

**MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
SEPTEMBER 7, 2004**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, September 7, 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
John F. Ruff, Secretary
Richard Littlehales
J.D. Krafczek
Paul L. Schwartz

ABSENT: Dottie Geiger

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Craig Peifer, GVC Consulting Engineer
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary
Eric Gardecki, GIS Administrator

1. MINUTES

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

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the September 7, 2004 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

- A. **EXETER COMMUNITY LIBRARY – PRELIMINARY PLAN, SHAW BRIEF SUBDIVISION – FINAL PLAN, FOREST HILLS SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD: MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

4. WAGNER -CONDITIONAL USE

Ms. Cusimano stated that Mr. Wagner was proposing to operate an office in his home at 17 Sycamore Drive as a home occupation. There would be no customers coming to the home. They would have no outside advertising or storage of equipment. The responses by the neighbors were all favorable. It would be a no-impact home occupation.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a conditional use for Mr. Wagner. The motion carried unanimously.

5. R. M. PALMER WAREHOUSE – PRELIMINARY/ FINAL PLAN – Barry Weaver

GVC reviewed the R. M. Palmer Warehouse Preliminary/Final plan (reference letter dated September 7, 2004).

Mr. Weaver stated that the only thing they submitted since the last meeting was the Traffic Impact Study and that needed to be revised. They would include the streetlights and stormwater for the improvements agreement. What else did they need to provide with that? Mr. Peifer replied the monuments and the curbing. Mr. Weaver stated they would put the monuments in beforehand so that would not need to be included. They would make the needed changes and resubmit.

6. GIESSUEBEL MINOR SUBDIVISION –PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN – David Giessuebel

GVC reviewed the Giessuebel Minor Subdivision Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated September 1, 2004).

Mr. Peifer stated that they needed to show the FEMA flood plain and the floodway boundary. The elevation datum used should be based on the FEMA elevations. They could shoot that location, tie it into the property and just put a note on the plan if there was a difference between FEMA and the plan. With item #3 concerning the trees, they were requesting a waiver because there would be no trees in the area of construction. Mr. Ruff stated that since there were no trees in the area of construction they would not need the waiver; just place a note on the plan. Mr. Peifer stated that with item #4 for the marking of the wetlands area, they would just need a note on the plan that the wetlands would not be disturbed during construction activities.

Mr. Peifer stated they needed Planning Module approval by the DEP. Mr. Ruff stated that signing the Planning Module was on the agenda for tonight.

Mr. Giessuebel stated that they would pay the Recreational Impact Fee. They would forward plans to the Township Sewer Authority. They would take care of items #8, 9 and 12. Mr. Bittig stated that for item #14, the date for the waivers was August 9th.

7. SHAW BRIEF SUBDIVISION – FINAL PLAN – Kevin Bensinger

GVC reviewed the Shaw Brief Subdivision Final Plan (reference letter dated September 2, 2004).

Mr. Bensinger stated that under zoning, they were looking for a waiver of the Environmental Assessment Statement. They were also looking for a waiver of the sidewalks.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.283 for an Environmental Assessment Statement and for Section 6.204 for sidewalks for the Shaw Brief Subdivision. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bensinger asked about item #2 under zoning for the speed limit on Huyett Street, could they have the speed limit posted at 25? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that we would address that with the Board of Supervisors and ask them to post it at 25mph.

Shaw Brief Subdivision continued

Mr. Bensinger stated that the first item for SALDO stated that a monument or marker should be set at the proposed Quinter property line and proposed right-of-way. Gibraltar Road was already monumented from the previous subdivision, so they would like to set pins instead. The Planning Commission agreed that one monument should be set along Huyett Street. Mr. Bensinger stated that they were waiting for the letter from the water company. They have E & SPC approval from the Berks County Conservation District. Mr. Bensinger asked if Mr. Peifer could clarify the improvements agreement? Mr. Peifer replied that if they needed to do anything with stormwater or if they got plan approval before the monument was set, that would need to be in an improvements agreement. Mr. Bensinger stated that under Stormwater #16, what was needed there? Mr. Peifer stated that the proposed grading shows a potential for discharge of stormwater onto adjoining properties especially for lot #3 and the swale. Mr. Bensinger stated they would check to see if infiltration trenches would work in that area.

8. LAKEVIEW AT GLEN OLEY FARMS – REVISED FINAL PLAN – Daniel Laudenslayer

GVC reviewed the Lakeview at Glen Oley Farms revised Final Plan (reference letter dated September 3, 2004).

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that the original easement was located in a tree row, they offset that so they would not have to remove the trees. The other changes were for lot #13 & 14; they changed the location of the pressure sewer lateral so they would not have to cross the wetlands. Mr. Schwartz asked if they would still be pressure laterals? Mr. Laudenslayer replied yes. Mr. Peifer stated that there was one discrepancy with the distance for the sewer easement. Mr. Laudenslayer stated they would correct that. Mr. Peifer stated that the Board of Supervisors granted them approval for lot #12 to access Oley Turnpike Road, so they changed the note on the plan to allow that. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that all the plans have “Revised Final Plan” on them. There was also a note on the plan that the plan supercedes all other plans in regards to the easements.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the revised Final Plan for Lakeview at Glen Oley Farms upon receipt of properly signed and sealed copies. The motion carried with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Krafczek, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Ruff voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

9. PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Daniel Laudenslayer

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

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they changed the plan to provide a smaller crossing of the wetland area and to provide future access to the Demko property. The water and sewer would be also be available for access to the Demko property. They were requesting waivers for the depth to width ratio on a number of lots. They were discussed at the previous meeting.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.514 for lot depth to width ratio for lots #4, 16, 18, 19, 20, 30, 60, 61, 84 and 85. The motion carried unanimously.

Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 continued

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.514 for lot depth to width ratio for lots #13 and #51, they were corner lots and the location of the house was preferable. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that for item #3 under SALDO, they would do one test well prior to final plan approval. Mr. Peifer stated that generally they do one test well for every ten lots, usually a minimum of 50-ft. deep and demonstrate they have adequate supply and that it was potable. Mr. Wilson asked how many properties would need wells? Mr. Laudenslayer replied around 8 or 9.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they revised the lighting and it met the ordinance. They would send that along to the utility company. For the E & S, if they would get support on the plan, then they would work on the E & S plan to send into the Berks County Conservation District. Mr. Peifer stated that they would need that with the final plan.

Mr. Bittig asked about the Fire Marshal letter. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they moved the fire hydrant to meet the concern. Mr. Bittig stated that another concern was to be able to provide pressure and flow rate for the hydrants. Mr. Laudenslayer stated an attorney contacted the water company in August and they were told that they would have a review soon. Could they wait until final plan? Mr. Bittig stated they would need that now. Mr. Peifer asked if they received any approval from the water company? Mr. Laudenslayer replied yes, they would provide adequate pressure to the 320 line. Mr. Schwartz stated that they might need to put in a cistern to be able to provide the proper protection. So they would be ok to proceed and get that before final plan approval.

Mr. Bittig asked what the lot area was for lot #20? Mr. Laudenslayer stated that it was incorrect on the plan and they would correct that. Mr. Wilson asked about item #10 for the driveways, what did they need to do? Mr. Peifer stated they could put the spots at the curb lines. Mr. Laudenslayer stated they would do that. They would also work on the gutter spread and for the grading for lots #47, 48 and 49. They might raise them and put in a wall. They were looking for conditional preliminary plan approval.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend conditional approval to the Board of Supervisors for the Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 Preliminary Plan subject to addressing the items in the September 2nd review letter particularly: receiving waiver approval, resolving item #8 for the Schoffers Road widening, and the Fire Marshal comments being addressed at Final Plan stage. The motion carried with Mr. Ruff, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Krafczek, Mr. Littlehales voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

10. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE VI – PRELIMINARY PLAN – C. J. Levan

GVC reviewed the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase VI Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated September 3, 2004).

Mr. Levan stated that they were looking for a waiver of the Environmental Assessment Statement.

Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase VI continued

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.283 for an Environmental Assessment Statement. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Levan stated that item #6 for the increase of the right-of-way to a minimum of 30ft. from centerline; they were requesting a waiver for that.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.216 for the additional right-of-way width for Scotland Drive due to the fact there was only 60-ft. along Scotland Drive. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Levan stated that other than receiving the waivers from the Board of Supervisors, they had no other comments for the plan, so they were looking for preliminary plan approval.

The Planning Commission agreed that they could come back as a preliminary/final plan.

Mr. Peifer asked that they submit written waiver requests for the previous waivers.

11. FAIRVIEW PARK II – PRELIMINARY PLAN - C. J. Levan

GVC reviewed the Fairview Park II Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated September 3, 2004).

Mr. Levan stated that the main entrance and the emergency access were reversed as had been discussed at a previous meeting. Mr. Peifer stated they show the emergency access as paved in stone, they should ask the Road Master whether it should be paved or stone. Mr. Levan stated that they proposed it as gravel as the existing lane was gravel. Mr. Peifer asked if that would be dedicated? Mr. Levan replied yes.

Mr. Bittig asked how many homes would be located there? Mr. Levan replied on that particular piece, 45. Mr. Bittig asked if there was one main road? Mr. Levan replied one main road and one emergency access. Mr. Bittig stated that did not meet the ordinance. Mr. Peifer stated that previously they showed the emergency access and the main entrance being reversed. The direction they were given was to approach the adjoining landowner, who they were getting land from to do this, to put the main entrance in on that property.

Mr. Bittig stated that by the ordinance it stated multiple accesses when they get above 20 homes. They were looking at double that amount with a single access. Mr. Levan replied that they did a number of sketches before submitting the preliminary plan. They tried to add an access through Alice Drive, but they didn't because of the impact to the environment. They checked with the Army Corp of Engineers to see what they would allow them to do with the project. They would not allow them to cross the 25-ft ravine. They minimized the grading to allow 2 culverts to be placed. There also was a small area of wetlands they needed to stay out of. They changed their access locations believing it would be acceptable to the Planning Commission. Mr. Wilson stated that the reason they flipped the two was because the width was not adequate. Mr. Bittig stated that it was a fully wooded site and with the small lots, that was something we were trying to avoid. Mr. Levan stated that the developer went back to the owner to purchase that second piece of property and that was resolved and they were moving forward with the plan. They didn't know if it would be

Fairview Park II continued

feasible to develop the property. Mr. Peifer asked if they looked at the wetland areas. Mr. Levan stated that they had the wetlands delineated and they were shown on the plan. The Army Corps and DEP were scheduled to meet regarding the project. They had given them the lot-grading plan. Mr. Bittig stated that we looked at the contouring on the original plan and there were a number of areas on the tract that qualify as steep slope areas that need to be protected. They run anywhere from 28 to 50%. We did not see that anywhere on the plan. Mr. Levan stated they did show a conservation easement on the plan. Mr. Bittig stated that they could not build there. Mr. Wilson stated when we walked the site; we did not think there would be such a large number of lots. We were under the impression they wanted larger lots and higher scale homes to avoid the steep slopes and the ravines. Mr. Wilson stated that we had expressed concern about the amount of traffic that would need access to 422 and how it might impact the development across the street by people cutting through there to get to 422.

Mr. Bittig asked how many total home sites they were planning? Mr. Levan replied 57. Mr. Bittig stated that they would need two full access areas. Mr. Levan stated that was the intention of the emergency access. Mr. Schwartz stated that the ordinance stated two means of ingress and egress shall be provided unless the Township granted a waiver, it did not state two full means of access. Mr. Wilson stated that the concern would be if there were an accident that would block one of the entrances. As far as he could see they would have another way to access the development. Mr. Schwartz stated that he felt the greater issue was the amount of traffic coming out of the development. Mr. Bittig stated that he was concerned if there was an accident on Fairview Chapel Road, it would block the entire access out of the development. Mr. Bittig and Mr. Littlehales both agreed they would not support the plan. Mr. Schwartz asked if Mr. Littlehales had a problem getting out of his development? Mr. Littlehales replied yes, it was a problem depending on the time of day. Mr. Levan asked what we would like the developer to do with the issue? Mr. Wilson asked if they did the traffic impact study? Mr. Levan stated they were working on that. Mr. Ruff stated that the plan was better than the original plan and that was what we asked of them.

Public Comment

Paul Pessagno, 340 Fairview Chapel Road, stated that previously they had a list of concerns about the development. They shortened the list and had a copy for everyone. They did not have to discuss them immediately, but wanted to have it recorded for the record. They owned an 8-acre property that adjoined the development on three sides.

Charles Douglas, 370 Fairview Chapel Road, stated that initially on the plan the entrance was going to be placed between his house and the neighbors. Now they planned to put it on the other side of John Lenarts property and it did not meet with another street. They did not have the benefit of an intersection there. They have offered their property. Mr. Douglas asked how wide the new road would be? Mr. Levan replied 34-ft. cartway and 54-ft. right-of-way. Mr. Douglas stated they called and spoke to someone and let them know it would be better if they bought their and their neighbors house to put the road in there. They could also put in some houses in that area. Mr. Levan stated that they were not aware of the conversation. Mr. Wilson stated that would be the ideal situation because the roads would line up better, but we were not in the position to tell them to buy the houses.

Fairview Park II continued

Mr. Levan stated that they believe they met the Township ordinance requirements based on what they have proposed. They followed the direction of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Wilson stated that he was disappointed with the plan because he was concerned with the number of houses on the property and the amount of traffic it would produce. Mr. Levan asked if the issue of the number of houses was raised at the last meeting? Mr. Schwartz stated that we were so concerned with the entrance issue at that time that we probably hadn't looked at the plan further than that. Mr. Wilson asked if they couldn't extend the street to go down thru to Lincoln Road? Mr. Levan replied that they have added a stub to be able to add a street in the future at the Pessagno property. They would take the comments back to their clients and see what they want to do. Mr. Bittig stated that they do violate the steep slope requirements. Mr. Levan stated they would look into that.

Mr. Levan stated that with comment #9 for lots 24, 25, 27, 45, 55 & 56, they were requesting a waiver for those. Mr. Bittig stated that some of the lots might be exempt, if they were over 27,000 sq. ft. Mr. Levan stated that lots #24 and #55 were larger. Mr. Schwartz stated that we would rather they try to reconfigure the lots and not need all the waivers. Mr. Levan stated that they would talk to DEP and the Army Corp. regarding that because they may also have an impact on the number of lots. Mr. Schwartz stated we did not see a problem with lot #56, but would like to withhold comment on the remaining lots until a later date.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.514, lot width to depth ratio for lot #56 and withhold comment on the other lots at a later date. The motion carried with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Krafczek, Mr. Bittig voting in favor and Mr. Littlehales voting opposed.

Mr. Levan stated that comment #10 concerned lot #32 and the reverse frontage. Mr. Peifer stated the lot had frontage on three streets. The issue was did the lot have reverse frontage or did it have three front yards? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it would be three front yards. Mr. Peifer stated that they should add a note to the plan that the house must front the street on the right, whatever name it would be. Mr. Levan stated that comment #15 addressed whether they should put curb and sidewalk on Fairview Chapel road, lots #53 and #54. Mr. Schwartz stated that currently there was no curb and sidewalk on Fairview Chapel Road so they should put a note on the plan. Mr. Levan stated that they added the note that no curbs and sidewalks would be put in at lots #53 and #54 until such time the Township finds it necessary. Mr. Peifer stated that there was one other comment that needed to be addressed concerned the ravine that starts at Fairview Chapel Road between the two lots that front there. We felt it would be hard to place two lots on that piece of ground where that ravine was located. The ravine may be deeper than it appeared on the plan. The driveways would be right on the edge of the ravine.

Mr. Bittig asked where the stormwater from the project would be going? Mr. Peifer replied Heisters Creek. Mr. Bittig stated that best management practice stated that it should go back into the ground. Were they doing infiltration systems? Mr. Levan replied they have not proposed infiltration, however, they have not gotten to that point in the design. Mr. Bittig stated that our Ordinance required Best Management Practice. Mr. Wilson stated that with the soil there, they might not be able to do that. Mr. Bittig asked what the land was used for previously? Mr. Levan stated that it was used by the Nursery for stock. Mr. Bittig was concerned that it may have been a dumpsite previously. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was original growth woods. Mr. Levan stated

Fairview Park II continued

that they have already done a Phase 1 assessment of the property and did not find anything. Did the Planning Commission want them to go through the comments in Mr. Pessagno's letter? They could address some of the comments listed. Most of the comments would be covered by the E & S approval or by the stormwater requirements in the SALDO. Mr. Pasagno asked where the stormwater from their property would go?

Mr. Levan stated they would go into the existing channels. Mr. Pasagno stated that where one of the existing channels was located, the water ran right into a proposed house. Mr. Levan stated that they would take care of that. As far as the impact on surrounding wells, they were proposing public water so they would not affect the aquifer. Mr. Pasagno stated they were concerned that they would get silt in their wells because their wells were shallow. After three days of good rain they have red dust in the water. It was not only their well, also the neighbors. Mr. Bittig stated that well water was not protected by law. Mr. Pasagno stated that they wanted it on record that if something did happen to their wells, then the Township was aware of their concern. Mr. Levan stated that concerning the hours of construction, that was something controlled by the Township and they would have to follow those regulations. Mr. Pasagno asked if they would follow the regulations or would the surrounding property owners have to call the Township? Mr. Levan stated that the developer would follow them. Mr. Pasagno stated that they did not follow regulations when they went into that area recently and tracked mud all the way down to Lincoln Road. Mr. Levan stated that they weren't sure if that was a sub-contractor or the developer, but it was a violation and they apologize. When it came to the development the Berks County Conservation District would enforce those regulations. Mr. Douglas asked what would be the access road for the construction. Mr. Levan replied that the larger entrance would probably be used.

12. FOREST HILLS SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD – Paul Ylvisaker

GVC reviewed the Forest Hills Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated September 2, 2004).

Mr. Ylvisaker stated that they were there to represent Heritage Building Group, who was there to represent the owners of the property. The property was zoned UR and they were planning to subdivide the parcel into two lots. Lot #1 would be 6.82 acres and lot #2 would be 14.72 acres. One item in the review letter from GVC concerned the SALDO in respect to minor subdivision was limited only to two lots created for single family homes. The one parcel being subdivided, which would be owned by Heritage, would be developed with town homes similar to the Carlino plan. That would come back to the Planning Commission at a later date. They were just looking to put a lot line in the parcel to give SCI Funeral services lot #1 and lot #2 would be for the Heritage group to purchase. They have time limits on getting the project done. The plan was for a minor subdivision only. The note was on the plan that any other development of the parcels would be required to go through full subdivision procedures. They were looking for a waiver of subdivision for single-family homes. Mr. Ruff asked if the plan was just for lot lines and not proposing any uses? Mr. Ylvisaker replied just drawing the lines. Mr. Schwartz stated that one of the concerns for the original plan was a second access off of Neversink Road. The concern would be that where they put the line for the property would not interfere with the area for second access.

Mr. Ylvisaker stated that they could not find funeral home in the Zoning Ordinance as a permitted use. Mr. Bittig stated that we were working on that. Mr. Ylvisaker asked if the Planning Commission would recommend a waiver so the plan could be recognized as a minor subdivision with the funeral home being part of Lot #1 and townhouses on Lot #2 instead of single family homes.

Forest Hills Subdivision continued

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 3.81 to permit the plan to proceed as a minor subdivision despite the fact that it was not for two single-family residential properties. The commercial use was pre-existing and the subdivision met the spirit of the ordinance. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ylvisaker stated that they would comply with item #2. Mr. Schwartz stated that the other bold item in the review letter concerned the Environmental Assessment Statement, which they could hold off and address with the land development.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.283 for an Environmental Assessment Statement. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ylvisaker stated that with item #12, could they do that with the land development? The Planning Commission agreed to let them wait until land development. Mr. Bittig stated that the plan showed a 27-ft. right-of-way. The ultimate right-of-way should be 30-ft. from centerline. Mr. Ylvisaker stated that they would comply.

Mr. Ylvisaker stated that Berks County Planning Commission had no opposition to the plan. There were no problems from the Fire Marshal and they did not see anything from the EAC so they were assuming that was ok. They would like to ask for approval, subject to adding the note on the plan and anything else they would like to add. Mr. Peifer stated they should add a non-building declaration for sewer. Mr. Ylvisaker stated they would do that.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend conditional approval to the Board of Supervisors subject to all comments in the GVC review letter dated September 2, 2004 being satisfied. The motion carried unanimously.

13. EXETER COMMUNITY LIBRARY – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Thomas Ludgate
Michele Kircher

GVC reviewed the Exeter Community Library Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated September 3, 2004).

Mr. Ludgate stated that they were planning to build a 15,000-sf. Library just beyond the existing library. Mr. Ruff asked what they were planning with the existing library? Mrs. Kircher replied that the upper area was the community center and the lower area would still be used. The tree on the lower area will have to be removed because it was diseased. Mr. Ludgate stated that under zoning it stated that only one building allowed per lot. Mr. Peifer stated that could have more than one, but the Township would have to ok it. Mr. Bittig stated that would be ok because it was a municipal use. Mrs. Kircher stated that the proposed amount of parking spaces were needed because they have 10 staff members and 10 volunteers and they average a number of 336 visitors a day. Our year-to-date count of people coming to the library as of July was 10,401. With the programs they run at the library they would need that amount of spaces. Mr. Bittig stated the concern would be with the amount of impervious surface. Mr. Bittig asked how many spaces were down at the existing facility? Mrs. Kircher replied that they did not know exactly, but most people were parking out on the street.

Exeter Community Library continued

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that more spaces were better. Mr. Littlehales stated that with some of the programs they have they would need the additional spaces. Mrs. Kircher stated that they wanted to do something right for a change and provide the additional parking and they had the space to do it. The Planning Commission agreed the additional parking would be fine. Mr. Ludgate stated that with item #8 for the Environmental Assessment Statement, they would ask for a waiver of that. Mr. Wilson stated we would grant that, but they would need submit it in writing. Mr. Ludgate stated that they submitted a waiver request for SALDO Section 4.239 to show the contour lines for the entire tract.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Krafczek, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.239, to allow them to show the contour lines for the developed area only. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ludgate stated they were looking for a waiver for the Water Resource Study because they were not demanding a large water supply. Mr. Schwartz asked if they were public water? Mr. Ludgate replied public.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.287 for a Water Resource Study. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ludgate stated that they were planning to have a separate driveway for the new library because it would be a separate use rather than sharing the driveway for the Community Center. Mr. Peifer stated that we did not have a problem with that, but it would be better to eliminate the second access. Considering the amount of traffic that would be using the library it would be better to have one entrance than the two driveways so close together. Mrs. Kircher stated that they would like to make the proposed driveway wider. Mr. Bittig stated that would be fine.

Mr. Bittig stated that they should pay attention to item #9 under Stormwater given the problems we have in the Township. Mr. Ludgate stated that they would. Mr. Bittig asked where the nearest fire hydrant was located? Mr. Ludgate replied there wasn't one near by; they were going to extend the water line and add a hydrant. They were waiting to hear if the location would be ok with the Fire Marshal.

14. EXETER HIGH SCHOOL – REVISION TO FINAL PLAN – Hugh Cadzow

Mr. Cadzow stated that they needed to revise the plan for the high school to enlarge the cafeteria to be able to service the maximum number of students that would be using the facility at one time. They reassessed the usage of the facility and it was found to be lacking in efficient area. The cafeteria expansion was purely table and chairs. The net result would be a lose of pervious grass area of 866-ft. The School Board wished to expedite review of the plan so they could continue to build while the plan was being revised. If it was needed they were requesting waivers of Section 3.01 and 3.02. Mr. Schwartz asked if they had any stormwater issues? Mr. Cadzow replied that they were just raising the inlet in the seating plaza slightly. Mr. Schwartz stated that we didn't see any problem except that they would need to revise the plan of record.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to recommend the Board of Supervisors allow the Exeter High School to continue with the construction of the proposed cafeteria while they work on the revision of the plan of record. The motion carried unanimously.

15. HANS GOHRIG HOUSE & KERR FARMHOUSE – INFORMAL DISCUSSION - Jared Barcz

Mr. Barcz stated that they were currently in the process of purchasing the Kerr Road Farmhouse and wanted to renovate it. They were also under verbal agreement to purchase the Hans Gohrig House as soon as they were done with the farmhouse. They wanted to learn what the Planning Commission wanted from them in doing the renovations. The process was new to them. They did not have actual plans until they own the house. They would update mechanicals and replace the roof. Mr. Ruff stated that we wished they would be starting on the Hans Gohrig house first. That building was the reason we applied the Historical Controls. Mr. Barcz stated they did not want to make changes on the Hans Gohrig house. They want to restore it to its original state. For the farmhouse they need to move in there as quickly as possible and get the permits so they could get started. Did we need to see their qualifications to be sure they would not knock over the Gohrig house? Mr. Bittig stated that they could not make it worse than it already was. Mr. Barcz stated that they would like to add dormers to the attic of the farmhouse so they could add some living space there. They wanted to improve the appearance of the house. The dormers would be appropriate to the period of the house. They would put in all new electric, plumbing and forced air. The basement needed waterproofing. Mr. Wilson stated that we did not see any problem with adding dormers to the farmhouse in keeping with the period. Mr. Ruff stated that it was the first time the Planning Commission would be working with the Historical Controls, so it was new to us too. The zoning was vague on the direction to take. Mr. Barcz asked if they would need to go to the Board of Supervisors concerning the farmhouse? Mr. Ruff stated that they would need to do that with the Hans Gohrig house. Mr. Barcz stated that they were thankful to Richard Levensgood for saving the Hans Gohrig house for them. Would the meeting cover the permits? Mr. Wilson stated that they would need to go to the engineering department for the permits. Mr. Schwartz stated that they might need to go to the Board of Supervisors to see how they wanted to handle the renovations of the Hans Gohrig house. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they could contact Mr. George Meiser for research for the project. Mr. Ruff stated as far as the mechanicals for the Hans Gohrig House, they should be able to get the permits for that. It would just be for the outside renovations that they would need to do Historical Controls. Mr. Schwartz stated that they would need to provide plans for the farmhouse for the Planning Commission to review. Mrs. Franckowiak asked what their intent was for the farmhouse? Mr. Barcz replied that they planned to have two units in the farmhouse and, after renovations, live in the Hans Gohrig House. The Planning Commission wished them luck with the project.

16. TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY LIMITS FOR TOBOLSKI PROPERTY

GVC reviewed the Scope for Traffic Impact Study for the Tobolski Property (reference letter dated September 3, 2004).

Mr. Peifer stated that Penn DOT wanted trip generation for the site and entrance design. They did not see the need to do anything else. Mr. Schwartz stated that the review should be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors and let them know we concur with it.

17. GIESSUEBEL MINOR SUBDIVISION – SIGN PLANNING MODULE

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to have the secretary sign the Planning Module. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ruff signed and dated the Giessuebel Minor Subdivision Planning Module forms for the DEP.

18. SET DATE FOR NOVEMBER PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The Planning Commission agreed to hold the November 2004 Planning Commission meeting on Monday, November 1, 2004.

19. ZONING WORKSHOP REMINDER – SEPTEMBER 22, 2004

The Planning Commission will hold the next Zoning Workshop on Wednesday, September 22nd at 7:00 p.m.

20. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Peifer presented the Windsor Township Tour booklet for the Cluster Developments in Chester County to the Planning Commission to help in preparing what locations to look at when Exeter Township takes a tour of that area.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they had a letter from Gary Kubovcsak that the Planning Commission should issue a response to give to the Board of Supervisors for the last meeting of the month. If they would like they could read the letter and discuss it at the next meeting. The Planning Commission agreed to read over it and discuss it at a later date.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to adjourn the September 7, 2004 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:06 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Correspondence to:

BOS: Wagner Conditional Use
BOS: Exeter High School Renovations revised Final Plan
BOS: Shaw Brief Subdivision waiver requests
BOS: Lakeview at Glen Oley Farms revised Final Plan
BOS: Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 waiver requests & conditional approval
BOS: Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase VI waiver requests
BOS: Fairview Park II waiver request
BOS: Forest Hills Subdivision waiver request and conditional approval
BOS: Exeter Community Library waiver requests
BOS: Tobolski Property Traffic Impact Study Limits

