

**MINUTES  
EXETER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
OCTOBER 21, 2013**

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, October 21, 2013 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  
Gary L. Shane, Secretary  
Glen Powell

**ABSENT:** Greg T. Unger

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Joe Rogosky, GVC Consulting Engineer  
Cheryl Franckowiak, Zoning Officer  
Linda Cusimano, Recording Secretary

**3. MINUTES**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Powell, seconded by Mr. Bittig to approve the minutes of the September 16, 2013 Planning Commission meeting and workshop as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. AGENDA**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Shane, to approve the agenda of the October 21, 2013 Planning Commission meeting with the addition of the Stonersville Social Club Planning Module. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. ALDI, INC. – PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Brian Meyers – Landcore Engineers**

GVC reviewed the Aldi, Inc. preliminary/final LDP (reference GVC review letter dated October 17, 2013).

- The agreement between Aldi, Inc. and Mr. Brice was revised to reflect the comments of the Township Solicitor. The Agreement was signed and the Township would receive a copy of that. A note would be added to the plan.
- DeMoss Road was not classified under the street ordinance and has a curb radii that complies with a local road, but does not comply with anything greater. If the road is classified at a local road then a waiver would not be needed. Ms. Cusimano would check the files. The truck template shows that the truck could make a left turn but not a right turn. They would be placing a no right turn for trucks sign at that entrance. Mr. Rogosky stated that it would be acceptable as long as the sign was placed in the intersection. Mr. Wilson asked if the traffic light timing would be corrected. Mr. Rogosky replied it would be reviewed by PennDOT.
- Aldi, Inc. received their NPDES and E & S control approval from the BCCD.
- Mr. Rogosky stated that all that was left was housekeeping items.

**MOTION BY** Mr. Shane, seconded by Mr. Bittig, to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Aldi, Inc. Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan conditioned on all outstanding items in the October 17, 2013 GVC review letter being addressed and all waivers being approved by the Board. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Wilson stated that he typically does not grant conditional approval; however, in this case he will make an exception for it. He further stated that he wanted it on record that he did not like the right out drive onto 422.

#### **4. INFORMAL DISCUSSION – 855 E NEVERSINK ROAD**

Ms. Franckowiak stated that Mr. Brice recently acquired a 5 acre property located at the corner of E. Neversink & Painted Sky Rd. He was interested in putting self storage units on the property, he thought it would be a nice use for it; however, it is not zoned for that use. Across the street on both E Neversink and Painted Sky Road the land was zoned Light Industrial which allowed for self storage units. The property was zoned UR which would allow for apartments/townhomes but that wasn't what he wanted to do with the property and thought the storage units would be advantageous to the tax base. After a lengthy discussion the Planning Commission agreed to defer the possible zoning change to the Planner. Then the Planning Commission asked that Mr. Brice have a sketch/informal/conceptual plan done on how he planned to develop the property for the Planning Commission to look at.

- **Ms. Franckowiak left the meeting**

#### **5. ZONING ORDINANCE REVISIONS**

##### **a. ROC revisions.**

Mr. Rogosky stated that at the last meeting we had various discussions on the ROC revisions and he wanted to find out how the Planning Commission felt about the revisions and get some guidance for these revisions, if the Planning Commission was happy with them or if there were other revisions that need to be made.

Mr. Rogosky stated that he wanted to recap what was discussed previously: retail sales not to exceed 40% of the total gross area of the existing building including the outside patio/terrace area. He further stated that he kept the 40% in for the cafeteria and wanted to know if the Planning Commission was satisfied with that percentage. Mr. Shane asked about 40% retail and 40% cafeteria, could they then have a total of 80% and get away with it? Then it would be only 20% office. Mr. Rogosky stated that he understood that 40% was of anything other than office. Mr. Rogosky stated that he would be happy to make any changes the Planning Commission felt was necessary. Mr. Shane stated that it should be worded so 60% would need to be office.

Mr. Bittig stated that he did not like adding retail sales as it was a restricted office commercial and felt it was already stretching a bit adding the cafeteria. Mr. Rogosky replied that they passed along allowing cafeteria to the Board so Dr. Wegman could move forward with the interior construction in his building. The zoning ordinance currently lists cafeteria at 20% and Dr. Wegman returned and asked for 40% with the next revisions.

Mr. Rogosky stated that it could be put in the ordinance that 60% would need to remain as office. Mr. Bittig stated that he agreed with changing it to 40%, but did not like adding retail. Mr. Rogosky asked what the consensus of the Planning Commission was on allowing retail in ROC zone. Mr. Wilson Mr. Powell,

Mr. Shane, Mr. Wilson were in favor and Mr. Bittig was not. Mr. Wilson stated that the problem with not allowing retail is that across the street it was allowed and there were offices located there, so he did not see a problem with adding retail. Dentists sell sonic toothbrushes so basically they already have retail in their offices, the same in a Doctor's office. Mr. Bittig stated that he felt that was different than total retail.

Mr. Wilson stated that they should put in the clause that it was allowed in an existing structure/repurposing. Mr. Rogosky replied that it might entice people to utilize existing structures. The Planning Commission agreed that they wanted retail sales to be added as a conditional use in the ROC zone and asked Mr. Rogosky to work on that. Mr. Rogosky asked if it should be listed as 1 acre or ½ acre lot to allow cafeterias in that zone. Mr. Wilson replied that he thought it should be ½ acre as there aren't too many large lots in that area. The Planning Commission agreed that it should be ½ acre lot to have a cafeteria.

##### **b. RC Zone**

Mr. Bittig stated that he drafted a few changes to the RC zone and it was on the workspace. He suggested adding more uses to the By Right Uses. Then he also suggested modifying the area, yard and height regulations. (See attached list) The Planning Commission agreed to incorporate Mr. Bittig suggestions into the RC zone. Mr. Wilson then asked the residents in the audience if they were here for any specific reason.

**Public Comment**

**Beverly Pauley, 81 Fourth Ave,** stated that she wanted to talk to Planning Commission about allowing chickens in the residential zone. She handed out a paper to the members and asked them to read it and if they had any questions to please ask (see attached). Her neighbors had chickens in a residential zone, the neighbors were also here and she didn't want this to turn into "the Hatfield & the McCoy's". Her major concern was that chickens can transmit diseases and she was also concerned about well water issues. She didn't like chickens in the residential zone. If she lived on a farm then this would not be an issue.

**Amber Patton, 91 Fourth Ave,** stated that she respected her neighbors. They didn't realize chickens were not permitted so they had gotten baby chicks and got a chicken coop for outside. Their chickens get out occasionally like pets can do and they consider them their pets. Her son helps with the chickens, feeding and gathering eggs to teach him responsibility. Ms. Cusimano stopped out at their property and informed us that chickens were not an allowed use in our zone so we gave them to a friend who has a farm. When she and her son went outside this morning and the chickens weren't there her son asked "where are my chickens"? She had to explain that they couldn't have them. As far as chickens spreading diseases with mosquitoes, the entire property behind them was wet – there were always mosquitoes and flies and the chickens ate them. Mr. Shane asked how many chickens they had. Mrs. Patton replied that they had seven of them. They did have a rooster that was crowing early in the morning, so they addressed that by getting rid of him. Ms. Franckowiak had told her that there was going to be discussions on possibly allowing for chickens, but in the meantime they needed to have them removed. She came in to ask the Planning Commission to allow for chickens in residential zones. Mr. Wilson stated that PSATS had a course about allowing chickens and the article stated that they were in favor, with restrictions. Ms. Cusimano stated that she listened to a webinar concerning allowing chickens and the Planning Commission asked that she put all the information on the workspace to review next month. Mr. Wilson asked that the Patton's and the Pauley's also receive copies. Mrs. Pauley asked how they handle the fungus spores that come from chicken feces. Mr. Patton stated that they had their chickens vaccinated. Mr. Bittig stated that Mrs. Patton talked about being responsible owners, but this was a zoning issue and assuming Exeter allows chickens in a residential zone, there was no way to control problems with this. Ms. Cusimano replied that restrictions would need to be written into the zoning ordinance.

**6. HISTORICAL AREA CONTROLS**

Historical Area controls were discussed. The Planning Commission agreed that the 300 foot setback for building anything within 300 feet of a historical structure should be for Class 1 historical properties only and at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors as they would have the final decision. Ms. Cusimano asked if they needed to make a motion as the Board wanted a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Mr. Wilson replied no, we did not need to make a motion, but this is what we recommend and we were also waiting for Andy Bellwoar's comments to finalize Historical Area Controls.

**7. REVIEW & COMMENT – ACT 537 PLAN REVISIONS**

Ms. Cusimano informed the Planning Commission that when revisions were made to the Act 537 plan (public sewer), according to the MPC the Planning Commission has the opportunity to review and comment. Mr. Bittig asked if there was a list of what exactly was changed. Ms. Cusimano replied that they did not supply that, but the review period is 60 days. Mr. Bittig will take one along home to read and discuss at the November 18<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

**8. REVIEW & COMMENT – AMITY ZONING ORDINANCE REVISIONS**

Ms. Cusimano stated that Amity revisions were on the workspace to review. The Planning Commission read through the changes and decided that they had no comments to pass back to Amity Township.

**9. STONERSVILLE SOCIAL CLUB PLANNING MODULE – APPROVE SIGNATURE**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Powell, seconded by Mr. Shane to approve signing the Planning Commission portion on the Stonersville Social Club Planning Module. The motion carried unanimously.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY** Mr. Bittig, seconded by Mr. Shane, to adjourn the October 21, 2013 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 9:35 pm. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gary Shane".

Gary L. Shane,  
Secretary

lrc