

MINUTES OF THE
EAST COVENTRY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 16, 2016
(Approved December 21, 2016)

The Planning Commission held their monthly meeting on Wednesday, November 16, 2016. Present for the meeting were Walter Woessner, Lance Parson, Kathryn Alexis and Larry Tietjen. Also present for the meeting was Marjorie Brown, Planning Commission Solicitor, Brady Flaharty, Township Engineer and Rick Tralies, Township Planner.

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

MINUTES

October 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Mrs. Alexis noted the spelling of her first name is incorrect throughout the minutes. Mrs. Alexis's first name is shown as "Katherine", but should be shown as "Kathryn".

Mrs. Alexis noted on page 3, under Pottstown Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission Update, the last sentence "The Zern property in Douglas Township is on 28.5 acres and is proposed for 240 townhomes on 7.4 acres open space" should read "The Zern property in Douglas Township is on 28.5 acres and is proposed for 240 townhomes with 7.4 acres open space".

Mrs. Alexis noted on page 1, the first sentence "Mr. Woessner called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm and the pledge of allegiance to flag was recited" should read "Mr. Woessner called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm and the pledge of allegiance to the flag was recited".

Mrs. Alexis made a motion to approve the October 19, 2016 minutes with the proposed corrections. Mr. Woessner seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 3-0-1 vote. Mr. Tietjen abstained.

August 17, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Mrs. Brown noted on page 3, item 9, 7th line reads "of the Use and Occupancy Certificate for Lot #", with the location and materials of construction" should read "of the Use and Occupancy Certificate for Lot #1 with the location and materials of construction".

Mrs. Brown noted on page 3, item 10, 3rd line reads "SALDO §418.2 requiring sidewalks along all streets in nonresidential land developments in order" should read "SALDO §418.4 requiring sidewalks along all streets in nonresidential land developments in order".

Mrs. Brown noted on page 9, under Historical Commission Update, 3rd line reads "research. The Historical Commission strongly recommended the do the Historical Resource Act." should read "research. The Historical Commission strongly recommended they do the Historical Resource Act research".

Mr. Woessner made a motion to approve the August 17, 2016 minutes with the proposed corrections. Mrs. Alexis seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 4-0-0 vote.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

Preliminary / Final Plan for Auto Quest Collision Reverse Subdivision

Mr. Andrew Miller gave a brief description of the proposed project for the Auto Quest Collision Reverse Subdivision. Mr. Miller asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for the applicant. The Planning Commission had no questions.

Mr. Woessner reviewed the following motions for the waiver request for Auto Quest Collision Preliminary / Final Reverse Subdivision Application.

1. SALDO §301.3.B(1) – Major Subdivision

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §301.3.B(1) to permit the Plan to be processed as a minor preliminary / final reverse subdivision plan.

Motion made by Mr. Woessner, seconded by Mrs. Alexis. Approved (4-0-0)

2. 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.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Parson. Approved (4-0-0)

3. SALDO §404 – Monuments and Markers

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §404 requiring the installation of monuments at property corners in order to allow a monument to not be installed at the corner identified as "Mag Nail Found Held" on the Plan on the condition that monuments be installed at the two remaining property corners.

Motion made by Mr. Woessner, seconded by Mrs. Alexis. Approved (4-0-0)

4. SALDO §405.9 – Road Widening Improvements

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §405.9, which requires that additional paving or other street improvements be provided for existing streets to the extent deemed by the Board of Supervisors to be in the public interest, in order to allow a six (6) foot wide shoulder in lieu of an eight (8) foot wide shoulder along the subdivision frontage.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Parson. Approved (4-0-0)

5. SALDO §406.7 – Street Right-of-Way Width

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §406.7 requiring that road widening improvements be installed along existing roads of improper cartway or right-of-way width, in order to allow a six (6) foot wide shoulder in lieu of an eight (8) foot wide shoulder along the subdivision frontage.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Woessner. Approved (4-0-0)

6. SALDO §418.2 and 418.4 – Sidewalks

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §418.2 and §418.4 requiring that sidewalks be installed in order to not require sidewalks be installed along the subdivision frontage.

Motion made by Mr. Parson, seconded by Mr. Tietjen. Approved (4-0-0)

7. SALDO §416 – Curbs

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §416 requiring that curbs be installed in order to not require curbs be installed along the subdivision frontage.

Motion made by Mrs. Alexis, seconded by Mr. Parson. Approved (4-0-0)

8. SALDO §419 – Parking Areas

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §419 requiring that all parking areas be paved and curbed in order to allow the existing parking areas to remain unaltered.

Motion made by Mr. Woessner, seconded by Mrs. Alexis. Approved (4-0-0)

9. SALDO §428 – Landscaping, Screening and Buffering

Motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors **APPROVE** the Applicant's request for a waiver from SALDO §428 requiring that landscaping, screening and buffering be provided in order to not require any landscaping be provided within the side yard setback area of the property.

Motion made by Mr. Parson, seconded by Mr. Woessner. Approved (4-0-0)

Mrs. Brown read the proposed motion for review.

Mrs. Alexis made a motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the Preliminary / Final Minor Reverse Subdivision Plan prepared by Hopkins and Scott Inc. dated June 29, 2016, last revised October 29, 2016 and submitted by Michael J. Makris d/b/a/ Auto Quest Collision for the property located at 2579 New Schuylkill Road, in the form of the Resolution presented to this Planning Commission, and that incorporates all comments from the ARRO Consulting, Inc. review letter dated November 4, 2016, all comments from the Natural Lands Trust review memorandum dated November 8, 2016 and all comments from the Wisler Pearlstine, LLP review letter dated November 8, 2016. Mr. Woessner seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 4-0-0 vote.

Conditional Use Application 2016-01 for 86 Baptist Church Road by SBA Towers

Mr. Richard Lemanowicz, Esquire, Lemanowicz LLP Counselors at Law, reviewed the proposed Conditional Use Application for a cell tower located at 86 Baptist Church Road, submitted for the Applicant SBA Towers. Mr. Lemanowicz stated he submitted a Waiver of Time Limits for Action on the Conditional Use Application. Mr. Lemanowicz stated he realizes the proposed Cell Tower discussions will take more time for review. Mr. Lemanowicz stated some of the documents state the tower is 140', but the actual tower measures 125'. Mr. Lemanowicz stated this will be corrected on the next submission.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated his Professional Engineer will walk through where they are proposing to build the tower at 86 Baptist Church Road. Mr. Lemanowicz did not plan on going through each line of the review letters at this meeting and stating whether they will comply at this time. Mr. Lemanowicz is more interested in discussing setbacks, appearance of the tower and circulation issues. Mr. Lemanowicz introduced Mr. Jeremy Hoagland, Crossroads Group, LLC. Mr. Hoagland stated the tower is proposed to be placed forty (40) feet from the property line of the cemetery. Mr. Hoagland stated there is no intention to consolidate the parcels. Mr. Lemanowicz stated one thought was to acquire an easement from the Parkerford Baptist Church for the additional fall zone. Mrs. Brown stated she will have to review the ordinance to see if a fall zone easement would be a legally acceptable alternative to a zoning setback requirement. A discussion ensued about the placement of the tower on the property and clearance of the property.

Mr. Parson stated the access to the site goes through part of the parking lot for the cemetery. Mr. Parson stated there is an embankment with a five (5') foot to ten (10') foot drop. Mr. Parson asked if there will be any land disturbance near the embankment. Mr. Hoagland stated they tried to stay towards the higher part of the hill to prevent shifting of the ground.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked Mr. Hoagland if the tower will have strobe lights. Mr. Hoagland stated there will not be strobe lights on the tower, only maintenance lights.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked Mr. Hoagland if there will be shelters or cabinets. Mr. Hoagland stated there will be four cabinets with concrete foundations. Mr. Flaharty stated he had some confusion on the difference between a shelter and a cabinet. Mr. Flaharty stated the concrete pads and the stone driveway will have to be counted in the impervious coverage for the projects. Mr. Flaharty stated with the inclusion of these areas, the Applicant will have to make a stormwater management submission. Mr. Flaharty stated they will have to do some infiltration testing.

Mr. Hoagland stated there will be a fence around the tower, which will be seven (7') feet, plus one (1') foot barbed wire. Mr. Lemanowicz stated the pole will be brown and the branches will be green.

Mr. Woessner stated the tower shows three (3) antenna's. Mr. Lemanowicz stated that will be revised to show four (4) antennas.

Mr. Lemanowicz introduced his Planner, Mr. Brian Seidel, Seidel Planning and Design. Mr. Seidel reviewed the areal drawing of the proposed tower. Mr. Seidel stated they did a balloon test to see how the tower will be seen from all directions of the property. Mr. Seidel showed views of the model plan tower. Mr. Seidel showed photos of the different types of towers available

- Mono-pole
- Tree pole
- Silo

Mr. Parson's preference would be the tree pole. Mrs. Alexis's preference would be the tree pole. Mr. Woessner's preference would be the tree pole.

Mr. Woessner asked what the life expectancy is for the pole. Mr. Seidel stated the pole expectancy is forever. However, the tree branches require regular maintenance because they will fall off, but the Company will monitor the tree branches. Mr. Seidel stated the branches usually last approximately 15 years. A tree pole allows more co-location than a silo.

Mr. Tralies, Township Planner stated when the application gets further along, hopefully the Township will give the Township Landscape Planner and the Applicant's Planner some flexibility to review the species of the plantings.

Mr. Lemanowicz introduced his Radio Frequency Engineer, Andrew Peterson, dBm Engineering, P.C. Mr. Peterson stated he used the FCC formula to apply the frequency. Mr. Peterson gave a presentation on frequency. Mr. Peterson stated there is no concern on interference with other radio frequencies on the tower or in the area.

Mr. Tietjen asked why the cell tower is needed in this location. Mr. Tietjen stated he does not see a problem with coverage in this location. Mr. Peterson expanded on how they determine where to place towers. Mr. Peterson stated they have done an analysis of antennas in the area but have not received all the data from all the providers.

Mrs. Alexis asked if there are any other tower locations to co-locate on in the Township. Mr. Peterson stated there are no other locations right now.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated they had a meeting earlier this year with the Township and its consultant, Dr. Eisenstein, to discuss the cell tower. Mr. Lemanowicz stated Dr. Eisenstein asked for very specific requirements and very specific thresholds on these maps to help formulate his own opinion, but Mr. Lemanowicz is not sure what that opinion is, but that's why the maps are shown the way they are.

Mr. Woessner asked Mr. Peterson about the inconsistencies in Exhibit 6 of the Conditional Use Application. A discussion ensued. Mr. Peterson could not explain the inconsistencies. Mr. Lemanowicz stated they will look at it. Mr. Peterson stated Verizon is licensed in the 698/806, the 824/829, the 1850/1910 and the 1930/1990 frequency bands.

Mr. Woessner asked Mr. Lemanowicz if the application is supposed to go to the Zoning Hearing Board since the application is a Zoning Hearing Board application. Mr. Lemanowicz stated no.

Mr. Woessner stated the application shows the tower at 140' but you are saying it is really 125'. Mr. Lemanowicz stated yes, the tower is 125' and the application will be revised to show the correct height of the tower.

Mr. Woessner stated the plan shows five (5) pad sites, but you are only having four (4) pad sites. Mr. Lemanowicz stated yes, there are only four (4) pad sites and the application will be revised to show the correct number of pad sites.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated he would like his consultants to be able to deal directly with the Township's consultants. Mr. Woessner did not see any problem with this approach.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked the Planning Commission if there were any specific items they were requesting shown on the plans. Mr. Tietjen asked if a legend can be added to the maps to explain the colors on the maps.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated he would like to come back to the December Planning Commission meeting, but with next week being Thanksgiving, it seems more likely they will be back in January.

Additional Items to be Brought before the Planning Commission

Template for waiver letter from Applicants

Mrs. Brown gave a brief description of the proposed template for waiver letter. Mrs. Brown asked if the Planning Commission members had any comments or recommendations for the waiver letter. Mrs. Alexis stated the applicant should be required to list the hardship for the requested waiver. Mr. Flaharty stated the applicant should list the minimum relief requested. Mr. Woessner stated the applicant should state the exact words from the section of the ordinance.

Mrs. Brown stated she would revise the form and provide a copy for the Planning Commission to review.

Potential subjects for the December 21, 2016 Planning Commission meeting

Mrs. Imes asked the Planning Commission and Consultants if they had any topics for discussion at the December 21, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Flaharty stated he heard that Whispering Woods may be submitting the Final Plan Application for administrative completeness prior to the December 14, 2016 deadline to be placed on the January 18, 2017 Planning Commission agenda.

Mrs. Brown mentioned the FEMA review, but they are still finalizing the procedure.

Mrs. Brown mentioned she will speak to Mr. Rodgers about the Fairway Farm application. Mr. Flaharty stated Mrs. Brown may need two letters since there were two different applications submitted.

Northern Federation Update

Mrs. Alexis stated she was not at the meeting.

Historical Commission Update

Mr. Tietjen stated he was not at the meeting.

Pottstown Metropolitan Regional Planning Committee Update

Mr. Woessner stated Natural Lands Trust made a great presentation at the last meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Alexis moved to adjourn the monthly meeting at 8:56 p.m. Mr. Tietjen seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 4-0-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl A Imes
Secretary