

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MARCH 1, 2005

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, March 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
Dottie Geiger
Paul L. Schwartz

ABSENT: J.D. Krafczek

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 February 1, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

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

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

- A. LORANE RUN - PRELIMINARY PLAN; LINCOLN ROAD SUBDIVISION – FINAL PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bittig stated that with the submission of the Lorane Run Preliminary Plan application checklist they included a letter that stated they did not need to include certain items because the proposed subdivision did not meet the criteria for the studies requested. Those studies were needed. Their application was incomplete. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that those items were covered in the GVC review letter. It would be hard for us to go over a letter and judge the contents.

Mr. Bittig stated that all applicants should submit needed waiver requests with their applications.

The following business was discussed:

4. RUTTER – CONDITIONAL USE

Jack Rutter was proposing a home occupation to operate a construction office at 271 Dautrich Road.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that there would be no customers coming to the home, no storage of equipment, no signage and there were no problems with the neighbors. It was a construction office with just a phone and a filing cabinet.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant approval for the conditional use for Mr. Rutter. The motion carried unanimously.

5. EXETER COMMUNITY LIBRARY – FINAL PLAN - Thomas Ludgate

GVC reviewed the Exeter Community Library Final Plan (reference letter dated February 25, 2005).

Mr. Ludgate stated that they have addressed the Stormwater issue. They were waiting for the letters from the Water Company and Sewer Authority. They were also waiting for E & S approval. Mr. Bittig stated they had a letter of incompleteness from the Conservation District. Mr. Ludgate replied yes, but they have resubmitted since that letter and were waiting for the approval. Mr. Ludgate stated that they did have an old letter from the Sewer Authority and would get it to the Township. Mrs. Geiger asked if, in the future, the building would be able to be added on to. Mr. Ludgate replied yes, they also have more parking than what was needed for the current size of the building.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Exeter Community Library Final Plan with the condition that all outstanding items in the GVC review letter dated February 25, 2005 be addressed. The motion carried unanimously.

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

GVC reviewed the Toaldo Annexation Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated February 25, 2005).

Mr. Ludgate stated that they had a simple annexation plan which was presented last month. They have provided the written waiver requests for the Environmental Assessment Statement and the Lot Depth to Width ratio. They were also looking for plan approval.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of an Environmental Assessment Statement (SALDO Section 4.283 as defined in the Exeter Township Zoning Ordinance #500 Section 633) for the Toaldo Annexation Sketch Plan of Record as there were no improvements planned, it was a simple annexation. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.514; lot depth to width ratio, for the Toaldo Annexation Sketch Plan of Record. The motion carried unanimously.

Toaldo Annexation continued

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Toaldo Annexation Sketch Plan of Record. The motion carried unanimously.

7. LORANE RUN – PRELIMINARY PLAN

GVC reviewed the Lorane Run Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated February 25, 2005).

Mr. Wilson stated that no one would be there to discuss the plan. Mr. Bittig stated that they had 12 lots; two were quasi-flags and also pie-shaped lots. One-half of the lots were non-conforming. Mr. Schwartz stated that the EAC had two major concerns, one being the wetlands that were in the back yards of two lots. Also the one lot that fronted on Lorane Road had the detention pond taking up over ½ of the lot. Mr. Bittig stated that he felt the western road eventually could be punched through the development to connect to Hall Ave, which was a stubbed off street. We should convey that to the developer when they come in next month.

8. S.C.I. SERVICES – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Jon Tresslar

GVC reviewed the S.C.I. Services Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated February 25, 2005).

Mr. Tresslar stated that they revised and straightened the access to tie into Clayborne Road. For item #10 they would find out how the Board of Supervisors felt about taking the land for dedication. Mr. Peifer asked if they saw the memo from the Fire Marshal concerning the width of the access? Mr. Tresslar replied that they had. It stated that they had to have an unobstructed width of 20-ft. If they needed to pave it they would. Mr. Ruff stated that it was to be a paved surface. Mr. Tresslar stated they would pave it to 20-ft. Mr. Littlehales asked if they had enough clearance for the fire apparatus to go around the parking islands. Mr. Tresslar replied they would check to be sure the fire equipment could clear that. For item #28, they would put the Steep Slope Conservation Easement on the plan. They would provide the plans for the retaining wall with the final plan submission. Mr. Schwartz stated that some of the residents were concerned that they would be looking at a wall with no landscaping in that area, no buffer between the properties. Mr. Tresslar stated that they could place some shrubbery there. Mr. Schwartz stated that it all depended on what the wall looked like. Mr. Tresslar stated that he didn't believe they would be displeased with the construction of the wall. Mr. Schwartz stated that the residents would be happy with some buffer planted there.

Mr. Tresslar stated the stormwater management comment on the discharge from Basin B into an existing drainage easement; the existing easement was on the record plan. They were proposing to discharge into the natural drainage path. They were proposing to put in a level spreader in that area. They would be willing to escrow the necessary funds to remove the level spreader and to tie the pipe into the storm sewer when it was built. Mr. Peifer stated that the consultant said that they were going to escrow the money to install the 30-inch pipe. Mr. Tresslar stated that they did that without consulting him. They would escrow the money to connect into the storm sewer. Mr. Peifer asked if the outlet structure would remain where it was originally designed or moved? Mr. Tresslar replied that it would be moved to line up with the head wall. They intended to tie everything together. Mr. Bittig asked how much infiltration they were proposing?

SCI Services, Inc. continued

Mr. Tresslar stated that they had to do some perk testing first. Mr. Bittig stated that we have our new Stormwater Management Ordinance in place. Mr. Peifer stated that would not apply here. Mr. Bittig stated that it would. It was a State mandated ordinance.

Mr. Wilson asked if they would be paving the access road to the property line, but the other side was not paved? Mr. Tresslar replied that was correct. Mr. Peifer asked if they would be providing the easement for access through the Funeral Home until Clayborne would be opened? Mr. Tresslar replied yes, if that was what was desired then they would do that. Mr. Bittig stated that would be a good temporary fix. Mr. Wilson stated that it would still put a lot of traffic onto Hearthstone Drive. Traffic currently gets backed up onto the by-pass; with the new development it would put even more traffic there. We don't have the adequate infrastructure to handle new development.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the plan showed the temporary access through the Funeral Home? Mr. Tresslar replied no, but they would add that to the plan if that were a condition for approval. Mr. Schwartz stated that without the second access they were limited to 20 units. If they wanted to put in the 54 units they would need to have that second access through the Funeral Home. We would like to see that on the plan.

Mr. Bittig stated that the access from Clayborne should be a full street. Mr. Tresslar stated that they did not want traffic coming through the private community streets. Mr. Schwartz stated that they could put up signs that say "private community-no through traffic" like they do at Laurel Springs. They could also install speed bumps to deter through traffic.

Mr. Tresslar stated that they were looking for Preliminary Plan approval.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the S.C.I. Services Preliminary Plan with the condition that they provide the secondary access through the Funeral Home on a temporary basis until Clayborne Road was built through, understanding that the access Road to Clayborne be paved to 24-ft. with all restrictions they choose to place there in terms of signage and speed bumps to control outside traffic. And that all other comments in the GVC February 25th review letter are addressed at Final Plan stage. The motion carried with Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Ruff voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

9. **RUBY TUESDAY – REVISED SKETCH PLAN** – Matt Davenport
- Rick Longacre
- John Herman

GVC reviewed the Ruby Tuesday Land Development Sketch Plan (reference letter dated February 22, 2005).

Mr. Davenport passed out some plans that would be what they would introduce at Preliminary Plan stage. They removed the access off of Neversink Road because the grading would not allow that. All access would be provided off of Circle Ave. They also removed the second retail building next to Ruby Tuesday. They were proposing two offices on the upper portion of the lot. The offices would be two-story buildings. They wanted feedback before they proceeded with the Preliminary Plan. Comment #1 stated that they proposed three single structures on single lot. In order to evaluate zoning compliance they wanted to create theoretical lot lines, as they were not intending to subdivide. The plan showed that they were in compliance.

Ruby Tuesday continued

They adjusted the length of the office building to accommodate the first comment. Mrs. Geiger asked if the proposed office space would be one business or several businesses? Mr. Herman replied that they were for lease so there would be the potential for a number of businesses. Mrs. Geiger was concerned that there would not be enough parking spaces. Mr. Herman stated that they have the parking laid out in accordance with the ordinance. Mr. Peifer stated that as long as they stayed within the content of the office use, their parking was in compliance.

Mr. Davenport stated that for comment #8 concerning an easement for the Doskus lot, they would provide that. Mr. Bittig asked why they did not bring Romig Ave down into the parking lot of the office buildings and give the offices two accesses? All the traffic had to use Circle Ave. and Romig Ave was full width up to 140' above their property line. Why not bring that street all the way down? Mr. Longacre stated that Romig Ave was not finished horizontally and vertically it was really rough. They could do that if needed. Mr. Herman stated that since they had changed the grading, they might be able to do that.

Mr. Davenport stated that concerning sidewalks, there were existing sidewalks on the other side of the street on Circle Ave but no sidewalks along Neversink or Perkiomen Ave. They have not shown any sidewalks on their plan. Mr. Bittig stated that they might want to put sidewalks on Circle Ave for the people in the office buildings to be able to walk to Ruby Tuesday for lunch. Mr. Herman asked if they should put it in from driveway to driveway? Mr. Schwartz asked if that was feasible? Mr. Longacre stated they could do that.

Mr. Davenport stated that the review letter asked if curbing was required along Neversink Road and Perkiomen Ave. There was no existing curb line along either of those areas. Mr. Bittig asked if there was curb across the street at the bank? Mr. Davenport replied yes. Mr. Bittig stated that he would like to see curbing along Neversink and Circle Ave. Mr. Longacre stated that when they do the traffic study, PennDOT would dictate whatever improvements would need to be done. Mr. Schwartz stated that we should hold off on that issue until PennDOT voices their opinion.

Mr. Davenport asked about the steep slope comment in the review letter, was it necessary to show those on the plan? Mr. Longacre stated that was a man-made condition. Mr. Peifer stated that they could put in a waiver request for that. They might want to give a plan to the Fire Marshal for comments concerning the placement of the buildings before they proceed with preliminary plan stage. The Fire Marshal might have some concerns about the rear of the buildings for fire protection.

Mr. Davenport stated that the last bold comment referred to the fact that each parking lot had over 100 parking spaces and one access way. Mr. Schwartz stated that they addressed the upper lot with adding the access to Romig Ave. Mr. Wilson stated that usually our concern for two access points was for residential properties.

10. LINCOLN ROAD SUBDIVISION – FINAL PLAN - Daniel Laudenslayer

GVC reviewed the Lincoln Road Subdivision Final Plan (reference letter dated February 25, 2005).

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they have addressed the majority of the comments and concerns from the review. They received the approval from the Board of Supervisors to waive the Environmental Assessment

Lincoln Road Subdivision continued

Statement. They would execute the certificate of ownership. They were working on the easement agreement to give to the Solicitor. The right-of-way along Lincoln Road had already been done with the Gibbons Plan. They were not proposing any deed restrictions. They were waiting for the E & S approval. They would set the monuments so they would not have to be escrowed. They would provide the Auto CAD disk. They would seal the Stormwater Reports. Paul Herb would review the plans for the sewer laterals. They would place the drainage easement around the pond. Mr. Bittig stated that they just needed Sewer Authority approval; E & S plan approval and approval for the easement agreement.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant conditional approval for the Lincoln Road Subdivision Final Plan subject to meeting any outstanding items in the February 25th review letter. The motion carried unanimously.

11. EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES PHASE V – FINAL PLAN - C J Levan

GVC reviewed the Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Final Plan (reference letter dated February 24, 2005).

Mr. Levan stated that there was one bold comment in the GVC review letter concerning a letter from the water company. They brought along the letter from the water company stating that they have the necessary pressure to supply water to the development. Mr. Peifer stated that we would need four copies of the approved E & S control plan for the file. Mr. Levan stated that they would bring the stamped approved plan to the Township to be copied.

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

12. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – DR. ROBERT WAHL

Dr. Wahl stated that he was there to discuss the Wahl Subdivision. They wanted to subdivide one three-acre lot located along Hartman Road. They would not be doing the annexation on Limekiln Road. They needed clarification on what they would need to do to be able to get plan approval. With the removal of the annexation it would remove a lot of the comments in the review letter. Lot one was the parcel they wanted to sell. Lot three was the parcel on which their house was located. Lot two was the annexation parcel, which would now remain with their parcel. Mr. Bittig stated that there were a number of issues for the parcel they wanted to subdivide. That parcel was a steady 40% slope, it was all wooded and by our Subdivision Ordinance it would have to be protected and could not be built on. According to the surveyor the perks and probes were done on the upslope side. The septic would need to be downslope. The issue of the driveway access was a concern. Mr. Peifer stated that another issue was the need to survey the entire residue part or could they just have the survey for the proposed new lot. Mr. Ruff stated that the water company did not need to do the entire survey. Mr. Peifer stated that they should show the proposed driveway on the plan because of the concerns with location and grade. Mr. Bittig asked if they were under Act 319. Dr. Wahl replied yes. Mr. Bittig stated that if they cut off that lot then they would be penalized to pay back taxes for seven years. Mr. Wilson stated that Dr. Wahl was there looking for guidance. Mr. Ruff stated that doing the subdivision did not look feasible. Mr. Wilson stated that with the wooded area involved, steep slopes involved, the angle of the driveway, it probably would not be feasible. They would need to come in with the

Informal Discussion continued

location of the driveway around the septic system and be able to show the grade. Dr. Wahl stated it would probably not be wise to proceed with the plan with the costs involved.

13. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – DOUG KRAMER

Mr. Kramer stated that they were there to discuss a possible subdivision located on property owned by the Penn View Mobile Home Park. They own frontage along Heidelberg Ave that they would like to subdivide into three lots. They would comply with the zoning in that area. They looked at the flood study from FEMA and checked the elevations. Lot 3 would have some area that was in the 100-year flood width. Mr. Peifer asked if that area was dedicated open space? Mr. Kramer replied that the mobile home park was there a long time. Mr. Bittig stated that lot 3 would be hard to put a building on. The new Stormwater Ordinance requires 50-ft setback. Mr. Peifer stated that it applied when there was no study done. Mr. Wilson stated that there was a 20-ft sewer easement located next to lot 3. The back corner of lot 3 had been flooded recently with heavy runs. Mr. Kramer stated that they would ask for a waiver for mapping the residue lot. Mr. Bittig stated that Ordinance No. 452, Section 4.00C would deal with lot 3, no principle building shall be allowed in any floodway or flood fringe area. Lot three would have the fringe area. Mr. Wilson stated that it would be better for two lots.

Mr. Kramer asked how to proceed from here? Mr. Peifer stated that what they were looking for was whether they could proceed with the subdivision, was it allowed? Mr. Schwartz asked if there were any conditions on the original home park? Mr. Ruff stated that we wouldn't know that. Mr. Schwartz stated that we would assume that there was no plan on file with the Township. Mr. Wilson stated the mobile home park was a pre-existing non-conforming use. Mr. Ruff stated that they should proceed with either two or three lots depending on the flood plain. It would be a good use for the lots.

14. LAMAR ADVERTISING - APPEAL PETITION

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that we have a separate stand alone Sign Ordinance for which Lamar filed appeals to the Board of Supervisors. They sued us and it went to court. The Judge said that though it was not technically a zoning issue because there was a blurb in the Zoning Ordinance that says "see sign ordinance", he sent it back to the Zoning Hearing Board. Lamar was challenging our ordinance. It was suggested that we revise our Sign Ordinance to state that you could have billboards but have a requirement for density. Mr. Wilson asked if we should do a letter to the Board? Mr. Schwartz stated that was a legal issue, not a planning issue.

15. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Wilson stated that he received a letter from the School District asking to meet with the Planning Commission to discuss future growth. The Planning Commission asked Mr. Gardecki to update the future development map and agreed to two dates, Wednesday, March 23rd or Wednesday, March 30th. One date would be used for the meeting with the School Board and other date was for the Zoning Workshop/Meeting.

Mr. Wilson stated that the Joint Comprehensive Plan was completed and would be presented to the Board of Supervisors for public hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to adjourn the March 1, 2005 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:15 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

- BOS: Rutter – Conditional Use
- BOS: Toaldo Annexation waivers and Sketch Plan of Record approval
- BOS: SCI Services, Inc. Preliminary Plan approval
- BOS: Lincoln Road Subdivision Final Plan approval
- BOS: Exeter Golf Club Estates Phase V Final Plan approval
- BOS: Exeter Community Library Final Plan approval