

**MINUTES  
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2004**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, March 2, 2004 at the Township Hall, 4975 DeMoss Road, Berks County, Pennsylvania. Donald R. Wilson, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by the Pledge to the Flag.

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

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

**1. MINUTES**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to approve the agenda of the March 2, 2004 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

- A. **LIMEKILN HEIGHTS – PRELIMINARY PLAN, MCGINNIS/BEAVER ANNEXATION – PRELIMINARY PLAN, KEMP SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD: MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mrs. Geiger to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

#### **4. BALTHASER – CONDITIONAL USE**

Mr. and Mrs. Balthaser were requesting a conditional use to relocate their home occupation of a landscaping business to their new home located at 4966 Hafer Road.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the Balthasers sent out notification to the surrounding property owners and had received replies. The majority of concerns were over the private driveway that served as access to their home. They have two vehicles for the business that the employees would come to the house to pick up for work. They have offered assurance that they would not generate a lot of traffic over the private drive. Mrs. Geiger asked if they had parking for the trucks? Mrs. Balthaser replied that they would have macadam parking for them. Mr. Bittig stated that most concerns were over the private drive that was bound by court decree. (limited to 12-feet in width by court order)

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it was the only access to their property. Most of people who responded negatively to the notification had other means of access to their properties, with the exception of the property on the corner. The Planning Commission looked at the pictures of the trucks that were used by the business. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the Balthasers have assured her that they would use landscaping to screen the vehicles from view. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that there were other instances where vehicles for business were parked at the home and the employees come to pick up the vehicles. With the exception of the concern for the private lane, they appear to be in compliance with the zoning ordinance for their proposal. Mr. Bittig stated that there was nothing they could do about the width of the driveway because of the court order. Mr. Wilson asked if it was constructed as a roadway or a private drive? Mrs. Franckowiak replied a private drive. Mr. Wilson stated he was concerned with the small dump truck and damage to the pavement. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the Balthasers were responsible for 50% of the maintenance and upkeep of the private driveway.

#### **Public Comment**

**Thomas Howell**, 4970 Hafer Road, stated that he was concerned with the future, that the business may grow and also where they would store their bushes and trees. The driveway was just one lane and there was no place to pull over for two vehicles to pass. They were concerned about the traffic on the driveway.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the conditional use.

**Mike Kern**, 259 Gibraltar Road, stated that his father-in-law, who lived at 299 Gibraltar Road, was concerned with having a commercial property at that location. Mr. Hafer owns ½ of the private driveway and had access to the same. If the business would grow then they were concerned with the traffic. The Hafers have a horse trailer that they take back there and there was no room for more than

Balthaser Conditional Use continued

that trailer. Children play there and they were concerned with additional traffic. They do have speed bumps placed to try to slow down the traffic.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors would take their comments into consideration and explained why it was called a Conditional Use, to see if they should place conditions on the use.

**John Lavender**, 4950 Hafer Road, stated that they did not have problem with the Balthasers having the business in their home. They were concerned with the traffic because it was a residential neighborhood. He did have four children and at times they cross that drive.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that home occupations in general were allowed as a conditional use. That was why they were here now, the first step for Conditional Use proceedings were to come before the Planning Commission so we could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Balthasers were offering assurance to us that they can meet all the requirements in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wilson stated that he was concerned with the two vehicles and the traffic generated by the employees. They live on a private drive and not a Township Road and we cannot do any enforcement on a private drive. He was not in favor of the increased traffic.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they were here for conditional use. They could allow the office in the home with the possible condition that the work vehicles were kept offsite.

Mrs. Balthaser stated that they have one full time employee. They were in business last year at a different location and they had no problems with the neighbors there. They also complied with all the conditions in zoning for home occupations. Mr. Wilson asked if they put mowers in the back of the pick-up trucks or did they have trailers for that. Mrs. Balthaser stated they put them in the trucks. Mr. Bittig stated that he would agree to one pick-up truck and one employee, but not multiple trucks on the private lane. Mr. Krafczek stated that he had a problem with the employees coming to the house for the vehicles and driving out to the site and then driving the vehicles back at the end of the day. With two personal vehicles driving in and out, there was no problem with that. We don't want a lot of people coming in and driving out of that easement. As for the office as a conditional use, he was fine with that. Mr. Schwartz stated he agreed with that.

Mr. Wilson asked if there would be outside storage at that location. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they would not be storing anything or accepting deliveries at their home, nor would they have customers coming into the home.

Balthaser conditional use continued

**MOTION BY** Mr. Krafczek, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to amend the previous motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for the Balthasers with the condition that restrictions be placed that no employees go to the home to get access to the vehicles. The vehicles should be stored elsewhere for the employees to gain access to them. The motion carried with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Krafczek, Mr. Bittig voting in favor and Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

Mrs. Balthaser stated that it would place a hardship on them. They do have two personal vehicles. She felt that they would leave for work and they would come home and in her opinion it would not be increased traffic.

**5. MILLER COMMERCIAL - PRELIMINARY PLAN** – John Hoffert

GVC reviewed the Miller Commercial Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated 3/1/ 2004).

Mr. Hoffert stated that the Miller Commercial Subdivision was situated on the south side of 422 off of Cardinal drive. The purpose of the plan of the 27 acres was to cut off one lot that the Service Electric Company could purchase. They were also creating an additional lot #1, a two-acre parcel that would access an existing drive off of SR 422. At the last meeting, the Planning Commission raised the issue of trees and grading being done and that the plan should be changed to show those changes. They have done that. They have written requests for waivers. In the GVC review letter, for item #4 they were requesting a deferral of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan.

Mr. Bittig asked about the clearing of the property, did they have an erosion and sediment control plan for that? Mr. Hoffert replied not to his knowledge. Mr. Miller inadvertently brought in two dump truck loads of dirt onto that area. They believe the area was less than 5,000 sq. ft. and a plan was required for more than 5,000 sq. ft. They would not remove any more trees until a plan was approved.

Mr. Hoffert stated that they were looking for waivers for deferment of the following sections of the SALDO for lots #1 and #2, Section 4.26, 4.273, 4.283, 5.98, 5.99, 6.203 and 6.2042.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a deferment for the requirement of SALDO for lots #1 and #2: Section 4.26, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan: Section 4.273, Stormwater Management Report: Section 4.283, Environmental Assessment Statement: Section 5.98, Traffic Impact Study: Section 5.99, water resources study: Section 6.203 and 6.2042 for Curbs and Sidewalks until such time that lot #1 and #2 were developed. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hoffert asked if they could get approval for the Miller Commercial Subdivision Preliminary Plan?

Miller Commercial continued

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Miller Commercial Subdivision Preliminary Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

**6. HUBERT A. BRICKEY PROPERTY – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD – Roger Fry**

GVC reviewed the Hubert A. Brickey Subdivision – Sketch Plan for Record (reference letter dated March 1, 2004).

Mr. Fry stated that they would like to go over the review letter from GVC. Under zoning, item #1 concerning the note on the plan for further subdivision. It was worded that way to allow additional annexation, not subdivision to create new building lots. Mr. Bittig stated that there were steep slopes in that area, they would need to note permanent conservation easements there. He had a copy of the verbiage needed for the note to be placed on the plan. Mr. Fry stated that the purpose of possible annexation would be for a buffer zone. Mr. Bittig stated that the buffer would be there. Mr. Wilson stated that steep slopes should not be excluded from someone who would be interested in more property. Mr. Bittig stated that they would need to state that they could not further subdivide for additional building lots. Mr. Fry stated that they were looking for what they should note on the plan. Mr. Bittig stated the note should say it should not be further subdivided for the purpose of building lots.

Mr. Fry stated that for the shared drive access, the sight distance was 9-ft short of the dimension. The existing drive was short for the required distance. They were looking for assistance on how to address that issue. Could they get a waiver for that? Mr. Ruff stated that we couldn't waive zoning issues. Mr. Fry asked if they could move the cartway over 9-ft in the easement? Instead of centering it in the right-of-way, place the cartway 9-ft to get the required site distance? Mr. Peifer stated they have seen that in other situations. If they would do that it would improve the conditions of a later comment.

Mr. Fry stated that for items #3 & #4 they would comply. With item #5 for the PA DEP Sewage Facilities Planning Module, they have sent that in and were waiting for a reply. On item #7 at the last meeting they requested a waiver for the 3:1 slope on the side of the driveway. It stated in the review letter that at Pathfinder they had a similar condition where landslides have occurred. They did not know what the controls were on that plan. Mr. Peifer stated that they used permanent matting and that did not work. Mr. Fry stated that there were new neighbors next to the Brickey property and Mr. Brickey spoke to them. They said they would be happy to allow them to grade up to their driveway. Because of that, they may be able to get the 3:1 slope. Mr. Schwartz asked if there was any possibility they could eliminate that driveway? Mr. Fry stated that they doubted that. But the question was, they may be able to get 3:1, but if they could not, could they get a waiver for 2:1? Mr. Peifer stated that the concern would be for the wintertime with icy conditions coming down the drive. Mr. Fry asked if they could place split rail fence or boulders there? Mr. Littlehales stated that boulders might be a good idea if placed in an artful manner. Mr. Fry stated they would need to ask the neighbors, as they would be placed on their property. If we can get 3:1 slope with moving the drive and grading the neighbors'

Brickey Property continued

property, would there be a concern about the steep grade? Mr. Peifer replied no. Mr. Peifer stated they could move the detention pond up higher and then use the 2:1 slope there only. Mr. Fry stated they would just need that waiver for the slope in the area of catch basin one. Mr. Schwartz asked if Mr. Peifer was convinced that they would be able to stabilize that area? Mr. Peifer stated yes.

Mr. Fry stated that under stormwater management, they have a waiver request. Instead of running the water down to the one pipe on Rugby Road, they were proposing to run it to an existing 36-inch pipe that goes under Rugby Road. With the original survey of the property they had located a 15-inch pipe. If they were able to utilize that 15-inch pipe for their stormwater management, they would not need to request the waiver. Because of improvements and construction on Rugby Road, they could not use that pipe. Instead they would like to run it down to the existing 36-inch pipe. The 36-inch pipe discharges into wetlands. They were moving water from one watershed to another. They felt it was a reasonable request. Mr. Fry offered pictures to show the exact location and the pipe they were discussing. Mr. Wilson asked if they were requesting a waiver to place water from one property to another property rather than having a detention pond? Mr. Fry replied that no, they have a detention pond. They were looking for the area to release the water from the detention pond. Mr. Schwartz stated that the additional runoff goes into a detention pond and that was metered out at the same rate or lower than pre-development, so they were only dealing with the same amount or less. We don't want to stop the water from going into the wetlands; if you do that the wetlands will dry up. Mr. Fry stated that they were just asking to take the water that originally would go into two areas and place them just into the one area. Mr. Wilson asked about comment #6 for the about the infiltration trenches? Mr. Fry stated that they would be sure that the water would go into the detention pond. They were asking for a waiver to use the 36-inch pipe and for a waiver of the 3:1 slope in the area of catch basin one.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of SALDO Section 5.517, maximum slope along an adjoining tract not owned by the subdivider from 3:1 to 2:1 only in the area along catch basin one, due to the fact the consultant has provided stabilization methods to the slope there. The motion carried with Mr. Bittig, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Krafczek, Mrs. Geiger voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver from SALDO Section 5.823 and Appendix V, Section II to allow the diverting of stormwater to the existing 36-inch pipe rather than the 15-inch pipe that no longer exists, contingent on satisfactory stormwater calculations be provided. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Krafczek voting in favor and Mrs. Geiger voting opposed.

Mr. Fry asked for approval of the Sketch Plan of Record with conditions? Mr. Ruff stated that we would need to see the plan with the new sight distance.

Mr. Fry thanked the Planning Commission.

**7. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – FINAL PLAN – C J Levan**

GVC reviewed the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Final Plan (reference letter dated February 27, 2004)

Mr. Levan stated that they would like to go over GVC's review letter concerning item #10, for the right-of-way agreement. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that we received that item today and Mr. Hoffert was going to bring that along to the Board of Supervisors meeting on Monday night.

Mr. Levan stated that on comment #12 for the water supply, it was being processed by PA American Water Company. Mr. Bittig stated that they needed the required pressure for the fire hydrants. Mr. Filippini stated that they were adding booster pumps to be able to get that.

Mr. Levan stated that under Stormwater Management, the item in black, they had gone before the Supervisors requesting a waiver and that item had been deferred. They were to investigate the possibility of connecting detention Basin 1 to the outlet structure of the existing wetland area in Phase IV of this Development. On Saturday, he had gone out to look at that area. There was some sediment that was blocking the riprap outfall. There were also some branches blocking the outlet pipe. They wanted to discuss that and get feedback from the Planning Commission. There was some discussion about tying the stormwater system together, however, if they did that they could totally dry up the wetland area. The wetland pond was created according to DEP requirements. Mr. Bittig stated that at last months meeting we recommended that Mr. Bensinger speak to the neighboring property owners where they had a river running down the driveway to see if they could alleviate some of that problem. What did Mr. Bensinger do? Mr. Levan replied that they did not know, but they fully met the stormwater reduction. With the street being put in they reduced flows to those properties in half. They would be diverting it into a different detention basin. Concerning item #14 with the retaining wall, they would be doing soil tests there. Could they get Final Plan approval?

**Public Comment**

**Wendy Nguyen**, 99 Linree Ave, asked where the water would be going? Mr. Levan stated that it would go into the detention pond and flow through the outlet structure and flow out of their property. If the outlet structure was properly maintained they should not have a problem. Mrs. Nguyen asked about the debris in the structure that was possibly contributing to the problem. What would prevent that from happening in the future? They had cleaned that debris. Mr. Levan stated that the maintenance of their property was not the responsibility of the person developing the new area. Mrs. Nguyen stated that she understood that. Mr. Levan suggested lowering the outlet structure on their wetland pond. Mr. Bittig stated that it could eliminate the wetlands and that would not be allowed. Possibly they could add a low berm to add depth to the pond. Mr. Filippini stated that there was a 20-ft. swale that leads to the pond. There were a lot of live springs in that area. They could add a berm but it would be hard to maintain the yard. Mrs. Nguyen stated that they were concerned that the detention pond would drain into her pond

Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V continued

and overflow. Mr. Levan stated that the water that flows into the basin was metered out over a 24-hour period.

**Peter Barbis**, 91 Linree Ave, asked what the total surface area of the pond and how deep the water would be? Mr. Levan replied that the total area was 4 to 5-ft. and approximately 6 to 12-inches deep. Mr. Barbis asked if the Homeowners Association would be responsible for possible mosquito problems and west Nile? Mr. Levan stated that mosquitoes take 5 days to breed and the water will dissipate before that.

Mr. Levan thanked the Planning Commission.

**8. LIMEKILN HEIGHTS – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Andy Kent**

GVC reviewed the Limekiln Heights Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated March 1, 2004).

Mr. Kent stated that for comment #1 under Zoning with the existing driveway, they would get an easement agreement from the neighbor, Mr. Houpp. Mr. Bittig stated they would need the access agreement in writing. Mr. Kent stated that as far as sight distance for the drive, there was 554-ft up the hill and 364-ft going down the hill. Under SALDO item #10 for the right-of-way for Curtis Drive they would change the width to 54-ft. Curtis Drive would not be offered for dedication. With item #11, the Township should determine if it would allow the proposed cartway width of 20-ft. What was the opinion of the Planning Commission? Mr. Schwartz stated that as long as they have the right-of-way the cartway width would be fine.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.2352, cartway width, to allow the 20-foot cartway width for the private street (Curtis Drive). The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kent stated that with item #12 for curbing, they thought they would not need to put in the curbing. Mr. Peifer stated that they would need to take care of the waiver officially. Mr. Bittig stated they would need a written waiver request. Mr. Kent stated that for item #14, lot #1 may not meet the lot depth to width ratio, they like the configuration. Could they get a waiver for that? Mr. Schwartz stated that with lots that size it shouldn't matter.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirements of SALDO Section 5.514, lot depth to width ratio for Lot #1. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kent stated that for item #15 to revise the layouts of Lots #4 and Lot #1 to locate access for Lot #4 on proposed Curtis Drive instead of existing Wegman Road, that was discussed at Sketch Plan and they

Limekiln Heights continued

were told that four lots would not work on a private road. Mr. Bittig stated that it sounded as though they had plenty of sight distance for the existing drive. There should be no problem for that.

Mr. Kent stated that for item #20, they needed to know what the required width of the easement should be around the pond and the stream. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that typically it would be a 20-ft easement. Mr. Bittig stated that it should be 10-ft from the top of the bank on both sides of the stream and around the pond.

Mr. Kent asked about item #27, would the Township want recreational open space or pay the recreation impact fee. Mr. Schwartz stated that typically they would take the impact fee. Mr. Bittig stated that would be up to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Kent stated that with item #24 for sidewalks it was determined they would not need it. Under General Comments item #2 the developer should consider annexing to the adjacent property owner – Houpp, the part of Lots 1 to 2 that are located on the northeast side of Curtis Drive. They did not want to annex that, they needed that for the grading of the street and they were concerned that if they annexed it the owners may plant trees and it would block the view.

Mr. Kent thanked the Planning Commission.

**9. CLEON W. & CINDY KEMP SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN FOR RECORD - John Huck**

Mr. Huck stated that they did not have a review from GVC, but they wanted to discuss the plan. The proposed subdivision was located on the north side of Lorane Road. The purpose of the subdivision was to separate the two existing dwellings onto separate lots and ownership. The zoning was SR-2. They had two issues they would like to discuss. There was an existing driveway to the garage that goes on to Lot #1 through Lot #2. They could split the driveway off, but they prefer not to do that. Family owned all of it. Cleon and Cindy own 50% of the property the other 50% was owned by Cleons' mother and two sisters. They want to divide it so Cleon and Cindy would own Lot #1 and then the mother and sisters, who also own the adjoining lot, would own Lot #2. Mr. Peifer asked if they wanted to annex the adjoining lot or let it stand by itself? Mr. Huck replied that they would prefer to let it stand by itself. Mr. Schwartz asked how close the garage was to the proposed property line? Mr. Huck replied 10.1 feet. Mr. Schwartz stated that with the use of the driveway they would prefer to see an easement for that. Mr. Huck stated that it would be written that as long as it was family owned there would be an easement, however, if the property were sold they would have to move the driveway onto the property completely. Mr. Huck stated that the other issue was the well. They share the well, but they both have separate sewer facilities. They would like to continue the use until such time the property would be sold to someone outside the family. The Planning Commission did not see a problem with that.

Mr. Bittig stated that the ultimate right-of-way should be shown on the plan. Mr. Huck thanked the Planning Commission.

**10. MCGINNIS/BEAVER ANNEXATION – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Robert Miller**

Mr. Miller stated they had no review from GVC but would like to discuss the plan. Previously they annexed land to Mrs. Beaver, she now wants to acquire more land from the McGinnis's for a buffer. It was not contiguous. They would suggest a 125-ft right-of-way to access the property. Mr. Bittig asked if the one-acre tract adjoins the Beaver tract? Mr. Miller replied it did not. Mr. Bittig stated that it did not meet the definition of an annexation in our SALDO. Mr. Wilson asked if they could sell the one-acre and the roadway to Mrs. Beaver and give them right-of-way to access their property? Mr. Bittig stated they could do that. Mr. Miller stated that they did not realize that the annexation parcel had to be contiguous. In the County review the only item in question was the access to the parcel, which was why they had the easement shown. Mr. Wilson asked if they wanted to just make the 1-acre a separate lot, was there anything in the ordinance that would prevent that? Mr. Bittig stated it did not meet our definition of a legal lot because it does not abut a private or public road. With that lot, it has steep slopes on it so they would need to have a conservation easement added to the plan.

Mr. Miller stated that they would wait for the review letter to see if there were any other issues to be addressed.

**11. YEAKLEY BRIEF SUBDIVISION – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Brian Boyer**

GVC reviewed the Yeakley Brief Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated February 27, 2004).

Mr. Boyer stated that in the GVC review letter there were some minor issues that they could address. Under Zoning for the required stopping distance for the shared driveway, they would try for an easement or go for a zoning variance. Mr. Schwartz asked what they were proposing for the site now? Mr. Boyer replied it still hadn't changed, two flag lots and two road front lots. They wanted to have a formal action on the plan and go to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Schwartz stated we should do that.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors not approve the Yeakley Brief Subdivision Preliminary Plan due to previously discussed problems with the plan and the items listed in the February 27<sup>th</sup> GVC review letter. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bittig stated that he would get the Sections of the SALDO for the letter to the Board of Supervisors.

**12. TRAFFIC STUDY LIMITS FOR THE NOLEN GROUP**

GVC made recommendations to the scope of the Traffic Impact Study for the proposed development off of Rugby Road (reference letter dated February 19, 2004).

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that we received the letter from GVC defining the scope of the Traffic Study needed by the Nolen Group for the proposed development off of Rugby Road. It states in the SALDO that the Study limits are to be determined by the Board of Supervisors. We have the letter for the

Traffic Study continued

Planning Commission to review and offer their suggestions to the Board if anything would need to be added. Typically the Board looks to the Planning Commission for recommendations.

### **Public Comment**

**Pat Vlasak**, 211 Rugby Road, asked if they could make a request to add Rugby & Valley Drive, Rugby Road & Green Road and the entrance to Devon Green (Lincoln Drive). They should also add the proposed Community Center. There was a problem with speeding on Rugby Road. They had requested the police to sit in their driveway to try to stop speeders there. Could they have the speed added to the traffic study? Mr. Peifer stated they could make the request and the Planning Commission would decide if they wanted to have that added. Mrs. Geiger stated that it should be considered. Mr. Peifer stated that when they do the study they take into consideration the traffic, as it was now and then what it would be with the new development. They see if there would be a change in service levels. The longer you wait at the intersection the lower the level would be. They rate it from A to F. Then the Township had the right to ask them how they will mitigate the problem. Any short cuts they know that people were using to get to 422, they could have those areas added to the list. Mrs. Vlasak asked if just the Township reads the review or would PennDOT also see it? Mr. Peifer stated that PennDOT would get involved with Shelbourne Road because that was a State Road. If the study would say that something would need to be done on Shelbourne Road, then the State would need to be brought in.

**Mark Speece**, 240 Rugby Road, stated that they should add Lincoln Drive and Rugby Road to the list. It was potentially hazardous there and it should be added to the list. People stop to take a left turn there to go east onto 422 and the cars speeding on Rugby Road have rear-ended cars or had near misses at that location.

**Barry Ziegler**, 15 Longview Drive, stated that six months ago they sent a letter requesting them to look at the intersection of Longview Drive and Valley Drive. That area had become a short cut from Rt. 562 to Pennsylvania Ave to Valley Drive through Devon Green to Walmart/422. A number of times they have come out of that intersection and have almost been hit.

**Connie Perry**, 1 Valley Drive, stated that traffic had increased in the years they have lived there. Could they add the intersection of Glamour Ave, Valley Drive and Rugby Road to the list? That was also used as a short cut to Wal-Mart. In the 25 mph zone people were driving at least 35/40mph and had to squeal to a stop at the stop sign. She was concerned with the safety of the children. There was a problem at that location even without adding 132 townhouses behind them.

**Thomas Howell**, 4970 Hafer Road, had a suggestion to add a speed study. Also to ask how many speeding tickets were written for that area.

**Charles Russo**, 180 Rugby Road, stated that 13 years ago they came to the Township requesting speed be monitored and enforced. They had to properly post the speed. It had been done. They agreed that

Traffic Study continued

they should ask for speeding tickets for that area. They had never seen anyone pulled over for speeding. One question they had for the traffic study, how would the traffic study tell you if the left or right turns into the development would be safe for school busses? Mr. Peifer stated that those issues would be dealt with inside the Subdivision Ordinance for Sight Distance. Tonight we had two plans that had sight distance problems and neither one of them received waivers for that. With the Traffic Study, they would make recommendations for improvements.

**David Addison**, 19 Longview Drive, stated that with the previous list of roads to be included in the traffic study, they did not believe that Rugby Road and Lincoln or Rugby Road and Glamaur were on that list. Could the Planning Commission have those added to the list?

Mr. Wilson stated that they would add them to the list and present it to the Board of Supervisors on March 22, 2004.

### **13. DISCUSS DATE FOR ZONING WORKSHOP**

The Planning Commission agreed to meet on Tuesday, March 23, 2004 at 7:pm for the next Zoning Workshop.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to adjourn the March 2, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:08pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Balthaser Conditional Use  
BOS: Miller Commercial Waiver Requests  
BOS: Miller Commercial Preliminary Plan Approval  
BOS: Hubert A. Brickey Property Waiver Requests  
BOS: Limekiln Heights Waiver Request  
BOS: Yeakley Brief Subdivision Plan Denial  
BOS: Nolen Group Traffic Study Limits

