

MINUTES
EXETER TOWNSHIP
January 16, 2017

The Regular Meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, January 16th, 2017 at the Township Hall, 4975 DeMoss Road, Berks County, Pennsylvania. John W. Bittig, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. followed by the Pledge to the Flag.

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Glen Powell, Vice Chair
Gary Lloyd
Sebastian Sottosanti
Gary Shane
Lisa VanderLaan

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Joseph Rogosky, GVC Consulting Engineer
Ramsey Reiner, Recording Secretary
John Granger, Township Manager
Peter Simone, Simone Collins Landscape Architect

ABSENT: Hunter Ahrens

MINUTES

MOTION to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of December 19th, 2016 was tabled until the next meeting due to 3 abstentions.

AGENDA

MOTION by Ms. VanderLaan, seconded by Mr. Shane, to approve the agenda of the January 16th, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

REORGANIZATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. Rogosky, led the reorganization discussion for the Planning Commission. New appointments are as follows:

Chairperson: Glen Powell
Vice Chairperson: Lisa VanderLaan
Secretary: Gary Shane

DOLAN, PETER J & KRISTEN- SKETCH PLAN OF RECORD

- Mr. Rogosky discussed that there is no relief required by SALDO and that the Berks County Planning Commission has no adverse comments on this sketch plan. He also asked for clarification on “clean and green” but noted that there were no other “major issues.”
- Mr. Hoffert, attorney for the Dolans, clarified that it is enrolled in “clean & green” and will stay in it. Ms. VanderLaan asked for clarification that the homeowners were taking off corner of one piece of property and adding to another portion and whether both areas were over 10 acres.
- Mr. Hoffert asked to table the sketch plan so that the Dolan’s may resubmit for approval at next month’s meeting. The Planning Commission agreed.

STONERSVILLE OVERLAY EXTENSION

- Peter Simone, Simone Collins Landscape Architects discussed the possibility of extending the Stonersville Overlay.
- Brian Ackerman, 325 Walnut Road, questions why the extension was necessary. Mr. Powell responded that the Board of Supervisors thought it would make sense to extend the uses to Walnut Road. Mr. Ackerman noted that the area is not heavily traveled and that it was unnecessary to include Walnut Road for business use. Ms. VanderLaan asked Mr. Ackerman had specific concerns. Mr. Ackerman expressed that he felt as though the Township was bringing up the issue because of a property that did not fit the needs of the homeowners and that it was the responsibility of the Township to fix this problem for them. Mr. Lloyd mentioned that the Planning Commission is willing to revisit any and all zoning if it seems as though it does not make sense. There was discussion about how impact of a change in zoning and permitted uses on a property is measured.
- Dan Smitt, 21 Spring Meadow Lane, noted that the Walnut Road property being discussed was “clean and green.” He asked why the village overlay would be extended all the way to the edge of the area. He disagreed with the idea of an extension and did not approve of the idea of permitting small engine repair in the area.
- Brian Minner, 11 Spring Meadow Lane, also disagreed with the idea of an extension.
- Terry Hafer, 170 Wegman Road, asked what the difference between bike repair and small engine repair would be.
- Ms. VanderLaan remarked that the Village Overlay was done in 2010. The Township must consider how everyone will do business, not just one property.
- Mr. Simone reminded the Planning Commission, that in terms of retail sales it must not alter the district and must comply with environmental protections. Some uses are permitted by right or special exception or conditional use. Ms. VanderLaan agreed that this would give the BOS or Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) the opportunity to impose certain conditions and would have to go through a specific process.
- Mr. Shane asked Mr. Simone if extended made sense from a Master Planner point of view. Mr. Simone replied that it made sense from a planning standpoint. Zoning is often reactionary and it’s important to find a balance. Ms. VanderLaan questioned whether it made more sense to extend the overlay or to change the zoning. Mr. Simone responded that extending the overlay would make more sense; changing zoning might have unintended consequences. Ms. VanderLaan asked that this discussion be brought to the Board of Supervisors and that it should be tabled until it was put on the BOS agenda.

PROPOSED STORAGE TRAILER ORDINANCE

- The Planning Commission reviewed an updated draft of a Storage Trailer Ordinance that was created by Simone Collins. The intent is to discourage permanent storage of tractor trailers.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 16th, 2017 PLANNING COMMISSION – PAGE 3 OF 3

- Mr. Lloyd asked if these trailers are on the street. Mr. Simone commented that these would be beyond yard setbacks.
- There was discussion about the affect this ordinance might have on farmers or truck drivers. Mr. Granger commented that if these tractor trailers are being used in hauling operations, they are permitted. This is a discussion on the prevention of trailers being used for storage instead of a building. Managing this would be one way to prevent this from occurring.
- Discussion commenced over what agricultural items would be permitted to be stored and what districts would be affected by this ordinance. Mr. Shane asked if the AP district would be able to be excluded from this ordinance. Mr. Simone mentioned that there would be a nominal fee for agricultural uses.
- There was discussion about the proposed screening mentioned in the draft. Some members felt as though it was too restrictive. Ms. VanderLaan commented that she was not interested in putting agricultural areas under more pressure. Mr. Simone suggested that yard setbacks would be reasonable.
- The Planning Commission and Simone Collins will redraft the ordinance and discuss at a later date.
- Scott Graham, 27 Kinsey Hill, mentioned that he had a similar experience in Collegeville and was required to submit a zoning permit.
- There was discussion on portable storage containers. This was tabled until a revision has been completed.

NEIGHBORHOOD VILLAGE OVERLAY

- Mr. Simone presented a map of the proposed Neighborhood Village Overlay (NVO). He explained that this would allow for small businesses in more of a village experience. He suggested that it be a conditional use as to not make it onerous on small businesses. Applicants would be able to present a sketch plan to PC or BOS instead of going through a Land Development process. The first draft of NVO allowed for a neighborhood design review committee. He noted that the NVO should be specific and should list specific uses. He also mentioned that design guidelines have “no teeth” and that conditional uses require compliance.
- Ms. VanderLaan mentioned that neighborhood committee would allow for more community involvement and less government. Mr. Lloyd mentioned that Planning Commission allows neighborhood groups to come to meetings and speak. Mr. Granger noted that this would give residents affected an opportunity to discuss before it comes to PC or BOS. If they do not create a committee, the responsibility would fall on them. Mr. Rogosky asked if it would be possible to notify residents similarly to the process by ZHB.
- Mr. Powell mentioned that he wanted wording tying NVO “into certain amount of feet near existing commercial structures” in the NVO.
- Ms. VanderLaan stated that this should have specific uses as the intent of the NVO was for this to be a buffer between 562 or 422 and the residential areas.

- Mr. Simone agreed to look at existing commercial zones and come up with a distance. He would also like the Township solicitor to take a look.
- Vince DeStefano, 35 W, 47th Street, asked if it was mandatory to be on a corner. Mr. Simone replied that you must be on a corner. Mr. DeStefano asked if they could put a strip mall on the corner property. Ms. VanderLaan responded that this was not the intent of the NVO. Mr. Simone noted that there would be a 5000 square foot maximum and that use would need to be considered.
- Ms. VanderLaan stated that it would go to the Board.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

- A draft on Historic Resources was presented by Peter Simone.
- Ms. VanderLaan asked that requirements for financial analysis be written. Mr. Simone responded that he would provide that after doing some research.
- Mr. Powell asked how many properties this would affect. Ms. VanderLaan replied that there were six and that guidelines would need to be discussed.
- There was discussion on the different classifications and the Comprehensive Plan.
- The Planning Commission will review after financial review is complete and will discuss at the next meeting so that the BOS may review.

DISCUSSION ON DATE FOR JOINT MEETING WITH BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. Powell asked if the Planning Commission would be able to meet with the Board of Supervisors for joint discussion, possibly in March or April. Ms. VanderLaan would like the Board of Supervisors to come to the Planning Commission meeting and asked to put this on the BOS agenda. Mr. Powell noted that a regular meeting would be fine, but it must be advertised.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Ms. VanderLaan, seconded by Mr. Sottosanti to adjourn the January 16th, 2017 meeting of the Exeter Township Planning Commission at 8:55pm. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Glen Powell
Chairman