

**MINUTES**  
**EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**SEPTEMBER 4, 2007**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, September 4, 2007 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  
Richard Littlehales, Vice Chairman  
John W. Bittig, Secretary  
Paul L. Schwartz  
Gary L. Shane  
Greg T. Unger  
Gregory A. Shantz

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

**1. MINUTES**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to approve the minutes of the August 7, 2007 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Unger voting in favor and Mr. Shane, Mr. Shantz abstaining.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Shantz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the agenda of the September 4, 2007 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

- 4. FAIRVIEW CORNER – PRELIMINARY PLAN** – George Chajkowsky – Madelyn Fudeman  
- Dan Becker

Ms. Fudeman stated that she was asking, on behalf of applicant to get recommendation for preliminary / final approval. She explained that last time she was here there was one outstanding issue; they had no letter from PennDOT; but the update was that their engineer was stuck on the turnpike. She shared the conversation with Brian Boyer of PennDOT; Mr. Boyer advised them the letter was to be finalized by Wednesday and issued no later than the end of the week with no major changes other than line striping on Shelbourne, and no changes to the access which was the Planning Commissions previous concern. She believed that they would have the letter from PennDOT in time for the Supervisors meeting. Mr. Becker (on behalf of the tenant; purchaser of dunkin donuts) asked if they could please get the project underway and done as quickly as possible. Ms. Fudeman then stated that Mr. Boyer assured them unofficially that there would be no changes of the nature that the Planning Commission offered concern and that the letter should be here by the end of the week, which would enable them

### **Fairview Corner Continued**

to go to the Board. Mr. Littlehales asked to see the plan one more time. Ms. Fudeman asked for Preliminary / Final approval. Mr. Peifer replied that the plan was at preliminary stage. There were other outstanding issues in the June 29 letter and nothing had been resolved since then. Mr. Chajkowsky stated that the last issues were comments regarding the temporary trucks that come in and load / unload at the facility. He then stated that, at a previous meeting with the engineer and staff, the engineer requested access data for tractor trailers and prepared a plan that showed a tractor trailer 40' long. That plan was submitted prior to the last review. Ms. Fudeman issued clarification that this was not a production site for Dunkin Donuts; this was a satellite store with no tractor-trailers required; they would be using a box truck and all other concerns were addressed except for PennDOT. Mr. Peifer asked about the 222 / Cumru Dunkin Donut; was that a production or satellite location? Ms. Fudeman was unsure. Mr. Peifer stated that he thought they indicated for the plan, at that site, it would be box truck; but that was not the case. Mr. Peifer suggested that they would be crossing lanes at the turns. Mr. Chajkowsky stated that was not the case. Mr. Peifer looked at the plan with the engineer and showed them what he meant about crossing lanes with interior traffic movement and argued about crossing flow lanes. Mr. Chajkowsky stated that it was only a drive aisle. Ms. Fudeman suggested that if Dunkin Donut was representing via testimony that there would be box trucks only, that was going to be the case; the movements on the plan were being shown using box trucks and that's what should be reviewed. Mr. Littlehales suggested that the assumption was made that the trucks would only be coming in off of Shelbourne; coming east and exiting west. Mr. Chajkowsky stated that was the case. Mr. Littlehales stated that as long as it was a box truck he didn't care. He further stated that he was more concerned with patrons coming out making a left from the driveway thru 4 lanes of Shelbourne traffic to access 422. Mr. Chajkowsky stated that Wendy's was already doing it. Ms. Fudeman stated that the hours for Dunkin Donuts and Wendy's were so different, it would not be conflicting. Mr. Peifer suggested that Mr. Maize indicated that the peak hours of Shelbourne Road would coincide with Dunkin Donuts; forcing people to make bad choices. Mr. Schwartz asked if there were any other comments, to which Mr. Peifer replied, the loading / unloading blocked parking spaces. Mr. Schwartz asked where it was located? Mr. Chajkowsky replied at the bottom of the site where the truck would be pulling in. Ms. Fudeman stated that the note on the plan stated that loading / unloading wouldn't be taking place while parking was needed. Mr. Peifer suggested that those spaces could be utilized for employee parking. Mr. Littlehales stated that as far as employee spaces go, he didn't think he'd ever seen Wendy's lot completely full, so he suggested an agreement could be reached for the employees to park at Wendy's. Mr. Wilson stated that it was always supposed to be one continuous circular site and now the engineer was suggesting something different that perhaps he overlooked previously. Mr. Chajkowsky started to explain the configuration and Mr. Wilson stated that he remembered it going to be strictly a complete go-around and come out, meaning no 2-way. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was Dunkin Donuts; not Wal-Mart. Mr. Wilson suggested the potential was that someone could be backing in and out of traffic.

### **\* Mr. Unger arrived**

Mr. Unger asked if they were working in conjunction with Exeter Commons for traffic concerns. Ms. Fudeman replied no, they were some distance from that center and this plan had been before the Planning Commission for quite some time. Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Peifer to summarize the issues. Mr. Peifer replied that the plan had never been reviewed as Final, so as it related to Preliminary: PennDOT HOP; Stormwater and note issues. Final plan would not generate a lot more comments. Mr. Becker asked what he would need to see for stormwater? Mr. Peifer replied they needed to see the calcs, how the water would be treated before it was released. Ms. Fudeman asked if they could get the Stormwater calculations in to Mr. Peifer could they go for Conditional Approval with the Board on Monday? Mr. Peifer stated that he would need to have them by Thursday morning. Mr. Schwartz stated that he was OK doing this for preliminary; but the major concern going with final plan

### **Fairview Corner continued**

approval was putting pressure on Mr. Peifer to rush thru calcs on Thursday at the expense of some other job and that we haven't had a look at Final plan issues either. Mr. Becker stated that PennDOT was final plan stuff, improvements agreement; etc. and he suggested that what they're looking at were final plan issues, but the point about rushing Mr. Peifer was well received, however, they don't want to lose construction time. Mr. Schwartz threw out a thought, if it were simple issues that took a few minutes to look at and approve, we had a zoning workshop, which was a legal township meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>. Would the Planning Commission be willing to look at the Final plan at that time and suggested giving Preliminary plan approval tonight? Mr. Wilson stated that he hated to hear unofficial and conditional approval that left us open to seeing something different. Mr. Schwartz replied that's why he's recommending Preliminary approval, not Preliminary / Final. Mr. Unger added that because he works in the industry; he did not think it was fair to Mr. Peifer to review that in less than a day. Mr. Peifer replied that it was not the whole report, just some calcs.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend Preliminary Plan approval for Fairview Corner Land Development Plan with outstanding issues being addressed at final plan stage and to put the final plan on the zoning workshop agenda. The motion carried with Mr. Littlehales, Mr. Shantz, Mr. Shane, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Schwartz voting in favor and Mr. Unger, Mr. Wilson voting opposed.

**5. EXETER COMMONS – PRELIMINARY / FINAL LDP** – Henry Koch, Jr. – Russ McFall  
- Kevin Trapper – Jeremy Fogel – Don Jacobs

GVC reviewed the partial submission of the Exeter Commons Land Development Plan (reference letter dated August 31, 2007). (The previous review letters dated August 3, 2006 were also discussed)

Mr. Koch stated that he wanted the Planning Commission to know that there had been meetings with GVC, Township staff and the developer's engineer and thanked everyone for that. Mr. Koch then stated that that they resolved the issue of land development vs. subdivision, as the two plans would be incorporated together. He felt that would eliminate a lot of issues. Comment #17 in the August 3<sup>rd</sup> GVC review letter dealt with submission information as it related to the E. A. C. and that those concepts raised should be considered. One major item was trees and replacement of trees. Comment #2 would be addressed. The first formal comment of the review related to zoning, comment #2 would be addressed. Another major issue was the landscaping issue; Mr. Koch remembered that Mr. Peifer asked the Planning Commission to review the landscaping plan, sheet 9. He then suggested that perhaps the Planning Commission would be able to address that issue tonight; they believed they complied, but suggested the buffer yard area should be discussed with the Planning Commission. Mr. McFall showed the cross section exhibit A, of the landscaping plan; he showed the wall and existing vegetation and expressed that they felt the intent of the ordinance had been met. Mr. Unger asked him to explain how the wall wrapped around. Mr. McFall showed the Planning Commission. Mr. Shane asked about natural vegetation. Mr. McFall replied yes, there was a lot of natural vegetation. Mr. Unger asked about the style of the wall? Mr. McFall indicated tiered mesa blocks with a geo-grid locking system, however the wall had not been engineered. Mr. Schwartz stated that his concern was that they were relying on vegetation on someone else's property, if they took it down or it died, who was responsible? Mr. Trapper indicated it was the Township who was the neighbor, all wooded and not part of the active golf course. He further explained that they cored 50' – 60' down thru the rock / wall area and the data was being analyzed right now to learn the best system for the wall. Also before anything was built, obviously permits, etc. would be obtained and the groundwater must be analyzed as well. Mr. Unger asked what the groundwater was in that area? Mr. Trapper stated that he couldn't respond immediately. From an engineering standpoint it was being evaluated and the best situation would be done.

### **Exeter Commons continued**

Mr. Unger asked about the safety for kids going back there and making believe it was a rock-climbing mountain? Mr. McFall stated that a fence would be installed at the top and suggested placing one at the bottom; also the tenants would supervise that area. Mr. Schwartz stated that the 50' rear drive aisle was pretty wide, and asked if the slope could be adjusted so as to not be so steep? Also the wall systems could incorporate vegetation into the wall, plus he suggested that the design of wall could affect stormwater as well. Mr. Shane asked why the drive aisle was so wide? Mr. McFall replied that was a plan requirement. Mr. Unger suggested a 3:1 slope, where would that take the wall? Mr. McFall replied at 180', which would be too much. Mr. Trapper stated that it's being evaluated and would certainly be addressed. Mr. Littlehales suggested that green best practices should be applied wherever possible, the parking lot, water run off, etc. Mr. Schwartz stated that personally he'd like to see a 40' drive aisle and said he's still concerned about relying on the other owner being responsible for off site screening. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that she would address the issue with the Board since it was Township property. Mr. Wilson suggested that we should discuss, at workshop, how we had rules that do not allow building on steep slopes but no rules about creating steep slopes. Mr. Koch asked if it was the Planning Commission's thought that the issue of the buffer zone be discussed with the Board of Supervisors?

Mrs. Franckowiak replied that it would be an issue to be discussed with the Board and then the Planning Commission would be satisfied with what ever the Board indicated. Mr. Schwartz stated that he wanted to list the issues that needed to be addressed with the Board along with our comments and concerns; no offense to them but the developer would put the questions to the Board the way they wanted it put. We also needed to make sure that our concerns were conveyed. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that it would not be Mr. Koch approaching the Board; she would take it to the Board based on what the concerns were. Mr. Schwartz asked if a list could be keep with those items. Mr. Koch stated that they were looking for guidance from the Township as they could not effectively dispose of all the topsoil and they were working with Mrs. Franckowiak to come up with a reasonable solution. He then noted that they would comply with the following issues #9, #4 A, B, and C. Concerning 4.D, they would put the required note on the plan; they would clarify 4.E and comply with 4.G. For items #5 and #6, they would comply. Mr. Koch further stated that they would comply with #9. They submitted the report with regard to the methodology for tree sampling. Mr. Koch then asked what the Planning Commission would recommend to the Board concerning the issue of the 4,000+ replacement trees?

Mrs. Franckowiak replied that was an issue that would be discussed with the Planning Commission at the next workshop. She originally suggested it was an issue that would be handled, much like the Berkshire Bank, and Troy felt that with over 4,000 trees, it might be difficult to handle placing them on Township owned property. It would have to be on Township owned property because we couldn't expect private property owners to let someone come in and plant trees and then be responsible for them. Mr. Bittig replied that they could be used to protect the riparian zones; however, that would be on public and private land. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that it was an issue that we were working on an answer for them.

Mr. Koch stated that the next items in the review letter concerned SALDO, comments #1 thru 4 dealt with plan requirements and supply of info, they would comply. With regard to existing features, they're working with Mr. Peifer and they would be submitting more clear information. Mr. Fogel suggested that Mr. McFall just resubmitted that information. Mr. Peifer replied yes, that's correct. Mr. Koch stated that they would comply with comments #6, 7 and 8. He then suggested that at last meeting he misspoke stating that there were no slopes greater than 25%, that area would be shaded showing the steep slope area. Mr. Peifer replied that was OK. Mr. Koch stated that they would comply with #10; numbers 11 & 12 were submitted and satisfied. They submitted a new aerial. Mr. Peifer stated that was OK. Mr. Koch stated that they would comply with #14 and 15; #16 would be addressed and shown; they would provide #17. He further stated that #18 addressed the discrepancies with PennDOT and they were now coordinated between the two; #19, 20, 21, 22, 23 were housekeeping items. Concerning #24, the note would be added. Mr. McFall stated that they would show the

### **Exeter Commons continued**

utilities where they crossed and show the correct isolation distance. Mr. Peifer replied that was OK. Mr. Koch stated that they did not envision deed restrictions, but there would be an owners association and that would be supplied for review. They would comply with #28 and would provide an AutoCAD dwg. Mr. Gardecki suggested shape file. Mr. Koch stated that they were working on #30 as an exemption, the plan was reviewed by Gannett Fleming with minor comments and they would be addressed. They would comply with #32; they would incorporate #33; they were waiting for the letter from PA American Water Company; #35 was a comment only. With B & C, they would be revising the report and that would be addressed. Item #36 concerned the improvements agreement; that would come in due course. Item #37 would be discussed with the Board of Supervisors. Item #38 was a grading issue and they would comply with that. Mr. McFall clarified by stating that where there were no retaining walls, they would comply with the 3:1. Mr. Koch stated that they would provide the guide rail as suggested in item #39. Mr. McFall stated that they would provide the additional information for the stormwater as they were proposing six underground detention areas and they would be "tweaked" to accommodate Mr. Peifer's comments. In addition they would be analyzing the swale into the type M double inlet. Mr. Bittig stated that the swale went into a 15" pipe. Mr. McFall stated that they looked down there and there were two type M inlets located there; one was a 36" pipe and at the double type M inlet there was an additional 36" pipe. Mr. Peifer asked Mr. Bittig if he was talking about the Vitillo maps of the storm sewer? Mr. Bittig replied yes. Mr. Peifer stated that those maps were not correct. Mr. Koch asked about the Planning Commissions "hot points" with Stormwater so that they could address them in a manner that would be satisfactory. Mr. Bittig replied that his was solely what was in the ordinance; that every developer got their fair share of downstream capacity to keep people from being flooded out and prevent destruction of property downstream. If they could get the water offsite and all the way down to the river without flooding out E. Neversink, the Green Tree area and the Golf Course. Mr. Schwartz stated that he was more concerned not with getting it off the site, but with keeping it on the site; the intent was to minimize how much water left the site. Obviously they were in a situation where they were taking pervious soils and creating impervious area and they had a large amount of stormwater run off to deal with. Also they were taking water out of the ground because they were not infiltrating, and PA American was providing water from wells in Exeter. So essentially they were a net user of water and a net depletor of the ground water, which impacted everyone down aquifer from them. Anything they could do on their site to both infiltrate and recharge ground water or to minimize the amount of water they took out of the ground somewhere else would be beneficial. That might require some creative thinking on their part, possibly storing rainwater for other uses, such as watering landscaping, flushing toilets, etc. Mr. McFall stated that they were looking at creative uses and that would be incorporated in their submission. Mr. Trapper stated that they would also be handling the runoff from the additional impervious surface for the highway improvements. Mr. Koch stated that under stormwater #1 & 2 they would comply. Comments #3, 4 & 5 were housekeeping, #6 they would comply. Item #7 would be addressed. They would comply with #8; item #9 concerned the HOP plans. For #10 they would design that to work. They would comply with #12, they would revise #13. They would comply with #14 & 15 and they would resolve #16. Concerning #17, they would provide the notes, they would correct #18. They would use the rational method as mentioned in #19. They would comply with #20 & 21. Item #22 had been discussed. Mr. McFall stated that they would resolve item #23. Mr. Koch stated that they would provide #24 & 25. They were still discussing #26 & 27 with DEP. Mr. McFall stated that they would comply with #28. Mr. Koch stated that they would be using CMP pipe and would be responsible for the maintenance. Mr. Koch then stated that the streetlights for DeMoss would be shown with the next submission. They would provide the catalog sheets and they wanted to discuss the reduced lighting after normal business hours. Mr. Littlehales stated that they needed to either completely shut down the lights or do it on a percentage basis; most times it was done on a "high-low". Mr. McFall stated that they would add a note to the plan as to how that would be addressed. Mr. Koch stated that they would consider the comments by the Fire Marshal; they had already discussed the EAC comments. The Berks County

### **Exeter Commons continued**

Planning Commission comments would be considered. One of the County Planning Commission comments was that the property was to be made “user” friendly. Mr. Trapper stated that they would be providing a pedestrian crossing at 47<sup>th</sup> street, with crosswalks and pedestrian access controls. Also there would be pedestrian crossings at the DeMoss Road extension and at the main entrance to the shopping center traffic signal. There currently was a bus stop located at the Sunoco. They would provide sidewalks for anyone using that stop to access the center. They were coordinating with Berks County Transportation Authority to promote pedestrian safety and if BARTA would need to provide extra routes because typically employees of the center would use public transit. They would extend the sidewalks along the St. Joseph Hospital Center side of DeMoss Road into their center. They felt that they addressed the comment of providing safe pedestrian access to the front door of the center. Another comment was to provide bicycle racks in front of the stores. Most of their anchors do that. Mr. Wilson stated that he did not want to see pedestrians “run for their lives” crossing eight lanes on 422 at W. 47<sup>th</sup> street. Mr. Jacobs stated that when the pedestrian button was activated they would get the full time that they needed to cross 422. Mr. Wilson stated that he felt that pedestrians and bicyclists were also “traffic”. Mr. Koch stated that they were in discussion with Scott Reider for an access located there. They would contact the Codes Department concerning the plumbing and the fence. He then asked if there were any other comments from the Planning Commission.

### **Public Comment**

**Thomas Howell, P.O. Box 4635**, stated that he felt that they should provide jitneys or an overhead tram for the neighbors. Also Boscov’s turned their lights off. He thought that there was an agreement between Wawa and the Country Club concerning the water runoff.

**Jeremy Slonaker, 4375 Prestwick Drive**, asked if there was a sidewalk on 47<sup>th</sup> into the center or just a walkway across 422? Mr. Trapper replied that there was striping on 422, a pedestrian crosswalk then a physical concrete sidewalk running into the site at main entrance. Mr. Slonaker then stated that his other comment was that he agreed with Mr. Wilson, pedestrians and bicyclist were considered “traffic”. They just demonstrated a vehicular solution. He thanked the developer for including some plans for pedestrian access, but there was a whole section along 422 that could be added with sidewalk and further on 47<sup>th</sup> where sidewalks were needed.

**Karl Schemberg, 207 Lisa Lane**, asked about the 47<sup>th</sup> crosswalk, which side was that located on? Mr. Jacobs showed the location on the west side of 47<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Schemberg asked if it wouldn’t be better to locate that on the east side as there would be one less lane to cross and they wouldn’t have the deceleration lane to contend with? Mr. Littlehales stated that he felt that was a good idea. Mr. Schemberg stated that his only other suggestion was to put a “no turn on red” sign at the intersection. Mr. Jacobs stated that it was not standard to put a “no turn on red” sign at an intersection with a decel lane. Mr. Bittig replied that might not be the standard, but we requested and got that at the eastbound 422 intersection of Lincoln Road for the Wal-Mart plan. Mr. Koch stated that they could look at that.

**Ralph Bibbus, 212 Gibraltar Road**, stated that his concern was the traffic noise and noise abatement. The Planning Commission talked about the traffic noise, but what was going to be done about it? He stated that he has lived here for 23 years and could not sleep with his windows open in good weather, which disturbed him. What was going to be done about that? The second item was, since he was brought into this at the last minute and wasn’t sure about the details as to what had already transpired, he asked if this would be put to any public referendum or public voting? Mrs. Franckowiak replied no. Mr. Bibbus stated that he did not know anyone who was in favor of the project.

### **Exeter Commons continued**

**Randy Newnham, 4489 Delmar Drive**, stated that he was wondering what would happen to pedestrians once they entered the center, were they then faced with just a huge parking lot? Mr. Trapper replied that they would be accessing through the parking lot drive aisles, no different then if you were going to anchor C and had to park at another location and walked over. Mr. Newman stated that he was concerned with the internal traffic flow, because the Target center on the other side of town had a really bad internal traffic flow and he thought this one reminded him of that one. Mr. Trapper replied that was a valid comment and when they started to design their center, they were told about the difficulty of that center. With their design, they placed the parking perpendicular to the center with an east - west drive aisle. They felt that they did a much better job with internal traffic flow.

**Walter Gubernot, 206 W. 46<sup>th</sup> St.**, stated that they were putting a shopping center at the busiest intersection in the Township and that was not the place for a shopping center, it should be put somewhere else. The traffic would be worse; it already backed up past the Mt. Penn exit. He knew someone that had a garage in Gibraltar and he had a property that someone was looking to build homes on; where were these people going to go? They would come across Gibraltar Road to 46<sup>th</sup> street and the volume of traffic was just going to “blow up”.

Mr. Koch stated that he wanted to discuss the second review letter dated August 31<sup>st</sup>. There would be a chart which would show the present owners with the boundaries and the new owners with their boundaries and hopefully that would address some of the issues. Under Zoning - #1 was resolved. Concerning comment #3, they would place a note on the plan that the “free standing” lot was not a separate building lot. Mr. Koch further stated that comment #5 was important. They were taking a portion of the Sunoco property, by condemnation, along the front of 422 and the rear at DeMoss Road. The Solicitor had implied that with condemnation it was not necessary to go through a subdivision, so they did not provide an area on the plan for signatures from Sunoco. They wanted to be sure there was no misunderstanding for that situation. He further stated that Mr. Hoffert would confirm that. Mr. Bittig asked who was doing the condemnations? Mr. Koch replied Exeter Township. Mr. Koch asked if Mr. Peifer understood that? Mr. Peifer replied that was the first he heard of that and asked if that was the case with DeMoss in the rear? Mr. Koch replied yes. Mr. Bittig stated that he felt obligated to make a political statement; he was vehemently opposed as a private citizen to the taking of land by eminent domain for commercial development and for the benefits thereof. He further stated, shame on our Solicitor and Board of Supervisors for supporting that kind of activity. Mr. Koch replied that we were relocating DeMoss Road as the Board desired and was not for private gain, it was a public street. Mr. Schwartz replied yes, it was a public street; however the intent of the official map was to extend DeMoss Rd. through, not to end there. Mr. Koch replied that he was not disagreeing with him. Mr. Schwartz stated that it was raising the question, what was the status of the plan and was it their intend to abandon DeMoss Rd.? He further stated that we needed to address that issue with the Board of Supervisors to find if that was acceptable to them.

Mrs. Franckowiak replied that it was acceptable by virtue of the fact that the Board started the condemnation proceedings. Mr. Schwartz responded by stating that the Planning Commission wanted that addressed in writing from the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Koch replied that they were trying to work that out with Sunoco. He then stated that they would comply with #6. Under SALDO #1, that had gone away. There would be no residential areas on the site. They would comply with #14, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, & 28. Item #29 would be addressed. They would relocate the pipeline and show that on a future submission.

### **Public comment**

**Karl Schemberg, 207 Lisa Lane**, asked how much ground would be taken from the Sunoco? Mr. Koch replied that he truthfully did not know off the top of his head. He did not want to give incorrect information.

### **Exeter Commons continued**

**Thomas Howell, P.O. Box 4635**, stated that since the people of Exeter were paying a large portion of their money for the traffic improvements, he thought that someone should look out for our best interest. If it did not work or if whatever was put in was sub par construction, who was looking out for the people? We needed to only pay once, not twice.

**Jeremy Slonaker, 4375 Prestwick**, stated that they previously discussed rational and irrational people with regards to walking inside of the parking area where they park in one area and walk clear across to the other side. So since they did not want to deal with irrational people, they were not providing sidewalks for the rational people. He felt that not only were they not dealing with the irrational people, they did not want to deal with the rational people who used sidewalks to get from one area to another.

Mr. Wilson asked about the proposed “truck-flow” through the site. Mr. McFall and Mr. Trapper addressed the question. Mr. Schwartz stated that his frustration was that we were seeing plans with things that were a “done deal” with no guidance from the Board of Supervisors. We were assuming that when they came in with a plan that meant it had been approved. We needed guidance from the Supervisors and we had gotten none. He further stated that was why he was short with the developer. Mr. Littlehales replied that there were too many things that were sprung on us and we had no clue that they were already covered by the Board. Some of those items had a great impact on what decisions needed to be made and we did not have time to evaluate them when it was just “dropped” on us. Mr. Schwartz stated that things that were “done deals” with the Board were open questions for us; we needed to know the answers. DeMoss Road to him was far from a “done deal”. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that issue was addressed in the Board minutes, and now you were asking for the Board to go an extra step to have Troy take time to write a letter to the Planning Commission when you all got copies of the minutes. She said it was documented in the minutes and the Planning Commission all got copies and the assumption was that they all read them. Mr. Schwartz replied that he was sorry but we got the Board minutes the same time that we got everything else, he did not have time to read them before he came in and he had no way of getting them before that. Mr. Littlehales stated that he read them online, but when they were online they were never up to date. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that she would pass that on to Troy. Mr. Schwartz stated that what the Board decided one night changed another night and he did not feel it was our responsibility to keep up with changing decisions. We need (on issues that we have identified as critical to this development) clear guidance to say “this has been decided, you don’t have to worry about this; this is the way we are going”. What happens to DeMoss Road, what happens to the cross-town connector, what happens to pedestrian crossings, what about the fence and the retaining wall? These were the issues we need to hear about and have a definite answer, not by reading the minutes. Mr. Wilson stated that at a previous meeting we mentioned items we needed to hear about, he mentioned them at the TIF meeting and he also provided an email with questions that needed answers and we got no response. They were in our minutes, the Board could read our minutes and find the questions and give us the answers. We need the answers in order to move forward and not be in direct conflict with the Supervisors and then we could work together and get it done. Tonight we found out that there were condemnations happening and that was never mentioned to this Commission before now. The Supervisors might have known it, but we did not. Mrs. Franckowiak replied again, the assumption was that they were in the minutes, so she would talk to Troy and see what could be put together for the Planning Commission, but she offered concern at burdening the manager with yet another task.

**6. CONDITIONAL USE – GOUGHLER – 254 PENNSYLVANIA AVE**

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Mr. Goughler planned to have an ice cream truck that he would operate three months out of year. He would park the truck in his driveway. The neighbor impact letters were returned with no concerns. He met the intent of the Ordinance. Mr. Goughler stated that when the truck was parked in the driveway all the magnetic signs would be removed. The only signs to remain would be the caution sign.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Shantz, to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the conditional use for 254 Pennsylvania Ave. The motion carried unanimously.

**7. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mr. Wilson reminded the Planning Commission about the workshop scheduled on September 18<sup>th</sup> at 7pm. Ms. Cusimano reminded the members to bring along the package she provided with the items that needed to be discussed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Unger, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to adjourn the September 4, 2007 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 10:12pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

John W. Bittig  
Planning Commission Secretary

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Clarification letter  
BOS: Goughler Conditional Use  
BOS: Fairview Corner Preliminary plan