

**MINUTES  
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JULY 5, 2005**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, July 5, 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  
Dottie Geiger

**ABSENT:** J.D. Krafczek  
Paul L. Schwartz

**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. Littlehales to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting as corrected:

Item #16: Mrs. Geiger stated that the Township did not approve of flag lots.

The motion carried unanimously.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to approve the agenda of the July 5, 2005 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

A. **MYRICK SUBDIVISION - FINAL PLAN; FAUST TRACT – SKETCH PLAN; PINEVIEW RIDGE – FINAL PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

**4. BREWER – CONDITIONAL USE**

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mr. Brewer was planning to operate a business called “Kitchen Tune-Up” as a home occupation. They would be taking phone calls from potential customers and go out to their homes. They have a warehouse out by Sam’s Club where they kept all of their materials and supplies. The only thing they would be doing from their home would be answering their phone and do paperwork. They have contacted all the neighbors and there were no problems. There would be no signage.

Mrs. Geiger asked what was involved with that type of business? Mr. Brewer replied that they do cabinet restoration and new cabinet install. They also did wood floor restoration.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Mr. Brewer because they met the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. PINEVIEW RIDGE – FINAL PLAN – Lon Seitz**

GVC reviewed the Pineview Ridge Subdivision Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated June 24, 2005).

Mr. Seitz stated that they addressed most of the items in the GVC letter and sent it to Mr. Peifer to review. Mr. Peifer stated that they have addressed most of them, however they needed signatures and suggested that the note in response to #1 under the Subdivision Ordinance for the replacement of trees be put on the record plan. That way potential buyers would see that note rather than be buried on page 13. Mr. Seitz stated that they have the E & S approval and DEP approval. They brought along seven signed and sealed plans. Could they have page 13 recorded rather than change the plans? Mr. Peifer replied that would be fine. Mr. Ruff asked if the monuments were in place? Mr. Seitz replied yes.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Pineview Ridge Final Plan provided that they work out the improvements agreements and provide the electronic format of the plan. The motion carried with Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Ruff voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

**6. PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – FINAL PLAN – Daniel Laudenslayer**

GVC reviewed the Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 Final Plan (reference letter dated June 24, 2005).

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that most of the issues in the review letter were minor. They were working on the E & S plan and addressing the comments they received on that. They met with the Fire Marshal and made changes to the plan that he approved. They put the note on the plan concerning the hydrants. They were waiting for the adequacy letter. They changed the water line that was in error with the size. Mr. Bittig asked about Pa American requesting the easement on the property, what was the reason for that? Mr. Laudenslayer replied that they wanted the easement to be able to loop up into Walter Greths’ property. They needed to place it there so they wouldn’t need to run it through the conservation easement. Mr. Bittig stated that he was concerned with the possibility that they would re-subdivide. Mrs. Franckowiak asked if there wasn’t a note on the plan that they couldn’t re-subdivide within ten years? Mr. Bittig replied perhaps but that was just for ten years. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that the certificates would be signed and they would

## **Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 continued**

provide the electronic disk. The attorneys were working on the improvements agreement. The Sewer Authority was reviewing the plan. Bill Whitman was designing the headwalls and they would send those plans to GVC. They have addressed the comments from the EAC and have added to the landscape plan that they would use wetland grass seed mix in the detention areas and wetlands. They met with the University Rifle Club and worked out an agreement with the fence between the properties. Mr. Littlehales asked the representatives of the Rifle Club if they were in agreement with the 4-foot high fence. They replied yes.

Mr. Bittig stated that he didn't know what the Historical Commission wrote back, but they should keep in mind the fact there might be an Indian Settlement located on the property. Mr. Laudenslayer replied that the letter stated there might be something located there and if they found something it would need to be reported. Mr. Bittig stated that they might find some artifacts and they should be aware of that. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they were looking for conditional approval. Mr. Bittig stated that they had a number of outstanding items that we needed including BCCD, water company letter and improvement agreements. They should come back with those items.

### **Public Comment**

**Mr. Robert Nye**, University Rifle Club, stated that he began attending the meetings in March of 1998 and he appreciated the indulgence and the co-operation of the Planning Commission.

7. **HERITAGE MEWS – FINAL PLAN** - Andrew Connor  
- Brian Focht

GVC reviewed the Heritage Mews Final Plan (reference letter dated June 24, 2005).

Mr. Connor stated that they had Berks County Conservation District approval and the planning module approval. They received the letter from Greg Koontz, Building Code Official, concerning the retaining wall and they would comply with all of his comments. The Homeowners Association would maintain the fence and the retaining wall. Mr. Bittig asked how high the retaining walls would be? Mr. Focht replied that one wall was 8-foot and one was 6-foot. They would provide the structural drawings. Mr. Connor asked if the Township would allow Belgium block instead of standard vertical curb? They brought along pictures to demonstrate how they looked. They requested that because they felt it looked better and although it was more expensive to install it was a lot cheaper to maintain. As that was a private common parking area and private streets they asked the Planning Commission if they would be allowed to use the Belgium block?

Mr. Wilson asked if the curves on the street would be concrete? Mr. Connor replied that it would be concrete curb up until the ultimate right-of-way. Mr. Bittig asked if we had any experience elsewhere in the Township with Belgium block? Mr. Peifer replied that they might have some in South Heidelberg. He then asked if they would be providing the Homeowners Association with replacement block? Mr. Connor replied that they could do that. Mr. Bittig stated that as that would be on the private roadway he did not have a problem with that. Mr. Connor stated that they were not planning on having the street taken over by the Township. The Planning Commission consensus was that they could put in the Belgium block. Mr. Connor stated that they would address the comment from the Fire Marshal and add a fire hydrant at the entrance of the development. They would talk to the Board of Supervisors to see if they would like to take the land or if they should place deed restrictions as a conservation easement with no further development allowed. Mr. Wilson stated that he preferred if the Township would take the land for open space.

### **Heritage Mews continued**

Mr. Focht stated that they have two outstanding drainage issues. They met with Mr. Peifer in the field and they agreed to do additional calculations showing what the actual discharge was, pre versus post. They faxed the new information to Mr. Peifer and they would be sure to address any issues he might find. They submitted the plan before the Township adopted the Act 167 Ordinance. In reviewing the new Act 167, the actual discharge rate for the site remains the same for either ordinance. They would be providing infiltration and they obtained the NPDES permit from the Conservation District and DEP. They met the infiltration requirements of the Act 167. They were asking for a waiver of the requirement of the new Ordinance. Mr. Peifer stated that the documentation that was needed was in their E & S narrative and they would have done a post construction stormwater report for the E & S approval, was that correct? Mr. Focht replied yes they did.

Mr. Wilson asked if they were in receipt of the letter and pictures from Mr. and Mrs. Finley concerning their property? Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Finley if he could point out his property in relation to the pictures that he provided. Mr. Finley did so and stated that he was concerned with the retaining wall and how it might divert stormwater onto his property. Mr. Focht stated that the units were positioned lower than the retaining wall. As part of that design there would be a fence on the top of the wall. A swale would be located behind the retaining wall. There was also an existing 12" pipe that discharged just past the retaining wall. There was a 15' wide drainage easement and there was supposed to be a swale located there. However, over the years the swale has been filled and no longer existed. They were proposing to put in a 2 by 2 yard drain to capture what comes out of the pipe and put the swale in along the wall. It should help get some of that water out of there.

### **Public Comment**

**Mr. William Finley, Jr.**, 3 Lori Court, stated that water runs down from Neversink along the back of the properties. He was concerned that the owners of the town homes could receive water from his property and that would result in a lawsuit. Mr. Focht stated that the retaining wall would have an under drain so there should not be a problem with water from Mr. Finley's property. Mr. Finley asked if they could put a pipe in along the wall instead of the swale? Mr. Focht stated that if they would put in a pipe, then no landscaping could be placed on top. Mr. Finley asked if they would be amenable to putting in a pipe instead of the swale? Mr. Focht stated that they could meet to resolve the issue as long as that could be a condition as they were requesting Final approval. Mr. Connor stated that anything decided between them and Mr. Finley was subject to GVC approval.

Mr. Bittig asked if they received DEP & BCCD approval? Mr. Connor replied that they have both. Mr. Wilson stated that he still had a problem with the traffic that would be produced from the development.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Heritage Mews Final Plan subject to working out the Improvements Agreement, the open space issue and working out the issues with the adjacent property owner. The motion carried with Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

**8. RUBY TUESDAY – PRELIMINARY PLAN** – Rick Longacre  
- Doug Plank

GVC reviewed the Ruby Tuesday Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated June 23, 2005).

Mr. Longacre stated that they met with the Township and GVC to look at the existing conditions on Romig Ave. They would re-create the existing turnaround area and would also pave it. The area leading up to that was 17-ft wide and they would provide 24-ft width. They also discussed how to handle that area and the thought was to leave it open but put a note on the plan that the access would be open until such time the Board of Supervisors would request that to be closed with a chain and be used for emergency only. That would only occur if the traffic became a problem. They believed that most of the traffic would use Circle Ave. Mr. Wilson stated that he disagreed with that. If someone lived on the west side then they would use Romig Ave. Mr. Longacre agreed that to some people using Romig Ave would have its advantages. Mr. Wilson stated that they should not close it off just because people were using Romig Ave, as it was a public street.

**Public Comment**

**Judy Magee**, 3913 Romig Ave, stated that at the last meeting Romig Ave was being discussed as an emergency entrance to be chained and not being used as a through street. She was thankful that her children were grown. She always used the light to go out onto Perkiomen Ave. She thought that they were going to bar using the access onto Romig. She was concerned that people coming out of Ruby Tuesday would turn right, go into the office-building parking lot and drive out onto Romig. She asked if Romig Ave would be curbed? Mr. Longacre stated that it would just be paved.

**John Magee**, 3913 Romig Ave, stated that at previous meetings it was said that the entrance onto Romig Ave would “absolutely not” be open. That it would be only used as an emergency access and would be chained off. He felt that at least 60% of people would use Romig Ave. Mr. Longacre stated that what he had said at the last meeting that it could go either way, they were willing to chain it or leave it open. Mr. Magee disagreed. Ms. Cusimano stated that at the site meeting, the Highway Superintendent, Clarence Hamm requested that it be open to start and work from there. Mrs. Magee asked if Romig Ave was a public road all the way to the end? Mr. Bittig stated that it was public to the property line. Mrs. Magee asked why it was never paved? Mr. Longacre replied that if they would look at the original plan that was probably intended to come around and connect into Circle Ave, but that never happened. They put out a solution for their concern about opening Romig Ave and if the Supervisors agreed that overuse of the road was detrimental to that area, then they would put up the chain. Mrs. Magee asked how it would be determined that it was detrimental? Mr. Longacre stated that they would start with Romig Ave being open; if there would be safety issues they would contact the Board of Supervisors and request that to be closed. Mr. Magee stated that it was the first time he heard that Romig Ave would be open to traffic as it was always proposed as being closed. Mr. Ruff stated that the minutes from the last meeting back up what was being said. Mr. Bittig stated that the original plan came in with no access to Romig and the Planning Commission requested a second access. Then it came down to whether it should be emergency or open. If it would become a problem with it being open, then the Supervisors would have the option to chain it. Mr. Wilson stated that there might be a time when other neighboring properties would become commercial offices so we could not guarantee that Romig Ave would just service residential properties. Mr. Longacre stated that they placed a note on the plan stating that they would chain off Romig Ave if at a future date it was deemed necessary. They were working with the Fire Marshal to address his comments.

### **Ruby Tuesday continued**

Mr. Wilson asked what was the square footage of Ruby Tuesday? Mr. Longacre replied 4700sq.ft. Mr. Wilson stated that buildings of 5,000sq.ft. and above needed to be sprinklered. He felt that they came in with a building under that size to not sprinkler. Mr. Longacre stated their insurance providers make sure that they protect their kitchen areas. He then asked Mr. Peifer if there were any other issues? Mr. Peifer replied that Tony Maize had done the review on the Traffic Impact Study and gave Mr. Longacre a copy of the review. Mr. Longacre stated that they would address any other outstanding items. Mr. Bittig asked how their discussions with PennDOT were progressing? Mr. Longacre replied that they were putting the plans together for PennDOT. Also they were working on the stormwater and the geology. They did some clearing along the front clearing line and they would drill for coring. They would be doing underground water retention, but the entire system had a liner underneath. They were looking for Preliminary Plan approval. Mr. Wilson stated that the Township needed commercial development more than it needed residential, but he was concerned with traffic problems that were in that area already, getting worse by the development. Mr. Longacre stated that they felt it would be helped by the extra lane on Circle Ave and having the streets aligned better than they currently were. Mrs. Geiger stated that she felt Romig Ave should be chained and used for emergency only.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Ruby Tuesday Preliminary Plan with the condition that all the outstanding items be addressed at Final Plan stage. The motion carried with Mr. Ruff, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig voting in favor and Mr. Wilson, Mrs. Geiger voting opposed.

Mr. Ruff stated that he would like to see what improvements PennDOT recommended for East Neversink. Mr. Bittig stated that when they went to PennDOT they might require a left turn lane on East Neversink at Circle Ave. Mrs. Frankowiak asked if the Planning Commission could write a letter to PennDOT and request that a left turn lane be added? Mr. Wilson replied that we should do that.

### **9. MYRICK SUBDIVISION – FINAL PLAN – Robert Myrick - John Forry**

GVC reviewed the Myrick Subdivision Final Plan (reference letter dated June 23, 2005).

Mr. Forry stated that they had addressed the issues from the GVC review. One of the issues was the site distance for one of the driveways. They have talked to the neighbor and they cut back the bushes so they have the site distance. They tied up the lines to the wetlands per the review. They showed the profile of the driveways to prove they were not too steep. Mr. Wilson asked if the house was shown in the steep slope area? Mr. Forry replied yes, they were proposing to locate the house there. They could build in the steep slope area; the question was the slope of the driveway. Mr. Peifer stated that the Township could allow building in the steep slope area as long as they had the approval from the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. He would confirm the clearing for the driveway and that the pins and monuments were set. Mr. Forry stated that for the E & S approval, the individual lot owners would apply for that and the note concerning that was on the plan. Mr. Forry asked Mr. Peifer if there were any other items that need to be addressed? Mr. Peifer replied that the wetland boundaries showed two segments of W2A and W2B that do not appear in the wetland boundaries of bearings and distances. Mr. Forry stated that they would address that.

### **Myrick Subdivision continued**

Mr. Peifer stated that they also had a note on the plan that referenced the wrong Township. Mr. Forry stated that they would correct that. Mr. Bittig stated that we would need to compare the preliminary and the final checklists to be sure that all the items were submitted. Mr. Bittig compared the two lists and asked if the Water Resource Study was done? Mr. Peifer replied that they did not need to do that study as they had on lot wells and there were only 4 lots. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Myrick if they could remove the old bus that sits on the property. Mr. Myrick replied that they were in the process of cleaning up the property and they would do that.

Mr. Peifer stated that they needed the Certification of Ownership on the plan. They needed the Fire Marshal endorsement on the plan. The easements had been provided around the on-lot sewage systems. They received the letters from the utility companies. They need to re-submit the electronic plan with the changes. They needed to address the waiver requests and place the dates approved on the plan. They submitted waivers for Section 4.37 for the landscape plan and Section 4.39 for the E & S to be submitted at building permit stage.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirements of SALDO Section 4.37, for the landscape plan, based on the fact that it was a wooded area. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirements of SALDO Section 4.39, for the Erosion and Sediment Control plan to be addressed at building permit stage. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Myrick Subdivision Final Plan contingent upon the minor housekeeping items being addressed. The motion carried unanimously.

### **10. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – REVISION TO GRADING PLAN – C. J. Levan**

GVC reviewed the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Revised Plan of Record (reference letter dated June 21, 2005).

Mr. Levan stated that they have received a letter from the Township Sewer Authority and they would change the pipe. They have the approval letter from Pennsylvania Water Company and a letter from Berks County Conservation District for E & S approval. They also had copies of the stamped approved plan from BCCD. Berks Homes were submitting to GVC revised cost estimates for the Improvements agreement. The plan currently showed 3-1 slopes in the area of Constitution Ave into lots 1 & 2. What they would like to do was if during construction, it appeared they could, they would have a sheer rock face in that location. They would also be sure to have geological testing done and address the fencing issue. Mr. Wilson asked what the elevation of the rock face would be? Mr. Levan replied 20 feet. Mr. Bittig asked what lots would be affected by that? Mr. Levan replied Lots 1, 2 and also the open space area. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Peifer what the requirements would be for fence in that area. Mr. Peifer stated that they usually refer fencing to the Building Inspector. Mr. Wilson asked if instead of the sheer rock face the plan called for a retaining wall? Mr. Peifer replied that it was 3-1 slopes. Mr. Levan stated that it would still be possible to do that. The developer was

**Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V revised grading plan continued**

requesting the sheer rock face if it would be possible. The Planning Commission agreed that they should keep it at the 3-1 slopes.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V revised grading plan. The motion carried unanimously.

**11. CRESTWOOD SOUTH LOT 71 – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Steve Bensinger**

GVC reviewed the Crestwood South Lot 71 Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated June 24, 2005).

Mr. Bensinger stated that with item #1 under Zoning concerning the sight distance, the required sight distance was 143-ft. In order to do that they would need to remove some of the additional parking spaces. Mr. Bittig asked about what was being done about the plant species? Mr. Bensinger replied that they were waiting for the letter stating that there were no endangered plants located there. Item #2 about the trees, they walked the property with Mr. Schwartz and there were seven trees located on the property. Two they would be able to save and the others would need to be replaced. They would try to get more trees in where they could. Mr. Wilson stated that the Ordinance stated that there should be one tree every 50-ft, how could they design the development without taking that into consideration. Mr. Bensinger stated that it was hard to do that and avoid the utilities. They were hoping to find areas to place trees that would not be a problem. Item #6 about the island planted with grass, the concern was whether or not a fire truck could make the turn. They did the specs and the truck would be able to turn around. Mr. Ruff asked who would maintain that area? Mr. Bensinger replied that the Homeowners Association would. Mr. Wilson asked if they could do mountable curbs there. Mr. Bensinger stated that they could look into that. Another waiver they were looking for was for the driveway sight distance for units 1, 2 & 3. Item #13, they were only proposing sidewalk on the north side of the street. They were requesting a waiver for that. Mr. Bittig asked if there were sidewalks on both sides of the adjacent property? Mr. Bensinger replied that there were sidewalks proposed around Colin Court but wasn't sure if there was sidewalk in front of Outlook Point. Mr. Wilson stated that he felt that the sidewalk should be on the side with the lesser amount of intersections, which would be on the south side of the street. Mr. Ruff stated that with the houses located on the south side he felt that they should put the sidewalks where those houses were located. The Planning Commission agreed that if there was sidewalk on both sides in the adjoining area, they should put the sidewalk on the south side rather than the north side.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they had three waivers they were requesting: Section 5.305, to allow a landscaped island in the center of the cul-de-sac; Section 5.558 to allow the driveway for Lot 1 to be located opposite the intersection and the driveway for Lot 2 to be permitted to have a 39' distance from the centerline of the driveway to the intersection of the cartway and Section 6.204, for sidewalks to be located on one side of the street.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of Section 5.305, to allow the landscaped island in the center of the cul-de-sac based on the turning radius information that was submitted and taking into consideration that it was a private street. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Crestwood South Lot 71 continued**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of Section 5.558 to allow the driveway for Lot 1 to be located opposite the intersection. The motion failed to carry with all members voting opposed.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of Section 5.558 to allow the driveway for Lot 2 to be permitted to have a 39' distance from the centerline of the driveway to the intersection of the cartway. The motion failed to carry with all members voting opposed.

The Planning Commission tabled the vote concerning the sidewalks until it was determined where the sidewalk was located in that area. Mr. Bittig asked Mrs. Frankowiak to check the Crestwood South plan and the Outlook Pointe development plan to see where the sidewalks were located.

### **12. FAIRVIEW CORNER – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Vince Fioravanti**

GVC reviewed the Fairview Corner Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated June 20, 2005).

Mr. Fioravanti stated that the proposed building was probably going to be Dunkin Donuts. There was an outside chance that it would be a Starbucks. They would comply with the comments in the GVC review letter. They would not be putting in a loading dock as they get deliveries at off peak hours. Water lines and Sewer lines already existed on site. They would put in underground detention basins. Mr. Bittig stated that they needed to follow the new Stormwater requirements. Mr. Fioravanti replied that they would test the soils to see if they would perk. They did get a “no conflicts” letter from PNDI. Mr. Wilson stated that he was concerned with traffic backing up on Shelbourne to turn into Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Bittig stated that even though the driveways onto Rt422 and Shelbourne Road already existed, they might need to go to PennDOT because they were changing conditions. Mr. Fioravanti stated that they would do the Traffic Impact Study if the Planning Commission wanted it. They were requesting waivers for Section 4.281, wetland delineation; Section 4.283, Environmental Assessment Statement; Section 4.284, Environmental Hazard Report; Section 4.282, Traffic Impact Study; Section 4.287, Water Resource Study; Section 4.273, partial waiver in respect to the Stormwater Management requirements.

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

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.281, wetland delineation as it was obvious there were no wetlands on the property. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.284, Environmental Hazard Report as the site was always open. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bittig stated that the waiver for the Water Resource Study was not needed, as the site was less than one acre.

### **Fairview Corner continued**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors allow the Rational Method to be used to design the stormwater system. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Wilson, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.282, Traffic Impact Study. The motion failed to carry with all members voting opposed.

### **13. FAUST TRACT – SKETCH PLAN – Brian Kobularcik**

- Michael Sodl
- John Wilkinson

Mr. Wilkinson stated that their subdivision was in three Townships. The majority of the subdivision was in Alsace; there were 7 units in Exeter and 6 units in Lower Alsace. The units in Exeter would be along Old Friedensburg Road and served with public sewer and on-lot water. For item #3 under Zoning, they would be removing the old silo. Item #4, they would be removing the garage. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they have done surveying and topo reports. The house located on the property was in terrible state. Once they received the Historical report, if they could they would remove the house. They were not proposing to save any of the structures. There were wetlands located on the Alsace area. They would be requesting a waiver of the Environmental Assessment Statement. They felt that they were not in an environmentally sensitive area. Mr. Wilkinson stated that all the Stormwater would drain into Alsace. Mr. Wilson asked how many lots would be in Exeter? Mr. Kobularcik replied that it currently showed 7, but 2 more could be added.

Mr. Wilson stated that our regulations stated that when there were more than 3 lots, all driveways must connect to internal streets. He would not be in favor of allowing all those driveways out onto that narrow road. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they did not read that in the Ordinance. There were already two existing driveways located there. They would be sure that they had safe sight distance. Mr. Wilkinson stated that the lots were larger than the required lot size. Mr. Bittig stated that they did not meet the depth to width ratio on the lots. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they would request waivers for that. Mr. Bittig stated that he would not vote for the waivers. They could widen the lots to meet that. Mr. Wilson stated that they could put more frontage with fewer lots and a cul-de-sac or loop street. No driveways should come out onto Old Friedensburg Road. Mr. Peifer stated that Section 5.24 was one they could look at. Mr. Ruff stated that it was also in Section 5.551. Mr. Kobularcik asked if they could do shared driveways? Mr. Wilson replied no, it always became a problem. Mr. Wilson asked if they have gone to Alsace with the Plan? Mr. Kobularcik replied no, they go on Thursday and Lower Alsace the next week. Mr. Wilson stated that most Townships were looking at internal streets and not having a lot of driveways on such a small country road. He understood it would be hard with having their roads in different Townships. Maybe the best approach would be when they talked to Alsace, was to tie these properties into their loop street. Then the traffic would travel onto a better road. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they looked at that, but there would be municipal boundaries running through the roads. A lot of municipalities do not want to maintain the roads. Mr. Wilson stated that Exeter maintains most of Old Friedensburg even though it was not entirely in Exeter. Mr. Bittig stated that they had plenty of land; it was a matter of accessing it in an intelligent manner to reduce the impact on the existing poor road structure. Mr. Kobularcik asked if they would do an internal road system, would we still require them to do improvements on Old Friedensburg. Mr. Ruff stated that they would just need to provide the additional right-of-way. Mr. Wilson stated that we would not require them to upgrade the street. He then asked how much of the subdivision was located in Exeter? Mr. Sodl replied 5.13 acres, around 11% of the overall tract.

### **Faust Tract continued**

Mr. Wilkinson asked about the new Stormwater Ordinance and felt it did not make sense to hold stormwater in Exeter then outlet it onto Alsace and hold it again, so would Exeter allow Alsace to review and determine the Stormwater? Mr. Peifer stated that Alsace should be under the Act 167 as well. Mr. Bittig stated that we could look at it as an entity as long as the intent of the Stormwater Management was met with infiltration beds or detention basin. Mr. Wilson stated that our concern would be that it met our requirements for Stormwater Basins. Mr. Wilkinson asked how would they handle open space? Mr. Wilson stated that we required open space or fee-in-lieu of. Mr. Kobularcik stated that the table did not show under 20 units. Mr. Wilson stated that then it would not be required. Mr. Kobularcik asked who would take care of cisterns? Mr. Peifer replied that the property owner did and they needed the cistern when there were 5 or more properties without public water. Mr. Wilkinson asked if they would need to do a Water Resource Study since there were only 7 lots in Exeter? Mr. Peifer stated that since they were doing public sewer and on-lot water it would apply. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they did not want to over-densify the area and they just needed direction and with the comments they received they would come back with changes.

### **14. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mr. Gardecki stated that the County lost Exeter Townships Official Map. What he found looked as though it needed work. Would we like to review the map and make the necessary adjustments or should we ask the Board to repeal? Mr. Bittig replied that we should review it and then decide. The Planning Commission agreed to meet on Wednesday July 20, 2005 at 7pm to discuss the Official Map.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mrs. Geiger, to adjourn the July 5, 2005 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:40pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Ruby Tuesday Preliminary Plan  
BOS: Myrick Subdivision Waiver and Plan approval  
BOS: Pineview Ridge Final Plan  
BOS: Heritage Mews Final Plan  
BOS: Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V revised grading plan  
BOS: Brewer Conditional Use  
BOS: Crestwood South Lot 71 waiver request  
BOS: Fairview Corner waiver requests