

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
SEPTEMBER 5, 2006

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, September 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, Secretary
Richard Littlehales
Dottie Geiger
Paul L. Schwartz
Gary L. Shane

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Joe Rogosky, GVC Consulting Engineer
Anthony Maize, GVC Consulting Traffic Engineer
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary
Eric Gardecki, GIS Administrator

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the minutes of the August 1, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the September 5, 2006 Planning Commission meeting with the addition of Country Club Estates II retaining wall and a new overlay district. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

- 3. READING CENTRAL CATHOLIC H S – PRELIMINARY PLAN** – Henry Koch, Jr.
- Mark Kitzmiller
- Kevin Mohn
- Terry Manmiller
- Madelyn Fudeman
- Robert Hanna

GVC reviewed the Reading Central Catholic High School Preliminary Land Development Plan (reference letter dated September 1, 2006).

Mr. Koch stated that they have gone to the Board of Supervisors concerning the berm area and the Board let them know that what they were proposing was not what the Board intended. The Board wanted examples of what they proposed to see if that would be effective and would provide that to the Board.

Reading Central Catholic continued

The next item concerned the items from the Environmental Advisory Council. Mr. Kitzmiller stated that at the time of the EAC review the flood study had not been done. They have since done the 100-year flood study of the Owatin Creek and that is depicted on the current plan. There were two accesses off of Ritter Road and the north access point clips a corner of the floodplain. Floodwaters would cross Ritters Road prior to inundating the north access drive to any great extent.

The next issue was groundwater pollution potential from salting the parking lots and other paved areas. The stormwater management design consists of curb barriers surrounding the collection points at various locations. The stormwater runoff would enter those areas and be conveyed by pipes to the detention basin. The detention basin was part detention and part retention and would have a lining and they had hard piping from the point of collection. So there would be no point of contact for surface water getting to the ground water. Where the water goes into the detention basin there was the potential for mixing and diluting that water and would alleviate any major threats of pollution of groundwater. Mr. Rogosky asked if they were proposing BMPs as part of the NPDES permit? Mr. Kitzmiller replied yes. Mr. Rogosky stated that would address some of the pollutants. DEP required now that X amount of flow must be infiltrated, regardless of our Ordinance. Mr. Kitzmiller then stated that the item concerning the riparian buffer that was recommended along the Owatin creek, he thought that the buffer was to provide a buffer from activities on the property to the stream. The topography in the area in the northeast corner of the tract where the Owatin runs is not located near any activity areas and would not be a threat to the creek. Mr. Koch stated that there was a buffer of trees currently located there and they were not going to disturb that. Mr. Schwarz stated that was what we were looking for. Mr. Bittig stated that they were proposing to run all their water out from the detention basin to be metered out to Ritter Road. He then asked what was the capacity of the culvert running under Ritters Road? Mr. Kitzmiller replied that there was a dual 15" pipe that had a capacity of 15 to 20 cubic feet per second. Mr. Bittig stated that he was concerned with the post development outflow, which had to go through that pipe. They might make the five-year storm with the 15, above that they could not make it, where was that water going? Mr. Kitzmiller replied that he believed that the basin discharge was designed to fit through that twin culvert. Mr. Bittig stated that in their summary it said that the post development output would be anywhere from 10-years at 18 ½-CFS and 50-years at 25-CFS. Where would that water go? We would not allow them to push more water down onto the adjacent property owner. They would need to take care of the water on-site. Mr. Kitzmiller replied that they would replace the twin pipes with elliptical culverts. Mr. Bittig stated that they would not be allowed to increase the flow onto Mr. Baushers property. Mr. Kitzmiller stated that a certain amount of water goes through those pipes and a certain amount of that water goes over the road. If they take 10 through the pipe and 5 over the road, they would still be getting 15. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Bausher how often the water flows over the road. Mr. Bausher replied 4 to 5 times a year. Mr. Schwartz asked if there was sheet flow over the road that was overflowing from the pipe? Mr. Rogosky replied that he believed what was happening was the two pipes can only handle a certain amount of flow and the remaining amount flowed over the road. Mr. Schwartz asked if we were saying that was an acceptable situation? Mr. Bittig replied no. Mr. Schwartz stated that we could not permit sheet flow over the road. Mr. Bittig stated that if you read Mr. Peifer' Stormwater Review, it stated to infiltrate the water.

Regardless of the concern of sinkholes and the expense, they need to get the water back into the ground, and to limit the flow to the capacity of the pipes.

Reading Central Catholic continued

Mr. Kitzmiller stated that if they put in 20 feet of pipe and nothing goes over the road, have they met the goals? Mr. Bittig replied that was a good question, the name of the game was to get the water off of the road, and to not impact the downstream neighbor, and put the water back into the ground. Mr. Rogosky stated that it sounded as though they were routing the water through that existing pipe to determine what the flows were for each respective storm. Considering that they only had capacity for two 15-inch pipes and whatever did go into the spillway, keep in mind what our Ordinance requirements were and that they did not want to exceed what was going through that pipe now. Mr. Koch replied that they were well aware of the situation, were aware of the regulations and understand the position. They would not change the condition or increase the flow.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the problem was what was the flow? Was the flow the legal flow or the accidental flow? Mr. Rogosky stated that they had two flow conditions. They could drive the pre-development flow to the upstream end of the pipe. But then they needed to look at the flow coming out of the pipes because it almost acted as a natural detention basin. It was ponding up and then being routed through the two 15 inch CMPs and the road was acting as a spillway. What we were trying to do was to not make that condition worse. Mr. Bittig stated that the bottom line was that if they never route more water than those two pipes could handle, they would need to hold the rest on site. Mr. Schwartz stated that the preexisting flow included what was washing over the road right now. Mr. Shane asked if they put in oval pipes would that stop the overflow onto Ritter Road and not increase the flow? Mr. Kitzmiller replied yes. Mr. Bittig stated that the downstream channel was becoming extremely eroded. That was another condition that was not allowed. Mr. Kitzmiller stated that they could put an energy-dissipating device on the other side if Mr. Bausher would allow that. Mr. Ruff asked if the flow was over the same spot on the road? Mr. Kitzmiller replied yes. Mr. Ruff stated that the width was dictated by the topology of the road that it was crossing. Mr. Koch asked what was topology? Mr. Ruff replied the shape of the road channel.

Mr. Koch stated that they wanted to discuss the issue of paved and impervious surface. They passed out a new chart dated September 5th. Mr. Koch then stated that they turned to the definitions in the Ordinance. They felt that some guidance on the issue was found in the definition of open area. The Ordinance stated that the paved area could not exceed 10%. As they interpret the word paving, they have 7.9% and satisfy the Ordinance. They had been advised in the past that the Planning Commission considered the tennis court, the sidewalks and the track as impervious material and paving. Their argument was it was not paving. They wanted to call to our attention the definition of open space where it stated free of all buildings, paving and impervious surfaces. If in fact paving included impervious surfaces, there would be no reason to put that word in there because it would be redundant. They suggested that the Ordinance was specific and impervious did not necessarily mean paving. So if they would back out the tennis court, sidewalks and the track and classify it as impervious and not paving, they would satisfy the requirement of the Ordinance. One issue was that the Planning Commission did not want to see large seas of macadam. They tried to honor that and they did not have large seas of macadam. They also felt that the Planning Commission should be aware that fact that with technology developing, there now were sidewalks that were considered porous. They were prepared to offer testimony to that extent. Their position was that their submission as it was, satisfied the definitions and the requirements for paving, the buildings and impervious areas. They also satisfy the open area requirements and would ask that we accept their position. Mr. Ruff asked if they were proposing to use pervious pavements for the sidewalks?

Reading Central Catholic continued

Mr. Koch replied no, not at this time. Mr. Bittig asked about the emergency access road around the building that was proposed to be built with grass pave 2, what was that? Mr. Mohn stated that it was synthetic material that was a grid of cores. Mr. Manmiller stated that it was a very pliable plastic that enabled them to fill in 2½ by 2½ inch pockets. The whole frame was 2 foot by 4 foot by 2¾ inches thick that gets placed on ¾ stone and would be filled with screened topsoil, cover that with grass seed and any vehicle can drive on it. Mr. Littlehales asked what the GW rating was? Mr. Manmiller replied that they would get that information. Mr. Bittig stated that was certainly pervious material. Mr. Hartman stated that he understood the logic of Mr. Koch's statement but he was not persuaded. The definition of impervious from the Township Zoning Ordinance described what impervious was intended to meet in the Ordinance in part by saying "such as buildings and paving", clearly implying that there were other kinds of things besides buildings and paving that would also be impervious. Buildings and paving were examples of impervious. Looking at the definition of open area, it said, "free of all buildings, paving, impervious surfaces, etc. He believed that the most rationale interpretation of the definition of open area would be that it was intended that buildings and paving would be among those things intended to be impervious. Probably there was a typo or an omission of the word "other" impervious surfaces from that definition of open area. The most rational reading of the sentence would be to give it the meaning "free of all buildings, paving, other impervious surfaces". While he understood the reasoning, it did not make sense that the Ordinance intended to exclude buildings and paving from impervious surfaces. It was intended that buildings and paving were examples of impervious and that the definition of open area intended to be inclusive of not only free of all buildings and paving, but free of all other impervious surfaces. Mr. Koch stated that if he had the liberty of re-drafting the Ordinance, he could make it read that way. If in fact, there was an error in the Zoning Ordinance, it must be construed most liberally against the Township because any ambiguity has to be resolved in favor of the applicant or the property owner. It was well-founded fundamental law and he did not believe that the ordinance could be changed because there was a typographical error. Mr. Hartman asked where it said that impervious excluded buildings and paving? Mr. Koch replied that there was a subsidiary listing therefore it was a series, rather than a disjunctive or "other". Mr. Schwartz stated the definition of impervious clarified that. Mr. Hartman stated that they had to read it together to find a sensible meaning and when you read impervious together with open area he felt that the conclusion was that buildings and paving were examples of impervious surfaces. He would be more persuaded by their argument if they had some other kind of language that would indicate an intention to exclude buildings from impervious surfaces. The list did not say that buildings and paving were not examples of impervious surfaces. Mr. Koch stated that they agreed that they did not say that, but not all impervious surfaces were paved. That was their position they would take on the matter. If the Planning Commission would accept their position they were under the 10%, if not, they were 10.65%. It was something that was diminimus. Dr. Hanna stated that sidewalks were not paving, so they were at 9.8%. Mr. Bittig replied that sidewalks were concrete, they were paving. Dr. Hanna replied that it was impervious surface. Mr. Koch stated that he had seen wood chips as sidewalks. Mr. Bittig asked if they would use woodchips? Mr. Koch stated that Mr. Bittig's degree of absoluteness did not always apply. Mr. Schwartz stated that if they were less than .8 then they were ok. Mr. Bittig stated that they should go to the Zoning Hearing Board to get relief. Mr. Schwartz stated that if they were as close as they claimed to be and they had options, why not go with the options, why argue the point? 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.

Reading Central Catholic continued

Mr. Koch stated that they had the letter of serviceability from the Water Company and handed that out. They had done the 100-year flood plain in the Stormwater report. With item #16 Environmental Assessment Statement, they have provided that to the planning staff. They have complied with the Ordinance. They would not be doing any irrigation with the groundwater, so comment C would not apply.

Mr. Koch stated that with the stadium lighting, the Board of Supervisors asked for legal holdings. The solicitor stated that they considered the matter closed. That legal precedence held that Ordinances adopted after the filing of the Conditional use application had no application. It was in the Municipalities Planning Code. Mr. Bittig asked what section that was? Mrs. Fudeman replied that it was Section 917. Mr. Koch stated that they wanted to co-operate and would ask permission to request two waivers for the height of the poles and the light standards in the parking lots. They were in accordance with their prior discussions. The first waiver was for the height of the stadium lighting and asked the Planning Commission to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the waiver. The waiver exactly represented the items discussed by their lighting expert, Mr. Bush, at the last meeting.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz to table the waiver for the 70-foot pole heights for the reason that it would be contingent on the stadium remaining in the same position and elevation. If the stadium was moved, then we would not support the waiver.

Mr. Koch asked if they would state that everything would remain the same, they did not want to lose a month.

Mr. Hartman stated that the Planning Commission could do a conditional waiver, as long as the plans would not change and the stadium would stay at the same location and base elevation. Mr. Schwartz stated that he would withdraw the motion to table that.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of Ordinance #612 for stadium lighting pole standards of 70-ft and allow the fixtures to be mounted at 80-ft contingent on the location and elevation of the stadium was not changed on the plan and all the photometrics on the plan remained the same. The motion carried with Mr. Ruff, Mr. Shane, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig, Mrs. Geiger voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed. Mr. Wilson stated that he was opposed to anything conditional.

Mr. Koch stated that the other waiver was for the parking lots and would accept a conditional waiver for that also. Mr. Schwartz stated that the parking lot lighting was not an issue.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of Ordinance #612 for the parking lot lighting standards of 20-ft and allow the fixtures to be mounted at 30-ft. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Koch stated that they have a new Traffic Impact Study and passed a copy to Mr. Maize and another to the Township. The last issues dealt with the comments from the Fire Marshal. They were perplexed with some of the comments that the Fire Marshal made. They had a meeting planned with the Fire Marshal on September 19th.

4. **WAL-MART SUPERCENTER – PRELIMINARY PLAN**

- Todd Steiger
- Eric Ostimchuk
- Henry Koch, Jr.

Mr. Steiger stated the main comments for their plan was with the traffic portion. They met with PennDOT to try to convince them to allow a break in the median and PennDOT told them that they needed to exhaust all other design alternatives and even then they might not allow the break. They have a revised concept plan that they presented to PennDOT. Mr. Maize had some concerns with the plan, particularly the alignment of Lincoln Road and Lincoln Drive. They revised the plans to address that. On August 22nd they met with PennDOT and they presented the revised plan. The concept was agreeable to PennDOT. He then stated that on August 23rd Mr. Maize issued a letter that from a traffic engineering standpoint there was no longer a reason to recommend against approval of the Preliminary Plan. However, part of the letter concerned the north side of 422 and no parking along that area off Lincoln Drive. Mr. Maize stated that from a purely traffic operational standpoint the conceptual plan that was presented to PennDOT and PennDOT accepted as feasible would mitigate the impact from the proposed development. He then stated that the Board should be aware that PennDOT's review was commensurate with the level of detail presented on the plan. As the design develops and the plans were presented to them, then the review comments would reflect the changes in the detail. The plan called for widening of Lincoln Drive and that could be accomplished within the right-of-way. However, in order to replace the sidewalks, additional right-of-way would need to be acquired. If that would be changed, that would make the potential of non-conforming lots. Also it would require eliminating parking on that street.

Mr. Bittig asked if that would require no parking for the entire block? Mr. Maize replied yes, to some extent. Mr. Steiger stated that they were looking at different alternatives in order to maintain the sidewalks. Mr. Maize stated that because of the addition of the turn lanes with that slight over vertical someone coming from the north to the south could drive directly into one of the left turn lanes. Mrs. Geiger stated that she would hate to see those people lose their parking on the street. She would also like to see signs to direct people to use the east side right turn lane along SR422 into the Wal-Mart lot. Mr. Koch stated that they would try to do that. Mr. Maize stated that whatever Wal-Mart could do in the way of signage and improvements to make the east entrance more attractive would not hurt. Mr. Steiger agreed that they would do everything they could to do that. Mr. Littlehales stated that an entrance to the store located there would certainly help.

Mr. Steiger replied that there would be an entrance located there for the Supercenter. Mr. Wilson stated that there was now an extra lane for people coming out of Dairy Queen and Scott's Car Wash to cross over. Mrs. Geiger stated that there was a no-left-turn sign located there. The owner of Dairy Queen stated that sign was not located there. Mr. Bittig asked if the proposed design mitigated the impact, would that take care of the additional traffic? If it makes it worse, then we could not approve the plan. Mr. Ostimchuk replied that the no-build scenario would operate at a level F.

With the build condition and improvements implemented we would have a level of service of D. Mr. Schwartz stated that we were hoping it would get better, not get worse. We were hoping for relief for Dairy Queen and Taco Bell. They did not have problems until Wal-Mart. Would this help them? Mr. Ostimchuk stated that with the intersection improvements and the traffic clearing faster, it would help the operations of the adjacent driveways.

Wal-Mart continued

Mr. Koch stated that was what PennDOT was looking for with the concept plan. If they could they would have the intersection 300 feet down the road. They were in the process of acquiring additional right-of-way from Dairy Queen. He felt that Mr. Maize was correct from a traffic-planning standpoint the Preliminary Plan should be approved. Mrs. Geiger preferred the entrance location further down SR422. Mr. Maize stated that PennDOT considered it a congested corridor and did not want to allow that.

Public Comment

Matthew Doll, representative for Scott's Car Wash, stated that the dedicated right-turn only lane would cause access problems for their customer's coming in off of SR422. And for people coming out of the Dairy Queen exit, with the constant traffic coming around the corner, that would cause additional problems to exit there. He felt it was important to point out that it was a problem that was a Wal-Mart creation. He understood that PennDOT stated that the creation of more flow would help the customers was incorrect. He respectfully disagreed with that. Mr. Ruff stated that he would like to recommend a no-turn-on red sign be added to the right turn lane at that intersection. Mr. Littlehales stated that he would prefer that also.

Mr. Koch stated that the Planning Commission could instruct Mr. Maize to push for that if he would agree. Mr. Maize stated that he would offer that there was specific criteria that needed to be met for a "no turn on red" sign to be installed and he could not remember what those criteria were. Mr. Schwartz stated that with the north side of the road, the issue was the hump in the road, could that be milled down to change the hump. Mr. Ostimchuk stated that it was possible, but the issue was the alignment. Mr. Bittig felt that we should have solution that would not impact those homes and their sidewalks. Mr. Ostimchuk stated that he felt that they could do that.

Joe Gumeniski, 130 Fairview Chapel Road, asked if they couldn't close the entrance on Lincoln Road? The Planning Commission agreed that they could not close that entrance.

Mr. Steiger stated that they were looking for Preliminary Plan approval. Mr. Ruff stated that he did not like that the people on the north side would lose their on-street parking. Mr. Schwartz stated that he wanted the minutes to reflect that we were not necessarily endorsing the plan as shown and also to show we had concerns that needed to be addressed at final plan stage.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant conditional Preliminary Plan approval contingent upon the issue of the Car Wash, Dairy Queen and Taco Bell driveways being addressed to the satisfaction of the owners and to address the north side (Lincoln Drive) issues to protect the interest of the property owners located there. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Ruff, Mr. Shane, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Schwartz voting in favor and Mrs. Geiger voting opposed.

Mr. Steiger stated that he wanted to thank the Township for allowing Mr. Maize to attend the meetings with PennDOT.

5. BERKSHIRE BANK – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Lon Seitz
- Dan Becker

GVC reviewed the Berkshire Plan Preliminary Land Development Plan (reference letter dated September 1, 2006).

Mr. Seitz stated that the Zoning issue was being addressed by Mr. Essig and asked Mrs. Franckowiak to explain that. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she spoke to Mr. Essig on the Zoning Variance issue and he stated that because the subdivision plan was approved taking into consideration the Zoning relief and the rest of that subdivision has been built, that he would recommend to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors that the decision would stand. He would be sending a letter to us. Mr. Bittig stated that they would still need to go to the Zoning Hearing Board on another issue.

Mr. Seitz stated that with item #2, they listed 8 or 10 species of deciduous trees and also where they would be placing the trees on the plan. He also listed 6 or 8 ornamental trees and where they would be placed and also listed 4 or 5 evergreen trees for screening. All of the trees were from the Ordinance and would like to be able to choose from that list. They listed those on the plans and they would like to make the choice of the trees when they were ready to do the landscaping. He felt that they met the Ordinance with the species. Mr. Bittig stated that they were just in Preliminary Plan. Mr. Seitz stated that they were also looking at Preliminary/Final Plan. They have geared the project that way. Mr. Bittig stated that the plan was reviewed as a Preliminary Plan by GVC. Mr. Ruff stated that he did not have a problem with the way they presented the landscaping. Mr. Schwartz agreed and our only concern was if the trees were suitable for the location. Mr. Seitz stated that Berkshire Bank would have landscaping that was dynamite.

Mr. Seitz stated that they were requesting a waiver of the Environmental Assessment Statement requirement. They have gotten a letter back that there were no environmental impacts and also the same from the EAC. Mr. Schwartz stated that he would like to see that they put in signs for the drive through to discourage people from sitting at the drive through with their engines running. He would appreciate that.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Shane to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of an Environmental Assessment Statement (SALDO Section 4.283 as defined in the Exeter Township Zoning Ordinance #620, Section 629) given the location and the existing conditions. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Seitz stated that with item #10, the tree inventory report, the resulting number was that 154 trees needed to be planted on the site. If they tried to put that many trees on a lot this size, they could not physically put that on the site. Mr. Bittig stated that was an item for the Zoning Hearing Board and they surely could show that they had a hardship. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that previously we had looked at the possibility that they could plant those trees on Township property, in the parks, to meet that requirement although the cost of going to the Zoning Hearing Board might be less than the price of the trees. Mr. Becker stated that they had timing issues that would make the option of the trees an issue they might like to pursue.

Mr. Bittig stated that we would need to check with the Park Director, Joe Seltzer. Mr. Gardecki stated that they might like to place the trees in Community Park or Pineland Park. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she could check with Joe and let them know. Planning Commission agreed that they would be agreeable to that

Berkshire Bank continued

solution. Mr. Seitz stated that they submitted the E & S control plan and were awaiting that approval. They were looking for a waiver of the Traffic Impact Study, as there was already a traffic signal located there.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of the requirement of SALDO Section 4.282 and 5.9814, Traffic Impact Study. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Seitz stated that they were looking for a waiver of the Environmental Hazard Report.

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant a waiver of the requirement of SALDO Section 4.284, Environmental Hazard Report due to the fact that it was a bank and there were no hazards involved with a bank. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Seitz stated that they were looking for a waiver of Water Resource Study.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 4.287 and 5.99, Water Resource Study. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Seitz stated that they were working on the exemption letter from DEP. They were working on getting the letter of serviceability from the water company. The plan shows that the building would be sprinklered. The Fire Marshal has approved the plan. He then stated that they had a typo on the lighting and would be corrected. The stormwater management report had a missing page, which he provided. They were looking for Preliminary Plan approval.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant Preliminary Plan approval subject to all the items in the September 1, 2006 review letter being addressed at Final Plan, the receipt of the authorization letter from Mr. Essig, co-ordination with Parks and Recreation for the replacement trees, and approval of the waivers from the Board of Supervisors. The motion carried with Mr. Ruff, Mr. Shane, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig, Mrs. Geiger voting in favor and Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

6. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – SELF STORAGE UNITS - James Mascaro ; - Al Dejanero

Mr. Mascaro stated that they had a proposed plan for self-storage units along Rt. 82 adjacent to the landfill property. It would be built in a three-phase plan. They were looking to make it a first class center; they did not want just a steel building. It would be secured and completely gated. They would have the office in front of the gates. There was public sewer running through the property. They would be bringing in public water from Lincoln road. There was a thick line of trees that would screen the units from the street. Mr. Ruff asked what the Zoning was? Mr. Dejanero replied that it was Light Industrial, except the one little area that was SR1, and that storage units are an allowed use. They would be getting the land subdivided as part of the process. Mr. Mascaro stated that they would have 20-ft between the units. Mr. Dejanero stated that another Zoning issue was the 20-ft between buildings, Zoning required 50-ft between the buildings. Mr. Littlehales stated that he would like to see a larger space between buildings to allow the trucks to back up to the units. Mr. Wilson stated that he would like to see screening between all the units and Rt. 82.

7. **COUNTRY CLUB ESTATES PROPOSED RETAINING WALL** – Henry Koch, Jr.

Mr. Koch asked that this item be tabled until a later date.

8. **ZONING CHANGES**

A lengthy discussion ensued about the letter from the Board of Supervisors concerning the change with the parking requirements and space size in the Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Ruff to table a response to the letter from the Board of Supervisors and direct GVC to get hard numbers and provide more information about the proposed parking changes and address it at a later meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

9. **OVERLAY DISTRICT**

Mr. Wilson stated that Henry Filippini would like to do some development at Exeter Golf Club Estates near the Clubhouse that would bring in some stores, like Flying Hills. The Planning Commission agreed that Mr. Filippini should come in to the Planning Commission for an informal discussion with a sketch of what he would like to do there.

Mr. Wilson reminded the Planning Commission that the October meeting was on Tuesday, October 3rd. Mrs. Geiger stated that she would be unable to attend, as she would be on vacation.

Mr. Littlehales stated that he had been working on the digital displays for the Ordinance, but now saw that the Board has directed someone else to work on that.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Ruff, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to adjourn the September 5, 2006 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 11pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Berkshire Bank waivers and Preliminary Plan
BOS: Wal-Mart Supercenter #1777 Preliminary Plan
BOS: Reading Central Catholic waiver request
BOS: Zoning Change