

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 3, 2006

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, October 3, 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
Gary L. Shane

ABSENT: Dottie Geiger
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Craig Peifer, GVC Consulting Engineer
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer
Eric Gardecki, GIS Administrator

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the minutes of the September 5, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting with the following correction:

Item # 3: Reading Central Catholic High School – Page 4, last sentence, change to: They needed to show us that they made an effort to get under the number before we would consider supporting them with the Zoning Hearing Board.

The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the October 3, 2006 Planning Commission meeting with a change to the order of items: Reading Central High School, 1st and Zoning issues 2nd since the Planning Commission had legal representation present for both of these items. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

A. **GEISHAUSER SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD; PENN VIEW SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN:** **MOTION BY** Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

4. HOME OCCUPATION – 880 SCHOFFERS ROAD

Lisa Bingaman, owner of 880 Schoffers Road, proposed to utilize space in her pole building for the purposes of creating and selling craft items. The business would be by appointment only; off-street parking

Home Occupation continued

was available; no deliveries would be made to the home; all other zoning regulations were met and responses from all designated neighbors were received and offered no concerns.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the home occupation for 880 Schoffers Road. The motion carried unanimously.

5. READING CENTRAL CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL – PRELIMINARY PLAN

- Henry Koch, Jr.
- Robert Hanna
- Florin Carjan
- John Maurer, Jr.
- Daniel Altman

GVC reviewed the Reading Central Catholic High School Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated September 29, 2006).

Mr. Koch indicated that the berm issue was in the hands of the Board of Supervisors. The Environmental Advisory Council submitted official comments with regard to flooding of the Owatin Creek; however, Centrals' position was they were ok as far as that was concerned; it was being evaluated by their engineer perhaps as part of stormwater. Mr. Peifer stated comments regarding the flood plain were in 9-14-06-review letter. Mr. Koch stated that they were still reviewing that issue with their engineer. The next issue dealt with the review comment dealing with impervious vs. pervious; their position was that the comment was merely a comment and offered that they were within the ordinance now. Mr. Peifer offered that he agreed that they were at 9.99; however, he elaborated that on the plan they did not include all of the impervious areas in their impervious calculations and attempted to explain that they showed it but did not total it. Mr. Peifer stated that sidewalk and hard service recreation should be part of paved area number; Mr. Koch stated that he didn't interpret the letter that way. A lengthy debate ensued and Mr. Peifer clarified – they were in fact at 9.99; they just need to have the plan reflect that, as the plan currently stated 7.76. Mr. Peifer also stated that he wanted it corrected and suggested that the way they showed it now; they could essentially add 2.23% to get to 9.99 and would then be over on the allowable limits. Mr. Bittig told Mr. Koch that they should just put it on the plan. Mr. Koch stated he would have it fixed. Elizabeth Magovern, esq., the attorney from Hartman, Hartman, Howe & Allerton, agreed that it needed to be corrected on the plan. Mr. Peifer again explained that if it remained as it was, someone could interpret it to mean that another 2.23% of paved area would be allowed and would still meet the ordinance. Dr. Hannah stated that he had a problem with the proposed correction of the plan and that he considered it impervious and doesn't deny it; however argued that the Zoning Ordinance still was unclear and for that reason did not want to change it. Mr. Bittig then suggested putting it to a vote now and they would get a "no" vote. Again they argued the definition and what the ordinance allowed for impervious / paved area amounts; lot coverage, paved, etc.

Mr. Peifer explained that he was quoting their plan; lot coverage; paved area; and other impervious area which was their designation, not the Township's designation. His point was that area was part of the paved area and should be included to get to the 9.99; they dropped off the tennis court; hard area recreation and sidewalk. Mr. Koch offered that the requirement of the ordinance said impervious was less than 10%; and

Reading Central Catholic continued

offered they were not conceding that these paved areas were not impervious. Ms. Magovern stated that her interpretation was that the hard surface was impervious.

Moving on the with review letter, Mr. Koch mentioned comments regarding SALDO #1 and #13 and suggested that these were final plan items; item #14, the letter of serviceability was presented at the last meeting. Mr. Peifer argued that the letter submitted did not include statement as stipulated in the ordinance that the water has not been allocated anywhere else and several other statements that should be contained. Mr. Koch offered that the letter was a service letter according to MPC and was not arguing the issue.

The next item for discussion was the question of irrigation – the initial report in the Water Resource Study mentioned irrigation but the submitted letter now stated that irrigation was taken out for clarification purposes.

Mr. Koch went over some of the Stormwater Management Report comments offered in a letter dated 10-03-06 from GVC, which dealt with stormwater; firstly a bold comment regarding the drainage involving ball / soccer fields: Mr. Koch stated they were comfortable that they could address that item to GVC's satisfaction and would do so.

Item 10 / Item 14 – Mr. Koch was of the opinion that they submitted that report and that they were prepared to discuss with the Commission why they felt it was impractical to do infiltration on the site and they planed to make a presentation with regard to the geology of site. Mr. Koch stated that Section 503.C of the Stormwater Regulations was the governing document for the issue.

Mr. Koch introduced Hydrogeologist, Florin Carjan, who performed an evaluation of historical information regarding site and subsurface; investigated the subgrade condition of the entire 110-acre site and stated that he tried to find possible infiltration areas. Mr. Carjan concluded that infiltration on the site was not recommended because of the carbonate geology and went into detail. He talked about different rock formations and suggested it would be difficult to remove and also suggested it was the same formation as found at the Exeter Library site and talked about wasting money, etc. Mr. Carjan summarized by stating that the bottom line was that these soils would not allow water to penetrate; it would create sinkholes which were problematic and were hard to fix; infiltration would only make it worse. Mr. Koch suggested that the ordinance allowed deviations if infiltration was not possible; Mr. Bittig countered by saying if they refused to infiltrate, they're going to have to build the biggest damn lake and further suggested that during soil testing, the auger was drilled 12' down and they never hit rock; and suggested that the water must be put back into the ground; but because they stated in their report that it was expensive that was too bad.

Mr. Bittig also stated that if there were active sinkholes – he'd agree completely with their argument. Mr. Carjan suggested that they can't just see sinkholes – it takes years and years; water comes – washes soil, etc. He then stated that the formation of sinkholes could actually be predicted during investigation process and they found signs during investigation that, yes, sinkholes would be prevalent; it was a slow process. Mr. Bittig asked what they were going to do with all the water? Mr. Bittig then suggested that infiltration was a pertinent part of the Ordinance and stated that if infiltration was not feasible it must be demonstrated; which meant they have to demonstrate that to the Township. Mr. Koch stated his position was that had been demonstrated and further suggested that Mr. Bittig was not qualified to make that determination; rather, they presented expert testimony, which constituted demonstration; and they would

Reading Central Catholic continued

use Best Management Practices for the site without infiltration. Mr. Bittig stated it would be interesting. Mr. Wilson posed the following: if the site was susceptible to sinkholes – would proceeding with the construction of the building and accessories be detrimental? Would using Best Management Practices offer enough protection for the inevitable sinkholes? Mr. Wilson also stated that he was concerned with the safety of the students. Mr. Bittig asked if there were separate building standards for sinkhole susceptible sites and that we should not be irresponsible by allowing construction of the high school on that type of geology if that was what their expert was suggesting. Mr. Littlehales asked if there was a way to determine the most logical area on the site that sinkholes would occur? He further suggested that as it was on their property it was their problem; however if it would be on the perimeter of property; residences should not be affected. Mr. Koch was advised that he made a misstatement when referencing the ordinance; it should be 305.c; not 503.C.

Mr. Koch then introduced John Maurer, Jr., to discuss Best Management Practices. Mr. Koch asked Mr. Maurer if he heard Mr. Carjans' testimony to which he responded yes. Mr. Koch asked if it was determined that the property was not conducive to infiltration, then what? Mr. Maurer stated that Section 306.b.2, page 11 of the Stormwater Ordinance applied as it related to Best Management Practices. He then stated that these requirements would be met and offered some details of the site. Post development rate would be significantly less and the road would not flood anymore. Mr. Ruff asked if the outfall velocity of the new pipes would be matched? Mr. Maurer responded that it would be less. Mr. Ruff stated that he did not want to see an erosion problem on Mr. Baushers' land. Mr. Bittig asked if GVC did analysis on design? Mr. Peifer replied that they must revise the outlet structure and do some rerouting for post development and based on 1-2 year storm to see if it would meet the 24 hour drain down requirement; that might change slightly, but not by much. Mr. Maurer stated that he met with Mr. Peifer a week ago, ran some of the figures and concurred with Mr. Peifer's info for the 33-hour figure. Mr. Koch questioned Mr. Maurer by asking him if they would be able to satisfy all Ordinance requirements to which Mr. Maurer replied yes. Mr. Maurer then stated that they met Sections 306 and 307 – stream bank erosion requirements. Mr. Koch talked about the Ordinance provision regarding manual creation and asked Mr. Maurer if that would be part of final submission to which Mr. Maurer responded affirmatively. Mr. Schwartz asked if it was going to be a wet bottom pond, clay bottom or plant base? Mr. Maurer responded that he wasn't sure if that had been finalized. Mr. Schwartz asked if it would look like a swimming pool? Mr. Maurer stated that it would be pretty big. Mr. Koch suggested that it would be aesthetically pleasing; to which Mr. Schwartz responded it was a matter of biological function; open pond with nothing living in it; mosquitoes in it; fish pond, frogs, reeds, etc. Dr. Hannah stated that he would get back to them with finalization. The EAC offered concern about the pond (potential of it being a dead body of water or a living; breathing pond). Mr. Schwartz further suggested that runoff from road with salt would be detrimental to a living pond and asked that that be addressed.

Public Comment

Mrs. Swartley, 31 Troxel Road, asked Mr. Maurer if the flow of water in the Owatin Creel would be increased; as she lived below the property and the creek flowed thru her property. Mr. Maurer replied that the rate of discharge after development would be less than she experienced now. He then stated that it would be a bigger volume; but would be spread out over time – not such a big gush of water all of a sudden and he informed her that she would see improved conditions.

Reading Central Catholic continued

Mr. Koch went on to review the Traffic Impact Study and wanted to clarify some non-bold issues; the first one suggested working with Exeter School District. He then stated that they contacted the school district and the school district did not want to work with them; they saw no valid reason to deal with them and felt that they have satisfied that requirement. Mr. Koch then called on their Traffic Planning Consultant, Daniel Altman, with Traffic Planning and Design. Mr. Altman stated that comment item #14 was an included improvement in the study; they were proposing to optimize signal and timing at Perkiomen and Gibraltar. Comment #15: the Ordinance requested improvement sketches of intersections and Mr. Altman stated they were in the Traffic Study, just in wrong place; they were located in the middle toward the rear of the appendices. Comment #16: preliminary cost estimates were included; however, GVC felt the estimate might be low and it would be addressed later after final engineering. Mr. Koch clarified that it would be addressed, but not until final design because they were still unsure of what they were dealing with (potential r.o.w., etc.). Comment #18: concerned the submitted Traffic Impact Study for that Section of the Ordinance. Mr. Koch reminded the Commission that the Board suggested studying additional intersections for 12-hour studies; however, they had taken position that a 12-hour study did not accomplish anything since a peak hour study would show more. Mr. Altman stated that they looked at worst time periods of the day so there would be no different outcome with a 12-hour study. Mr. Altman further explained that PennDOT did not request that because it did not provide different information. The Planning Commission suggested that the Board minutes should be checked as it related to a waiver; i.e., since it was the Board who directed a 12-hour study, the Planning Commission suggested that the Board should deal with it; and to not look to the Commission for recommendations since they imposed the 12-hour study. The Planning Commission further suggested that the Board look to GVC for traffic expertise. Mr. Altman further stated that with or without the project; the signal at Shelbourne and 562 needed to be addressed; Gibraltar and Shelbourne turn lanes were discussed; Central was looking to pursue funding; however, their position was that with or without the project – the study showed the intersections needed to be improved and Central was looking to put improvements in. Mr. Bittig asked if they were looking for PennDOT's commitment to do the improvements? He also asked Mr. Altman if he knew where PennDOT was going with these improvements without the project? Mr. Altman replied that Gibraltar and Shelbourne counts showed that a signal was needed there, without school traffic. Mr. Bittig suggested Gibraltar and Shelbourne as well as Shelbourne and 562 would adversely impact the school's transportation because it's a disaster already. Mr. Koch stated that it was a good opportunity for the Township and the developer to work together to resolve the issue with PennDOT. Mr. Peifer stated that the Board authorized GVC to attend PennDOT meetings with the developers, provided the developer's paid for their time. Mr. Wilson stated that without turn lanes at a potential light at Shelbourne and Gibraltar, no improvement would be made with just a traffic light. He believed that a light with turn lanes would be an improvement and said that the intersection functions very well as is, with 4-way stops.

Mr. Koch addressed the Fire Marshal comment regarding fire hydrant locations and pressure by stating that they met with the Fire Marshal and letters have been exchanged. There was an understanding now with respect to hydrants and the minimum amount of pressure associated with the hydrants.

Mr. Koch requested Preliminary Plan approval, subject to comments tonight and the understanding that all outstanding issues could be addressed at final plan stage.

Reading Central Catholic continued

Mr. Bittig stated that some of the issues should be looked at by GVC to be sure they were all in place prior to taking action. There was no public comment. Dr. Hannah suggested Conditional Preliminary Plan approval, to which the Planning Commission remained silent. No motion – no action.

6. ZONING ORDINANCE CHANGES - Elizabeth A. Magovern, Esquire

Ms. Magovern explained that Chris Hartman had comments regarding the proposed ordinance changes and would address that in writing. She explained that she did have a conversation with Mr. Hartman during his absence and he verbally offered the following (based on the letter he received from the Zoning Officer): Dual Use definition was ok – but he had concern about the use in the Rural Village Overlay and suggested that dual use could be a problem in the AP District. She then stated that Mr. Hartman suggested limiting it to rural area only and offered an explanation. More discussion ensued, and the Planning Commission agreed to take a look at written correspondence that Mr. Hartman would submit and make changes accordingly.

Public Comment

Louise Swartley, 31 Troxel Road, stated that she wanted to thank the Planning Commission for their actions, convictions and attempts; unfortunately, she then stated, the Supervisors have not taken their recommendations and suggested that hopefully that would change. Personally, she'd like to thank Mr. Bittig, Mr. Wilson and Cheryl Franckowiak for taking time in explaining rural village history and the proposed changes to the ordinance to her. She shared that her main concern was sewer proximity to the village and potential challenges and thinks that could cause a problem.

Concerning parking lot ratios: Mr. Bittig went thru and made some changes after having discussions with Mr. Schwartz. Mr. Peifer presented some information from two different sources and stated that one thing that needed to be noted was that right now it's based on gross floor area; the definition of which talks about roofed areas; so areas in garden centers with no roofs don't count towards parking. These recommendations talked about gross leasable area, which would include garden centers in the calculations. A general discussion regarding the issue took place and someone mentioned the idea of retailers utilizing parking spaces for seasonal merchandise, to which Mr. Schwartz suggested that proved the point that the Ordinance required way too much parking. Mr. Peifer asked if they intended to keep open space area the same? Mr. Bittig replied yes and then went on to note that maintenance of spaces (landscaped) must be better addressed; as with everything else there was a lack of enforcement, e.g., screen plantings shall be maintained permanently with plant material. Mr. Schwartz mentioned parking space size and design and asked why was hairpin striping in the proposed changes? Mrs. Franckowiak explained that the Board liked it when they saw George Reeve's presentation and specifically requested that it be placed in our ordinance as a requirement. The issue of the 18' verses 20' long spaces was addressed. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was not the length of the vehicle; it was how people parked their vehicles. They either went too far into the space in front of them or their rear end hung out into the traffic aisle. He further stated that the additional 2' provided a buffer. More discussion took place and the general consensus on length of space 18' vs. 20' was as follows: Mr. Wilson, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ruff liked 20'; Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Shane,

Zoning Ordinance changes continued

Mr. Bittig liked 18', which was a tie. Mr. Wilson referenced "Roberts Rules of Order" and suggested that when there was a tie vote, whichever way the Chairperson voted essentially "wins". If that was true, the vote should be weighted to the 20' length recommendation.

As it related to the parking space ratios: the unanimous consensus of the Planning Commission was: retail and service, 4/1,000s.f. of gross leasable area, shopping center 4/1,000s.f. of gross leasable area; convenience / grocery without gas pumps 3/1,000s.f. gross leasable area.

7. GEISHAUSER SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD – Karen Krater

GVC reviewed the Geishauser Subdivision sketch Plan of Record (reference letter dated September 29, 2006).

Mrs. Krater from Hoffert Surveying explained that the plan entailed subdividing a 1.5 acre parcel from a 10 acre tract; the existing dwelling was on public sewer and had on-lot well. The new lot would be the same, public sewer and an on-site well. Mrs. Krater went over the bold comments, which were: the requirement of an Environmental Assessment Statement. She then asked if it could be waived or was it a requirement for every project regardless of scope? Mr. Ruff stated that he'd recommend a waiver when one was submitted. Comment SALDO #1: Since that was part of the Lakin Annexation and must go through the major subdivision process, Mrs. Krater asked if it could go preliminary / final? Mr. Bittig mentioned #2 under zoning, was using old zoning information and requested that it be updated. Comment #9, erosion and sediment control, Mrs. Krater asked if it could be deferred until proposed lot was actually developed? Mrs. Franckowiak explained that an E&SC permit was required as part of the building permit process. The Planning Commission agreed with the request. Mrs. Krater stated that the wetlands delineation had been done; 98% of wetlands was in wooded area and would be shown on future submissions. She then stated that they were requesting a waiver from the requirement to put curb and sidewalk along Oley Turnpike Road since there was no curb and sidewalk in area.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the waiver of the requirement of SALDO Sections 6.203 & 6.204 for curbs and sidewalks since there were no curb or sidewalks in that area. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz mentioned the comment from the EAC, which was to consider a conservation easement around woods on new lot; if there were wetlands it would be done anyway. He then explained that the intent was to preserve trees and it looked like only two would be removed. Without a conservation easement nothing precluded the homeowner from bulldozing everything; consequently, that was why they were being asked to consider the easement. Mr. Peifer suggested adding a note on the plan that if trees were to be disturbed during construction then a tree inventory would be required as part of the building permit process.

Mr. Bittig inquired about the Fire Marshal comments and referenced the access road requirement of 150'; the site was 220'; she asked if access roads were required to every structure; to which the Planning Commission promptly referred her to the Fire Marshal.

8. PENN VIEW SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN – Doug Kramer

GVC reviewed the Penn View Subdivision Sketch Plan (reference letter dated October 2, 2006).

Mr. Kramer represented the plan and said he was at a meeting about a year ago to discuss the 3-lot subdivision along Heidelberg Avenue, which was part of a mobile home park existing in the community. The owner was trying to create 3 lots off of Heidelberg Avenue; the last time he got the idea the Planning commission liked it and was comfortable and he then asked if he could go from sketch to final. The Planning Commission suggested they were not comfortable with the plan and began addressing the bold issues:

Item #1 – Mr. Kramer mentioned that the area was the open space for the mobile home park when he was at the prior meeting; and he did not receive any negative comments; Mr. Schwartz stated that the consensus was that there was no knowledge of mobile home park open space issues and that should have been researched to answer the question. Mr. Bittig stated that the issue was density, by pulling chunks of ground out made the mobile home park more non-conforming; he then stated that there were about 125 to 130 mobile home units. Mr. Kramer put up an aerial map and tried to give visual concept of what was going on. Mr. Kramer suggested that the 3 proposed lots were separated by a stream away from the majority of the mobile home park. Mr. Bittig asked if they would remove some of the units to comply with zoning? He then stated that the allowable density was 5 d.u. per acre after removal of flood plains and recreational areas; since the park was already over density, taking more land off made it worse. Mr. Kramer replied mathematically yes, but practically, no. Mr. Wilson stated that jumping back to practical side, why was open space left on the other side of the creek if it was not practical for open space uses and then suggested that although it was located on the other side of creek, the mobile home park was approved with open space on other side of creek. Mr. Kramer stated that the plan was approved and built prior to zoning so that was not true. He then stated that 3 homes would be better than existing woods. Mr. Wilson stated that he disagreed; woods were better than building lots. He then asked about flood plain issues, wouldn't the flood plain bisect the building lot? He further stated said 3 houses along Butter Lane had been wiped out in that area. Mr. Kramer stated that he was well aware of L.O.M.A. issues, etc.

Mr. Kramer then asked if an Environmental Assessment Statement would be required for the project given its size and density? Mr. Bittig replied that given the flood plain, yes, it was required. The Planning Commission agreed. Mr. Kramer then asked if the wetlands only in the immediate vicinity be delineated. The Planning Commission agreed that was ok, it did not need to be for the entire tract. Mr. Kramer asked about the R.O.W., currently it was a 50' R.O.W. was that Ok? Mr. Peifer replied that they needed a 60' R.O.W., as that was what the Ordinance called for. The Planning Commission agreed. Concerning Item # 7, access into rest of the area as an easement into the lot, Mr. Bittig stated that they were dealing with 2 items – Zoning Section 600 and SALDO Section 5.52 which dealt with frontage and street access. The Ordinance stated that we can no longer have 'orphaned' properties. They must have street frontage. Mr. Kramer stated that it had frontage on other side of property, but the fact was you couldn't get to it unless they had the easement. He then stated that the Sewer Authority had use of land, not exclusive ownership as long as the easement wasn't obstructed. Mr. Schwartz stated that mowers could use the access. Mr. Wilson offered that across Heidelberg there was an old paper street that went up to Exeter Road and that the proposed driveways could not enter a street in close proximity to an intersection. The plan was called Brookside but there could be a statutory limit of paper streets on maps

Penn View Subdivision continued

Mr. Bittig asked about the wrong size lot dimensions. Mr. Kramer stated that they had old zoning data and it would be modified. Mr. Bittig stated that looking at lot 1, he didn't believe a building could be placed on there. Mr. Kramer replied that they would look at that. Mr. Wilson stated that it was not a major development; but three more houses on the most dangerous road in Exeter was his concern. Mr. Ruff suggested guidance on comment #1 on whether or not they would need to go to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Kramer stated that they would get legal counsel. Mr. Wilson stated that they should check validity of the paper street.

9. COUNTRY CLUB ESTATES II – RETAINING WALL

Mrs. Franckowiak explained that the item would not be addressed as the developer was deciding whether or not they're going to build according to Final Plan rather than be faced with a revision to the Plan of Record.

10. RUBY'S WAIVER REQUEST – Ric Longacre

Mr. Longacre presented some background by stating that the plan had been approved; preliminary site clearing had been done; however, when preparing shop drawings, the estimator came back and shared discrepancies in the plans. There were some changes that were supposed to occur that didn't make it onto the plans so they resubmitted revised plans to GVC to check details. One of the controversial items was regarding the underground storm structure, for which Mr. Peifer's comment was that the plan showed polypipe, but what was now being proposed was aluminized pipe. Mr. Longacre stated that the nature of system was perforated 4' diameter pipe encased in 2B stone in a PVC liner (which was a watertight liner and that the rest of the pipe system was plastic/waterproof). The issue was that the ordinance required that if the system was in a public street, it must be concrete pipe; if it was part of the conveyance system on private property it could be something else; and that area was the storage area, not a conveyance area and not on public property. Mr. Longacre went on to talk about the PennDOT publication to verify that aluminized metal pipe was recognized by PennDOT. He then shared a second document that was a result of an independent study by steel manufacturer based on field installations. Mr. Schwartz inquired what's on top of the structure? Mr. Longacre replied that was paving (a minimum of 18"). Mr. Peifer questioned the studies provided and stated that they were based on storm pipe and asked if the aluminization was done before or after perforation? Mr. Longacre replied that it was after the perforation was done. Mr. Peifer asked for verification / proof of that.

Mr. Bittig stated that he was unsure if a waiver was required since the ordinance dealt with storm sewer line and that was not part of the line. He further stated that he was concerned about opening a Pandora's box. Mr. Longacre stated that he fully agreed, it's a private facility and asked why it was regulated? Mr. Peifer countered by stating we're regulating the design of the system for capacity for the life of the project. Mr. Longacre stated that the system was subject to inspection; agreements would be in place for the system and vault that would be carried out all as part of the Best Management Practices.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of Stormwater Ordinance Section 3.10.10.C.7 to allow the change to corrugated metal system that the applicant was requesting pending review of the specs by GVC. The motion carried unanimously.

11. LIGHTING ORDINANCE – VALHALLA – Pat Dolan

Mr. Dolan talked about up lighting the building and he didn't find anything in ordinance about it. Mr. Littlehales stated that it was not there because it was prohibited and that the lighting must be angled down. He then stated that if they wanted it to be up lighted, it would have to be granted via waiver as no up lighting was allowed except for illumination of flagpoles. Mr. Wilson asked if the desired up lighting was in a particular location. Mr. Dolan stated it was wrap around landscaping to illuminate building. Mr. Schwartz stated that he found Section 6.B.3 and 6.D.7 in the Ordinance. Mr. Littlehales stated that what Mr. Dolan was showing might be ok if it was in a protected location, otherwise, it could get whacked by either a lawnmower or snow blower. Discussion took place and Mr. Dolan was informed that a waiver was not required.

After Pat left the meeting, someone indicated that, based on the content of Section 6.B.3, a waiver would be required.

12. SCOPE OF TRAFFIC STUDY – EXETER COMMONS

GVC reviewed the scope of Traffic Study for Exeter Commons (reference letter dated September 29, 2006)

Mr. Schwartz suggested adding the 422 off ramp at East Neversink Road and the intersection between Friends Diner/Bowl-o-rama/Water Machine.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors add the following: SR422 off ramp at East Neversink Road and the intersection between Friends Diner/Bowl-o-rama-Water Machine to the scope of Traffic Study for Exeter Commons. The motion carried unanimously.

13. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – EXETER GOLF CLUB ESTATES TOWN CENTER

- Henry Filippini

Mr. Filippini presented his idea for a town center and suggested that he wanted to see if there was a future for the idea based on the Planning Commission's feedback, and if not, he'll just go with the allowed zoning and build townhouses. There was much discussion on the success of town centers in other communities, particularly down south. Mr. Littlehales asked about improvement of sight distance along Shelbourne Road? Mr. Filippini stated that was done already and with latest improvements he estimated there was about 200' of sight distance. The proposal would house multiple commercial tenants in a new building and the existing building: small tenants like a hairdresser; little restaurant; little deli or a little grocery store.

There was discussion on dwelling units above the storefronts, to which the Zoning Officer, Mrs. Franckowiak raised concern. She stated that if the Township was willing to provide an overlay district to incorporate Mr. Filippini's ideas for commercial tenants, then why also allow the residential units in addition, since they were already allowed. If the Township was willing to accommodate the commercial development, then the concession should be a reduction in potential dwelling units and not commercial as a bonus.

The possibility of a rezoning application was also addressed and much discussion took place, with the consensus being to rezone it to a Neighborhood Commercial District. There was some thought that could be viewed as spot zoning, but the idea emerged to use the development as a prototype for other

Informal Discussion continued

communities to be able to utilize as well. Overall, the Planning Commission welcomed the town center concept, with the idea that it would provide the individual communities and surrounding communities a household service type of commercial establishment in their own neighborhood.

The consensus was to offer support to Mr. Filippini's efforts to rezone to Neighborhood Commercial as a prototype for other communities to enable them to also provide the town center concept within a residential subdivision.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to offer support of Mr. Filippini's efforts to rezone to Neighborhood Commercial as a prototype for other communities. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to adjourn the October 3, 2006 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11:07pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc/caf

Correspondence to:

BOS: 880 Schoffers Road Home Occupation
BOS: Zoning Ordinance Changes
BOS: Geishauser Subdivision waiver request
BOS: Ruby Tuesday waiver request
BOS: Exeter Commons Scope of Traffic Study