

MINUTES OF THE
EAST COVENTRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING HELD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015
(Approved on October 21, 2015)

The Planning Commission held their monthly meeting on Wednesday, September 16, 2015. Present for the meeting were Walter Woessner, Kathryn Alexis, Lance Parson, Lawrence Tietjen and Jason McConnell. Also present for the meeting was Marjorie Brown, Planning Commission Solicitor, Brady Flaharty, Township Engineer and Rick Tralies, Township Planner.

Also present was Mariea Geho, Vice Chair of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Woessner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and the pledge was recited.

Agenda

Mr. Woessner asked if anyone wished to add or amend tonight's agenda. Mr. Parson moved to accept the September 16, 2015 Planning Commission Agenda. Mrs. Alexis seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 5-0-0 vote.

MINUTES

Mr. Woessner discussed a minor revision with Mrs. Imes pertaining to the Pottstown Metropolitan Regional Planning Committee. The correction is as follows: "Mr. Woessner stated there were no meetings held in July and August". Mrs. Imes stated she has made the corrections and the minutes in the Committee's packet show the corrected minutes. Mr. Woessner moved to approve the draft of minutes of the August 19, 2015 monthly meeting minutes. Mrs. Alexis seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 3-0-2 vote. Mr. Parson and Mr. McConnell abstained because they were not at the August meeting.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

Consideration of review of revised Whispering Woods Preliminary Plan

Mr. Ben Goldthorp and Mr. Tom Dredge were present to review the revised Preliminary Plan for the Whispering Woods Development. Mr. Goldthorp stated they reviewed the comments from all the review letters. Mr. Goldthorp stated they will continue to revise the plans for the will comply items.

Mr. Goldthorp stated the last time they were in front of the Committee in July, there was some questions pertaining to the sequence of construction. Mr. Goldthorp stated he noticed this item shown again in a couple of the review letters. From the MPC's perspective, this will be a single phase project with all securities being posted all at once at the beginning of the project. From a construction perspective, he would propose multiple paving sections. From a practical perspective, the stormwater basins would be built first, then water and sanitary sewers. He envisions paving a section of the road for approximately 25 homes with a temporary stone turn around. There would be another section paved for an additional 25 homes, completing the road in three phases.

Mr. Woessner stated this plan will not be received well by Ridge Fire Company. Mr. Woessner stated they do not want a turnaround, they will want the road to go all the way through. Mr. Goldthorp stated he will talk to them. Ms. Brown stated the Board of Supervisors will not like the turnaround idea either. Mr. Goldthorp asked if the Fire Company approves of the turnaround, does that mean the Township approves the turnaround. Ms. Brown stated she did not think so.

Mr. Goldthorp stated the second item he wished to discuss again included a conversation with the Park, Recreation and Conservation Committee at their August meeting. The Park, Recreation and Conservation Committee wants to have a Gaga Ball, Pickleball/Tennis Court, Pavilion, tot lot. The conversation went down the path of possibly reducing the standard specifications for the internal road and walking trail in order to add these additional items. Mr. Goldthorp stated he had a conversation with Mr. Flaharty and Mr. Kevin McAghon, who felt very strongly they wanted to stick to the Township's specifications rather than go with a waiver. Mr. Goldthorp wanted to circle back to the Planning Commission for their thoughts on the waiver. Mr. Woessner stated this topic can be discussed during the requested waiver review tonight. Mr. Goldthorp stated those were the two specific items he wanted to discuss. If the Committee wished to discuss each item in the review letters, that was fine.

Mr. Woessner asked if Mr. Flaharty wanted to discuss any specifics in his letter. Mr. Flaharty stated there were no specifics in his review letter he needed to discuss. The waiver discussion would cover any items he wanted to discuss.

Mr. Woessner asked Mr. Tralies if he had anything he wanted to discuss. Mr. Tralies stated he would like to discuss the Open Space Management Plan. The Open Space Management Plan is something that needs to be passed down to the HOA. The HOA needs to pass this information on to the homeowners. Mr. Goldthorp asked if there was an existing Open Space Management Plan he could use as a guide for their Open Space Management Plan. Mr. Tralies stated he did not have a plan to use as a guide, but there are a lot of resources available to create the Open Space Management Plan.

Mr. Tralies stated he wanted to discuss one of the waivers. The waiver issue is for the eight (8") inch caliper trees. The SALDO requires all eight (8") inch caliper trees in the existing woodlands be shown. Showing the eight (8") inch trees in the scallop edge of plan is okay with Mr. Tralies, but since the HOA will be taking care of the woodlands and a tree has recently fallen onto Mr. Woessner's property, maintenance of the large trees on the edge of the woodlands should be addressed.

Mr. Tralies stated you are wanting to use an alternate landscape concept. Whatever the alternate concept is and how it meets the requirements will have to be made clear on the plan.

Mr. Tralies wanted to discuss the one hundred fifty (150) replacement trees. Mr. Tralies wanted to know if it has been discussed where they will be placed. Ms. Brown stated one of the requirements in the Conditional Use Approval is to provide trees and landscaping in accordance with the conceptual landscape plan. Mr. Goldthorp stated they are not opposed to putting the trees there, they would just like to plant all the trees at one time, instead of piece meal planting of the trees.

Mr. Woessner stated we will review the waiver list. Ms. Brown provided a handout for everyone to review and record the outcome of the discussion of the waivers.

Waiver list and decisions.

Motions on Waiver Requests

1. SALDO §304.3.C - Site Context Map

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §304.3.C requiring a separate Site Context Map be provided, with the condition that the Applicant be required to include the table on page 2 from the Applicant's Waiver Request Letter dated September 1, 2015 on the Preliminary Plans.

Motion made by Mr. Woessner, seconded by Mrs. Alexis. Approved (5-0-0)

2. SALDO §304.3.G - Four Step Design Process

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §304.3.G requiring the four-step design process.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Woessner. Approved (5-0-0)

3. SALDO §304.3.H - Site Analysis

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO§304.3.H requiring a separate site analysis map be provided, with the condition that the Applicant be required to include the table on page 3 from the Applicant's Waiver Request Letter dated September 1, 2015 on the Preliminary Plans.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Parson. Approved (5-0-0)

4. SALDO §403.1.B - General Lot Design Standards

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from the general lot design standards in SALDO §403.1.B to allow the following lots to meet the right-of-way at angles other than right angles or radial to curves: Lots 1 - 12, 21, 27 - 30, 33 - 37, 46 - 49, 53 - 55, 58 - 61, 65 - 67 and 75 - 80, with the condition that the Applicant be required to provide a table on the Preliminary Plans showing the minimum standard being requested for the affected lots.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Parson. Approved (5-0-0)

5. SALDO§406.1 - Ellis Woods Road Widening

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §406.1 to reduce the required paved cartway half width from 14 feet to 12 feet and the shoulder width from 8 feet to 3 feet.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis and seconded by Mr. Tietjen. Approved (3-2-0) (Mr. Woessner and Mr. Parsons voting no.)

6. SALDO §406.1 - Spiece Road Half Cartway Width

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §406.1 to reduce the cartway half width from 14 feet to the existing +/- 12.5 feet.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Woessner. Approved (4-1-0) (Mr. Parson voting no.)

7. SALDO §426.3.B - Open Space Design Standards

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §426.3.B to dedicate active recreation area with slopes greater than three percent (3%), on the condition that the maximum slope not exceed ten percent (10%) and the average slope be less than five percent (5%).

Motion made by Mr. Tietjen, seconded by Mrs. Alexis. Approved (5-0-0)

8. SALDO §427.4.B - Illumination Standards

ACTION TABLED

The Applicant requests a waiver to provide a 0.4 foot-candle average rather than a 0.4 minimum.

9. SALDO §428.8.C.2 - Street Trees

ACTION TABLED

The Applicant requests a waiver to modify the spacing of street trees.

10. SALDO §429.2.D.(2)(c), Construction Specs §6.1.C - Trail Paving Thickness

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **DENY** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §429.2.D.(2)(c) to pave the trail with one (1") inch of wearing course over four (4") inches Type 2A Modified Aggregate base.

Motion made by Mr. Woessner, seconded by Mr. Parson. Approved (5-0-0)

11. SALDO §429.2.D(2)(d) - Community Trail

ACTION TABLED

The Applicant requests a waiver to modify the slope requirements for community trails.

12. SALDO §413, §414; Construction Specs §2.4.A - Street Paving

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **DENY** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §413 and §414 and Standard Construction Improvement Specifications §2.4.A to modify the paving specification for Wilbe Drive.

Motion made by Mr. Parson, seconded by Mr. Tietjen. Approved (5-0-0)

13. Construction Specs §5.1.A - Curbs and Sidewalks

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from Standard Construction Improvement Specifications §5.1.A to provide a three horizontal to one vertical (3:1) slope between the sidewalk and top of curb and to locate the outside edge of the sidewalk along the proposed ultimate right-of-way, on the condition that the tree planting locations be shifted as necessary to provide a minimum of three (3) feet between the planting and the inside sidewalk edge.

Motion made by Mr. Woessner, seconded by Mrs. Alexis. Approved (5-0-0)

14. Construction Specs §5.2.D & 5.2.F - Curbs

ACTION TABLED

The Applicant requests a waiver to construct Belgian block curb with a six inch (6") reveal

15. Construction Specs §7.2.F - Stormwater Management Facilities, Materials, Headwalls/Endwalls

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from Standard Construction Improvements Specifications §7.2.F to install high-density polyethylene endwalls in place of reinforced concrete.

Motion made by Mr. Woessner, seconded by Mr. Parson. Approved (5-0-0)

16. Construction Specs §8.3.C - Earthen Basin Embankments

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from Standard Construction Improvement Specifications §8.3.C to construct Basins A, B and C with slopes of three horizontal to one vertical (3:1), on the condition that the Applicant satisfy all conditions set forth in Comment No. 41 of the Township Engineer's review letter dated September 4, 2015, last revised September 15, 2015.

Motion made by Mr. Parson, seconded by Mr. McConnell. Approved (5-0-0)

17. SALDO §428 - Landscaping, Screening and Buffering

ACTION TABLED

The Applicant requests a waiver of the landscape requirements. [Note: need specifics to grant a waiver.]

18. SWMO §129.4.A - Ground Cover Assumptions

ACTION TABLED

The Applicant requests a waiver of the meadow ground cover standard in order to use the straight row crops ground cover standard.

19. Motion on Modification to SALDO Standards

MOTION to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a modification of the lighting standards in SALDO §427.4.B.2.D and §427.5.G to reduce the fixture mounting height to ten (10') feet in lieu of providing full cutoff shields.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Woessner. (Approved 5-0-0)

20. Motion re: Roadway

ACTION TABLED

Motion recommending that the roadway constructed within the development, identified as Wilbe Drive on the Preliminary Plans, be constructed as a private road and maintained by a homeowners association.

Mr. Woessner stated this concludes the end of the requested waiver review. Mr. Woessner started the discussion on Landscaping. Mr. Woessner discussed the street trees. Mr. Goldthorp needs to look at the tree counts on Ellis Woods Road, Spiece Road and Old Schuylkill Road.

Mr. Woessner instructed Mr. Goldthorp to look at the editorial items; font sizes. Mr. Woessner asked Mr. Goldthorp if he is planning on installing a project sign. Mr. Goldthorp stated they have not decided if they would like to do a permanent sign, may only be temporary. Can show a location on the plan in case the Homeowners Association would like to place something on the property.

Mrs. Alexis wanted to comment on Mr. Tralies discussion of placing trees along the trail.

Ms. Brown asked Mr. Goldthorp about the timeline for returning to the Planning Commission. Mr. Goldthorp stated he would like to go back to the Parks, Recreation and Conservation Committee in September. He would like to resubmit a revised plan in October in order to come back to the Planning Commission in November looking for Preliminary Plan Approval. Mr. Woessner stated Mr. Goldthorp will need to square away the waivers. Mr. Goldthorp stated he would hope to handle recommendations on approval of the remaining waivers being requested at the November meeting. Ms. Brown stated Mr. Goldthorp will need to submit the Open Space Management Plan also. Mr. Goldthorp believes the Open Space Management Plan is something they could produce rather quickly.

Mr. Parson asked Mr. Goldthorp if he is still anticipating putting shovel to the ground in March. Mr. Goldthorp stated that is what they are anticipating, as long as everything goes according to plan.

Consideration of review of the East Coventry Elementary School Preliminary Plan

Mr. Gus Houtman, P.E. of G.D. Houtman & Sons, Inc presented the proposed East Coventry Elementary School Preliminary Plan. Also present with Mr. Houtman was Jaclin Krumrine, CFO at Owen J. Roberts School District; Dennis Wozack, Director of Facilities at Owen J. Roberts School District; Maryann Marotta, Principal Architect at Marotta/Main Architects; Christopher Peters, Support Architect, Marotta/Main Architects; Frank Montgomery P.E., Traffic Engineer at TPD Associates, Inc and Eric Leeson, Landscape Designer. Project located on the North side of East Cedarville Road, west of Sanatoga Road. Mr. Houtman described the area where the proposed school will be located. Site is comprised of two (2) parcels, combined total of 51.998 acres. Property is Zoned R2 and will require Special Exception approval by the Zoning Hearing Board for the Public school use according to Section 702.3 (B) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Houtman provided the following details of the proposal:

- Construction of 1 story 38 feet Elementary School.
- No immediate plan for the existing Elementary School.
- Access Drive will be twenty-five (25') feet wide and located on East Cedarville Road.
- Parking will be in front and back of the building, consisting of 184 spaces with 6 handicap spaces.
- Curbs and lighting will be in all parking areas and access drives.
- Separate access loops have been provided for buses and car drop-offs. Buses will drive around the back of the school to drop children off at the side of the school building. Cars will enter the access drive, make the second right and drive the loop in front of the school to drop children off at front of building.
- Provide total three (3) athletic fields, large play area and kindergarten play area. Athletic fields will be built concurrent with construction of the school. Fields will be located in back of school building.
- Construction of three (3) separate Stormwater Management Facility Basins. Basins 1 & 3 drain to Pigeon Run. Basin 2 drains to the wetland area on the property which forms the headwaters of the tributary of the Schuylkill River.
- Will have three (3) infiltration facilities located in front of the school.

- New Utility extension - Water, Sanitary Sewer, Electric and Gas. Water, Gas and Sanitary Sewer will be extended from the intersection of East Cedarville Road and Sanatoga Road.
- Landscaping and lighting improvements associated with the traffic perimeter. All parking areas and access roads will be lit according to Township Code.
- Have received the following reviews from the following Township professionals:
 - Engineering Review - ARRO Consultants - dated September 9, 2015
 - Traffic Review - McMahon Associates, Inc - dated September 9, 2015
 - Planner Review - Natural Lands Trust - dated September 10, 2015
 - Building Code Official Review - Barry Isett & Associates, Inc - dated September 4, 2015
 - Solicitor Review - Wisler Pearlstine, LLP - dated September 15, 2015

Mr. Houtman concluded his presentation with the opening of any questions from the Planning Commission or Consultants or answer any issues that the Planning Commission or Consultants have at this time.

Mr. Woessner discussed the issue of no emergency access to the site. The Township is looking for an emergency access either from the existing school or from Pheasant Lane. Mr. Houtman stated the School District discussed the issue and would propose making a boulevard entrance of two lanes with a median to satisfy emergency access. Mr. Houtman explained with the Boulevard entrance, you would be able to direct the emergency vehicles in one side and allow traffic to go out the other side. Mr. Montgomery stated they have used these before and could make the boulevard longer and wider if that would be beneficial. Mr. Parson asked if this is similar to what they have in North Coventry. Mr. Houtman stated yes.

Mr. Woessner asked about sidewalks, curbs and widening East Cedarville Road. Mr. Houtman stated this was discussed with the School District. There is very low traffic along East Cedarville Road to justify the widening. It would be a large expense to the School District, costs that were not anticipated by the School District. The School District's initial response is to request a waiver for the widening of East Cedarville Road. Mr. Montgomery stated the volume would be very low so the School District decided not to introduce widening the road for turn lanes. Widening the road would promote faster speed. PennDOT would not like to see one section of the road wider than the remaining sections of the road. As for sidewalks and curb, you do not need curbs if you are not doing sidewalks. The School District is not proposing walkers to school so they do not want walkers. There will be school zone signs but no flashing light is proposed for the school zone. Mr. Montgomery is waiting to hear back from PennDOT on the proposed plan.

Mrs. Nocella asked why they are you not creating a direct walkway between the Coventry Glen community and the school. Ms. Krumrine stated the School Districts policy, with all schools, is that all children are to be bussed. Mrs. Nocella stated if you have a walkway from Coventry Glen to the school, the community would be able to access the fields for recreation. Ms. Krumrine stated the walkway is not in the budget right now. Mr. Houtman stated the walkway would not meet ADA requirements due to the substantial slope.

Mr. Tietjen asked how can you analyze the need for future sidewalks and road widening when you do not know what you are going to do with the existing school. How do you assess the impact on everything until you know what you are going to do with the existing building. You are not demolishing it, it may be used for another purpose. Mr. Montgomery stated they captured the existing school traffic with the traffic study of the new school. Ms. Krumrine stated the School District is looking at these properties as two (2) separate parcels.

Ms. Brown asked what the School District would do if they needed to change their current policy to allow walkability to the public schools, since providing transportation is not a legal requirement. What would you do for students if you constructed the school without sidewalks. Mr. Montgomery stated the School District will be dedicating ultimate right-of-way to the Township which could be used in the future for installation of sidewalks. Mr. Woessner mentioned that Pottstown is starting some activities with something called the walking school bus. Ms. Krumrine stated that is within the borough. Mr. Houtman stated if the School District provided sidewalks in the front of the school, they would not connect to anywhere. Mrs. Nocella stated she was thinking of Coventry Glen. The potential of having the children walk or ride their bikes to school would be available.

Mr. Steve Royer, 36 N Savanna Drive, Pottstown, PA 19465, stated Coventry Glen has a sizable community. The property actually backs up to a parking area. Mr. Flaharty stated they would have to put ramps in for the walking trail. Mr. Flaharty asked how much linear feet of ramp would be required. Mr. Houtman stated he did not know at this time, but could look into that. Mr. Woessner asked Mr. Houtman if they would be requesting a waiver for the sidewalk and road widening. Mr. Houtman stated yes, they would be requesting a waiver.

Ms. Brown asked when the School District will be submitting the application to the Zoning Hearing Board for special exception approval. Ms. Krumrine stated they will be submitting the application by the end of September, beginning of October. Ms. Brown stated the Zoning Hearing Board may attach conditions to a special exception approval. The timeline for the project and requesting approval from the board of supervisors may be affected.

Mr. Woessner asked Mr. Rodgers if the review letter from Barry Isett & Associates, Inc was provided to the Applicant. Mr. Houtman stated he did have a copy of the review letter. Ms. Marotta stated the review letter basically talks about the ADA requirements.

Ms. Brown pointed out the Municipalities Planning Code requirements pertaining to the 90 day review period. Given the number of Township consultant comments, the District may want to contact the Township and request an unlimited extension of the 90-day review period.

Mr. Tralies discussed the importance of talking about the landscaping due to the opportunity we have to make the site look like more than just a building. Mr. Houtman stated adhering to the landscaping requirements, would cost close to \$300,000.00. Plus, the school has security standards that they need to adhere to. Ms. Krumrine stated it is important to have clear lines of sight while the children are outside during the day. Also, they have budget constraints. Mr. Royer stated he sat in a meeting for a new high school which ended up looking like a prison. Mr. Woessner asked who is stipulating the security requirement. Is it a Federal or State requirement? Ms. Krumrine stated the School District has a safety officer that sets the guidelines. The School District wants to add shrubbery, but is looking for some relief. Mr. Woessner asked if Ms. Krumrine could forward the security requirements to the Township. Ms. Brown asked if Chester County has a Safety in Schools Task Force that has issued recommendations and best practices on this issue, and if so, asked that they provide a copy. Mr. Gleason stated there is also a long term sustainability issue when the landscaping cannot be maintained. Mr. Tietjen asked if the School District Safety Officer could work with the landscape architect to put together a plan with the trees you want to put in that is consistent with the security plan to show the Planning Commission that the designs are consistent and there no emergency access locations you cannot get to due to trees or shrubs. Ms. Brown noted that any variation from the landscaping requirements in the Zoning Ordinance would require a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mrs. Alexis stated the playgrounds are on the northwest side of the building. This location is not an ideal location for winter or summer. Mrs. Nocella asked if the location of the building is set in stone. Could the playgrounds be located differently? Ms. Marotta stated they wanted the school located on the highest area and the fields on the flat area. Mr. Royer asked if there will be any lighting on the fields.

Mrs. Geho stated a flashing light should be placed on East Cedarville Road. Mr. Montgomery stated there will not be a flashing light because PennDOT requires at least 1 walker in order to get the flashing light installed. Mrs. Geho stated in the original discussion, the plans showed a different path for traffic on school property. Mr. Houtman stated there are two (2) separate loops to keep car and bus drop offs separate. Mrs. Geho asked if the buses will be turning against traffic. Mr. Montgomery stated the buses will be confined to the outer loop. Mr. Royer stated there is parking in the back of the building. With the busses passing by the parking, won't that interfere with car traffic? Mr. Houtman stated that is overflow parking and parking for the fields.

Mr. Tralies asked if there was any thought to flipping some of the parking to the back of the building. Ms. Marotta stated they tried to keep the busses and parents separate. There is a single point of access for visitors, through the front of the building.

Mrs. Alexis stated parking is best if it is perpendicular to the school. This is the safest way for young children to cross traffic.

Mr. Woessner stated it looks like the exit for the buses will buck traffic.

Mr. Royer asked how the design works with the Exelon Evacuation Plan. Ms. Krumrine stated they actually discussed the plan with Exelon.

Mr. Woessner asked Mr. Flaharty if he had any questions or comments. Mr. Flaharty stated he believes the important topics have been covered. Mr. Flaharty asked Mr. Houtman about the timeline for the next submission. Mr. Houtman thought they would probably be back in November. Mr. Flaharty asked if Mr. Houtman has submitted anything to DEP and PennDOT. Mr. Houtman stated they are waiting to hear back from PennDOT. Mr. Houtman stated they are waiting to submit to DEP until all the comments have been revised.

Mr. Woessner asked Ms. Brown if she had any other comments. Ms. Brown stated she did not unless the Mr. Houtman had any questions or comments. Mr. Houtman stated he will reach out to the Solicitor if there are any questions or comments.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE COMMISSION

Continued discussion of Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance and Zoning Map

Ms. Brown continued the discussion of the proposed Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance and Zoning Map starting with page 21.

- Section 1405 6. - Tower Based Facilities in the Rights-of-Way:
 - E. Related Equipment - Section (2), Section (3), Section (4) and Section (5) - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.
 - E. Related Equipment - Section (6) - Proposed change is to delete this section.
 - F. Relocation or Removal of Facilities - Section (1), Section (2), Section (3) and Section (4) - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.
 - G. - Reimbursement for ROW Use - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.

- Section 1405 7 - General Requirements for All Non-Tower Wireless Communications Facilities
 - A. - Permitted in the Wireless Communications Facilities Overlay District - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.
 - B. - Prohibited on Certain Structures - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.
 - C. - Visual or Land Use Impact - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.
 - D. - Removal - Section (1) and Section (2) - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.
 - E. - Insurance - No proposed changes from the Planning Commission.

After a discussion with the Committee, Ms. Brown will review the remainder of the ordinance and revise to make the language consistent.

At the next meeting in October, the Committee will review the remainder of the "Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance and Zoning Map Amendment", continue with the review of Ordinance No. 2015 - "Miscellaneous Street and Sidewalks, Subdivision and Land Development and Zoning Ordinance Amendments" and the "Transmission Pipelines - Model Ordinance."

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Alexis moved to adjourn the monthly meeting at 10:30 p.m. Mr. Tietjen seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 4-0-0 vote. Mr. Parson needed to leave the meeting early.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A Imes
Secretary