

**BOROUGH OF MEDIA
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
February 1, 2005**

The Media Borough Planning Commission met on the above date with the following members present: Chairperson Steve Moss, Peter Williamson, Robert Yosua, Tina Mason. Also present were Code Enforcement Officer Jeffery, Borough Engineer Walton, and Vice-President Robinson. Chris Pavlou, Larry Morroni and Bill Payne were absent from the meeting.

Steve Moss called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Peter Williamson made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 4, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting. Robert Yosua seconded the motion with changes made to note Bill Payne made the motion to approve December 7, 2004 minutes not Steve Moss and correction to spelling of Bill Payne's name under Adjournment. Motion carried unanimously.

Application for Wireless Communication Facility

301 N. Jackson Street – Sprint

Richard Lemenowicz, Esq. representing Sprint Spectrum, reviewed a request to install a wireless antenna on the roof of the Borough Hall at 301 N. Jackson Street, Media, PA for the purpose of addressing a significant gap in their wireless communication network. This gap involves only Sprint and the Media Borough and covers approximately one (1) mile. Mr. Lemenowicz described the type of installation as "stealth" which means that it is as hidden as possible. The antenna will be enclosed within a cylinder to hide it. Mr. Lemenowicz then detailed the items that he had submitted in relation to the application. Steve Moss identified his two primary questions from a Planning Commission standpoint, the safety of the antenna and exactly where the gaps were and how they will be filled. He asked that the witnesses which Mr. Lemenowicz brought with him specifically address these questions in their presentations. Mr. Lemenowicz stated from a safety perspective, the proposed installation is in compliance with the FCC standards for human exposure to Electric Magnetic Fields (EMF). Steve Moss enquired if there were any residents affected. Jim Jeffery responded nine (9) residents are within the 200 feet radius of the antenna and each were notified via first class mail of application and the date and time of Planning Commission meeting. No inquiries or comments were received from any of the residents on this matter. Mr. Lemenowicz wanted to clarify for the record that this was a permitted use for utilizing an existing structure. Mr. Lemenowicz introduced Tim Nguyen, an Electrical Engineer, as an expert witness concerning radio frequency. It was established that Mr. Nguyen had no state certification nor was he ever previously qualified as an radio frequency expert witness; however, Mr. Lemenowicz cited Mr.

Nguyen's years of experience and that he had been accepted as an expert in other municipal hearings and zoning hearing board presentations. Mr. Nguyen reviewed exhibit A2 which detailed streets and highways of coverage area. The exhibit also displayed in color the current coverage without the antenna and the expanded coverage with the antenna installation. There was a white area of approximately one (1) mile that currently has no coverage. This one-mile area is considered significant by Sprint and coverage is required for Sprint to comply with FCC guidelines for optimum coverage to maintain their license. Questions were asked concerning required height to fill the gap. The minimum height of the antenna to cover the gap and comply with FCC regulation is 61 feet from the ground. This translates to eight (8) feet above the elevator shaft/roof. The antenna is housed within a cylinder. The next witness, Scott Chambers, a Civil Engineer, reviewed exhibit C1, the site/area plan. He described the installation and reviewed different elevations of the installation. Steve Moss asked about how much wind could it withstand. It complies with the standard per Mr. Lemenowicz. Tina Mason commented that the proposed antenna is actually lower in height than existing antennas. Mr. Lemenowicz agreed to comply with items one (1) through eight (8) that were detailed on NDI memorandum Rev. 1/22/05. Additionally, Borough Engineer Walton requested a certification by a structural engineer that antenna installation meets requirement for wind load. Walton stated we use ICC 2003 code. He also requested a narrative explaining lightning protection. Walton requested and received confirmation that there was no fastening external to the building; it is all internal. Tina Mason requested and received confirmation that there would be no negative increase in lighting noise or odor for surrounding neighborhood. In answer to Tina Mason's questions concerning on going maintenance, Scott Chambers explained after initial installation there may be someone coming by monthly just to make sure everything was operating correctly. There is a central monitoring system. If site abandoned, Mr. Chambers indicated they would take care of it. Steve Moss cited ordinance that requires yearly certification which protects the Borough from that issue. Jim Jeffery noted for the record that there would be no issue with local police frequency. There will not be. A question was asked if Borough would receive rent for this installation. The answer was yes. A contract has been worked out with the Borough to rent the space. There was a request to have a copy of the effect diagram (the after diagram) be supplied to the Borough. It was given to Jim Jeffery at the meeting. Peter Williamson made the motion that the Sprint permit application be approved as submitted with the condition that the applicant address to the Borough Engineer's satisfaction his comments on the memo dated January 22, 2005. The motioned was seconded by Robert Yosua. Motion carried unanimously. Steve Moss complimented presenters on their presentation.

Zoning Review

201 N. Edgmont Street-Jay Haggerty

Jay Haggerty, resident and local contractor, reviewed his request to demolish an existing garage and construct a 483 square foot, two (2) -story garages in its place. Per Jim Jeffery, this is a continuation of a previous plan. Mr. Haggerty was advised to add

notation on this plan that this is a revised plan to avoid confusion in the future. Mr. Haggerty proposes the garage will have the same appearance as the house. Mr. Haggerty has an antique car which he wants to put in garage along with his wife's car. He indicated that parking in his area is becoming a problem. He currently has three vehicles. His truck, which is 19 feet long, will remain in the driveway. The second floor will be used for storage. His revised plan eliminates a previous variance related to a rear set back. He has a very wet basement so that is why he is looking for second floor storage. Robert Yosua questioned is the wet basement due to topography or simply the age of the home. Mr. Haggerty stated house is actually elevated; the water is due primarily to age of house. When questioned about the height of the house, Mr. Haggerty did not know height. Peter Williamson asked if it was possible to sink the floor of the garage to lower the height of garage. Mr. Haggerty responded that could be an option and also offered that since he has no intention of garaging his truck, he could lower garage door from eight (8) feet to seven (7) feet. Mr. Williamson expressed concern with how big the garage was and the fact that the property is not set back. Steve Moss suggested that the Commission deal with the recommendation of two (2) stories initially. The current code (311.63B) does not support two stories. The maximum height allowed is 18 feet. This would be an additional variance request. In answer to question by Steve Moss, the existing garage will be demolished and Mr. Haggerty will not use existing foundation due to crumbling. Tina Mason asked about existing trees. The two trees closest to the garage will be removed. Peter Williamson read standards for review of variances to identify issues facing the Planning Commission when making variance decisions. Mr. Williamson identified that the primary reasons for the variances being requested appear to be driven by space issues in Mr. Haggerty's house and the convenience to him because of the number of vehicles. Borough Engineer reviewed NDI comments. Mr. Haggerty stated there would be no bathroom but he is considering running a gas line for heat. Borough engineer suggested Mr. Haggerty go across the street and take a digital picture of his house, the existing garage, the alley and the people next door on Second Street and print it out. Next using the same scale he would superimpose on that digital picture his proposed garage and location he wants. This will give a good idea of what it will look like as you come down the street to determine compatibility with the neighborhood. Mr. Haggerty should note on his site plan that he is removing one parking space from the street. Additionally, one foot does not provide sufficient easement for maintenance on the back of the building. Borough Engineer stated Mr. Haggerty needed to get an easement from his neighbor. Steve Moss suggested that Mr. Haggerty attempt to reduce the number of variances required and possibly rethink the need for a second floor. Steve Moss asked if Mr. Haggerty wanted a recommendation tonight or will he bring it back the next time. Mr. Haggerty is withdrawing current plan and signed the waiver at the meeting. Vice-President Robinson suggested if Mr. Haggerty is rethinking plan, he consider narrowing driveway off the street and then opening it back up so he wouldn't be eliminating public parking. Steve Moss thanked Mr. Haggerty for continuing to work with the Planning Commission on his proposal.

Miscellaneous

After close of the Zoning Review, there was an open discussion on best way to address Planning Commission's participation with the Comprehensive Plan Task Force. There was discussion of the Planning Commission's role in the process. Additionally, the Planning Commission requested a copy of the working document prior to the February 23rd meeting so they would have sufficient time to review. This would enable them to come prepared to provide input at the meeting.

Adjournment

Robert Yosua made a motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Tina Mason at 8:55 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted
February 3, 2005

Mary Jane Boyland
Administrative Assistant