

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JANUARY 5, 2006

The rescheduled meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, January 5, 2006 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, Jr., Secretary
Dottie Geiger
Richard Littlehales
Paul L. Schwartz
Gary L. Shane

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 December 6, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Shane voting in favor and Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Ruff abstaining as they were absent for the meeting.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the January 5, 2006 Planning Commission meeting with the removal of Riethmuller Rezoning, as they would not be present. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

A. EAST GATE – PRELIMINARY PLAN; APPLEBEE’S AT SHELBOURNE SQUARE – PRELIMINARY PLAN; TMG HOMES LAND DEVELOPMENT – SKETCH PLAN: MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

4. REORGANIZATION

The Planning Commission moved to appoint the following officers for the year 2006:

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to nominate Mr. Donald Wilson as Chairman of the Planning Commission. There were no other nominations. The motion carried unanimously

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to close the nominations and appoint Mr. Donald Wilson as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2006. The motion carried with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Bittig, Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Shane voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mrs. Geiger to nominate Mr. Jack Bittig as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission. There were no other nominations. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mrs. Geiger to close the nominations and appoint Mr. Jack Bittig as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2006. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mrs. Geiger to nominate Mr. John Ruff, Jr. as Secretary to the Planning Commission. There were no other nominations. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mrs. Geiger, seconded by Mr. Bittig to close the nominations and appoint Mr. John Ruff, Jr. as Secretary of the Planning Commission for the year 2006. The motion carried unanimously.

5. FAIRVIEW PARK II – PRELIMINARY PLAN – WAIVER REQUEST - Stephen Bensinger

Mr. Bensinger stated that at the last Planning Commission meeting there was a discussion about SALDO Section 5.551 and 5.558 dealing with lots 47 & 48 on Fairview Chapel Road. On Section 5.551, he felt that they met the Ordinance as it stated, "Subdivision shall be designed to minimize the number of driveway intersections with existing public roads. Wherever deemed feasible by the Township and required by the Township to minimize driveway intersections with existing Township roads thus reducing interruptions to traffic flow and minimizing accident hazards and to minimize erosion, sedimentations and run-off problems onto existing public roads". The two lots have driveway access onto Fairview Chapel Road. There were 51 proposed lots for the subdivision and only two would have access onto an existing public road. The section concerning erosion and run-off onto public roads would not apply as the two lots would have the water dropping onto the back of the properties, no water would run-off onto the road. The second waiver was for Section 5.558, which stated that in the case of a collector street, which Fairview Chapel Road was, they needed a separation distance of eighty feet from the intersection of the cartway line to the centerline of the driveways. Lot 47 met the requirement, but not lot 48. The waiver request was for lot 48. Mr. Bittig asked why they had the situation since that was not a problem with the original plan from 1993? Section 5.308 stated that Supervisors encourage design of through streets and while the use of cul-de-sacs was not prohibited, they were discouraged when other options were available. Why don't they bring that cul-de-sac through to Fairview Chapel, opposite Dauphin Drive? Mr. Bensinger replied that was discussed before at the September 12th Board of Supervisors meeting. It was agreed upon by the Supervisors and their legal counsel that they met the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance and the cul-de-sac was acceptable.

Fairview Park II continued

Mr. Bittig stated that action concerned the number of units on a cul-de-sac. What have they done to demonstrate that it was infeasible to run the cul-de-sac down to Fairview Chapel Road and not need the driveway accesses? Mr. Bensinger replied that as he stated before to the Board, the Army Corps of Engineers preferred not to grant any permits to enclose existing drainage swales/ditches. They met with Kevin Dougherty with the Army Corps of Engineers and it was his recommendation that they did not disturb any of the large drainage swales/ditches on the property. The likelihood of getting that permit was very slim. Mr. Bittig stated that the letter from the Army Corps of Engineers stated that any disturbance required permits, not that they were prohibited from doing that. Mr. Ruff stated that having a driveway that close to an intersection on a collector street was a bad idea. Mr. Schwartz stated that we had approved driveways onto Shelbourne Road for Hunters Run and now that he saw them, he felt they were a bad idea and would not like to see that happen again.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Shane to recommend the Board of Supervisors not grant a waiver of the requirement of SALDO Section 5.558; requiring separation distance of eighty feet from the intersection of the cartway line to the centerline of the driveways because it was a potential accident hazard. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of SALDO Section 5.551; for the driveway for Lot #47 and #48 being allowed to access Fairview Chapel Road. The motion failed to carry with all members voting opposed.

6. ROBERT R. & NORMA K. OSWALD SUBDIVISION – PLAN EXEMPTION - Stephen Bensinger

Mr. Bensinger stated that the Robert and Norma Oswald property was located on the south side of Old Friedensburg Road east of Butter Lane. It was 3.35 acres and would be subdivided into two lots. One lot would have the existing house located there. The lot with the existing house did encroach onto Exeter Township on the southeast corner. The lot that would be subdivided off for the proposed house was entirely in Lower Alsace Township. They were requesting a waiver from the subdivision process in Exeter Township.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant plan exemption for the Robert R. & Norma K Oswald Subdivision as there was only a small portion of the property located in Exeter Township and no new development would be located there. The motion carried unanimously.

7. WINDY WILLOWS – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Brian Kobularcik

GVC reviewed the Windy Willows Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated December 30, 2005).

Mr. Kobularcik stated that they had two copies of the Environmental Assessment Statement to pass out for review. Mr. Peifer stated that item #12 under SALDO was basically stating that we needed letters from all the municipalities that they were in agreement for the boundary lines. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they had confirmation from two of the three. Last night Lower Alsace Planning Commission recommended Preliminary Plan approval to their governing body. They also accepted the municipal boundaries as shown

Windy Willows continued

on the plan. They were waiting for Alsace approval. Mr. Bittig stated that once they had that they would need to bring in a letter confirming that. Mr. Schwartz stated that could be dealt with at Final Plan stage. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they submitted a Water Resource Study and there was a question concerning the study and they had additional information, which they submitted to the Township. Mr. Kobularcik stated that the Fire Marshal required two 6,000-gallon cisterns and they were providing three 4,000-gallon cisterns in order to meet the depth and cover requirements. They had a verbal OK but were waiting for a letter from the Fire Marshal concerning that. They did a Phase I Environmental Study and it was submitted to the EAC for review. Mr. Schwartz stated that the EAC did not meet in December so it would be looked at next month. Mr. Bittig asked about some of the items listed as a potential problem, what were they planning to do about them? Mr. Kobularcik replied that any of the little items would be removed. When they negotiate the sale of the property, anything that the buying party raised as a concern would be removed. Mr. Peifer asked if that would be the sale to the individual property owner? Mr. Kobularcik replied no, the sale to the builder buying the entire property. Mr. Kobularcik asked if they would need a waiver of the Environmental Hazard Report or was the Phase I report enough? Mr. Peifer replied that we were Ok with the Phase I report and would not need a waiver. Mr. Wilson stated that the Planning Commission should review the proposed streetlights shown on Plan Sheet 9 and asked if could they show us that? Mr. Littlehales looked at the plan and stated that they did not look good for that type of development. Mr. Schwartz stated that it met GPU specs. Mr. Peifer stated that it met the spacing requirements. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they would switch out the detail to another type of light. Mr. Bittig stated that they needed letters from the Exeter and St. Lawrence Sewer Authorities. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they knew they had the treatment capacity for the sewer, but the problem was in the conveyance. They would need letters from St. Lawrence and Exeter. Mr. Bittig stated that St. Lawrence was having a problem with their line. Mr. Kobularcik stated that there was a 15" line coming through Exeter, which then went into a 12" line through St. Lawrence and then into 15" line again in Exeter. Mr. Bittig stated that until that problem was resolved it was their problem also.

Mr. Peifer stated that concerning pipe 22, which ran from the cisterns to inlet #4 and the line that goes back into a line in Alsace Township. That line had a velocity of over 12 fps. The velocity was internal to the system and they were asking for a waiver. The pipe would be the responsibility of the Homeowners. The Planning Commission agreed that they should submit that in writing and they would recommend the waiver be granted. Mr. Kobularcik stated that they would bring back two Preliminary Plan approvals and that should be acceptable that Alsace would permit the discharge of stormwater runoff from the Exeter Township portion of the site. For Item #18, they would divert the water from flowing along Old Friedensburg Road. They were reducing the current condition. Mr. Schwartz asked if we needed to take any action or just to say that the rate was acceptable? The Planning Commission agreed that the minutes should just reflect that the rate was acceptable. Mr. Kobularcik passed out a letter, which addressed the comments for item #5 under Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Wilson read item #6, which stated GVC recommended no building permits be issued until the developer provided documentation signed and sealed by a professional land surveyor that the required sight distance has been made available at that location.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff that the Planning Commission agreed to accept that recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend that the Board of Supervisors grant Preliminary Plan approval for Windy Willows subject to resolution to all comments in the GVC review letter dated December 30th during Final Plan stage. The motion carried with Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ruff, Mrs. Geiger, Mr. Shane, Mr. Littlehales voting in favor and Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bittig voting opposed.

8. ZACH'S AUTO SALES – PRELIMINARY PLAN

No one was present to discuss the plan.

9. APPLEBEE'S AT SHELBOURNE SQUARE – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Nick McAndrew
- Amit Mukherjee
- Bob Bauer

GVC reviewed the Applebee's at Shelbourne Square Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated December 29, 2005).

Mr. McAndrew stated that the 6.2-acre lot was previously subdivided a year and a half ago. The driveway was constructed to alleviate traffic flow from Shelbourne Square. Mr. Peifer stated that zoning item #2 was just for information that a variance was granted for lot area and lot widths at both the street line and building setback lines. Item #4 regarded the loading area for Applebee's. Mr. McAndrew stated that an area of 15ft x 90ft was designated as the loading area. The truck to service the grease trap would be parked along the building. They were extending the utilities to the southern section of the site for potential future development and they would put a note on the plan stating that. They were unsure what that would be.

Mr. Bittig stated that the land coverage was based on the total lot. When the next person would come in they would still need to meet those requirements. Mr. McAndrew stated that they did not feel that they needed a Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Peifer stated that their building did not come up to the threshold amount in that section of the Ordinance to require a Traffic Impact Study, but the Township still had the option to say that they wanted one done. Mr. Bauer stated that he talked to PennDOT today to see if they were still Ok with their permit and PennDOT replied that they were. The only permit that would be needed was for PA American Water Company.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of SALDO Section 4.282 and 5.98; Traffic Impact Study as the Planning Commission agreed it was not needed and not required as the site would generate low volume traffic. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. McAndrew stated that they corrected the problem with the retaining wall. For item #13 for the lights, they were hoping not to have to add additional lights on the street. Mr. Peifer stated that it was just the visibility of the drive entrance for the traveling public. Mr. McAndrew stated that they could put on double heads and move some over to create spillage to give more light to the existing driveway. Mr. Littlehales stated that the other end down by the shopping center was a problem. Mr. Bauer stated that they would be painting lines on the road, which would help. They were working on that with the Shopping Center owner.

Mr. Bittig asked if they received a letter from the water company? Mr. McAndrew replied yes, they did and he gave the Planning Commission a copy. They were hoping to put off Section 305 & 306 in the Stormwater Ordinance until the next step of the development. Mr. Peifer stated that they would need to do that with the Erosion and Sediment Control plan. Mr. McAndrew asked if they could put that in the channel? Mr. Peifer stated that he would need to look into that. Mr. Mukherjee stated that part of the requirements that they did a year ago with the subdivision, was that they analyzed the existing detention pond and what impact the development would do to the functionality of the pond. At that point in time they needed to take the two-year post development and reduce it to the one-year predevelopment. Ordinance 591 was adopted early in 2005. All they would have needed to do was to choke down on the orifice of the outlet structure. There was sufficient volume in the detention pond to offset the new development. One thing that they did with the

Applebee's continued

Conservation District was they limited the NPDES boundary to the 6.2-acre property. They were hoping to provide for the criteria for the lot into the existing detention pond. Mr. Bittig stated that they could not do that per the Act 167 Ordinance. Mr. Mukherjee did not want to bypass the criteria; they wanted to view it as an amendment to the permit of last year. Mr. Peifer stated that the "out" options were only for soils or if there were existing features on the lot that prohibited infiltration, without that they needed to do infiltration. Mr. Mukherjee stated that the detention pond was outside our permits boundary. Mr. Bauer stated that they would do infiltration if that were needed. They would put in 6,000 cubic feet of storage on the remaining portion of the tract. When they develop that portion of the tract they would then abandon that and move it to another location. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they would soon have the letter from the Sewer Authority stating that they have the capacity. Mr. Wilson asked what they were doing about the Fire Marshal comment concerning the extra hydrant? Mr. McAndrew replied that they moved the hydrant closer to the building and the Fire Marshal requested another hydrant. They had driven by the location and there was another hydrant located along 422 by the music store around 400 feet from the lot. They talked to the Fire Marshal and he was agreeable to that. Mr. Mukherjee stated that they should have an adequacy letter from the Berks County Conservation District and they were hoping to get Preliminary Plan approval. He also added concerning the meeting that they had with the Engineering Staff (Cheryl and Linda) a couple of months ago, the staff was wonderful and that he wanted that to be on record.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Applebee's Preliminary Plan subject to resolution of the open issues in the GVC December 29, 2005 review letter being addressed at Final Plan stage. The motion carried unanimously.

10. TMG HOMES, INC. LAND DEVELOPMENT – SKETCH PLAN – Bruce Radar
- Chad Martin

GVC reviewed the TMG Homes, Inc. Land Development Sketch Plan (reference letter dated December 29, 2005).

Mr. Radar stated that they were proposing a shopping center at the corner of Pineland Road and 422. They passed out a photo rendition of the development. The development would have a two-story building for the shopping center, a bank and a restaurant. A detention pond was proposed for the rear of the lot. It was a sketch plan and they wanted to bring it to the Planning Commission to get input before they began design of the project. Mr. Shane asked why it showed a one-story building? Mr. Radar replied that it was a two-story, from the front it was one story for retail and the back was a one-story walk out basement for offices. They needed to move the building back further as they needed to get rid of parking spaces along the road. They delineated the wetlands and would stay out of them. Mr. Peifer stated that item #3 was just looking for more information to show that they would be in compliance with the open area. Mr. Radar replied that they would take care of that. Mr. Peifer stated that item #5 concerned the height of the buildings. Item #8 concerned the need for the HOP. Mr. Radar stated that they were working on that with a Traffic Engineer. Mr. Peifer stated that item #11 concerned the distribution of the parking for the uses. Mr. Radar stated that they would possibly move the building back and that should help. Mr. Peifer stated that an Environmental Assessment Statement would be needed at Preliminary Plan stage. Mr. Wilson stated that he was familiar with the property and he knew that years ago trash and other items were dumped and buried on the property, behind

TMG Homes, Inc. continued

the house with the white columns. Mr. Peifer stated that item #2 concerned improvements along Pineland Road. Mr. Bittig stated that it was showing a 27' right-of-way from centerline and we required 30'.

Mr. Wilson asked if they had enough sight distance on the curve? Mr. Radar replied that they had issues that they would be working on. Mr. Wilson stated that he would prefer to see their entrance lined up with the drive for the nursery across Pineland Road. Mr. Peifer stated that they also had to deal with the separation distance for 422. Mr. Radar stated that he appreciated all the comments so they could move on to design the Preliminary Plan. They were working with the water company to get public water to the site. Mr. Bittig stated that there was no water on the north side of 422, so that would also be a PennDOT issue. Mr. Radar asked what was needed to preserve the natural features of the site. Mr. Schwartz stated that there might be some trees on the rear of the lot that need to be preserved. Mr. Bittig stated that they should have a copy of the Stormwater Management Ordinance that required infiltration. He also stated that they might be exempt from a Water Resource Study, Section 5.9974, due to the soils type. They had C & D soils and that might get them an exemption. He then stated that he wanted to point out the steep slopes area on the west end of the property that needed to be protected with a conservation easement. Also, there was a provision in the new Zoning Ordinance that stated that breaks needed to be put in between parking spaces. Mr. Wilson asked about the homes that had wells, did we need to be concerned with what happened to the wells? Mr. Peifer replied that they needed to be abandoned in accordance with DEP regulations. Mr. Wilson stated that the one home had three wells. Mr. Radar stated that they would be submitting Preliminary Plan for the March meeting.

11. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – 301 WEGMAN ROAD – Thomas Ludgate

Mr. Ludgate stated that they had a plan for a two-lot subdivision, where the parents wanted to keep the front lot with the existing house and subdivide a lot at the rear for the children. The only problem was that the rear lot would be a flag lot. The Planning Commission and the Township did not like flag lots, but there was a provision in the Ordinance that allowed them. Their client asked to bring the plan before the Planning Commission and get input to see if they could proceed before spending a lot of money. Mr. Bittig stated that they would have a problem getting a driveway in for the flag lot, as there was a drop off along the road.

Mr. Ludgate stated that they haven't done any surveying or checked for sight distance. Mr. Bittig stated that they would also have to address providing a turnaround for emergency equipment. Mr. Ludgate asked if that had to be paved or could it be stone? Mr. Bittig replied that they would have to check with the Fire Marshal. He then stated that they would have to show the steep slope area as a permanent conservation easement.

Mr. Ludgate replied that they would do that after they did a survey. Mr. Bittig stated that they would need to meet sight distance. Mr. Littlehales stated that it all came down to flag lot or no flag lot.

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that previously there was a subdivision with two flag lots on Littlefield Ave that the Board hated, but that was with smaller lots. Mr. Bittig stated that these were big lots. Mr. Shane asked if there were houses on the adjoining properties? Mr. Ludgate replied not close by. Mr. Ludgate then asked if they would need to do Wegman Road improvements? Mr. Schwartz replied that we could have the Highway Superintendent look at that. As far as sidewalks, etc., that would not be needed. The Planning Commission agreed to send a letter to the Board of Supervisors stating that we were Ok with the flag lot as long as they met the sight distance requirement and subject to meeting all the requirements of the Ordinance.

12. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – HANS GERISCHE HISTORICAL HOUSE – Jared P. Barcz

Mr. Barcz stated that they planned to work on the Hans Gerische house on Kerr Road and he hung up an architects drawing of what they wanted to do to the building. They have done the 100-year flood plain study and the wetlands. What he wanted to know was before he began the work, did he need to meet with the Historical Commission, the Board of Supervisors or the Planning Commission for approval. He was hoping to get started because he and his fiancé planned to marry on the property in May of this year. Mr. Ruff stated that the Ordinance stated that it was at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors whether the Planning Commission or Historical Commission did the review. Mr. Wilson asked where the addition would be located? Mr. Barcz replied that it would be located away from the public eye. The proposed work to the house would be top notch and historically accurate. The house was a treasure and he intended to treat it as such. Mr. Schwartz asked if the addition would be in character with the rest of the house? Mr. Barcz replied yes, it would be. He then showed the Commission a sample of the tiles that would be used to re-roof the house. The Planning Commission agreed that Mr. Barcz should go to the Board of Supervisors to get direction on who needed to approve his plans.

12. APPEAL PETITION – BORDIC MOBILE HOME PARK

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Bordic Mobile Home Park now had interest in selling mobile homes on site. The application did not specify that. They did not want to sell homes to keep in the park, they wanted to sell them and then they would be hauled out. Mr. Bittig stated that they were in an SR2 Zone, so they basically wanted to do retail sales in an SR2 Zone. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it wouldn't be bad if they kept them on a site in the park. Mr. Bittig wanted to know what the hardship was? Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they did that 20 years ago, but did not continue the use so they now have the variance request. Mr. Schwartz stated that he would be inclined to recommend that they grant the variance to sell the homes if they remained in the park. Mr. Wilson stated that someone who owned a mobile home could want to move it to another park and then the restriction would prevent him or her from doing so. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that was what was allowed now. They were looking to add retail sales on site. Mr. Wilson stated that he did not think the number of sales would be great, they would be insignificant. Mrs. Franckowiak asked would they want retail sales in a residential zone? Mr. Wilson agreed that would be a problem.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to send a letter to the Zoning Hearing Board stating that the applicant had not demonstrated a hardship that would warrant granting a variance, the Planning Commission would have no objection to allowing sales of mobile homes on lots to people who intended to live there, or an occasional sale to move to another location, but would not want to see a variance granted to permit normal retail sales. It was inappropriate at that location due to the traffic problems that already existed in that area. The motion carried unanimously.

**13. FAIRVIEW CORNER – PRELIMINARY PLAN - Charles Cross
- Dave Horner**

GVC reviewed the Fairview Corner Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated December 29, 2005).

Mr. Cross stated that they would landscape the lot keeping in mind the clear sight triangle. They would not be changing the traffic pattern. Mr. Horner stated that there was an existing right turn in, right turn out driveway next to Wendy's and an all turn access off of Shelbourne road. They would tie into the existing

Fairview Corner continued

access points rather than create new ones close to the intersections. They planned to put in a barrier so people could not make a left turn on the access off of 422. Mr. Peifer stated that might cause a problem for the people coming out of Wendy's in that it would not allow them to turn towards the drive-thru. Mr. Horner stated that they would be sure that Wendy's was in agreement with their plan. Mr. Littlehales stated that he believed there was a problem with the access off of Shelbourne. Mr. Horner stated that they had just received a review of the Traffic Study and that was mentioned and they would look into that. Mr. Shane asked what type of restaurant it would be? Mr. Cross replied like a Dunkin Donuts. He then stated that the other issue was the truck loading access. Mr. Horner stated that in the review letter it stated that the pattern for the trucks should be shown. They would not be using tractor-trailer delivery trucks but they would demonstrate how the truck that would be used would circulate through the site. Mr. Peifer stated that they would need to provide confirmation that they would not be using tractor-trailers for the deliveries at that location. Mr. Wilson stated that he was concerned with traffic problems at the one access area off of Shelbourne Road. Mr. Horner stated that it would be addressed with the PennDOT H.O.P.

Public Comment

Thomas Howell, 820 Lorane Road, stated that given the traffic at Wawa and McDonalds at peak hours what exactly was the stacking capacity at the drive-thru, how many cars could be in line without causing a problem for the facility? Mr. Cross replied that it was around 8 or 9 cars.

Mr. Cross stated that they would provide a tabulated loading schedule on the plan. Mr. Wilson asked how that would regulate the use for the trucks. Mr. Peifer stated that there should be a letter from them for the file that states the hours of operation and the times for deliveries. The loading zones were shown on the plan in front of parking spaces so it was critical that they provided the letter with that information. Mr. Bittig stated that he thought the Environmental Assessment Statement was acted on. Mr. Schwartz stated that he felt that drive-thru had an adverse environmental impact with cars running while waiting in line. As far as doing an EAS they should just show how they would mitigate the impact on air-quality.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend just providing information on how they planned to mitigate cars in the drive-thru and the impact on air-quality, rather than submitting a full-blown assessment. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cross asked about providing 15-ft wide easements for the proposed Stormwater Management facilities, they were proposing swales, infiltration basins and bio-retention areas. With the size of the lot being so small, the 15-ft area would encroach on parking spaces. The Planning Commission agreed that they just needed to show the 15-ft easements on the plan. Mr. Peifer stated that it would just be lines shown on the plan and the only time it would need to be used was if there were any problems with the underground retention areas. Mr. Cross stated that they needed a waiver of the Environmental Hazard Report.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of SALDO Section 4.284; Environmental Hazard Report. The motion carried unanimously.

14. GENERAL DISCUSSION

The Planning Commission agreed to meet on Thursday, January 12th at 7:00pm for a SALDO workshop and to discuss changes to the Telecommunications Ordinance.

The Planning Commission agreed to meet in July on Tuesday the 11th as the regular date for the meeting would have been on the 4th of July. The Planning Commission also agreed to meet in November on Wednesday the 1st as the regular date for the meeting would have been on Election Day and elections would be held in the meeting room.

Mr. Peifer stated that the owners of property next to westbound Rt422 and across from Rt82 wanted to prepare the site for sale of lots for commercial use. They were not currently proposing any development, but wanted to be sure they followed everything by the Ordinance so not to cause any problems for when they would. They were basically doing grading and the site was wooded. They were asking for some members to walk the site for tree counts. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she would email members of the EAC to see if they would be interested. Mr. Bittig agreed to meet with them at a date to be determined. Mr. Peifer stated that they were going through the Act 167 Ordinance with their grading project. They received a permit from PennDOT to put in a temporary driveway across from Rt82. The Planning Commission agreed that they should review the drainage plan reviews from GVC and then send GVC's recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Littlehales stated that he had an amendment to add to the Lighting Ordinance, which he passed out to the members. It showed examples of bad and good lighting. The Planning Commission agreed to add the amendment to the Lighting Ordinance. He also passed out information on light shields.

Mr. Wilson stated that he wanted to thank everyone for serving on the Board. He felt that we had a great group of dedicated people on the Planning Commission. He also thanked them for having confidence and voting for him as Chairman for another year. Mrs. Geiger stated that he did such a good job.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to adjourn the January 5, 2006 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:50pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Planning Commission minutes

January 5, 2006

Page 11 of 11

Correspondence to:

BOS: Windy Willows Preliminary Plan approval

BOS: Applebee's at Shelbourne Square Preliminary Plan approval and waiver request

BOS: Robert R. & Norma K. Oswald Subdivision plan exemption

BOS: Fairview Park II waiver request

BOS: 301 Wegman Road recommendation

ZHB: Bordic Mobile Home Park