

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
SEPTEMBER 6, 2005

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, September 6, 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

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 2, 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 September 6, 2005 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

3. GODSHALL ANNEXATION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD – Andy Kent

GVC reviewed the Timothy & Deanna Godshall Sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated August 30, 2005).

Mr. Kent stated that the 12 deeds were being drawn up by Mark Koch, the comment concerning the municipal boundary lines was insignificant as there would be no building, just an annexation of land. Mr. Ruff stated that he agreed. Mr. Kent asked for Sketch Plan of Record approval.

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

4. LITTLE VIEW HILL – FINAL PLAN – Andy Kent

GVC reviewed the Little View Hill Final Plan (reference letter dated September 1, 2005).

Mr. Kent stated that they would correct the soils on the plan. They would set the pins. The individual lot owners would submit the stormwater control design and the E & S approvals for that. Mr. Peifer stated that they would need to prepare and submit an E & S control plan for the sewer extension. Mr. Kent stated that when the sewer extension plan was approved by the Authority, they would prepare and submit an E & S plan to the County. They would put the note on the plan stating that the recreation impact fee would be paid at such time that a building permit was submitted for each lot. They finally received the archeological review letter and would submit that to the Township. Under Stormwater Management, their Engineer went over Section 305.2 and disagreed with Mr. Peifer's interpretation of that and gave Mr. Peifer a copy of the Engineers' letter for review. Mr. Kent stated that the only other comment was that private street should be referred to as a private drive. The outstanding issue was the planning module, which would be submitted to the Township for review. Mr. Bittig asked about the easement agreement with the utility companies, did they submit that? Mr. Kent replied that they submitted a copy of the old easement agreement that stated there were no restrictions on the land and was waiting for the letter from the utility company confirming that. Mr. Wilson asked how many homes would be constructed? Mr. Kent replied three new homes.

Public Comment

THOMAS HOWELL, 820 Lorane Road, stated that all the deeds refer to the lane as a "private street", none of the deeds refer to that as a "private drive", how could they change that? Mr. Kent replied that when they did the designation for 911, they had to designate certain streets and drives and it fell under the category as a "drive". Mr. Howell replied that the deed stated it was a "street". Mr. Schwartz asked what the impact would be with that? Mr. Howell replied that streets were constructed different than a drive. Mr. Ruff stated that it was irrelevant. Mr. Wilson stated that it was used as a private drive so changing the name from "street" to "drive" was fitting for its current use.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant Final Plan approval for The Little View Hill Subdivision subject to Mr. Peifer's approval of the infiltration volume calculations, the letter from the utility company, planning module approval, Township Authority approval of the sewer design, and the improvements agreement being completed. The motion carried with Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

5. PATHFINDER MEADOWS SECTION 2 – FINAL PLAN – Daniel Laudenslayer

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

Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they had the PA American Water Company approval letter for the extension agreement. GVC was reviewing the deeds and the cost estimates. The zoning issues have been resolved. The E & S plan has been approved and the Township had copies of that. They were waiting for the final approval from the Army Corps. Fee-in-lieu of open space for the tract would be handled by the developer. The Certificate of Ownership would be executed. They had submitted the deed restrictions and the Solicitor would review them. The improvements agreement estimates were prepared and the Sewer Authority approved the estimate presented to them. Schoffers Road permits were applied for and were waiting for final approval from the Army Corp. There were a couple of items concerning the headwall. Mr. Peifer stated that comment #2 did

Pathfinder Meadows Section 2 continued

not need to be done, that was before the plans for the headwall were submitted. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that they completed the legal description for Schoffers Road and would submit that. About the comment concerning William Brunner accepting parcel C, they put a note on the plan that if Mr. Brunner did not accept Parcel C it would become part of the Homeowners Association. Mr. Bittig asked when they would be getting the permits for the Schoffers Road pipes? Mr. Laudenslayer replied that they were hoping for approval within 60 days.

Public Comment

ROBERT NYE, University Rifle Club, stated that they had an agreement with the developer whereby the developer would install a fence as a continuation of the sound barrier wall along the common boundary line. The fence would continue the sound barrier to the road. Through misunderstanding, the club felt the fence, as presented, was not as high as what was originally considered. The fence, as shown, was 4 feet high. The club understood the fence would be as high as the sound barrier wall. They were in consultation with the attorney for the developer and questions have been asked what control the Township had over the height of the fence, was that controlled by Township Ordinance or Codes? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the only thing in our Ordinance was that anything over 10 feet high had to be set 5 feet from the property line, there was no maximum height. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that the area Mr. Nye was discussing was where the sound barrier wall could not cross the water, so they proposed the 4-foot fence from the 8-foot sound barrier on one side of the stream to the right-of-way and then connected to the other side of the 8-foot sound barrier wall. Mr. Nye stated that they would be in consultation privately with the developers' attorney. Mr. Littlehales stated that he would like to see the fence built higher than 4-feet. Mr. Ruff stated that it should be consistent with the height of the sound barrier wall, which was 8-feet. Mr. Schwartz stated that the wire mesh fence was certainly not a sound barrier. With a major break in that wall, would it be doing any good? Mr. Laudenslayer replied that the wall was not actually a "sound barrier" it was called that because of the material it was constructed of, but it was more of a child barrier. Mr. Wilson asked what the length of the opening was? Mr. Laudenslayer replied that it was 77-feet. Mr. Nye stated that there were trees located there that helped absorb the sound. The Planning Commission agreed that they did not realize it was that much of an opening when originally presented. A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the fence and the wall. Mr. Laudenslayer stated that he would go back to the developer about extending the sound barrier wall along the area where the fence was to be placed. Mr. Ruff asked if that would be acceptable to the gun club? Mr. Nye replied it would.

Mr. Bittig stated that they needed the permits and the PA American Water Company review letter before the Planning Commission could approve the plan. Mr. Wilson stated that he was concerned with the amount of traffic that the development would produce onto SR 562 and Shelbourne Road.

6. **RUBY TUESDAY – FINAL PLAN** – Rick Longacre
- Matt Davenport

GVC reviewed the Ruby Tuesday Final Plan (reference letter dated August 11, 2005).

Mr. Longacre stated that they wanted to give an update on the Ruby Tuesday plan to the Planning Commission. They had some planning issues and details that needed to be addressed. They would add the handicapped ramp details, construction details and restoration paving. With the comments concerning PA American water company, they did flow tests to confirm that pressures and flows were adequate in the area. They were bringing the water supply to the site from the other side of 422. They expect the approval letter in a

Ruby Tuesday continued

week. With the issue of the geology on the site, there were a number of Sections in the Ordinance that reference that. They would be turning in the report that would address the infiltration, which showed that every place they would be carving out, there would be no place for infiltration as it was solid rock. The underground stormwater retention/conveyance system was watertight. The water would be metered off the site to an adjoining inlet in the PennDOT system. They were working on the easement agreements, utility agreements and the improvements agreements. They were working on the Berks County Conservation District E & S approval. The location would be treated differently, with a pond on each site, and would be done independently. They needed the Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT for the intersection at East Neversink and Circle and the signal program. Both applications needed to be made by the Township and were approved to be signed by the Board. Mr. Longacre asked Mr. Peifer if those were all of the outstanding items. Mr. Peifer replied that they were all of the “big ticket” items. Mr. Wilson asked about the offsite metering of the water, where did the PennDOT system take the water? Mr. Longacre replied that they did not know, but the stormwater system would be reviewed and approved by PennDOT. Mr. Wilson was concerned because there was already flooding on the Bowl-o-Rama parking lot. Mr. Longacre replied that their runoff was controlled the same as any other development, they were not allowed to release any more water. The underground box would meter the water off-site at the same rate.

Public Comment

JUDY MAGEE, 3913 Romig Ave, stated that she was concerned that the water being taken away from the site would affect her well water. Mr. Longacre stated that the water that would go into the system would be water from the parking lots and the building. The entire area was rock, so in terms of hydrology, it would remain the same after as it was before.

RON DEFREES, 4001 Circle Ave, asked how the heavy equipment would access the site? Mr. Longacre replied that the construction entrances would come in off of Circle Ave. Mr. DeFrees asked what the agreement between the developer and the Township was concerning the Romig Ave access? Mr. Longacre replied that they would construct and pave the right-of-way of Romig Ave. It would be widened to 24-ft and they would re-construct the bulb area for the turn around in the right-of-way of Romig Ave. Mr. DeFrees asked what would happen with the curbing, would it be on both sides. Mr. Davenport replied no, that they would hold the southern curb line, but there would be no curbing on the other side of the street. Mr. DeFrees asked if Romig Ave would be a through street or emergency only access? Mr. Longacre stated that it would be left open, but the bollards were shown on the plans to set up when and if the Board would decide to close it for emergency use only. The plans were to leave it open until there was a situation when the Township would decide to close it. Mr. DeFrees asked if the parking lots for the office buildings would have speed bumps? Mr. Longacre replied no, speed bumps created a liability for the property owners. Mr. Wilson stated that if the traffic became a burden using Romig Ave, then the Township would review whether they should close it. Mr. Ruff stated that if there was a problem with the traffic on Romig Ave, they would need to approach the Board of Supervisors to request the chain being put in place.

JOHN MAGEE, 3913 Romig Ave, asked if Romig Ave would still be designated as a “no outlet” street. Mr. Longacre replied yes. Mrs. Magee stated that she was opposed to having Romig Ave entrance opened and then asked if the “no outlet” sign would be relocated to a more visible location. It was currently located behind the telephone pole. Mr. Bittig replied that Mrs. Magee addressed that earlier with the Board of Supervisors, which was the proper place to do that.

Ruby Tuesday continued

Mr. Longacre stated that Ruby Tuesday hoped to break ground before winter. They could put in the footers and build in order to open in the spring. Until they received the Conservation District approval, they could not do any site work. They would like to move forward with the project before the PennDOT approval was received. Mr. Peifer asked if they planned to build the infrastructure? Mr. Longacre replied that they would need to do the E & S controls first and then they would do the utility relocations. They would need final approval on the plan in order to secure financing. They would look for final approval when they received the Conservation District approval. There was a provision that they could get final approval with a note on the plan concerning PennDOT approval. They would complete what was needed and return for plan approval.

7. CRESTWOOD SOUTH LOT 71 – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Steve Bensinger

GVC reviewed the Crestwood South Lot 71 Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated August 30, 2005).

Mr. Bensinger stated that they revised the plan and put sidewalks on both sides of the street. They revised the plan to address the driveway issues. The remaining items in the GVC review letter could be addressed at Final plan stage, so they were requesting Preliminary Plan approval. They would also address the open space issue with the Board of Supervisors. They were proposing to dedicate the lower portion of land to the Township. Mr. Wilson asked if they would consider giving the upper portion to the Township instead of having it maintained by the homeowners association? Mr. Bensinger replied that they would check that out.

Mr. Bittig asked if they received the Historic review letter? Mr. Bensinger replied that they were waiting for that.

Public Comment

JOSEPH RUDDEROW, 65 Stephanie Court, asked why would we want the Township to take something rather than the homeowners association? Mr. Wilson replied for recreation purposes, our soccer field was connected to that area. The Township owned the land on the opposite side, and then they would both be connected. Mr. Rudderow asked if the Township owned it rather than the homeowners association, would it come off of the tax roles? Mr. Peifer replied that open space does not get taxed. His understanding was the open space owned by the homeowners association was not on the tax roles. They could ask that question at the Board of Supervisors meeting when the solicitor is in attendance.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Crestwood South Lot 71 Preliminary Plan with the understanding that all outstanding issues were dealt with at Final Plan stage. The motion carried with Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Bittig voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

Mr. Wilson stated that he was concerned with the additional amount of traffic onto East Neversink Road.

8. FAIRVIEW PARK II – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Steve Bensinger

GVC reviewed the Fairview Park II Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated August 31, 2005).

Mr. Bensinger stated that comment #7 dealt with the emergency access. Their attorney felt that there was a legal issue involved since the access was approved by the previous Fire Marshal. He met with the new Fire

Fairview Park II continued

Marshal and he was ok with Terry Francis signing the plan. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it would be on the agenda for Monday night's Board meeting. Mr. Bittig asked if the issue of the adjacent land ownership was taken care of. Mr. Bensinger stated that the entire tract would be sold to the developer and that portion of the land ownership was being handled with the subdivision plan. Mr. Peifer stated that if that was the intent of the plan, then it should be noted on the plan. Mrs. Geiger asked that they also included the note listed under item #6. Mr. Bensinger replied that they would do that. Mr. Wilson asked if the emergency access was a legal street? If it were barricaded off, would that meet our requirement of two streets? Mr. Schwartz stated that our ordinance did not say "streets" it just stated two accesses. Mr. Bensinger replied that it was taken as a vote, 4 to 1, by the Planning Commission that stated it was acceptable as the second means of access. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was subject to the Board of Supervisors decision on Monday. Mr. Bittig asked if was gravel or paved? Mr. Bensinger stated that it was gravel, but they could pave it if that was what was needed. They also have addressed all the other issues in the Fire Marshal review letter.

Mr. Bensinger stated that they were looking for waivers for lot depth to width ratio for lots #12, 33, 34, 39, 46 and 51. Mr. Bensinger demonstrated how they could make changes to the lots to not need the waivers, but it would not reduce the number of lots. Mr. Bittig stated that at a previous meeting it was asked why Phillip Ave did not come all the way down and the answer was that there was a deep ravine located there. Mr. Bensinger stated that the Army Corps and DEP did not want them to cross any ravines. Mr. Bittig stated that there were two public safety hazards located there. The ravine where the pipe comes under Fairview Chapel Road was eight feet deep with vertical sides. His concern was a child could drown there with a good rain. The other issue was there were 26 home sites that could only get out at one chokepoint. He felt that was unacceptable. If they ran Philip straight down and came out onto Fairview Chapel opposite Dauphin it would alleviate that. Mr. Bensinger felt that they could not get permits from DEP to do that. They did the traffic study in August 2004 and the conclusions were that they needed to add stop signs. Mr. Schwartz asked if what Mr. Bittig was saying was that it was essentially a 26 home cul-de-sac? Mr. Bittig replied yes. Mr. Bensinger stated they were in with sketch and preliminary plans and that had not been an issue before. Mr. Wilson stated that it was overlooked previously, but Mr. Bittig had a valid point. Mr. Bensinger stated that they would investigate the issue further and talk to DEP and the Army Corps.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the waiver of SALDO Section 5.514 for lots #12, 33, 34, 39, 46 and 51 because they demonstrated how they could change the lots to conform without reducing the number of lots. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales voting in favor and Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Bittig voting opposed.

Mr. Wilson asked if the flag lots had shared driveways? Mr. Bensinger replied that they were individual driveways but they were put together to satisfy the Fire Marshal request for a 20-ft wide driveway with a turn-around at the end for the fire truck. There was a shared driveway on lot 27 & 26 and also on 19 & 20. They were 10-ft on one side of the line and 10-ft on the other side. They could create the easements if they were needed. Mr. Peifer stated that they would need to create the easements and show them on the plan. They must be constructed according to the plan for the reasons that the Fire Marshal stated. Mr. Bittig asked if the streets were shown the full width? Mr. Bensinger replied that the streets were 34-ft wide as shown on the previously approved plan. Mr. Bittig stated that they did not conform to the current Ordinance. Mr. Bensinger stated that they were requesting a waiver of that requirement. Mr. Bittig asked if the right-of-way width was 54-ft? Mr. Bensinger replied yes. With the new Act 167 Ordinance #591, it recommended street widths to be narrower for less impervious surface. The plan allowed parking on one side. Bucks County allowed for 28-ft

Fairview Park II continued

wide cartway with parking on one side, the same for New Jersey, and Delaware allowed for a 21-ft wide cartway with parking on one side. Mr. Schwartz stated that he agreed on having less impervious surface, however, how would we deal with having adequate parking? Mr. Bittig replied that could be solved with having 15,000 sq. ft. lots, then there would be plenty of off street parking. Mr. Schwartz stated that they would need to provide for parking somewhere else, either in community lots or off-street. If they could come up with an alternative, he would support the narrower streets. Mr. Bensinger stated that he provided examples of 34-ft wide roadways with parking on both sides. Mr. Peifer stated that West Lawn has 34-ft roadways with parking on both sides and there were times when two cars could not drive down at the same time.

Public Comment

THOMAS HOWELL, 820 Lorane Road, asked if they would be able to handle the largest fire truck? Mr. Bensinger replied yes, it would satisfy the 2003 fire code, which would handle the largest truck.

An unidentified woman in the audience stated that before the Planning Commission considered reducing the width of streets, they should try to drive a school bus through the Long Pond Development.

Mr. Wilson agreed that with the number of lots and the smaller size they would need to make the streets wider. Mr. Schwartz stated that he would agree to smaller streets if they could demonstrate adequate additional off-street parking, as that was a problem elsewhere in the Township. Mr. Bensinger asked if they could re-visit the waiver if they could demonstrate additional parking? Mr. Wilson replied yes.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors not grant the waiver of SALDO Section 5.2373, to allow parking on one side of the street. They should have parking on both sides of the street with the full width size of the street unless they could demonstrate adequate additional off-street parking. The motion carried unanimously.

9. ZONING ORDINANCE

The Planning Commission discussed and agreed on the corrections to the Zoning Ordinance.

10. AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION ZONING

Mr. Schwartz stated that the Exeter Township Board of Supervisors voted to submit for review and recommendation changes to the Exeter Township Zoning Ordinance, the motion was made as follows: "Motion by Dr. Ganas, seconded by Mr. Barbieri to submit to the County and the Township Planning Commission, in accordance with Section 804 of the Township Zoning Ordinance & Section 609 of the Municipalities Planning Code, a proposed amendment to Section 401 subsection 4 of the Zoning Ordinance providing for a change in the Agricultural Preservation District to allow for public, private or religious schools (Kindergarten thru 12) as a conditional use and to schedule a public hearing for September 12th at 6:00 P.M. in accordance with the Municipalities Planning Code and to consider enactment of the same. Motion carried with Mr. MacBean, Dr. Ganas and Mr. Barbieri voting in favor and Mrs. Starr and Ms. Ciotti voting opposed". Mr. Ruff stated that it was not in keeping with the Exeter Township Comprehensive Plan to allow schools in the A.P. Zone. Mr. Bittig stated that even if it would be approved it should be as a special exception, not a conditional use. Special exception, in front of the Zoning Hearing Board was how

Agricultural Preservation Zoning continued

all schools were done. Mr. Ruff stated that was pointed out in Mr. Kennedy's letter. Mr. Schwartz stated that the most important thing that was raised with the Board of Supervisors was that permitting a school to go into any location required municipal services; public sewer and public water. The State was unlikely to approve a school location that did not have public sewer and public water. Mr. Bittig stated that the State provided funds for municipalities to purchase land for schools. However, covered under the Department of Education Plan Con. C, there was a statement about Agriculture Land Preservation policy. It referred to executive orders that stated Public Schools would not get money if they take prime agriculture land. The latest order was No. 2003-2 that stated prime agriculture land should be protected under the order and included (a) lands in active agriculture use, which most of the lands were in active AG use (b) lands devoted to active AG use for the preceding three years and (c) fall into at least one of the AG lands described below: (1) preserved farm land, (2) farm land in Ag security areas, (3) farmland enrolled in Act 319, clean and green (4) farm land planned for agriculture use and subject to effective Ag zoning. If they allowed schools in the AP district they would violate the Township Comprehensive Plan as well as the pending Joint Comprehensive Plan and the County Plan. Mr. Schwartz stated that it might also violate the Act 537 sewage plan. Mr. Bittig stated that it also violated the Municipalities Planning Code Section 603.G.1 that stated, "Zoning Ordinances shall protect prime Ag land and may promote the establishment of Ag security areas". It was mandated by the MPC. That would invalidate the entire zoning district. Mr. Schwartz stated that the key planning issue was not the building of one school in the AP Zone, it was the impact that providing that school had, with adding public water and public sewer in that area. Once they run those facilities, we would have little to say to stop the building of houses in that area. Mr. Bittig stated that there were two entities wanting the change: the Archdiocese that wanted Central Catholic, and the Exeter Township School District. He received an anonymous letter that stated that Exeter School District already had over 180 acres of land in the Township, including Lausch where they had a ¼ acre building on 40 acres of ground. It would be better to satisfy the Archdiocese by doing the lesser of two evils and move the zoning line over and then we would not have to mess with the whole AP Zone. There also was land in the Light Industrial Zone that could be used for schools rather than in the AP district.

Public Comment

GARY WEGMAN stated that he was a fifth generation farmer on agriculture preservation land in Exeter Township. He was there on behalf of many of the farmers in Exeter. If the zoning change was allowed to take place, Ag Preservation will be killed in Exeter Township. It would be gone. There was a woman in Oley complaining about sludge being sprayed on the farmland next to the Elementary school, who was there first? It did not sound like the Planning Commission was in favor of the change, however the Board of Supervisors were the ones that had the authority to make the decision. There was a plan to prevent the need for schools in the AP zone. In 1960 there was over 7,000 acres of active agriculture farmland in St. Lawrence; before Antietam Shopping Center, Nichols and Luther Lausch Elementary were built. Once the infrastructure went in, then all the houses followed. Now there was a plan for a Cross Town Connector. Once a school was allowed to be built in the Ag Zone, then the lid would be lifted for any school to buy cheap agriculture land. Our land was cheap; by making it AP farmers did not get fair value for their land, because it was 40-acre minimum. They accepted that because they farm it. If schools were allowed to come in, then they would be killing their farms because they could not spray fungicide due to the fact that it would drift. Mr. Wegman asked the Planning Commission to convince the Board of Supervisors to not allow schools in the Agriculture Preservation Zone. He also stated if that was allowed then taxes would go through the roof because all the AP land would be developed and we would have lost Agriculture in Exeter.

Agriculture Preservation Zoning continued

Mr. Bittig stated that Mr. Wegman was correct, the land values have been artificially held down. They had some of the best farming in the county located there. He then asked Mr. Wegman to please come next week to the meeting, bring along the other farmers and speak to the Board of Supervisors.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to not pass the proposed amendment for the following reasons: It violated the Township Comprehensive Plan; it violated the County Comprehensive Plan; it violated the Department of Education Plan Con. C; it violated the Township Act 537 sewage facilities plan; it would result in unregulated growth throughout the rest of the Township increasing necessary services, in particular, schools. If they would build the school that would generate accompanying residential development, which would, in turn, generate a need for more schools, which would, in turn, generate more residential development. It would be a never-ending cycle until all the land was gone. If they proceed to add schools as an allowable use it would invalidate the Agriculture Preservation Zoning. Also, if they would proceed to allow schools, it should be as a special exception, not a conditional use. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to adjourn the September 6, 2005 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:13 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Agricultural Preservation Zoning District
BOS: Crestwood South Lot 71 Preliminary Plan
BOS: Godshall Annexation Sketch Plan of Record
BOS: Fairview Park II waiver requests
BOS: Little View Hill Final Plan