopes of 25% or greater they show that. Mr. Peifer stated that they should graphically show the slopes on the plan. Mr. Wilson asked if all the slopes of 25% or greater were already shown in the conservation easement? Mr. Giessuebel replied yes. Mr. Schwartz stated that they had a comment from Mr. Bittig. His recommendation was to add the area on the side of the driveway at the 600-ft. contour. Mr. Giessuebel stated they would not build anything there. Mr. Ruff asked that they show a permanent conservation easement there. Mr. Giessuebel stated they would. With item #7 for the wetlands, do they need to do a new delineation? Mr. Peifer stated that it was done with the previous subdivision plan. Mr. Schwartz stated that there would be no benefit to do that. Mr. Ruff stated that would be good enough.

Mr. Giessuebel stated that they had a written waiver request for Section 6.218, posting the area along the conservation easement. Mr. Ruff stated that they should put a note on the plan to add the signage to lot #1 prior to construction.

Giessuebel Subdivision continued

Mr. Giessuebel stated that they were looking for a waiver of Section 5.99, the Water Resource Study.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.99 for the Water Resource Study. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Giessuebel stated that for the Planning Module, they contacted the Sewer Authority and they had no problem with tying in the second house. Mr. Peifer stated that an official form needed to be sent into DEP. Mr. Giessuebel stated they would show the 10-ft easement from the bank of the stream on the next plan. They were looking for a waiver for shoulders and curbing along Butter Lane because they would need to cross the stream and wetlands in order to do that.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.238 & 5.239 to add shoulders and curbing along Butter Lane. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Giessuebel stated that they would pay the Recreational Impact Fees. With the Stormwater Management Report, they were looking for a waiver for that. Mr. Peifer stated that the biggest concern was with the driveway for Lot #1 and stormwater coming down onto the street and causing washout. Mr. Giessuebel stated that the driveway was flat with no elevations and any water runoff would go into the stream and wetlands. The second driveway already has the E & S plan approval.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.80 and appendix 5 due to the limited amount of impervious area being added and the fact that the topography does not lend itself to stormwater retention on site, except in the wetlands which was proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Giessuebel stated that item #16 would be fixed and the proposed grading for the driveway on Lot #1 would be shown. With the connection for the sewer what needed to be done for that? Mr. Peifer stated they should contact the authority to find out where they should connect. And they should also show the restoration details for the street.

Mr. Giessuebel asked if they could come back with a Preliminary/Final Plan? The Planning Commission agreed they could do that.

**9. EXETER CAR CARE II – PRELIMINARY/ FINAL PLAN** - Brian Boyer  
- James Smith

GVC reviewed the Exeter Car Care II Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated June 29, 2004).

Mr. Boyer stated they were changing the size of the building to less than 5,000 sq-ft to meet the requirements. Mr. Wilson stated that he wanted to comment that he was concerned with them circumventing the intent of the sprinkler system by downsizing the building. His concern was having the repair facility near residential properties. Mr. Smith stated that it would have cost an additional \$40,000 for the system and since it was close in size that was why they dropped it down.

Exeter Car Care II continued

Mr. Boyer stated that they could not find out the ownership of the storm sewer system and easement. They show the required easement on the plan. For the drainage easement for the proposed facilities, it starts at 422 and runs through to Lot 2, the GVC letter stated they would like to have it run up to Hafer Road. What should they do? Mr. Ruff replied that they should just show it up to Hafer Road giving the Township access to it.

Mr. Boyer stated that there was an existing septic system and no sewer lateral on 422, but the sewer bills reflect two connections. They wanted to provide a sanitary easement and connect to the existing lateral. They were waiting for an answer from Harold Boone, to see if they could connect both to the same lateral. However calls to Mr. Boone could only be made from 8am to 10am and they were still waiting for an answer. They would add a grinder pump. The Board of Supervisors deferred the requirement for curbs and sidewalks. Did they need to show the curb and sidewalks on the plan? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they just needed the note on the plan that they were deferred until such time the Township requires that.

Mr. Boyer stated that the monuments have been set. They would fix the wording and the elevations. They were looking for conditional approval.

### **Public Comment**

**Erich J. Schock**, Fitzpatrick, Lenz & Bubba, P.C., stated that he met with Jon & Amy Lavender, 4950 Hafer Road concerning the project. At the last meeting for Exeter Car Care II, there was a lengthy discussion concerning the Traffic Impact Study. The Lavenders were concerned about the number of trips for the repair garage, which was set at about 20 cars per day. If no traffic study was done now, they were concerned that future traffic could be higher. They understand that a commercial use was permitted there. They wanted it to be brought to the Planning Commission attention that they were concerned with the amount of traffic that may come out onto Hafer Road. Mr. Littlehales stated that the kind of repair work to be done there would not warrant a lot of traffic. The building was being reduced in size and they would not have the capacity to produce the kind of traffic that they were concerned with. Mr. Peifer stated that at the time of the discussion they had a Sketch Plan that showed additional retail on the front lot. It had been changed since then to have the front lot remain the same. Mr. Boyer stated that it had previously shown traffic coming in from Rt. 422. Now there would be no access from Rt. 422 to the proposed garage. Mr. Smith stated that initially they showed an entrance off of Rt. 422 and that was what had triggered the need for the traffic study, but that had since been changed. Mr. Boyer stated that they had requested a deferral of a traffic study until such time that the second lot would be developed. Now that lot would not be developed. Mr. Wilson stated that Wawa & Eastwick generate a lot of traffic onto Hafer Road. Mr. Krafczek stated that based on the current proposed use, the amount of trips would be so minimal that it would be a burden on the developer to go through the expense for a traffic study. He understood their point if they would change the use. Mr. Smith stated that it would be an 8-bay service station. It would not be a "Jiffy Lube" type of business with a lot of cars in and out. For a "Jiffy Lube" business they need to have pits built underground for that. Our building design does not have open pits. We would be a repair business only. They could not drive through the building. It would be myself and three other employees there. All the oil changes would be done at the other location. All repairs would be done under roof. Mr. Boyer quoted "waiver of requiring a traffic impact study for the proposed repair garage use. A traffic impact study will be required for any future development of the site" was noted on the plan.

Exeter Car Care II continued

**Thomas Howell**, Hafer Road, asked if the monuments were set at the 60-ft right-of-way? Mr. Wilson stated that they had not been out to check that. Mr. Howell asked if once the plan was approved would all the properties along Hafer Road have a 30-ft right-of-way? Mr. Peifer replied no, only that property. Mr. Wilson stated that the other properties would not change until such time they would come in for development.

Mr. Boyer asked for conditional approval of the plan.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to recommend conditional approval to the Board of Supervisors for the Exeter Car Care II Preliminary/Final Plan subject to meeting the conditions listed in the June 29, 2004 GVC letter, item's #5: drainage easement, #6: resolution of the sewer lateral, #8: showing the approximate location of curb and sidewalk, correct drafting areas on # 10, #11, #12, #13: providing prints and #14: providing the improvements agreement. The motion carried with Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Krafczek, Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ruff voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

#### **10. FAIRVIEW PARK II SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Stephen Bensinger**

GVC reviewed the Fairview Park II Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 2, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that they were proposing a 56 single-family residential subdivision located off of Fairview Chapel Road. It was partially in the SR1 and partially in SR2 Zoning Districts. For Item #6 under Zoning they would demonstrate that. For item #12, they followed boundary of the previously approved and recorded subdivision plan. Mr. Peifer stated that the line did not show on the tax map. Mr. Bensinger stated they would plot and deed that area.

#### **Public Comment**

**Charles Douglas**, 370 Fairview Chapel Road, asked about the size of the right-of-way to the development. On the plan it showed the right-of-way becoming wider beyond his property, indicating they would need more road. How could they have traffic moving on a 35-ft. width road? Mr. Peifer replied that was one of the comments in the review letter. Mr. Douglas asked if they were allowed to have one way in and one way out? Mr. Peifer replied that was also one of their comments. Mr. Douglas stated he was concerned with the traffic driving next to his property. They could purchase his property to make a larger right-of-way. Mr. Douglas asked if they were planning on building low-income housing? Mr. Bensinger replied no, they would be building nice homes there.

**Paul Pessagno**, 340 Fairview Chapel Road, stated that he was concerned with water runoff onto his property. Mr. Bensinger stated that they would not increase runoff onto his property; they would be putting in a detention pond. They would meet the requirements of the SALDO. Mr. Pessagno asked if the stub road would be put in place with radius and macadam? Mr. Schwartz replied that typically they did require that. Would you like to see the stub street located there? Mr. Pessagno replied yes, he would. He was also concerned about endangered species, he believed there were bog turtles located there. Another concern was water quality. He also had 14 pages of comments about the subdivision, could he present that? Mr. Wilson replied that he could submit his concerns in a letter and bring it into the Engineering Department to be

Fairview Park II continued

forwarded to the Planning Commission.

**Lillian Kent**, 310 Fairview Chapel Road, stated that she owned three acres along Fairview Chapel Road and was concerned about the two homes being placed to her north. The land located there was wet even in the drought, because there were springs located there. She felt sorry for anyone who would live in those homes. Mr. Schwartz stated that they might have some of the lots restricted so they would have no basements. Mr. Wilson stated that we were also concerned with driveway locations on Fairview Chapel Road.

Mr. Bensinger stated for comment #13, they would add the conservation easement to the steep slope area. With item #15 for Philip Ave, they were proposing Philip Ave to be extended into a cul-de-sac, which would have 10 dwellings on it. They were not sure if it was dedicated. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she would verify that. Mr. Bensinger asked if it were, what issue does that raise? Mr. Peifer stated that if it were not, that would be a bigger issue. Mr. Bensinger asked if they could get a right-of-way from the property owners, would that satisfy the Township? Mr. Peifer stated that if it were private, they would need to get signatures from the people who own the right-of-way to allow them to do the extension. Mr. Bensinger stated they would check that. The original plan called for the road to come from Fairview Chapel Road all the way back to Philip Ave. and Alice Drive, however, they chose to put in the cul-de-sac because there were two very large drainage ditches located there. DEP now tried to discourage any disruption of drainage swales and they would need permits to do that. With regard to the entrance, they were proposing a 35-ft right-of-way; they were showing a 24-ft. wide road at the access point with no parking. There would be no parking allowed and no homes were proposed to be built there. That strip of ground was there for the purpose of access to the property. There was a stub street located next to the Pessagno property in case they would develop their property. They had discussed an emergency access to be added onto an adjoining property, also owned by their client that would access Fairview Chapel Road. Mr. Littlehales stated that they showed one way in and one way out and that was not permitted in our SALDO. Mr. Bensinger stated they would be looking for a waiver of Section 5.234 and for 5.220. Mrs. Geiger asked why they did not design the subdivision so they would not have to ask for so many waivers? Mr. Bensinger stated that was due to the shape of the ground.

Mr. Bensinger stated for item #20 the logical choice for the street name would be Buddies Place. For item #21, they could change the boundary line to follow the right-of-way of the road. For item #22 they would be asking for waivers for lot depth to width ratio for lots 22, 23, 25, 43, 44, 55 & 56. Lot 22 may be exempt. With item #24, lot 30, the letter states that it was a reverse frontage lot. They did not agree with that. Lot 31 would be a reverse frontage lot and they would show the 75-foot rear yard. For item #30, they would change Philip Ave, but they would ask for a waiver for the entrance on Fairview Chapel Road. With item #31, sidewalk & curbing along Fairview Chapel Road, did they need to do that? Mr. Wilson stated they should show that as if it would be put in. Mr. Bensinger stated they could show it on the plan for the future, as in a deferral. For item #32, they did not show a planting strip because they only had 35-ft width, they would ask for a waiver of that. Item #36, they would show the grading there. For item #37, they would establish the easement there. The main issue for the development was the access, would the emergency access satisfy the Township for having two access points? Mr. Wilson stated they should put the emergency access next to Mr. Douglas's property and have that chained. Then put the main access where they proposed to put the emergency access. The Planning Commission agreed. Mr. Littlehales and Mrs. Geiger stated that they were concerned with the amount of waivers they were asking for.

**11. PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Daniel Laudenslayer**

GVC reviewed the Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 6, 2004).

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they would fix item #6 under Zoning. Item #2, under SALDO, they had 5 trees that were located where the road would be placed. They would replant trees to replace those. With 2B for lighting, they would add streetlights. Mr. Littlehales stated they would need type 3 lights. Mr. Peifer stated that they should check the streetlight ordinance. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that with item #2C, which side of the street should they allow parking? Mr. Schwartz stated they should allow parking on the outside or on the side of the street where the houses would be built. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that with comment #3 concerning the conservation easement area it states that the Planning Commission should review that. Would that be acceptable? The Planning Commission agreed it looked good that way.

**Public Comment**

**Bob Baddorf**, University Rifle Club, asked if the dark area was the entire area to be graded?

Mr. Laudenslayer replied that it was an easement; they would not touch that area. The sound wall had to be moved out of the wetlands and that area would be annexed to the Rifle Club. They did not put the bearings and distances on that because if the sound wall becomes the boundary line then they would have to build the sound wall exactly where it was on the plan. They would try to keep the wall as straight as possible.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that with comment #12F, the review letter stated they recommend a meeting between the developer and the Township to reach an agreement in regard's to Schoffers Road widening and grading. They would do that. With Item #13, for the lot depth to width ratio, they removed the one cul-de-sac and that took away some of the lot depth to width ratio problems. Lot 13 was a corner lot, would that be a problem? Mr. Wilson stated that they could change the placement of the house. That lot would be ok. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that lot 58 & 59 were the pie shaped lots. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it would be a problem because they have such a small rear yard. Mr. Ruff stated they should design them another way. Mr. Laudenslayer asked about lots 82 & 83, would they be ok? Mr. Littlehales stated he would be ok with them. The Planning Commission agreed. Mr. Laudenslayer asked about lots 4, 20, 30, 18, & 19? Mr. Peifer asked if they couldn't add more property to the rear of lot 4? Mr. Laudenslayer stated they might be able to do that. Mr. Schwartz stated that we would be ok with those, but they would still need to get the waivers.

Mr. Laudenslayer asked about lot 41, would they get a waiver on that lot? Mr. Ruff stated that in GVC's review letter they raised the question on whether Copperbeech Court should be extended into the Demko Property. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they looked at that, but they would need to come through a stream and would need to get a GP7 permit. Also, they would not be able to get a 5% leveling area there. That was why they had the cul-de-sac there. Mr. Wilson asked why they did not eliminate that Court; they added a lot of expenses to put that in there, could they eliminate the cul-de-sac and just have one driveway?

Mr. Laudenslayer stated they would look into that.

**12. INFORMAL DISCUSSION - 5940 LORANE ROAD – Susanne Creveling - Joseph Tarrantino**

Sue Creveling stated that they were there to represent the Lorane Road Partners. They brought in a Sketch Plan for a 13-lot Subdivision in the SR1 Zoning District. They planned to utilize the existing house located there. They would have public water and public sewer. They met the 9,000 sq.-ft. requirements. They were

Informal Discussion continued

looking for the Planning Commissions opinions and ideas. Mr. Wilson stated he had concerns with site distance. Mr. Littlehales stated lot 7 was an odd shape. Mr. Ruff stated that they should put the two lots together. Mr. Krafczek stated that two would fit better than three. Mr. Wilson stated that at least they were not common driveways; we don't like those. Mr. Peifer stated that with the street they would need a 50-ft. straight area before they took it into a curve. The front lots would be reverse frontage with a 75-ft. rear yard from Lorane Road. Ms. Creveling asked for direction on the right-of-way widths for Lorane Road and for the street into the development, what should they be? Mr. Peifer replied that Lorane Road should have a right-of-way width of 30-ft. from centerline. Were they proposing on street parking? Ms. Creveling replied no. Mr. Peifer stated that they should provide a 54-ft. right-of-way. Ms. Creveling asked if they should provide on street parking? Mr. Ruff replied that with the small lot size they should have on street parking. Ms. Creveling asked if that would still be the 54-ft. width? Mr. Peifer replied that they would need an 8-ft. wide lane for parking. Would it be on one side? Ms. Creveling replied yes, one side. Mr. Ruff asked where they were planning to put their storm water detention? Ms. Creveling replied they would be on lot 13 & lot 1. That was the low point. Mr. Wilson asked if the Planning Commission had any other comments on the plan? There were none.

**13. ZONING WORKSHOP**

The Planning Commission agreed to hold the next Zoning Workshop on Tuesday, July 20, 2004 at 7pm.

**13. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

The question was raised for the scope of the Traffic Impact Study for the Tobolski Property located on 422. The Planning Commission agreed that GVC would do a review and provide a scope for the traffic study to be addressed at the next Planning Commission meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to adjourn the July 6, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:25pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Correspondence to:

BOS: Zook Conditional Use  
BOS: Hubert A. Brickey Property - conditional approval  
BOS: Exeter Car Care II – conditional approval  
BOS: Giessuebel Subdivision – waiver requests

