

**MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JULY 11, 2006**

The Rescheduled Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, July 11, 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, Secretary
Richard Littlehales
Paul L. Schwartz

ABSENT: Dottie Geiger
Gary L. Shane

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Craig Peifer, GVC Consulting Engineer
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary
Eric Gardecki, GIS Administrator
Christ Hartman, Special Counsel

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to approve the minutes of the June 6, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting with the following corrections:

Item #5. **AMBER HILL** - Rik Longacre – spelling correction.

Item #12. **WAL-MART SCOPE OF TRAFFIC STUDY** – add: Mr. Ostimchuk stated that they have previously explored the undeveloped property next to Weis Markets and found it unsatisfactory for highway access.

The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the July 11, 2006 Planning Commission meeting with the removal of Fairview Corner – Preliminary Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

A. **30 BEECHAM ROAD – FINAL PLAN; THE WEILER TRACT – PRELIMINARY PLAN; BERKSHIRE BANK – PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

4. READING CENTRAL CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL- PRELIMINARY PLAN

- Henry Koch, Jr.
- Thomas Bush

GVC reviewed the Reading Central Catholic High School Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 7, 2006).

Mr. Koch stated that previously a question was raised as to whether there was an official submission for the status of Maiden creek Plaza as the developer, so they had prepared and submitted a letter on behalf of the Diocese indicating that Maiden creek Plaza is the developer. He then stated that they were requested at the last meeting to insure that Senator O’Pake had begun the process attempting to locate funds for roadway improvements. A letter has been delivered to the Township indicating that he had earmarked funds in the budget for that purpose. At the last meeting they discussed the berm and whether that would satisfy the conditions imposed in the Conditional Use. He then asked if the Planning Commission got direction from the Board and, if not, would they have the Planning Commissions permission to talk to the Board to see how they felt about that. Mr. Bittig replied that the minutes of a previous Board meeting indicated that Ms. Ciotti stated that if they had any questions, the Board would address them. Mr. Koch stated that they would take that to the Board to get their decision. Mr. Bittig stated that the GVC letter stated that a number of comments had been addressed however, we have a graphic he believed came from Maiden creek that showed paved area. He asked if the gray area, 7.9% showed the paved area? They replied yes. Mr. Bittig then stated that since the concrete and other structural material such as “grass pave” had not been included he suggested that they go back and redo it. He then handed out a copy of the dictionary definition of paving, which listed the following items, “asphalt, concrete and hard surfaces”. Mr. Koch replied that they were prepared to present to the Planning Commission a letter from E. J. Breneman indicating that paving did not include those types of surfaces. Mr. Bittig replied that Mr. Koch had indicated that the definition was not in our Zoning or SALDO, and not in the MPC, so they would use the dictionary definition of paving. He agreed with them and he stated that the dictionary definition including those items he previous read. Mr. Koch replied that they used Funk and Wagnall’s and their definition did not include those items. Mr. Bittig stated that if they did not agree they should be prepared to litigate. Mr. Koch stated that he would prefer to discuss that and reach a reasonable solution. Mr. Bittig stated that our approach had always been consistent and the Exeter High School stadium, which was compacted, was included in the high school paved area calculations. Mr. Hartman asked if they knew what the consequences of using Mr. Bittig’s preferred definition would be in regards to the design of the project? Were they certain that they would have a difficult time in complying with the Ordinance if Mr. Bittig’s definition of paving was applied? Mr. Koch replied that he did not know the full extent of Mr. Bittig’s definition, so he did not feel he could answer that question. If they took Mr. Bittig’s position, would a stadium field with artificial turf be considered paving? Mr. Littlehales replied that it depended in what was under it, yes. Mr. Koch stated that was the type of issue they needed to discuss before they could address that answer. Mr. Wilson stated that the letter they gave the Planning Commission with the Funk & Wagnall’s definition; to pave: a road, lot etc. was to cover a surface with asphalt, gravel, concrete, etc. We were saying that finished surface was part of the etc. Mr. Bittig stated that it was important for Maiden creek to give us the numbers including the sidewalks, concrete aprons, emergency roadway around the property that we were concerned about. Mr. Schwartz stated that more importantly, the intent of the Ordinance was to limit the amount of impervious cover and stormwater runoff and all of the consequences of that. If it was impervious, regardless of the strict definition, it created the same problem and it needed to be dealt with. If they came in and said, “They had a problem” then we would expect them to show how they would deal with the problem. They would need to come up with numbers as asked for and tell us what the magnitude of the issues were, if there were issues and how they would deal

Central Catholic continued

with them. Mr. Koch stated that item #3 dealt with the existing house and barn and they previously indicated that they had no particular plans for the property and were not planning on demolishing them. They would mark them on the plan in the future for reference points. They were not planning on disturbing those buildings. Mr. Wilson asked if they were planning on maintaining those buildings or would they abandon those buildings to the point that they would need to be torn down? Mr. Koch replied that they had indicated that a portion of the barn would be used for storage and would be maintained and they might use the house for parent meetings. They haven't formulated that part of the plan. Mr. Bittig stated that we would hate to see a structure that could be reused subject to D.B.N. – demolition by neglect. Mr. Koch replied that they would address that with subsequent submissions. He then stated that they had addressed the bold item #13 as they had a response letter from the PHMC that indicated that there were no historical structures being disturbed by the project. The next comment concerned the Environmental Assessment Statement being reviewed by the Environmental Advisory Council and they would appear before them at their July meeting and address any issues that they might have. With regard to the lighting, they were aware that their expert, Mr. Bush, met with Mr. Littlehales and Mr. Schwartz and there might be possible compromises in regards to the lighting that might be acceptable to the Planning Commission depending upon their report. One issue involved the height of the poles in the stadium; they had proposed 90-ft poles, the Ordinance called for 70-ft. The revised plan showed an 80-ft height. Mr. Schwartz stated that the level of the ballfield was around 10-ft below the surrounding grade so, in fact, they had an 80-ft pole sitting in a 10-ft hole and the effect from the street was the same as a 70-ft pole at grade. The type of lighting they were using should reduce glare offsite, so they were not a problem. Mr. Littlehales stated that the type of fixture they were using greatly controlled the amount of glare. The houses nearby would not be affected by the lighting. Mr. Schwartz stated that they had asked Tom to provide a foot-candle diagram. Mr. Bush placed the diagram on the board and stated that it showed that none of the direct illumination left the site except out towards the road, but that was within the Ordinance requirements. Mr. Bittig stated that they should submit a written waiver request for the Planning Commission to act on and pass along to the Supervisors. Mr. Koch stated that the other issue that remained was the issue of the 1,200 ft buffer zone; their position remained the same that they were grandfathered because of the effective date of the Ordinance. He then stated that he assumed that they should go to the Board to get a ruling from them on that issue. Mr. Hartman stated that in the discussion last month about a waiver procedure based on the public library project and given the fact that the Supervisors followed that procedure in the past they should follow that again. Mr. Koch asked if their waiver request would include the height of the poles and to the location. Mr. Hartman replied yes. Mr. Ruff asked if the zero foot-candle line was a line where there was no effect outside of that line? Mr. Bush replied that was correct. Mr. Ruff asked if that was well within the distance from the stadium to the nearest house? Mr. Bush replied that was correct. Mr. Ruff stated that then the lighting would not impact the residences. Mr. Bittig replied not from the lighting prospective. They would need to check out the Noise Ordinance, since lighting and noise would be the two items impacting the neighbors. Mr. Koch stated that the other lighting relief they would request would be from the 20-ft high poles for the parking lot. Mr. Bush stated that it would reduce the minimum foot-candles on the lot. There would also be a difference in 7,300 watts between the 20-ft and 30-ft pole height. Mr. Littlehales stated that the 30-ft poles would be using the same wattage fixtures as the 20-ft poles, there was no difference in the lamping between the two, and it was just the way the light was distributed. Mr. Koch stated that they would like to incorporate that into a waiver request also. Mr. Schwartz stated that he and Rick agreed that was a much better approach. The Ordinance was Ok for a small lot, but the 30-ft poles worked better for larger lots. The Ordinance did provide relief "at our discretion". Mr. Hartman asked if there was any effect on the parking layout with the two different pole heights? Mr. Koch replied that the standards would be placed in planting strips.

Central Catholic continued

Mr. Hartman asked if they would be gaining any parking spaces? Mr. Koch replied no. Mr. Peifer stated that there was no revised Stormwater Report since the last meeting so the comments remained the same.

Mr. Bittig stated that in comment #14 & 15 concerning the ground water recharge, we would like to see how they planned to recharge the ground water. Mr. Peifer stated that they had a geologist looking at the site to determine whether or not infiltration was do-able. Mr. Koch stated that they have retained the services of Schuylkill Engineering to do the geotech study that was completed and would be reviewed by GVC. He then stated that they had worked in the Farming Ridge area so they were qualified for that area. Mr. Koch stated that in the Traffic Impact Study item #18, they were working with PennDOT concerning some of the proposed recommendations their study included. Of those, which were required now to remedy the existing conditions and those, which would be required because of their project. They did not want the fact that they were working with PennDOT to be interpreted that they would fund all of the improvements. They realized that they had a responsibility for their site and were trying to work with other agencies to get the money for that. He then stated that if we looked at Senator O'Pakes letter, it indicated that it might be beneficial as a joint effort or for the Township to contact the Federal Officials also to see if there were funds. Mr. Bittig stated that Mr. Holden and Mr. Gerlach sent in letters in support of the project last year so they should go for it. Mr. Koch asked if that would be a concerted effort? Mr. Bittig replied that would be a Board of Supervisors call. Mr. Littlehales asked what they were doing about the Fire Marshal comments? Mr. Koch replied that they received that memo and were studying those and would be back with a response.

Public Comment

Jordan Bausher, 391 Ritters Road, stated that he and his wife owned the farm on the east side of Ritters Road and they had two concerns about the development of the Central Catholic High School site that they wanted to share with the Planning Commission. The first concern was Ritter Road; the principal issue with Ritter Road was one of the road design rather than the volume of traffic to be put upon it. The portion of the road to be most used by the High School would be from Rt562 and Farming Ridge Blvd to the north. That section contained two precarious curves, each of them was "triple blind" which meant that drivers couldn't see around them for reason of grade, angle, and obstructions. On the first curve going south to north at the Jahn Cemetery, a 50' school bus cannot negotiate that without getting into both lanes at the apex of the curve. He presented photos to the Planning Commission that illustrated the danger of the curves. He then stated that since Ritters Road was a Township road, Exeter Township was obligated to make the road safe for the anticipated traffic at considerable expense to its taxpayers. In that the necessity for improving Ritter Road was brought about by the development of non-public entity it would seem unfair to take land from property owners on either side of the road for any improvement to the road. Since the site planners for the development did not seem interested in designing the principal entrance to the property from Rt. 562 perhaps they would be willing to have the land needed to improve Ritters Road come out of their property exclusively. Their second concern was surface water runoff and detention ponds. Properly controlling the runoff water from that property would be challenging. Their farm had been in their family since about 1890 and they had been living there for 43 years. At that time Jackson Meadows was being constructed and the closest development to the east were the few houses that had been built in Glen Oley Farms. There were hedgerows along Ritter Road and it was narrower. There was no history of flooding problems. They got through Agnes without incident. The flooding began when the Township widened the road and the hedgerows disappeared. They constructed swales to keep the runoff from damaging fields. The pipe conveying the Owatin Creek under the road rusted out and the Township replaced it with a larger diameter one necessitating increasing the road level by several feet for about 75 yards.

Central Catholic continued

Because that pipe was increased in size, they had to increase the one taking the Owatin under their driveway to avoid water damming up there. That worked for several years until the development of Farming Ridge reached the watershed drained by the Owatin and at that point they started to get serious flooding. When the culvert on Farming Ridge Blvd. was installed for the Owatin to run through, the trouble with flooding began in earnest. The culvert had about six times the capacity as the pipe under Ritters Road. Now Ritters Road was flooded several time a year and becomes impassible. The Owatin near their house would now overflow its banks, flow into the spring fed pond and backs water into their basement. With the development of the Central High property, the runoff onto Ritters Road would be increased substantially. To handle the runoff it was envisioned that the Owatin on the northeastern corner of the property would have to be run through a detention facility. In order to contain the runoff from the site development detention ponds of 400,000 to 500,000 gallons would be needed and the road into the property would have to be at or above the grade of the banks of the detention ponds along Ritter Road. Mr. Bausher then thanked the Planning Commission.

5. ASINO FARMS – FINAL PLAN - Susanne Creveling

GVC reviewed the Asino Farms Final Plan (reference letter dated July 6, 2006).

Mrs. Creveling stated that everything in the review letter was a "would comply". They were working with PA American for the water line. They were also working with Met Ed. She then asked for Final Plan approval. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Peifer about the clay bottom detention basin, would that be acceptable? Mr. Peifer replied that it ultimately would be discharged into the wetlands. Mrs. Creveling stated that if that would not work, GVC suggested a by-pass, which they would do.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Asino Farms Final Plan contingent upon successful completion of comments in the GVC July 6th review letter. The motion carried unanimously.

6. 30 BEECHAM ROAD – FINAL PLAN

GVC reviewed the 30 Beecham Road Final Plan (reference letter dated July 3, 2006).

No one was present to discuss the plan.

**7. WAL-MART SUPERCENTER - PRELIMINARY PLAN - Todd Stager
- Usunobun Osagie,**

GVC reviewed the Wal-Mart Supercenter Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated July 7, 2006).

Mr. Stager introduced the Architect, Usunobun Osagie who put a rendering up on the board for the Planning Commission to review. Mr. Osagie stated that at the last meeting the Planning Commission was looking for an upgrade in the elevations and the color was also an issue. He then stated that they lightened the color and changed the entry. They have also added ornamental fencing. Mr. Wilson stated that he had talked to them and expressed concern and was looking for a softer color and to get away from the "industrial" look. He then stated that he felt that it looked a lot better, and better than what was there now. Mr. Littlehales asked if

Wal-Mart continued

the “always” was a new feature. Mr. Osagie stated that was a signature mark and they could take the remark back to Wal-Mart. Mr. Littlehales and Mr. Ruff agreed that it looked fine. Mr. Schwartz asked if we interpreted the sign ordinance for things like that? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that would be handled with a sign permit. Mr. Wilson stated that our concern was that the amount of verbiage on the building might exceed the amount of signage allowed by Ordinance.

Mr. Stager stated that the bold items in the review letter related to traffic. He then stated that they were working with PennDOT and they were requesting a meeting with PennDOT and asked if there was anyway the Township could help to set that up. They did submit a concept plan and traffic analysis that would help improve the situation, but had not gotten a reply from PennDOT. They were hoping to put in a traffic light along 422 at the right-in, right-out entrance. That would help reduce the amount of traffic on Lincoln Road. They wanted to move forward and start the final designs for the project and get final approval. They would like to get Preliminary Approval from the Planning Commission. Mr. Littlehales asked if there was any way PennDOT would consider that? Mr. Stager replied that Eric Ostimchuk had been talking to PennDOT and they had requested the information so they could make an educated decision, so they were not saying no. Mr. Ostimchuk stated that Penn DOT’s original reaction last year was a “no way” type of approach, but the information they had given to them recently backed the idea that it was good as it provided relief to Lincoln Road. It was just trying to get a response from PennDOT and that was taking time. Mr. Stager stated that they were hoping to go to the Board for approval on the 24th. Mr. Bittig stated that traffic was the big issue for Wal-Mart. Mr. Bittig then asked if there was enough room behind the Wal-Mart to punch a road through to take the traffic off of Lincoln Road? Mr. Stager replied that the grading wouldn’t handle that.

Mrs. Franckowiak asked how Tony Maize felt about the light on 422? Mr. Ostimchuk replied that he liked it and that Tony suggested approaching PennDOT for that. Mrs. Franckowiak asked what were the odds that they would have a PennDOT meeting prior to the Boards meeting on the 24th? Mr. Stager replied they would know on Monday morning if they would be able to meet. He then asked if they could have a special meeting after the PennDOT meeting. Mrs. Franckowiak asked the Planning Commission how they would feel if Wal-Mart received backing from PennDOT and GVC’s technical backing, would we want them to come back again? She then asked the Planning Commission if they would set a date for a workshop and hear from them then. The Planning Commission agreed to have a workshop meeting on Wednesday, July 19th at 7pm. Mr. Bittig stated that in the review letter there were no other issues that would hold up the plan, so, if they had PennDOT approval for the traffic light we could act on that.

8. ZACH’S AUTO SALES - Barry Weaver

GVC reviewed the Zach’s Auto Sales Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated June 20, 2006).

Mr. Weaver stated that they had addressed the items in the GVC review letter. They provided the paving detail, the note about the lights and the planting screens. Mr. Schwartz stated that the only bold item was the Environmental Assessment Statement, had they done one? Mr. Weaver replied yes, that they just brought that in. Mr. Bittig asked what kind of evergreen were they planting? Mr. Weaver replied arborvitae along the back. There would be no plantings to the east as it was also Highway commercial. Mr. Bittig asked about the paving comment concerning PennDOT, had they done that? Mr. Weaver replied that they would be contacting them. Mr. Bittig asked how they were doing with the sewer issue? Mr. Weaver replied that the owner was getting in contact with the Township people. Mr. Bittig stated that the Mr. Koontz, Code Enforcement Officer, stated that they had to have at least one unisex ADA compliant toilet.

The Weiler Tract continued

meets and bounds, they would be making it easier as all the wetland delineation was within the drainage maintenance easement areas, which were subject to the meets and bounds of the drainage easements.

Mr. Peifer stated that would be fine if they were placing the same restrictions on that as the wetlands. The purpose of the meets and bounds were that they could not go in and do anything with the wetlands. They might not want to expand that boundary. Mr. Barba asked if they could do the grading needed now and then when they were completed the restrictions would apply? Mr. Peifer replied that they should place a note on the plan. Mr. Bittig stated that lot #1 was subject to steep slope protection. He then stated that they had a building footprint that was in the steep slope area. Mr. Rentschler stated that they would check that.

Mr. Mahoney stated that item #22 concerned the right-of-way, which they had, but they did not have the required paved cartway width along Stonetown Road. There was wetland located there and they wanted to minimize the area of disturbance. Mr. Bittig asked if they applied for their encroachment permits through DEP? Mr. Barba replied yes. Mr. Bittig stated that the Army Corps claimed jurisdiction for Heisters Creek area on the other side of Rt. 422, so they might have the same problem. Also the roadway onto Stonetown would run over a brand new 18-inch PVC pipe located there. Mr. Schwartz stated that they would need a written waiver request to lessen the cartway width. Mr. Wilson asked if that would be acceptable to the Supervisors with their trend towards wider streets. Mr. Bittig stated that there was no parking there, but there also were no houses located there. Mr. Mahoney stated that the Ordinance stated that it required parking where there were houses, it did not say for the full length of the street on which there were houses. They would present a waiver request. Concerning item #23 for shoulder improvements, where would they get that information? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that we would check with the Highway Superintendent.

Mr. Rentschler stated that Lot #2 was OK for lot depth to width. Mr. Mahoney stated that they were looking to the Planning Commission for direction for the layout of lots #13 & 14; they could comply with the lot depth to width ratio if they would make the stormwater detention area a separate lot. He then stated that it would be a non-buildable lot. They felt it made sense to request a waiver for those. Mr. Bittig agreed that it made sense. Mr. Rentschler stated that lot #23 fronted on two streets. Mr. Bittig asked what the area was of that lot? Mr. Rentschler replied that it was 22,000-sf. He then stated that lot #26 was the pie shaped lot and lot #30 could be revised to comply. Mr. Mahoney stated that they would present a waiver letter for those lots. He then stated that with item #28, the survey was done before the residence was constructed, so they might be in compliance, they would need to determine that and if it would be a burden. Mr. Wilson asked what the burden would be on them. Mr. Mahoney replied that they were not constructing a driveway for a residence. Mr. Wilson replied that they were constructing a street that came out directly across from the driveway. Mr. Mahoney replied that there were controls; they would need to maintain safe sight distance. Mr. Peifer stated that they would be creating a violation. Mr. Mahoney stated that they were not making application for the Discala property. Mr. Peifer replied that they were making application for their road to come out in that location which would create a violation on the Discala property. Mr. Mahoney stated that they would determine the distance. Mr. Barba asked if they could see the approved plot plan for that property? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that they could stop in during the day to see that. Mr. Mahoney stated that item #31 concerned the sidewalks that were not shown on the plan. Mr. Rentschler stated that they provided sidewalks on one side of the street coming out onto Stonetown Road to help minimize the impact on the wetlands. Mr. Mahoney stated that they were looking for guidance on that item. Mr. Schwartz stated that was what the Planning Commission agreed was acceptable at Sketch Plan stage. They would need to make a formal waiver request.

The Weiler Tract continued

Public Comment

Charles Williams, 440 Stonetown Road, asked if they would be taking the road through the wetlands onto Stonetown Road? Mr. Mahoney replied that was correct. Mr. Rentschler stated that they would be coming out to the west of the end wall. He then stated that they would be encroaching on .023 acres in one area and .058 acres on another.

Mr. Wilson stated that they would need to check with the Supervisors about the necking down of their road onto Stonetown Road. Mr. Peifer stated that could be a part of the Conditional Use. Mr. Mahoney asked if they would need to get through the Preliminary Plan stage first? Mr. Bittig replied that they would need to proceed with the Conditional Use application first. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that under the Conditional Use Section in zoning it stated that full size streets were required. The Board would not have the ability to grant a waiver, so were we telling them that they would need to go for a variance to get relief from the full width street requirement. Mr. Bittig replied that they would need to address the Conditional Use first, that was step one and then on to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Wilson asked if the property was entirely owned by Mr. Weiler and was it one tract? Mr. Mahoney replied that it was two tracts with one owner. Mr. Wilson stated that he was concerned with the fact that Mr. Weiler might come back and want to do a residential subdivision with his remaining tract. That would not be consistent with a design scheme for the Township. It would not be a total planned community. Mr. Mahoney replied that the residue lot was 7.35 acres. Mr. Wilson stated that he would like to see a note on the plan that the residue lot could not be further subdivided. Mr. Bittig stated that when they were in with a Sketch Plan, there was a request to include a note for the property owners that they be made aware of the horse farms that were in the immediate vicinity. Also, concerning Stormwater, could they come back with a summary of what the max outflow of the rate off the property would be?

10. RESIDUE OF ROYAL VIEW ESTATES – Brian Boyer - Charles Leazier

GVC reviewed the Residue of Royal View Estates (reference letter dated July 5, 2006).

Mr. Boyer stated that item #1 concerned the Conditional Use application and they were looking for a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Ms. Cusimano stated that the Planning Commission addressed the Conditional Use at the last meeting and Mr. Boyer would be receiving a copy of that letter. Mr. Boyer stated that they would adjust lot #3 to comply. He then stated that they have submitted the tree inventory, but just needed to submit which trees were being removed. They had minimal area to plant the replacement trees so they would like to offer some to the parks if that was acceptable. Mr. Bittig stated that it might be a Zoning Hearing Board issue. Mr. Boyer stated that they were not proposing on street parking because of the larger lots. Mr. Bittig stated it was considered low density in that area. Mr. Schwartz asked if they would need a waiver? Mr. Peifer replied that it would not require a waiver. Mr. Boyer asked what type of shoulder construction the Township would require? The previous subdivision required a two-foot shoulder. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that we would talk to Clarence about that and she thought that he would be meeting with Charlie. Mr. Leazier replied that was correct. Mr. Boyer stated that they had already received the waiver request from the Planning Commission and they would need to take that to the Board. He then stated that with item #17 under Stormwater, because of the steep slopes they might have to do a

Berkshire Bank continued

Mr. Seitz stated that Berkshire Bank had an equitable interest in lots #1 & 2 of Crestwood East. That tract had resisted development for a long time, as it was a difficult site to develop. They would combine both lots in order to develop that tract. There was conglomerate rock located there. They did some probes to see how deep the rock was. The grading on the tract was based on the rock. Mr. Bittig asked how deep the rock was? Mr. Seitz replied that one area was 9-ft, another area was 1-ft. and instead of doing a lot of cut, they would be bringing in a lot of fill. Because of the grade they needed to put the access road down further than the bank representatives preferred. They would be putting in a retaining wall that started at 1½ foot to 6 or 7 feet, which would be a good location for a sign. All the parking met the ordinance. The building would be two stories high. Berkshire Bank had two other locations, one at the Berkshire Mall and the other in Muhlenburg Township. The architect was Bill Meister and for the next meeting they would be providing the Architecturals. Mr. Heilenman stated that it would be their third location and they were a local bank.

Mr. Wilson asked if they had a bank at their operations center in Shillington? Mr. Heilenman replied no, it was just operations. Mr. Seitz stated that when Mr. Rimby put in Crestwood East there was a large detention pond located along the by-pass. He could not remember how the stormwater calculations were done, but he thought that they sized the pond to handle the entire development. All of the other tracts located there did not have a detention pond on them. They came into the Township and reviewed the files and uncovered papers that showed the detention pond was put in to handle the maximum impervious coverage of 50% of the lots. It was from that information that they based their stormwater calculations. Mr. Seitz then stated that he would need to look at the tree section of the ordinance and take care of that. He asked if the Planning Commission would walk the site to look at the trees and how would he set that up? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that they could call either Linda or herself and we would set it up for them. Mr. Bittig stated that they have done a tree inventory so all they would need to do was identify them. Mr. Seitz stated that they would need to discuss item #1 under Zoning. When the subdivision itself was done, that was when the variance was granted and all of the development followed those setbacks. Mrs. Franckowiak gave Mr. Seitz a copy of the variance that was granted. Mr. Seitz stated that they have requested waivers from some of the reports. They had also asked for a waiver of the Water Resources Study. Mr. Bittig stated that they were not exempt under the ordinance. Mr. Seitz stated that they did not ask for a waiver on the Traffic Study, as they did not feel it was applicable. They did not consider that as there was a traffic signal in existence there and the tract was the last parcel to be developed in the park. Mr. Bittig stated that they were located at a minor arterial. Mr. Ruff asked if they put in a waiver letter for that? Mr. Seitz replied that they had for everything except the traffic study. Mr. Ruff stated that they should put in the waiver letter a list of the reasons why they felt they should get the waiver. He then stated that he agreed with their logic, but would like to see that in a letter. Mr. Seitz stated that they had done the PNDI and it came back with a clean letter. They were waiting for the PHMC reply letter and as soon as they received the response they would get it to us.

Mr. Bittig asked if they received the Fire Marshal letter? Mr. Seitz replied that they would look at that. He then asked if they should provide sidewalks? Mr. Schwartz replied that the primary use for the sidewalks was for children to be able to walk down to the pool and he did not feel they were needed on the banks side of the street. Mr. Wilson asked about the screening? Mr. Seitz replied that there was supposed to a buffer from the residential houses across the street. Mr. Wilson stated that his concern would be the cars going through the drive through at night and the headlights would shine out to the intersection, not knowing what the grade was for that. Mr. Seitz stated that they could put the replacement trees in that area. Mr. Wilson replied that they probably would not want the trees to block the view of the bank either.

12. ZONING - PARKING

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she had been meeting with developers that would like to bring to our attention that our parking requirements might be a little too excessive. They asked us to pass the information out to our Planning Commission to look at and discuss at our next workshop. Mr. Wilson asked if it was too much as in the amount or the size? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that too much in the amount of spaces, too much macadam. Mr. Littlehales stated that no way we would want smaller sizes. Mr. Bittig stated that he looked for attribution and the only thing listed was Lowes, so we knew who did the report. He felt they should have put down who did the report. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they had a transmittal letter that she forgot to attach that was from the Goldenberg Group. She then asked that the Planning Commission would read the information and discuss it at the workshop.

Mr. Wilson stated that we should not forget the Planning Commission Workshop Wednesday, July 19th at 7pm.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff, to adjourn the July 11, 2006 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:35pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Zack's Auto Sales Preliminary Plan
BOS: Asino Farms Final Plan