

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JULY 6, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, July 6, 2011 at the Township Hall, 4975 DeMoss Road, Berks County, Pennsylvania. Donald R. Wilson, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. followed by the Pledge to the Flag.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Donald R. Wilson, Chairman
John W. Bittig, Vice Chairman
William R. A. Rush, Secretary
Richard Littlehales
Gary L. Shane

ABSENT: Christy Staudt
Greg T. Unger

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Joe Rogosky, 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 June 6, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

2. AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Shane, to approve the agenda of the July 6, 2011 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVE APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

A. **LORDS & LADIES SALON & MEDICAL SPA; FINAL PLAN: MOTION BY** Mr. Shane, seconded by Mr. Littlehales, to accept the preceding plan for review. The motion carried unanimously.

4. LORDS & LADIES – FINAL PLAN - Stephen Bensinger

GVC reviewed the Lords & Ladies Salon and Medical Spa Final Plan (reference letter dated June 30, 2011).

- The applicant is waiting for the E & S control plan review and will submit approved copies along with a completed Stormwater Operations & Maintenance manual & agreement when this is received.
- Note 24 on sheet 1 of 8 has been revised to reflect GVC's comment #6
- Plan notes have also been revised to include SALDO Sections 330-14.R(6) and 330-14.R.(7).
- The as-built plans will be submitted as required.
- The applicant has received approval from Gannett Fleming and the Township has possession of the letter.
- A note will be added to the plan stating that the annexation parcel will be combined in common deed with the existing Bowl-O-Rama Inc. parcel.

***William Rush arrived**

July 6, 2011 Planning Commission minutes - Lord's & Ladies' continued – Page 2

Mr. Littlehales stated that he had a list of items, upon his review that needed to be addressed:

First to comply with the Exeter Township Lighting Ordinance:

- 6.A.3.c – Mr. Littlehales would classify this application as “Medium Activity”, therefore the ordinance requires a maintained FC level to be .6 fc Minimum and Uniformity 2.4:1 Avg:Min; plan shows 1.1 Min. FC & Avg:Min ratio @ 3.36. That all would be in compliance EXCEPT that the fixture manufacturer (LSI) used a really bad LLF (Light Loss Factor) of .90 to calculate the layout. That’s not even close to the accepted LLF for HPS (High Pressure Sodium) lamps which is .77 or so. (See the attached chart from another manufacturer’s catalog listing typical LLF’s.) That means that ALL of the values shown are incorrect, having been thrown off by the use of the incorrect LLF.
- 6.D.3 & 6.D.4 – RE: Hours of Illumination: we don’t know if they comply with this section because it’s not noted anywhere.
- 6.I.4.a – Maximum mounting height is specified at 20’ AFG (including a 2.5’ high raised concrete base) and LSI shows a mounting height of 21’.
- 7.A.4 – Drawing Page 6.1 Base Detail shows a 24” high base, but, as noted above, the requirement is for a 30” high base.
- 7.A.5 – Fixture locations and tree planting locations are definitely not coordinated. The drawing and symbols indicate that there are at least three and possibly 4 locations where the deciduous trees planted will interfere with and block much of those luminaires’ outputs as the trees grow fuller and taller.

Other Items:

- The note concerning the striping in the parking lot did not specify “hairpin” striping.
- Mr. Littlehales felt that Zelkova was not an approved replacement tree. Mr. Bensinger would check into this.

Mr. Bensinger stated that all these items would be addressed and asked for conditional final plan approval.

MOTION BY Mr. Shane, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Lords & Ladies Salon and Medical Spa Final Plan subject to all outstanding items in the June 30th GVC review letter and incorporation of comments discussed being addressed. The motion carried unanimously.

5. VARIANCE REQUEST – BLANK – 204 WOOD LANE - David Blank

Mrs. Franckowiak stated that the Blanks wished to replace a carport that was placed there without a permit and considered illegal/nonconforming with a more permanent nonconforming structure. Mrs. Franckowiak further stated that most people don’t realize that a permit is needed for this type of structure and at the time the Blanks purchased the property the side yard setback was 8ft. Mr. Bittig asked Mr. Blank what type of structure was currently located there. Mr. Blank replied that it was an aluminum carport and they were having siding put on their house and the roof replaced, so they would like to have a carport built onto the house at the same time.

Mr. Blank further stated that it kept him and his wife dry getting out of the car when it was raining and kept the car clear of snow in wintertime. Mr. Bittig asked how close it was located to the side property line.

Mrs. Franckowiak replied 4ft. Mr. Bittig asked what his neighbor had located close to his property line.

Mr. Blank replied that his one neighbor has a carport 3ft from the property line; another neighbor has a two story building 3ft from the property line. Mr. Bittig stated that it looked as though the entire neighborhood was nonconforming. Mr. Rush stated that he personally (not as legal advice) felt he had a right to do it by adverse possession and felt that it was de minimis. Mr. Rush also felt it was a reasonable request as the neighborhood was not in compliance. Mr. Wilson stated that we would just be making a recommendation to the Zoning Hearing Board.

MOTION BY Mr. Rush, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Zoning Hearing Board allow Mr. Blank to build the carport in the interest of common sense. The motion carried unanimously.

6. AUTHORIZE SIGNATURE OF DEP PLANNING MODULE - BURKHART

Ms. Cusimano stated that we received the DEP Planning Module mailer for the Leon Burkhardt Sketch Plan of Record and needed the Planning Commission to sign the document.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Wilson to authorize signature of the Burkhardt DEP Planning Module. The motion carried unanimously.

7. FLOODPLAIN ORDINANCE REVISIONS

The Floodplain Ordinance revisions were discussed. Mr. Rogosky stated that he would take everything that was discussed, make those revisions and pass them along to Ms. Cusimano to upload on SharePoint for the next Planning Commission meeting.

8. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Ms. Cusimano stated that she received a time extension from AEM Architects, but did not receive one from Zack's Auto Sales. Mr. Bittig stated that he thought we did not need to act as the state passed a bill to extend the dates for approved plans. The Planning Commission agreed to make a motion to use if needed.

MOTION BY Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Littlehales to recommend the Board of Supervisors reject the Zack's Auto Sales Land Development Plan if it was not covered under the recent State Bill concerning expiration dates. The motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment

Jordan Bausher, 391 Ritters Road stated that at the last supervisors meeting Mr. Rogosky stated that Penn DOT was close to building the jughandle at Shelbourne Square Mall. Mr. Bausher asked if Shelbourne Road that went into the mall was a State or Township Road. Mrs. Franckowiak replied that it was a Township Road. Mr. Bausher stated that he thought the road was designed to go through the back of the shopping center to Painted Sky Road and serve developments located there. Mr. Bausher then asked if they planned on putting sidewalks on the jughandle bridge. Mr. Rogosky stated that he got further clarification on that matter since the last Board meeting; Penn DOT was not looking to do sidewalk, they were just asking the Township if there were any plans for a walking trail and if there wasn't one they would not put sidewalks on the bridge as they were concerned for pedestrian safety. Mr. Rogosky further stated that he did not think Penn DOT would be placing sidewalks on the bridge. He had only received preliminary plans for the project.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY Mr. Littlehales, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to adjourn the July 6, 2011 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 8:05pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,



William R. A. Rush,
Secretary

lrc

Correspondence to:

BOS: Lords & Ladies Final Plan approval

ZHB: Variance request - Blank