

**MINUTES**  
**EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**JANUARY 7, 2009**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, January 7, 2009 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  
Paul L. Schwartz, Vice Chairman  
John W. Bittig, Secretary  
Richard Littlehales  
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. Unger, to approve the minutes of the December 2, 2008 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Unger, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, to approve the agenda of the January 7, 2009 Planning Commission meeting with the removal of Henry Filippini's Informal Discussion and Miller II Subdivision and the addition of the Agricultural Security Area request and Scope of Traffic Study for Rite Aid. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. APPROVE APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

A. **FIRST IMPRESSIONS – PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to accept the preceding plan for review. The motion carried unanimously. The following business was discussed:

**4. REORGANIZATION & SET MEETING SCHEDULE & RESCHEDULE NOVEMBER MEETING DATE**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Unger to keep the same officers as the previous year. Mr. Littlehales respectfully declined due to personal reasons.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to elect Mr. Donald Wilson as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2009 and Mr. John Bittig as Secretary of the Planning Commission for the year 2009. The motion carried with Mr. Unger, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Littlehales voting in favor and Mr. Bittig, Mr. Wilson abstaining.

Mr. Wilson thanked the Planning Commission for their confidence.

## **Reorganization continued**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Unger to elect Mr. Paul Schwartz as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2009. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Unger, Mr. Littlehales voting in favor and Mr. Schwartz abstaining.

### **\* Mr. Shantz arrived**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Unger, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to continue to hold the Planning Commission meetings the first Tuesday of each month and change the time to 7:00pm, with the exception of the November Planning Commission meeting which would be moved to the day after Election Day, Wednesday, November 4<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm. The motion carried unanimously.

## **5. REDNER'S FUELING STATION – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN – Nick McAndrew**

GVC reviewed the Redner's Fueling Station Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated December 31, 2009).

Mr. McAndrew asked about zoning comment #5, the Environmental Hazard Report, was there a problem or was it a general statement? Mr. Schwartz stated that the EAC had not seen it yet. Mr. Bittig stated that he looked at it and it's pretty benign. Mr. Peifer stated that the whole tract was reviewed previously when Applebee's and the driveway to 422 were done. The Planning Commission agreed that it was just a statement. Mr. McAndrew stated that comment #8 concerned off-street parking for one employee; however no handicapped accessible van space was provided. That area was graded so that it's accessible but was just not handicapped designated, as only one employee would be working in the booth. Mr. Wilson asked how long the station would be open? Mr. McAndrew replied from 6am to 11pm and there would be two employees there during the switch over but they could designate two parking spaces. Mr. Wilson stated that they should be designated as employee spaces. Mr. Peifer stated that the issue we're raising was that there needed to be one handicapped space but that's the only use then; not an employee space, unless the employee was handicapped. Mr. Unger stated that they could put them next to each other and it didn't need to be labeled handicapped so someone wouldn't get a ticket. Mr. Peifer replied that by Ordinance it needed to be handicapped designated. Mr. Unger asked if it could be waived? Mr. Peifer replied that it was a Zoning and an ADA issue. Mr. McAndrew suggested that the best solution was to build a second space and keep one as a handicapped space. He then stated that under SALDO, comment #6 stated that the required flow rate and residual pressure for the fire suppression must be provided to the water company and should also be coordinated with Terry Naugle of GVC; they would comply. Mr. McAndrew stated that # 7; Traffic Impact Study waiver request was discussed last time and he provided a written waiver request.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Unger seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of SALDO Section 5.9814; Traffic Impact Study for Redner's Fueling Station as it was a minor addition to the shopping plaza. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. McAndrew stated that under Stormwater comment #3 concerning the blanket easement, he believed the Township Solicitor was looking into that. Ms. Cusimano replied that the Solicitor stated that he would draw up the agreement. Mr. Unger asked to see a plan that would show how the fueling station was situated as it related to the rest of the property. Mr. McAndrew complied. Mr. Bittig asked if they submitted the E & S control plan to the County. Mr. McAndrew replied that the County was making them apply for a permit even though they're less than an acre of disturbance so they were working on that. Mr. Littlehales asked about the

### **Redner's Fueling continued**

lighting, was there a plan submitted? Mr. McAndrew replied that they included the lighting plan with the submission and it was zero everywhere and the lights would be recessed in the canopy with no side glare. He then asked for conditional approval based on satisfying all the comments in the December 31<sup>st</sup> GVC review letter. Mr. Schwartz replied that the only minor issue would be if the EAC had any comments. Ms. Cusimano stated that she would pass along any comments to Mr. McAndrew.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Shantz, seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors grant Preliminary/Final Land Development approval for the Redner's Fueling Station plan subject to addressing any outstanding items in the December 31<sup>st</sup> GVC review letter including the review by the EAC. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Public Comment**

**Jordan Bausher, 391 Ritters Road, stated** that last Monday he was standing at the intersection of 422 and Gibraltar Road and he saw two ladies walk down from the Vet place to Arby's and then cross the street to the bank and across the street again to Burger King and to the restaurant, it was a pedestrian nightmare and he was reminded about the meeting with the Supervisors where they talked about the 422 Corridor and sidewalks. He knew that it was a very difficult thing, but if you think about it, the State/Commonwealth has perpetrated on us about two miles of the worst section of US422 that exists. Most of old 422 has been bypassed. When you think of the areas in Wernersville or Robesonia, the streets were wide and they had sidewalks there, but most of the heavy traffic there is now going up 222 and 78. We have a problem here and he wanted to focus on the principle of the danger that is there. He agreed with the Supervisors where sidewalks of the normal type would be dangerous along 422, but then he also agreed with the other Supervisors that if we don't start now, we never would. There were other types of sidewalks other than what we see in Farming Ridge. Consider the State also had a right-of-way and if the Township would make sure that sidewalks would be put in beyond those right-of-ways then it would take more property away from the owners. Think also about one other thing, the bridge that crossed the Schuylkill River on 422 at Valley Forge; there was sidewalk on that bridge, but there was a Jersey barrier there that protected the people walking. If someone got stuck on the bridge they were really in trouble. What he was pointing out to the Planning Commission was that he was hoping in the future that we would not just close the door on the Ordinance that pertained to sidewalks because there were other alternatives, not only for 422, but also for a lot of other areas. Also please keep in mind the area along 562 when the school comes up for development. So hopefully we can do something inventive and constructive to help pedestrians in the future.

### **6. RHINO BUILDING SERVICES – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN – Scott Miller**

GVC reviewed the Rhino Building Services Preliminary/Final Plan (reference letter dated January 2, 2009).

Mr. Miller stated that they would be asking for a waiver of impervious cover and that they added an ADA accessible ramp into the building with one ADA parking space. He further stated that comment #3 concerned the intended use, it was listed as commercial and they intended to use the building as office space. They calculated the parking spaces and they complied. Mr. Miller asked if #7, Environmental Standards would be applicable as it was a refit of an existing building? The Planning Commission felt that a note on the plan that they would remain in compliance with the Environmental Performance Standards would suffice. Mr. Miller asked about comment #14 for the proposed sign. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that it would be handled at the time of building permit application. Mr. Miller stated that they would change the

### **Rhino Building continued**

trees. He then asked about the relocation of the shed, was the location acceptable? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that if they physically attached the shed to the garage they would not have to have the five-foot separation distance, it was up to them to decide how they would like to handle that. And they would be compliant with the setback as long as it was located the same distance to the side property line as the existing garage. Mr. Miller stated that they would provide additional buffer along the property line and were trying to add more green to the area and they would make modifications to comply with the lighting. Mr. Littlehales stated that they might need some auxiliary building lighting, which would need to be accounted for on the plan. Mr. Bittig stated that we should address the waiver.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirements of the Stormwater Ordinance as the impact on the project will be diminimus. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he wanted to comment on #17 concerning buffer. He was trying to get a consensus from the EAC on the new list of trees. He would like to see allowing any native PA Trees on the site whether or not they were on the current list and provide some leeway, but Douglas fir was not on the list.

Mr. Miller asked for conditional Preliminary/Final approval.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Greg Shantz to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Rhino Building Services Preliminary/Final plan subject to addressing all outstanding items in the January 2, 2009 GVC review letter. The motion carried unanimously.

### **7. CUSTOM PROCESSING NEW WAREHOUSE – FINAL PLAN** – Pat Dolan

GVC reviewed the Custom Processing Final Land Development Plan (reference letter dated January 2, 2009).

Mr. Dolan stated that the first issue was the tree inventory report. He thanked Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Bittig for meeting with them last month. They were resurveying the trees for the proper count and then have the report corrected and submitted to the Township. He then stated that they provided the color renderings of the building, which were then placed on the board. Mr. Dolan stated that they would place the hydrant on the plan and showed where it would be located. Mr. Unger stated that he did not think that the curve was the proper place to put that, but he would defer to the Fire Marshal. Mr. Bittig replied that GVC reviewed that. Mr. Dolan stated that he would check with Terry Naugle, GVC to get the correct location before they provided that on the plan. Mr. Dolan stated that there would be around 50 trees that would need to be replaced, how was that handled? They might need to replace some of them offsite. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that we would handle that the same as Berkshire Bank, we would just hold the money in escrow and then the Township would approve the locations of the trees. Mr. Dolan stated that they would just place a note on the plan stating that they would replace whatever number of trees were determined to be needed.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Unger to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Custom Processing New Warehouse Final Land Development plan subject to addressing all outstanding items in the January 2, 2009 GVC review letter. The motion carried unanimously.

## **8. FIRST IMPRESSIONS – PRELIMINARY PLAN**

GVC reviewed the First Impressions Preliminary Plan (reference letter dated January 2, 2009).

Mr. Hoffert stated that the Kelly's would like to place an addition to the rear of their beauty salon and although the economy turned to the worse they had future plans to add an addition that would be cantilevered over the back parking deck. All the utilities were in place and they had access off of Perkiomen Ave. Everything appeared to be in shape other than modifications for parking and lighting. They had a problem with the ADA space; it couldn't be close to the entrance because of the grade. Mr. Peifer stated that Terry Naugle would review that and comment. Mr. Hoffert stated that with item #8 they would eliminate that space. Concerning #9, they would show the trash area. Mr. Hoffert further stated that with item #10, it was a second story cantilever addition, the ground cover wouldn't change, but they could put a side on it at a future date so all calcs were modified to account for it to be solid based. Mr. Hoffert then submitted copies of the architectural drawings with one full size set 24 x 36, and he also brought reduced copies as laid out and designed by Design Works for the Planning Commission to review. Mr. Hoffert then stated that the existing deck to the rear was the secondary access. The decking would come off, then it would go back up when the work was done and would still maintain the secondary access point for the second level. Mr. Hoffert then stated that comment #6 concerned an EAS or an Environmental Hazard Report; because of the simplistic nature of the project, did the Planning Commission have any requirements for those reports? Mr. Bittig stated that there would be no need for a Hazard Report or Environmental Assessment Statement for the project. Mr. Schwartz stated that this would be the same as the Rhino project, just put a note on the plan that they would comply with the Ordinance. Mr. Hoffert replied that they would do that. Mr. Hoffert stated that they would be adding possibly two new employees and it did affect the possibility of increased sanitary sewer water consumption, but it would be diminimus in nature relative to any increase and they could put that in writing to give to Paul Herb for his recommendation or opinion. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that she would forward that to Paul when she would receive it. Mr. Hoffert then stated that they had a written waiver request for two items relative to Lighting. They revised the Lighting Plan and they were going to go with three standards. Currently there was one outside flood lamp and on the front of the building they had wall mounted decorator lamps. The first waiver, based on the review letter by GVC comment #1; the prescribed ratio was not to exceed 20:1; it was 20.5:1. Comment #2 relative to uniformity ratio throughout the parking area, prescribed at a 4:1 ratio, it was a 5:1 ratio. The light would not affect the vision of motorists so they were requesting a waiver. Mr. Peifer pointed out that the Planning Commission wrote the Ordinance. Mr. Littlehales replied that was what waivers were for. Mr. Hoffert stated that the highlighted tails did spill over onto the Wawa property. Mr. Peifer stated it was in Wawa's detention pond. Mr. Hoffert stated that they would contact Wawa for the record to see if they would allow the "spillage" of light onto their property. Mr. Hoffert asked if the Planning Commission would support the lighting waivers. Mr. Schwartz replied that he would have no problem with that, but for the record would like to have correspondence from Wawa acknowledging their approval/acceptance of the "spillage".

**MOTION BY** Mr. Schwartz seconded by Mr. Shantz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirement of the Lighting Ordinance Section 6.A and allow a ratio of 5:1 instead of 4:1 and the max. to min of 20.5:1 instead of 20:1 max. to min. as the lighting would not affect the vision of motorists; also subject to receiving the letter from Wawa concurring that the minor "spillage" onto their property was acceptable. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Unger, Mr. Shantz, Mr. Schwartz voting in favor and Mr. Littlehales abstaining.

Mr. Hoffert stated that he had one final question in looking at the GVC review letter that was reviewed as Preliminary Plan and they had addressed most of those items, when they resubmit the revised plan, could they submit that as Preliminary/Final plan? The Planning Commission agreed that was fine.

**9. EXETER BIBLE CHURCH – LIGHTING WAIVER – Paul Weber**

GVC reviewed the Exeter Bible Church Lighting Waiver (reference letter dated January 7, 2009).

Mr. Weber stated that they were requesting waivers from the Lighting Ordinance for Exeter Bible Church parking lot lighting. Mr. Schwartz asked why they were replacing the Lighting? Mr. Weber replied that Met-Ed was removing the streetlights that they currently paid Met-Ed to use. They needed to provide lighting for their parking lot for safety and security lighting for their buses. Mr. Littlehales stated that they were doing this on a “shoestring” budget and he donated his services. A lengthy question and answer period with the Planning Commission ensued with a final decision from the members.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Schwartz to recommend the Board of Supervisors waive the requirements of Lighting Ordinance Section 6.A.3 to allow a minimum illumination level of 0.1 instead of 0.2; and allow a min to max of 26:1 instead of 20:1. Also Sections 6.D.3 and 6.D.4 to allow the full illumination levels after 11PM as they were using these lights for security purposes to curb vandalism on their property and the lights were only 150 watts each. Section 6.I.4.a to allow a pole height of 32 feet, as there would be no light trespass onto neighboring properties. Section 6.I.3 to allow fixture B be mounted with an angle of tilt of 20 degrees above horizontal, which would provide the maximum lighting efficiency while still maintaining cutoff criteria. Section 7.C which required certain notes be included on the lighting plan due to the limited capacity of plan printout size available to the Exeter Bible Church. They have provided a letter with the required notes to be placed in the file. The motion carried with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Bittig, Mr. Unger, Mr. Shantz, Mr. Schwartz voting in favor and Mr. Littlehales abstaining.

**10. WOODBURNING ORDINANCE**

The Wood Burning Ordinance was discussed.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Shantz seconded by Mr. Bittig to recommend the Board of Supervisors adopt the new Wood Burning Ordinance. The motion carried unanimously.

**11. AMENDMENT TO SALDO**

Mrs. Franckowiak explained that currently in our SALDO there was a generic Public Improvements Agreement form and the Solicitor made changes to that Section of the Ordinance so our Improvements Agreements would be specific to each subdivision or land development. Mr. Bittig noted that the proposed amendment essentially replaced existing Sections 3.61, 3.62, and 3.65, but did not say anything about existing sections 3.63, 3.64, and 3.66 through 3.73. He questioned whether the unmentioned sections were being retained or were being deleted; if deleted, were we losing anything? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that she would check into that with the Solicitor.

The Planning Commission agreed it was needed; however no motion was made pending a reply from the solicitor.

**12. AGRICULTURE SECURITY AREA REQUESTS**

Ms. Cusimano stated that we had a letter in our packet from Troy Bingaman with a list of five properties that were requesting to be placed in the Oley Agriculture Security Area. The Planning Commission was curious why Exeter Township did not have its own Agriculture Security Area/ASA. They suggested that perhaps

### **Agriculture Security continued**

this should be investigated and, if feasible, pursued. If this was something the Board of Supervisors was going to entertain, then the suggestion was to have these five applications included into the Exeter ASA. If this was not something for the Township to pursue, then the Planning Commission fully supported and endorsed these applications/properties being advanced and included in the Oley ASA.

### **Public Comment**

**Jordan Bausher, 391 Ritters Lane**, explained the Ag Security Area regulations and answered questions by the Planning Commission. He also stated that the properties were protected from eminent domain, but not complete protection.

**Michele Barrett, 120 W 47<sup>th</sup> Street**, stated that they just submitted an application for comprehensive greenway and transportation plan for the Township and while her goals were slightly different she thought that the greenway plan also would address the long range plan for open space for the Township. She wasn't sure if the ASA connected to the greenway plan. Mr. Wilson replied that open space and Ag Security were two different things.

### **13. SCOPE OF TRAFFIC STUDY FOR RITE AID**

GVC provided a scope of Traffic Study letter for Rite Aid (reference letter dated January 6, 2009). The Planning Commission discussed the Traffic Study Letter for Rite Aid. Mr. Unger stated that it would be ludicrous for a Traffic Study to be done when the road was under construction; they should wait until the roadway was completed. Mr. Shantz asked if we would make them wait a year to do their study? He did not think that we could make them wait that long. Mr. Peifer stated that we weren't talking about another Exeter Commons going in either; it was a single store. Mr. Unger stated that they would need to take into consideration Exeter Commons when they did the study. Mr. Schwartz stated that the turn lane in front of their property was closed. Mr. Unger stated that they should do a study on top of the study that was done for Exeter Commons to figure out what was additionally going to happen. Mr. Wilson asked if they knew that Rite Aid got the right in/right out onto 422? Mrs. Franckowiak replied yes, we received the letter from PennDOT. Mr. Schwartz asked how they would assess the traffic impact on a road that was closed? Mr. Wilson replied that they would be counting the traffic on the main highway. Mr. Unger felt that 25 to 30% of the people do not travel on 422 during the construction.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Shantz to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the recommended areas listed in the GVC letter plus the intersection of Oak Parkway & Gibraltar Road and also recommended that the traffic study not be completed until the all traffic lanes on 422 were open to be able to have an accurate count. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Public Comment**

**Tom Danks, 204 46<sup>th</sup> Street**, stated that they were talking about a lot of traffic coming off of 422 onto 47<sup>th</sup>, what about onto 46<sup>th</sup> street, the back end of where Rite Aid would be, was anyone looking at that? Was that the additional count they were discussing? Mr. Schwartz replied that the proposed study areas were 422 & 47<sup>th</sup> St.; 47<sup>th</sup> & Oak Parkway; 47<sup>th</sup> St. & the existing alley between Oak Parkway & 422; Oak Parkway & proposed site driveway; they were proposing to come out of the back of the property. Mr. Danks replied that they were assuming that everyone was going to turn onto Oak Parkway when in fact they have the

### **Rite Aid Traffic Study continued**

option to go down 46<sup>th</sup> street up to Greentree. He further stated that he if had the option he would go the back way to avoid the traffic. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that the people who lived back there would go that way. Mr. Danks asked if he could walk to the site; would there be a sidewalk to get there? Mr. Bittig replied only the sidewalks that were there today. Mr. Wilson stated that they would be putting in sidewalks on the Rite Aid property. Mrs. Franckowiak stated that they would not be required to retrofit sidewalks off-site.

### **14. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mr. Wilson stated that on Monday night the Board reappointed Mr. Shantz and Mr. Bittig to another 4 years and he wanted to thank both of them to agreeing to serve again.

#### **Public comment**

**Carol Laibe, 30 E. 34<sup>th</sup> Street**, stated that she wanted to put in one more plug for bikeways and sidewalks as it comes up from time to time. She recently read some disturbing comments from various Township Officials, and she was scenting a lack of enthusiasm for this. One thing that was mentioned this evening, it seemed to her that we were looking at sidewalks that ran in straight lines that ran from point A to point B. Route 422 and shoulders were talked about; 422 had it own problems and she walked on sidewalks along 422 and never felt like she was risking her life. Sidewalks do not have to be straight, instead of using frontage of properties the back of the properties could be used and winding behind properties. Just so they would have strategic cross-locations, which would require some expense. They could be developed one by one. When the plans came before the Planning Commission that would be the time to think planning ahead and think about the connectivity to a greater plan. The Planning Commission was where this kind of thinking needed to begin, when they come in, how could they connect, not just across the front. Walkers and bikers go out of their way to avoid traffic, but the Township could help by making things more accessible. She thought that would make this Township absolutely fantastic.

Mr. Schwartz stated that would make sense like with the Rhino plan and having a sidewalk in the back alley so it would run in the same direction as 422 without having to walk there. Mr. Bittig stated that several months ago we received copies of locations of existing sidewalks. He then asked if we were going somewhere with the connectivity? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that recently Michele Barrett filed for a grant, the Township did not want to spend tax dollars to go back and retrofit sidewalks in the Township, if there were money we could get our hands on through grants or anything like that, then they would start with the most densely populated areas. They would not tap into funds and they would not raise taxes to do this. Mr. Bittig stated that it would not start this year, but they could start laying out where the connectivity should be. Mr. Schwartz stated that we could be educated on other options as was previously discussed so we could recognize that. Mr. Bittig asked who owned that alleyway? Mrs. Franckowiak replied that we did not know.

#### **Public Comment**

**Tom Howell, address unknown**, stated that Jiffy Lube looked into the alley issue and the heirs of Althouse owned the property and they could not find them so it was in limbo. There were several right-of-ways through that alley.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he wanted to mention that yesterday there was a very nice luncheon at the Reading Country Club sponsored by the Berks County Conservancy for the EAC's of the County. The Country Club did a very nice job and we shone as a host.

Mr. Wilson stated that he wanted to mention that the Supervisors have asked of planning to start looking at the possibility of green construction and also architectural styles and think about what we could do to change our Ordinances to reflect that.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Unger, seconded by Mr. Shantz, to adjourn the January 7, 2009 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 9:36pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

John W. Bittig  
Planning Commission Secretary

lrc

Correspondence to:

- BOS: Oley Agriculture Security Area Requests
- BOS: Rite Aid Scope of Traffic Study
- BOS: Redner's Fueling Station waiver request & Preliminary/Final approval
- BOS: Rhino Building Services waiver request & Preliminary/Final approval
- BOS: Custom Processing Final approval
- BOS: First Impressions waiver request
- BOS: Exeter Bible Church waiver requests
- BOS: Wood Burning Ordinance