

**MINUTES**  
**EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**JUNE 1, 2004**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 1, 2004 at the Township Hall, 4975 DeMoss Road, Berks County, Pennsylvania. Donald R. Wilson, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30p.m. followed by the Pledge to the Flag.

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

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Joseph Rogosky, 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 May 4, 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 June 1, 2004 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

- A. **MEISTER SUBDIVISION – FINAL PLAN, EXETER CAR CARE II – PRELIMINARY PLAN, DEER RUN SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

**4. REVISION TO SCHOOL DISTRICT PLAN – ELA Group – Hugh Cadzo**

Mr. Cadzo stated that they needed to come in to revise the plan for the renovations to the High School because on 37<sup>th</sup> street near Mr. Adams house, there was a new parking area. Information provided to their office indicated the location of the gas lines. The gas line does not end where they were shown. The curb conflicts with the gas line. They have two options, #1 was to not include the curb, leave conditions as they were now, the

School revised plan continued

slope was 2-1: or #2 would be to shift it in 3-ft, which would require a retaining wall and disturb the trees that were located there. Mr. Cadzo stated they would like to eliminate the curb. They were told they would need to revise the plan. Would the Planning Commission find it favorable to eliminate the curb? Mr. Rogosky asked if they eliminated the curb what would they provide there? Mr. Cadzo replied that they could put in bituminous curb along the edge. Mr. Rogosky stated that bituminous curb was fine on a rural road, but when someone plowed it could be a problem. Mr. Cadzo stated they could put in the pre-cast curb with pins. Mr. Schwartz asked how far down the gas lines were located and could they put the pins in place? Mr. Cadzo replied they were 2-ft.

\* JD Krafczek arrived at this time

Mr. Rogosky asked about the second option, how far away would the curb be from the gas lines? Mr. Cadzo stated it would be 3-ft. With the pre-cast curb they could provide information to the Township on the curbing and also they would seal it. Mr. Bittig stated there might be a parking problem there. Mr. Cadzo stated they would have no parking in that area. Mr. Schwartz asked if there was a possibility of moving the gas line?

Mr. Cadzo replied it would be cost prohibitive. Mr. Wilson asked if they talked to Mr. Adams as far as what he would like? Mr. Cadzo stated that Mr. Adams did not want them to cut further onto his property and take out his trees located there. Mr. Ruff asked if they could get information on the pre-cast curbs. Mr. Schwartz stated that sounded like the best solution. Mr. Wilson stated that out of respect for Mr. Adams and not impacting his property further the pre-cast curb would be best. We would like more information on that. Mr. Cadzo asked if they could make a motion? Mr. Bittig stated they were trying to move on and get done with the project.

Mr. Schwartz stated that they would need to get more information to the Board of Supervisors to see if it was acceptable, but we could make a motion to the effect that they would need to provide that level of detail to the Board and for the Highway Department.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to support the revision of the Exeter School District plan to allow a pre-cast concrete curb that was pinned into place instead of the former curb shown on the plan. They would need to provide the details of the curb for the Board of Supervisors. The motion carried unanimously.

##### **5. MEISTER SUBDIVISION – FINAL PLAN – Bill Meister**

GVC reviewed the Meister Subdivision Final Plan (reference letter dated May 17, 2004).

Mr. Meister stated that in the review it stated that they needed 11 signed and sealed plans. They were provided to the Township along with the CD. The pins needed to be set and the plans could be held until they were completed. There would be no deed restrictions and they provided property descriptions for the file. They were annexing a parcel to his brothers' property, subdividing their mothers' home and another lot. They were looking for Final plan approval. Mr. Bittig asked when they would have the pins set? Mr. Meister replied they should have that completed before the Supervisors meeting. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Rogosky if there was anything missing with the plan? Mr. Rogosky replied no, as long as they provide verification for the pins being set then everything should be ok.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Meister Subdivision Final plan, subject to the necessary pins being set. The motion carried unanimously.

**6. HUBERT A. BRICKEY SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD**

GVC reviewed the Hubert A. Brickey Subdivision sketch plan for record (reference letter dated May 18, 2004).

They were still waiting for Berks County Conservation District Erosion and Sediment approval and would be back when they received that.

**7. EXETER CAR CARE II – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Jana Eppihimer**

GVC reviewed the Exeter Car Care II Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated May 26, 2004).

Ms. Eppihimer stated they brought along letters from the Historic and Museum Commission and PNDI. The plan was for a 2-lot Commercial Subdivision. Lot 1 was the Exeter Car Care II; Lot 2 was the Tarot Card Reader. The previous plan called for a future retail use, now the Tarot Card Reader would remain. Exeter Car Care would have their access onto Hafer Road. There would not be an access to that from 422. Mr. Bittig stated that the assessment records show the tract was currently residential, even though it was zoned Highway Commercial and was being used as Commercial. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it was a preexisting residential with a home occupation. Mr. Bittig stated that then they would be making part of the tract a conforming use.

Mr. Wilson asked if they would have outside storage of parts? Ms. Eppihimer replied no, they would have one-day service for cars and would not be storing those items outside. The dumpster area would be screened. With item #4 the landscape plan would not be a problem. Buffer screening would be added and a note placed on the plan. For item #5, they would provide full detail for that. Mr. Schwartz stated that he was concerned with the light spilling onto residential properties. Mr. Rogosky stated that a cut off shield was proposed. Mr. Schwartz stated they should have a detailed light diagram. Mr. Sayer stated that they would not have lighting through out the night. Ms. Eppihimer stated that with the Environmental Performance Standards, they had a letter from Mr. Sayer addressing those issues. With item #7 they did submit the Environmental Assessment Statement and they would be providing infiltration trenches in the basin area and the swale. Mr. Bittig asked if the plans for that were submitted? Ms. Eppihimer replied yes, they were sent to the Conservation District and one to GVC.

Mr. Wilson stated that he read about the air guns and was concerned with the noise. Mr. Sayer stated that the loudest noise they would generate would be from the air guns taking off tires. Mr. Bittig stated they should be sure to have sufficient buffer added to screen the noise. Mr. Sayer stated that this location was not a quick lube so the frequency of changing tires would be less than their other location. Mr. Bittig asked how many service bays would be located there? Mr. Sayer replied eight. The architect asked if they would like to see the plan for the building? The Planning Commission replied they would. The building would be a square 74 x 74 with a masonry split face and one bay on one side and three bays on two other sides. They were waiting for L & I approval. Mr. Wilson stated they have screening on Hafer and on the west and they would also need to add screening between the residence and the detention pond.

Ms. Eppihimer stated that with item #8, lot #2 not having sufficient width along 422. The lot has 99.66 width. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was pre-existing so it was a non-issue. Ms. Eppihimer stated that for item #9, driveway site distance, they would show that. They have DEP planning module exemption approval and were

Exeter Car Care II continued

waiting for the letter from PA American Water Company. With item #4, they could not find any record of an easement or ownership for the existing storm sewer. They were offering an easement that would sit entirely on lot 2. Mr. Wilson asked about the detention pond and where the outfall would go? Ms. Eppihimer stated that the outfall would flow into the inlet, which goes into Wawa and then under the road to the Country Club. Mr. Schwartz stated that if they do things correctly then the flow would be reduced.

Ms. Eppihimer stated that with item #5 for the Traffic Impact Study, they were looking for a waiver. They would have approximately 20 cars a day. Mr. Littlehales stated that with not having the through traffic allowed as with the other plan, he would support that. Mr. Bittig stated there should be a note placed on the plan prohibiting through traffic. Mr. Sayer stated that the other location would have the quick-lube; this location was for inspections and repairs and would have less traffic. Mrs. Geiger stated that there should be a sign at the front of the property saying no through traffic or dead end. Mr. Littlehales stated there was one located there now and it should remain.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.98 for the Traffic Impact Study based on the information received and the inclusion of a note prohibiting through traffic. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Eppihimer stated that they were looking for a waiver for the Water Resource Study. The proposed building would be on public water; the existing building would remain on a well. Mr. Ruff asked if the amount of impervious surface would be the same as what they remove. Ms. Eppihimer stated that they would be adding more, but they would have the infiltration system to help that. Mr. Sayer stated they would be using less water than the house that was currently located there.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.99 for the Water Resource Study due to the fact that what they were proposing would have less impact on the ground water than the existing residences. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Eppihimer stated that they were looking for two waivers. One was to not put in sidewalks and the other was to allow them to place the installation of curb adjacent to the existing cartway edge, rather than 6-ft. back from the edge of existing cartway as required by Section 6.203. Mr. Schwartz asked what we required across the street for the Little View Hill Subdivision? Mr. Andy Kent (representative for that subdivision) replied that sidewalk and curbing were required. If they were requiring that on one side of the road, they should require it here, or scrap it on both sides.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors not grant a waiver for the requirement of SALDO Section 6.203 and 6.204 for curbs sidewalks for the Exeter Car Care II Subdivision. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ruff and Mr. Krafczek voting in favor and Mrs. Geiger and Mr. Littlehales voting opposed.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to recommend the Board of Supervisors allow the installation of curb adjacent to the existing cartway edge, rather than 6-ft. back from the edge of existing cartway as required by section 6.203, due to the topography of the lot. The motion carried unanimously.

Exeter Car Care II continued

Ms. Eppihimer asked about item #10 for the drainage easements, would a blanket easement note be acceptable? Mr. Rogosky asked if they were trying to prevent having the easement shown on the drawing? Ms. Eppihimer replied they would have it for the storm sewer, the swales and the detention ponds. Mr. Rogosky stated they should have it shown on the plan so we would not have someone come in and encroach those areas.

Ms. Eppihimer stated they had the letters for #14 and #15. They were working on the comments from the Fire Marshal for the sprinkler system. Were there any other issues they would need to change? Mr. Bittig replied they would need to take care of preventing through traffic. Mr. Wilson stated that planting the screening would help that. Ms. Eppihimer asked if they could come back with a Preliminary/Final plan? Mr. Wilson replied it would be Ok.

### **Public Comment**

**Thomas Howell**, 4970 Hafer Road, asked where they would hook up to the sewer? Mr. Sayer replied that they would remove the second home and use that lateral for hook-up. Mr. Howell asked if there would be no parking on Hafer Road? Mr. Wilson replied that was correct. Mr. Howell asked what was the slope of the driveway? Ms. Eppihimer stated that it was between 8 & 9%. Mr. Howell asked about the location of the driveway and wouldn't the headlights go into Mr. Lavender's property because of the angle? Mr. Sayer stated there would be no nighttime traffic anticipated. Mr. Howell stated that it gets dark at 5 o'clock in the wintertime. Ms. Eppihimer stated that there would be a leveling area that would alleviate that.

**Dave Hafer**, 299 Gibraltar Road, was wondering whether there was any traffic study done on the amount of cars that travel on Hafer Road now? The reason he asked was because of the site distance coming out of that property and looking left they would have problems with the site distance. Ms. Eppihimer stated that the required site distance was 166-ft. and they have 270-ft. Mr. Hafer stated that they said the detention pond would improve the water run-off, he found that hard to believe because of the problems the Country Club had now. Mr. Bittig stated that the current ordinance required that the flow rates must be reduced. The volume of water would be the same, but it would be metered out over a longer period of time. Mr. Hafer asked how far back the building would sit from Hafer Road? Ms. Eppihimer replied that it would be 110-ft. back. Mr. Bittig stated that the ordinance required it to be 30-ft. Mr. Hafer stated that Hafer Road was residential, how can they change it to commercial? Mr. Rogosky replied that Hafer Road was a Township road and roads are never zoned. Mr. Schwartz stated that roads are not zoned, properties were. Mr. Bittig stated that the south side of Hafer Road was residential the north side was commercial and had been that way a long time.

### **8. DEER RUN SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Andy Kent**

GVC reviewed the Deer Run Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated May 28, 2004).

Mr. Kent stated that the proposed Subdivision was located south of Painted Sky Road between Sandy Run and Gibraltar Road. They would be using Old Gibraltar Road and Coral Lane for access. They were proposing

Deer Run continued

lots that were larger than the lots in Sandy Run. Currently the Township was in litigation for condemnation of the one area for the walking trail. They would like to connect the one entrance on Old Gibraltar Road with a street that could possibly connect to Neversink Road. Mr. Bittig asked if that was wetland in that area? Mr. Kent stated that it was not. The area there was wet because of a pipe that was six inches too high. It was mostly coal silt in that area. If the pipe were lowered the area would not be wet.

Mr. Bittig asked what the width was of the railroad bridge? Mr. Kent replied that it was 27-ft. and the drainage ditch, located there, would be replaced with sidewalk. Mr. Bittig stated that the highest point in the center of the arch was 12-ft. Mr. Ruff stated that the required clearance in the PennDOT bridge manual was 14' 6". If they did not have that they would need to get a design exception. Mr. Wilson asked who owned Old Gibraltar Road, the part that was abandoned? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that it belonged to the Township and had not been abandoned. Mr. Schwartz asked about the park in that area, don't we own that? Mr. Bittig stated that according to the tax maps we do not. Mr. Rogosky stated that he had asked the same question. It was a big issue because of the mosquito problems in that area. In reference to the pipe down there, the pipe could not be lowered without obtaining permits and removing a lot of trees. Mr. Kent stated they could fill it in with dirt and level it. Mr. Rogosky stated they could not because they were in a floodway and they could not encroach in that area.

Mr. Kent stated that with item #6 for the Historical review, they didn't think it applied there. Mr. Bittig stated that they would need to get a report from the commission stating that there was nothing in that area.

Mr. Kent stated they were looking for a waiver for the Environmental Assessment Statement. Mr. Schwartz stated that there would be no reason to waive that in an environmentally sensitive area. It was a sizable subdivision. Mr. Wilson asked if anyone wanted to make a motion to waive the EAS? No one on the Planning Commission complied.

Mr. Kent stated that with item #5, the area was mostly scrub trees. Would it be Ok to get a timber cruiser in there and they would tell us how many trees we would need to remove and then they would be replaced? They would replace all the decent trees. Mr. Schwartz stated that would be a reasonable approach, but they would need to identify the good trees. If they identify specimen trees and give us a tally on the rest, that would be fine. Mr. Kent stated that with item #7 the paving would be 18-ft. to 20-ft. and it would be one way through the bridge, with a stop sign on both sides. Mr. Rogosky asked if they approached Norfolk Southern (the owners of the bridge)? Mr. Kent replied that they had and originally they thought it had a concrete bottom and it does not. Norfolk Southern did not want someone trenching through there, they would bore through there so it would not damage the structure. They might get 15-ft. under there. Mr. Wilson stated that the Fire Marshal did have a concern about emergency vehicles gaining access under that bridge. Mr. Kent stated that they met the standard for the travel lanes with the exception of the bridge. Mr. Rogosky stated they would need to request a waiver for that. Mr. Kent stated that for Item #8A they did not show the right-of-way of Bybel Lane because that would be dedicated to the Township, but they could do that. Mr. Bittig asked who would build Bybel Lane up to Township standards all the way out to Gibraltar Road? Mr. Kent replied that if the developer would need to do that, they would. As for curbing on Bybel Lane, they did not think curbing was necessary with the park. They had a lot of issues that would need to be taken care of before they came back. Item 13, for the slope area, that was the railroad embankment, they could not put an easement there, it

Deer Run continued

belonged to the railroad. Mr. Bittig stated that there were some spots on the main tract, lot 7, 8 & 9.

Mr. Kent stated that item #14 for delineating the wetlands would be done. The existing farm had been bulldozed and hauled away. The Water Resources Study would be done. Item #21 for the one-way cul-de-sac, would the Township accept that design? The travel lane was 22-ft. wide, enough for parking. Mr. Bittig asked who would maintain the area in the middle? Mr. Kent stated it would be dedicated to the Township. Mr. Rogosky stated that the Board stopped taking over land, detention ponds, etc. Mr. Kent asked if they were not taking open space? Mr. Schwartz replied they would take parks, but not little chunks. Mr. Rogosky stated that we were also concerned with the snowplow getting through that area. Mr. Kent stated that it would be easier than a typical cul-de-sac. Mr. Schwartz stated that his personal opinion was he liked it but it might not get past the Board of Supervisors. They would also need to check with the Highway Department to see if the design was acceptable to them. Mr. Bittig stated they could bring the street down and loop it up to the north. Mr. Kent stated that was a possibility. Mr. Wilson stated they could also place a stub into the neighboring property.

Mr. Kent stated that the entire property would be deed restricted: no additional building lots. A Traffic Study would be done. For item #41, sidewalks and curb on Bybel Lane, it all depended on the Township.

Mr. Bittig stated that they needed to work on the landscape plan. There was an updated Street Ordinance No. 547 that had the new tree species list. Mrs. Geiger stated that she agreed with the note from Terry Francis (Fire Marshal) that they would need to change the name of the subdivision. Exeter already had a street called Deer Run. Mr. Kent agreed and thanked the Planning Commission.

## **9. ZONING WORKSHOP**

The Planning Commission agreed to hold the next Zoning Workshop on Wednesday, June 23, 2004 at 7pm.

## **10. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mr. Wilson stated that the Township was looking for volunteers for the Traffic Impact Advisory Committee. Mr. Ruff and Mr. Wilson agreed to volunteer for that committee.

Mr. Wilson stated we would meet again July 6, 2004. Mr. Bittig stated that he would be away for that meeting.

Mr. Wilson and Mr. Schwartz walked the Fairview Park location with Stephen Bensinger on Saturday, May 22. Mr. Schwartz stated that if you wanted to know where the roads would be placed, just look for the good trees. For the subdivision they were proposing two entrances that connected to existing streets. It looked as though they were crossing some swales. They wanted to avoid crossing the swale areas, as they were very large. They wanted to eliminate one cul-de-sac and two stream crossings.

Planning Commission minutes  
June 1, 2004  
Page 8 of 8

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to adjourn the June 1, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:00pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Exeter High School Renovations  
BOS: Meister Subdivision Final Plan Approval  
BOS: Exeter Car Care II waiver requests