

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 7, 2008

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, October 7, 2008 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
Greg T. Unger
Gregory A. Shantz

ABSENT: Gary L. Shane

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Craig Peifer, GVC Consulting Engineer
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary

1. MINUTES

MOTION BY Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to approve the minutes of the September 2, 2008 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Unger, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Littlehales voting in favor and Mr. Shantz abstaining.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Unger, seconded by Mr. Shane, to approve the agenda of the October 7, 2008 Planning Commission meeting with the removal of the Home Occupation and the addition of unapproved Subdivision deadlines. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW

- A. EXETER REALTY MANAGEMENT – FINAL PLAN; DIAMOND CREDIT UNION – FINAL PLAN; AEM ARCHITECTS OFFICE BUILDING – PRELIMINARY PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Shantz to accept the preceding plans for review. The motion carried unanimously.

The following business was discussed:

4. EXETER REALTY MANAGEMENT – FINAL PLAN – John Hoffert

GVC reviewed the Exeter Realty Management Final Land Development Plan (reference letter dated October 2, 2008).

Mr. Peifer stated that there were only two bolded items in the review letter; one was the executed agreement with the adjoining property for the removal of the paving. Mr. Hoffert replied that with the property to the south there currently was a section of the existing parking lot that extends down on to the Hertzog tract. An agreement has been prepared, but it hasn't been executed yet. They hoped to have the agreement executed prior to the next Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. Hoffert further stated that the only other bolded item was the uniformity ratio for the lighting. Mr. Peifer stated that we discussed that last month and they were requesting a waiver. Mr. Hoffert stated that they were looking for a 5:1 ratio, rather than the 4:1 ratio as written in the Ordinance. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Littlehales how much exposure would we be getting into in

Exeter Realty Management continued

granting this waiver, we have another waiver request for this same parameter. Was 4:1 a bad ratio?

Mr. Littlehales stated that it was just a measurement of the evenness of the lighting on the property.

Mr. Schwartz stated that it would be critical on a highway, but it wouldn't have enough of an impact on a parking lot. Mr. Bittig replied that we should keep that in mind when we were discussing Diamond Credit Union, we don't want to step on a "land mine". He further stated that all the lighting would be in the rear. Mr. Littlehales stated that it wouldn't be a problem with this property. Mr. Hoffert showed the Planning Commission the lighting plan.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Shantz to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant the waiver of the requirement of Lighting Ordinance Section 6.A and allow a ratio of 5:1 as all the lighting would be in the rear parking area. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Shantz, Mr. Unger, Mr. Schwartz voting in favor and Mr. Littlehales abstaining.

Mr. Hoffert stated that they have shown the dimensions of the shed on the plan as asked for at the last meeting. He brought along signed and sealed plans, four copies of the approved E & S control plans, three executed copies of the Stormwater Management plan, and three copies of the Stormwater Best Management Practices agreements, a check for the Stormwater Inspection Fund, disk of the property and, as per Renee Woods, a Planning Module was not needed. Mr. Hoffert stated that all items have been addressed with the exception of the executed agreement with the neighboring property for the temporary construction easement and asked for Conditional Approval based on the agreement being executed.

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Unger to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant Final Plan approval for Exeter Realty Management Land Development subject to an executed agreement being received. The motion carried unanimously.

5. DIAMOND CREDIT UNION – FINAL PLAN – Scott Miller

GVC reviewed the Diamond Credit Union Final Land Development Plan (reference letter dated October 2, 2008).

Mr. Miller stated that they would comply with the landscaping requirements. Under SALDO they would correct the waiver listed on the plan and would submit the waiver formally for approval by the Board of Supervisors. The rest of the items were basically clean up. The improvements agreements, filing the plan, the E & S plan has been submitted to the BCCD, they received the administratively complete letter and were waiting for the technical review. They would be submitting the application for the PennDOT HOP for the installation of the utilities. Stormwater has been cleaned up and they would be sure to have the agreements and the necessary funds in place. Mr. Miller further stated that under Lighting, they would be re-doing the lighting plan so it would comply with the Ordinance. Mr. Bittig asked about three inter-related items; #7 fire hydrants installed within 600ft; #9 letter from the water authority and #19 the HOP, in order to get water to the site they would need to come across the highway. Mr. Miller replied that they have received the information from the Water Company, which was part of the agreement that needed to be filled out with fixture types for the proposed water use, that information has been provided by the architect and was forwarded to the Water Company for their final review and consideration. Previously, in discussions it did not show but there would be a fire hydrant within the property so there would be adequate pressure for fire protection. Mr. Bittig stated that it has not been incorporated on the plan. Mr. Miller replied that they did not know the final location yet, but it would be added. The HOP would be applied for in the Water Companies name. Mr. Miller stated that they have received the exemption for the sewer-planning module from DEP. He then asked if the Board would be comfortable to grant conditional Final Plan approval and if not they would come back next month with all the items cleaned up. Mr. Schwartz asked if they would open

Diamond Credit Union

the road or bore? Mr. Miller replied that he felt that they would bore. The Planning Commission felt that they should clean up the items and return.

6. AEM ARCHITECTS OFFICE BUILDING – PRELIMINARY PLAN – Scott Miller - Phil Leinbach

GVC reviewed the AEM Architects Office Building Preliminary Land Development Plan (reference letter dated October 3, 2008).

Mr. Miller stated that they had been before the Planning Commission as sketch plan and at that time there were some issues with zoning; however, the Board of Supervisors approved the Restricted Office District on Monday, so the first couple of items in the review letter have been taken care of. They complied with the new overlay district. The only item under Zoning that they had a question about was the landscape buffer along Romig Ave. That area bordered the residential zoning area and they wondered how much buffering did they need along there? The Ordinance stated that it needed to be a complete visual barrier. He further stated that AEM architects were here to show what the building would look like in that area. The structure would be one story on that side. From the visual standpoint they could do an alternate landscaping plan, which would look more residential in the field. Mr. Wilson asked to see the architectural. Mr. Leinbach showed the model renderings. The view from Romig Ave was low profile, residential looking and they would prefer to do something more residential in look with the landscaping rather than a solid visual barrier. They wanted to keep it open in order to permit day lighting as they were building green. Mr. Littlehales replied that would be something we would need to consider to promote green buildings. Mr. Miller stated that they were pursuing LEED so they would have some solar capabilities on the building to help pick up the day lighting. Mr. Schwartz stated that the problem was it was in Zoning. Mr. Leinbach replied he understood. Mr. Schwartz stated that we could not waive something in Zoning, however the Zoning Officer could interpret something there. The Planning Commission would not like to force them to go to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Schwartz further stated that we would not like to be that restrictive in that zone.

Mr. Leinbach stated that they would approach the Zoning Hearing Board if needed, however, they would like to have the Zoning Officer look into that. Mr. Miller stated that their plan complied with the parking however if they needed to seek relief for parking, then they would also seek relief for buffer landscaping. Mr. Bittig stated that the Planning Commission seemed to be in agreement with landscaping that would look residential in feel instead of a complete barrier and he wasn't sure how much interpretation flexibility the Zoning Officer had, but if they would need to take it to the Zoning Hearing Board he would support that. Mr. Miller stated that he would see what the definition of visual barrier was. Mrs. Franckowiak asked where they were finding the visual barrier, because Section 604 stated suitable barrier. Mr. Peifer replied Section 608. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that Section 604 cross-references 608 and she could look into it and give her interpretation. Mr. Bittig stated that we would leave that in her capable hands. Mr. Miller stated that they would come back with a revision and see if that would be acceptable to the Zoning Officer. Mr. Leinbach stated that on the adjacent residential property they were working with the residents and would come to an agreement. The neighbors have already started a barrier on their property and they would like to reach an agreement and work on that with them. Mr. Schwartz stated that the EAC has been looking at the tree list and they felt it was too restrictive. The EAC had that on their agenda, ready to discuss that, however, in September he was the only member to show up. They hoped to work on that at the next meeting. Mr. Miller stated that #6 under zoning, the way they would be handling solid waste was basically it would be stored in the building in the rear and would be wheeled out to the curb just like a residential use. Mr. Leinbach stated that they would not need outside screened area. Mr. Miller stated that they would place a note on the plan noting that. Mr. Miller stated that concerning #7 regarding the loading space, the proposed deliveries for the

AEM Architects Office building continued

building would be UPS trucks and those types of deliveries, they would not need a loading dock or need for tractor trailers to make deliveries. They could provide documentation that would list the type of frequency and vehicles that would deliver, have it reviewed and put a note on the plan to that affect. They would have a drop off area, not a loading dock. Mr. Miller stated that for the tree inventory reports, most of the trees were old and decayed. They would provide additional landscaping, would they need to document that or would the statement of what they proposed to do suffice? Mr. Peifer replied that they should have the replacement trees come from the approved list. Mr. Miller stated that would do that. Mr. Peifer stated that they could list that on the plan itself. Mr. Bittig stated that they should list what was there today. Mr. Miller replied that it would be listed on the existing condition plan. Mr. Miller stated that the items under SALDO would be taken care. The infiltration testing was completed and they would comply with the Stormwater Ordinance. They did not need to do an NPDES permit with the BCCD or DEP as they were disturbing less than an acre. Mr. Unger stated that they should be sure that their infiltration would not permit water to percolate out through the steep bank in the front of their property. Mr. Miller replied that they would look into that. Mr. Miller then stated that they would provide the necessary footcandles in order to comply with the lighting Ordinance. Other than that there were only clean up items. Mr. Bittig stated that the County letter stated that the existing sanitary sewer lateral and overhead wires from S.R. 2021 were to be removed. If the removal extends into the right-of-way, a highway occupancy permit would be needed. Mr. Bittig asked if that was a fact?

Mr. Miller stated that they were still working on the utilities and one of the challenges was that they would like to occupy the building while the construction was going on. They would like to balance the demolition and the utilities with the new connection and that would be addressed accordingly. Mr. Wilson stated that he hoped that they would be a "good neighbor" when they did their signage. Mr. Leinbach stated that they hoped for exposure on Perkiomen Ave and possibly something on the building. They would be sure to comply with Zoning. Mr. Miller asked for Preliminary Plan approval with all the items being completed during Final Plan stage. Mr. Bittig stated that he would prefer to see stormwater and other items addressed before granting Preliminary Plan approval.

MOTION BY Mr. Unger, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the AEM Architects Office Building Preliminary Plan subject to all outstanding items in the October 3, 2008 GVC review letter being addressed at Final Plan stage. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Shantz, Mr. Unger, Mr. Littlehales voting in favor and Mr. Bittig voting opposed.

7. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – MICHAEL HARTMAN – MARCO FOLINO

Mr. Hartman stated that there was a lot at the intersection of Lorane & Hafer Roads that Folino builders would like to subdivide into two lots to build "green" homes there. One problem was that if they would provide additional right-of-way, as required by SALDO, then they could not meet the 12,000 sf. per lot requirement in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Hartman further stated that they wanted to come in to ask the Planning Commission if they would be able to waive the requirement of providing additional right-of-way in order to move forward with the plan. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that even if the Planning Commission would recommend giving the waiver, given the climate now with overcrowding the schools, and the Walk Bike Berks project, she just did not see the Board granting the waiver. It was noted that the adjoining property on Hafer Road was subjected to the same r-o-w requirement when it was subdivided several years ago. The Planning Commission asked questions concerning green building, but agreed that they would not support the waiver.

8. UNAPPROVED SUBDIVISION DEADLINES

Ms. Cusimano stated that there were three subdivision/land development plans that needed to be addressed by the Planning Commission.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Unger to recommend the Board of Supervisors reject the Applebee's revised drainage plan if the plan was not taken to completion by the Board meeting on October 27th. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors reject the Amber Hill Subdivision unless a time extension was granted. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors reject the Rite Aid Land Development plan unless a time extension was granted. The motion carried unanimously.

9. WORKSHOP REMINDER – MONDAY, OCTOBER 20TH 6:30pm to 8:30pm

Mrs. Franckowiak handed out maps for the workshop and asked the Planning Commission members to please bring them along on Monday, October 20th.

Public Comment

Jordan Bausher, 391 Ritters Lane, asked if there would be an agenda for the October 20th workshop? Mrs. Franckowiak replied there would not be an agenda as the only item was to talk about sidewalks.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Shantz, to adjourn the October 7, 2008 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 8:52 pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

John W. Bittig
Planning Commission Secretary

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Exeter Realty Management Final Plan and Waiver request
BOS: AEM Architects Office Building Preliminary Plan
BOS: Applebee's, Rite Aid and Amber Hill rejection letters