

**MINUTES  
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
FEBRUARY 1, 2005**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, February 1, 2005 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

**ABSENT:** Eric Gardecki, GIS Administrator

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

**1. MINUTES**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the agenda of the February 1, 2005 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

- A. EXETER COMMUNITY LIBRARY – FINAL PLAN; TOALDO ANNEXATION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD; LINCOLN ROAD SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD; COMMERCIAL BUILDING – SKETCH PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

**4. HERBEIN – CONDITIONAL USE**

Sherry Herbein was proposing a home occupation to operate a chocolate making and bakery business at 34 Foxglove Lane.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that there would be no customers coming to the home, no deliveries and no signage. They met the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. There were no objections from the neighbors.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Sherry Herbein with the condition that no signs be placed on the property. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. EXETER COMMUNITY LIBRARY – FINAL PLAN** – Thomas Ludgate

GVC reviewed the Exeter Community Library Final Plan (reference letter dated January 26, 2005).

Mr. Ludgate stated that they have added the new access road. The existing Library would be converted to a Community Center. The new Library would have two parking areas. Mrs. Geiger asked if there would be any removal of trees? Mr. Ludgate replied that some trees would be removed for the building. Mr. Schwartz asked if the walking trail would be disrupted? Mr. Ludgate stated that on the 25-ft wide driveway aisle they would add a 4-ft walking path to replace that. Mr. Bittig stated that under SALDO it discussed the detention basin drainage area. Who would have maintenance responsibility for those? Mr. Ludgate replied that he thought it would be the Township, but he did not know what the Library and the Township had worked out. Mr. Bittig stated that it would need to be resolved. He also stated that under Stormwater Management, the Stormwater release rate indicated that there would be an increase in runoff and that was not allowed. Runoff rate had to be reduced. Mr. Peifer stated he believed it would be reduced after they straighten out some items in the report. They used rainfall curves from a different part of Pennsylvania that got a higher rainfall than here for the post-development and with the pre-development they used our curves so it was an artificial increase. Mr. Ludgate stated that they would correct that and comply with the comment. Mr. Bittig asked if all the comments would be complied with by March 1<sup>st</sup> so we could give them the stamp of approval? When was groundbreaking? Mr. Ludgate stated that it was scheduled for March 19<sup>th</sup>. That date was for ceremonial groundbreaking. The bid package for the library would be going out mid February. They would comply with all the comments; the E & S control plan would take the longest. Mr. Littlehales asked if there was a lighting plan? Mr. Ludgate stated that there was.

**6. TOALDO ANNEXATION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD** – Thomas Ludgate

GVC reviewed the Toaldo Annexation Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated January 27, 2005).

Mr. Ludgate stated that the property was located on Pineland Road. The larger parcel (57 acres) actually owned the small triangle next to the Toaldo Property, which was connected to the large parcel at a common point.

\* J. D. Krafczek arrived at this time

Toaldo Annexation continued

Mr. Ludgate stated that Mr. Toaldo contacted them because he was interested in purchasing the small parcel to make his lot larger. They prepared the annexation plan to attach the small parcel to Mr. Toaldo's property. Mr. Bittig asked how large the annexation piece was and the Toaldo piece? Mr. Ludgate replied .81 acres and .92 acres respectively. It would be a total of 1.7 acres post annexation. Lot #2 would have sufficient frontage with three areas along Pineland Road, 110-ft, 445-ft and 180-ft. They would list that on the key map. They would show the ultimate right-of-way of 30-feet. They would end up with a lot having a width greater than its depth. Would they need a waiver for that? Mr. Ruff replied that they should submit a written waiver and he would support that. Mr. Ludgate stated that they needed to ask for a waiver of the Environmental Assessment Statement. Mr. Bittig stated they could submit both of those in writing and we would support them. Mr. Ludgate stated they would comply with everything, submit the waivers in writing and be back next month.

7. **PINEVIEW RIDGE – PRELIMINARY PLAN** – Lon Seitz  
- Barrie Pease

GVC reviewed the Pineview Ridge Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated December 3, 2004).

Mr. Bittig asked if they took care of the frontage issue. Mr. Seitz stated that they had copies of the deeds of dedication. Concerning the trees, they show the trees that had to be removed identified on the plan. There were 49 trees. Mr. Schwartz asked if they were specimen trees. Mr. Seitz replied that they were Poplar, Pine and Maple. They would be planting over 30 street trees. Mr. Pease asked if they would need to replace the 49 trees because the lots were wooded lots and he didn't know where they would be able to add more trees? As for the value of the trees that were being removed, three years ago he had a logger come in and they would not even log it because there was nothing worth taking. Mr. Peifer stated that the trees that were within the right-of-way could come out. The ones beyond that area needed to be replaced. That was the count we would need. Mr. Seitz stated they would be counted. Mr. Peifer stated that the replacement trees have to be 2½ inches in diameter and would need to be put in the escrow. They would not have to be in the front yard, they could be placed anywhere on the lot. Mr. Bittig stated that those would be in addition to the street trees. Mr. Schwartz stated that they were required to put in the street trees every 50-ft, then they would need to replace the trees that were removed.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the Water Resource Study shows a large reduction of retained water. Mr. Peifer asked if they went to the Erosion and Sediment Control people concerning what they would make them do with infiltration? Mr. Seitz replied that the E & S plan had been approved and they required infiltration. Mr. Bittig stated that they were reducing the base recharge by 3,300 gallons per day with around eight or so households of water consumption. The development sat on the top of a ridge and the ground water would be pitching to the north and the south. Most of it was diverted to the north. The people along Perry Street were in a water critical area. He was concerned about that. Mr. Seitz stated that they when there was public sewer and on-lot water there would be a loss. That was why they put in as many infiltration systems as they did to try to get as much water back into the ground.

Mrs. Geiger asked if they were running public sewer to each house? Mr. Seitz replied yes. Mrs. Geiger asked where it would be located. Mr. Seitz replied the sewer system would be connected into the sewer on Perry

Pineview Ridge continued

Street. Mrs. Geiger stated that was private property. Mr. Seitz stated it was private property, but there was a sewer easement located there and they had a letter from the authority showing they were able to connect to the system. Mr. Pease stated that even though the street was not opened it did not revert to the individual property owner; it was for the use of everyone in the Pineland Subdivision. Mrs. Geiger asked if they could let the property owners know that to avert any misunderstanding? Mr. Seitz stated that it would be best for them to attend a Sewer Authority meeting and have it explained to them.

Mr. Wilson asked if the frontage issue was taken care of? Mr. Seitz replied yes, and gave the commission copies of the deeds. Mr. Wilson asked about the site distance. Mr. Seitz stated that they would put in a five-foot cut into the bank to the right in order to obtain the 310-foot site distance that they previously showed. The Ordinance stated that they should have 379 feet, but it was hard to be able to travel at the posted speed around that curve. That was why they requested a waiver of the required 379-foot distance and allow 310-feet. They had plenty from the other direction. Mr. Bittig asked Craig if the 379-foot was based on the posted 40mph speed limit? Mr. Peifer replied yes. Mr. Littlehales stated that you could not go 40mph around that curve. Mr. Bittig stated that he could do that at 35mph, but in reality 30mph was better. What was the site distance required for 30mph? Mr. Peifer replied that he did not have the calculations for that and would find out and let them know. Mr. Seitz stated that they would take down the inside corner so they would be able to see what was coming around the corner. Mr. Schwartz stated they would need to see the calculations before making any decision on that. Mr. Wilson stated that the speed was posted at 40mph, so they would need to have the entire sight distance for the posted speed. He did not feel it was in the Township's best interest to waive site distance. It might make the Township liable.

Mr. Wilson asked about the 30" RCP on Pineland Road, what was that? Mr. Peifer replied that statement was to see if there was any existing problem in that area with water. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Pease if they had any flooding in that hollow? Mr. Pease stated that normally it was dry, this year was unusually wet and there was some water coming off of the street since they repaved it. Mr. Wilson asked if they would handle the stormwater runoff that would flow onto the adjacent property owners? Mr. Seitz replied, yes, they would.

Mr. Seitz stated that in the review letter concerning having the grading and utility plan recorded, they did not feel that should be recorded because it would depend on the kind of house being built as to how the lots would be graded. When you record a document that was the law. If you would need to make any changes you would need to make a revision to the Plan of Record. It would be a nightmare to have to re-record the plan for every lot when they start to build. Mr. Bittig stated that we had a problem previously where a developer did not follow the grading plan and it was a big problem. Mr. Seitz stated that the fact that you record that plan still did not assure that the developer would follow the grading plan. Mr. Peifer stated that then we would have something we could point to and show how it should have been done. Mr. Seitz stated that with every supporting document, why not record all those? Mr. Peifer replied that in Spring Township they record every sheet. Mr. Seitz stated that he never had to record a typical grading plan. Mr. Peifer stated that the Stormwater Management report was based on that grading plan that was saying the water was going in a certain direction, where the roof leaders would drain and we need that assurance that the water would not run down to Perry Street where the people feel they already have a problem. They were not the only ones that were being asked to record the grading plan. Mr. Seitz stated that they would already have the plan to control that. Mr. Seitz stated that the reason the Ordinance asked for the building box to be shown, was to be sure that it met the requirements for Zoning for side yards, rear yards and for rough grading. Mr. Peifer stated that

Pineview Ridge continued

there was a note on the plan that stated that was tentative and if you wanted to deviate they would need to come before the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Seitz asked why would you need to record them? Mr. Peifer stated that he was comfortable with that note but who would show them to the prospective lot purchaser. Mr. Seitz stated that it was inspected by the Township Engineer and would need to be policed on the administrative end of the Township. Mr. Peifer stated that was why it needed to be recorded. Then they could go back and say, that was how it was supposed to be, if there were side yards that were not properly graded or there was water being diverted to the wrong spots. Mr. Seitz asked why they required a grading plan with the building permit? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the grading plan was not required at building permit stage. They just required the footprint. Mr. Seitz stated that he was talked out on the subject and would move on. Mrs. Geiger asked if that would need to be recorded? Mr. Wilson stated that we required it. Mr. Schwartz asked if that was something new? Mr. Peifer stated that it had been complied with and grading plans have been recorded. Mr. Schwartz stated that he agreed with Mr. Seitz, every time they build a house they need to re-file the plan. No one could follow that. Mr. Littlehales stated that ideally it would be good to have something to point back to, but it would place a great encumbrance on a number of parties. Mr. Krafczek stated that with the Stormwater Management calculations, they based it on the grading plan. If they don't record the grading plan the Stormwater Management meant nothing. Mr. Peifer stated that the Stormwater plan had to work in the field and on paper. Mr. Krafczek asked if they couldn't record something general to say when the grading was done onsite that would correspond to the numbers in the Stormwater calculations. Mr. Seitz stated you never record something tentative. Mr. Krafczek stated that it would be general enough for them, but still have them match the Stormwater. Mr. Bittig asked where the driveway grading showed up? Mr. Seitz replied on the grading plan. Mr. Bittig stated that was a major problem in the Township. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the past was the past and we were proactive with that. We were paying attention. Mr. Seitz stated that none of the driveways would exceed the Township grades and the grading plan reflects that. Mr. Bittig stated that was one more element of the grading plan. Mr. Peifer stated that on plans that say the front roof leaders would discharge to the front and the back roof leaders would discharge to the back and then they were changed that they all discharged to the back that was where we had problems. That was why we needed to see that on the recorded plan. Mr. Seitz stated that the Ordinance did not require that to be recorded. Mr. Seitz asked if that wasn't an inspection problem? Mr. Peifer replied we did not inspect them. Mr. Seitz stated that someone in the Township did. Mr. Schwartz asked why the Township couldn't enforce when someone was directing the Stormwater incorrectly? Mrs. Franckowiak replied, we do, with the Drainage Ordinance. What Craig was stating concerned the roof leaders. Mr. Schwartz stated then the Township should go to the homeowner and tell them that their roof leaders were discharging incorrectly. Mr. Bittig stated that we did not have enough enforcement personnel in the Township to handle that. Mr. Peifer stated that if in 10 years there was a problem and we tried to find the grading plan, they could be missing. If they were recorded that would not be a problem. Mr. Schwartz asked whom would we go after at that time? Mr. Peifer replied usually that was the individual lot owner who made the changes and they would need to fix that. Mr. Krafczek stated that was why they needed a generalized plan to show which direction the Stormwater would flow. Mr. Seitz stated that was done, but they did not want to record it. He then asked the Planning Commission to decide as to what needed to be done.

Mr. Seitz passed out the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan approval letter from the County and then asked for Preliminary Plan approval. Mr. Schwartz stated they needed a waiver for the sight distance. We needed to table that until we had all the information. We could discuss that issue at the Zoning Workshop/Meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>.

**8. LINCOLN ROAD SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD – Daniel Laudenslayer**

GVC reviewed the Lincoln Road Subdivision Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated January 17, 2005).

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they made changes to the plan according to the GVC review letter. When they were in with the concept plan they were concerned with the position of the shed. They needed to have a shared access for the three lots instead of three single driveways because that would cause a sight distance problem. They provided a written request for waiver of the Environmental Assessment Statement. They would place the sight distance on the plan. They have corrected the rotation problem. Concerning #8 in the letter, they have shown the two trees on the property. One was located in the driveway, to be removed and one located next to the garage. They would be planting buffer trees. They took pictures to send into the Historic Commission.

Mr. Laudenslayer asked what a simple Stormwater Management report would cover? Mr. Peifer replied that we were concerned where all the water from the driveway would go. Would the water be running down onto the street and how would that be dealt with? Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they would install a small trap for the E & S and they could leave that in place. Mr. Bittig stated that they could install an infiltration trench along the lower end of lot 2. Mr. Schwartz stated that ideally they could do one for each of the houses for the roof leaders, but if the lots did not perk that might not be possible. Mr. Peifer stated that he was not looking for them to install a detention pond, just that they should not divert water to the neighboring properties or towards the street. Mr. Peifer asked if they would be doing an E & S control plan for the subdivision? Mr. Laudenslayer replied that they would be doing a small projects report and would do a simple E & S plan. Mr. Littlehales asked if the driveway would be paved? Mr. Laudenslayer replied that it was not over 10% so he did not know if they wanted that paved. Mr. Peifer stated that the address for the current dwelling was incorrect. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they would correct that.

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that there would be no deed restrictions. The review letter comments on dedicating the right-of-way of Lincoln Road. On the Gibbons plan they already dedicated the 30-ft right-of-way. They added the Fire Marshal block. They submitted the Planning Module exemption to Paul Herb. They have frontage on Lincoln Road for the sewer, so they would not need an extension. They sent a letter to PA American Water Company for serviceability.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.283, for an Environmental Assessment Statement (SALDO Section 4.283 as defined in the Exeter Township Zoning Ordinance #500 Section 633) due to the small size of the project. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Laudenslayer asked if they could move from Sketch to Final plan as stated in the GVC review letter.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to allow the Lincoln Road Subdivision to move from Sketch to Final plan stage. The motion carried unanimously.

**9. SCI SERVICES, INC. – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Jon Tresslar**

GVC reviewed the SCI Services, Inc. Preliminary Plan (reference letters dated January 28 & 31, 2005).

Mr. Tresslar stated that previously a concern was circulation on the previous plan. They have changed the parking so there would be parallel parking instead of head on parking. They have garages in the units and provided additional overflow parking so there would be more parking than required. They moved the building area over so it would not encroach in the steep slope areas. The other issue that remained was the access onto Clayborne Road. They planned an emergency access instead of a full-blown access. They did not want to mix the residential traffic from the adjoining development into their development. They read the review letter and planned to comply with everything listed there. They had a written waiver request for the sheet size of the plan.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.214; plan size, and allow them to use 30 by 42 inches. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bittig asked about comment #10; he wanted to know what the future plans were for that area?

Mr. Tresslar replied that they would deed restrict the rest of the land against any further development, to be dedicated to the Township if they would like that or maintain the area by the homeowners association.

Mr. Schwartz stated we would like to see restrictions placed there.

Mr. Tresslar asked about the additional circulation referred to in the letter. Mr. Schwartz stated that they might like to put in a walking path in the open space. Mr. Tresslar stated that the area was too steep.

Mr. Bittig asked if they would look at possibly adding a footpath into that area.

Mr. Tresslar stated that when they originally worked on the plan they looked for a secondary access. What they have proposed was a secondary access onto Clayborne. They preferred an emergency access only. They did not want traffic from the other development driving through to access Neversink Road. Mr. Wilson stated that the people in their development would probably prefer to drive through Crestwood to get to the by-pass. Mr. Bittig asked Mrs. Franckowiak what was the status of that section of Crestwood? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that they were working on Courtney Rea before they would be building that section. Mr. Bittig stated that it depended on the schedule for both developments to be able to make the access viable. Mr. Schwartz stated they needed an access that could be plowed and remain open. Mr. Bittig stated that the plan called for a 20-foot right-of-way with a 10-foot paved cartway. They should check with the Fire Marshal to see what size access they needed for the fire trucks. Mr. Tresslar stated they would do whatever was required for fire access. Mr. Wilson stated that they typically ask for two full accesses for developments over 20 homes. He would prefer two full access points for the townhouses. Mr. Schwartz agreed with Mr. Wilson and felt that when Clayborne Road was built that should not be dead-ended. Mr. Tresslar stated the Ordinance did not define accesses definitively and they believe they met the spirit of the ordinance with what they proposed.

Mr. Schwartz stated they should have their access and Clayborne Road aligned with a reasonable and practical emergency access at the present time. It must be maintained and opened. Mr. Tresslar stated that they would go out to the location and see if there was any sort of drive in that area to connect into, if not they could escrow and put a secondary access through the funeral home until such time Clayborne Road would be opened. They would keep it as an emergency access and restrict the use because it would be a private road

SCI Services continued

and felt that the people in our community should not have to maintain a private street for public use. If that would be unrestricted then the street should be dedicated and maintained by the Township, but they would have to make changes. They would prefer not to do that. Mr. Bittig stated that the stub and the emergency access would need to be aligned. Mr. Tresslar stated they would do that. Mr. Peifer asked what size we wanted for the emergency access, would a 10-foot paved cartway be all right? Mrs. Franckowiak stated we would check with the Fire Marshal.

Mr. Tresslar asked what they needed to do about curbing? Mr. Peifer stated that they were providing curbing along the northern West Neversink frontage not on the side towards the Funeral Home. Mr. Schwartz stated that they should put a note on the plan that if sidewalk were placed on the adjacent lot, at that time the developer would be responsible to put in curbing. Mr. Tresslar stated that they had satisfied the open space with the tract to the left. Mr. Wilson stated that was a Board of Supervisors issue. Mr. Tresslar stated they would show the Steep Slope Conservation Easement on the plan. They would like to defer the design of the retaining wall until Final Plan. Mr. Ruff stated that was fine.

#### **10. COMMERCIAL BUILDING – SKETCH PLAN - Vince Fioravanti**

GVC reviewed the Commercial Building Sketch Plan (reference letter dated January 27, 2005).

Mr. Fioravanti stated that they were developing the site at Shelbourne Road and SR422. They have a common driveway with an existing 30-foot access that was in place. They had inlets installed that tie into the Storm Sewer System of PennDOT. They planned to use underground detention basins that tie into the inlets. They were proposing a drive thru for either a bank or Dunkin Donuts. All the utilities exist. They would need to modify the Highway Occupancy Permit. They would extend the island at the westbound entrance so no one would try to make a left turn there. Mr. Peifer stated that would address comment #5. Mr. Bittig asked what the potential for fender benders would be? Mr. Fioravanti stated that they would bring in a traffic report. Mr. Bittig stated that with a Dunkin Donut they have the potential for high volume traffic. Mr. Peifer asked if they would know what the business would be before they would go for plan approval? Mr. Fioravanti replied that they thought they would. Mr. Peifer stated that they should know that for the parking requirements. Mr. Fioravanti stated that they would comply with the parking. They did not show a loading dock on the plan. Mr. Schwartz stated that we usually have a dedicated space for the armored car in the case of a bank. Mr. Peifer stated that for Dunkin Donuts, they use tractor-trailers for delivery. They would need to demonstrate that they could get their trucks through the property. Mr. Fioravanti stated that they would ask for a waiver of the Environmental Assessment Statement or they could do a Phase 1 report.

#### **11. SCOPE OF TRAFFIC STUDY FOR RUBY TUESDAY**

GVC reviewed the scope of the Traffic Study for Ruby Tuesday (reference letter dated February 1, 2005).

Mr. Wilson stated that GVC was recommending E. Neversink Road and Perkiomen Ave, Circle Avenue and Crestline Drive with E. Neversink Road. Mr. Schwartz stated that sounded reasonable. Mr. Wilson suggested adding West 39<sup>th</sup> Street to the study. Mr. Schwartz stated that not many people would know to cut through that street to get to the Ruby Tuesdays location.

## **12. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mr. Schwartz stated that someone asked him if we would be willing to entertain a cluster development in Rural Conservation District. Could we make some time available at the workshop? Mr. Bittig replied that they could come in at that time because that was advertised as a meeting. Mr. Peifer stated that with the issue for access for town home/apartment areas they should put something in the Zoning Ordinance to state that two accesses were needed for over 20 units whether they were private or public. That should be listed under the regulations for town home/apartments. Mr. Wilson stated that we should look at Village for the Zoning Ordinance. He then reminded the Planning Commission of the Zoning Workshop/Meeting on Wednesday, February 16<sup>th</sup> and the Joint Planning Commission Meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. Bittig stated that in the Stormwater Management they reference Maiden Creek Watershed. Mr. Wilson suggested that Mr. Bittig give those errors to Ms. Cusimano so they could be corrected.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to adjourn the February 1, 2005 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:00pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Herbein – Conditional Use  
BOS: Lincoln Road Subdivision waiver request  
BOS: SCI Services, Inc. waiver request