MAIDENCREEK TWP. PLANNING COMMISSION

P.O. BOX 319, BLANDON, PA 19510

October 6, 2016

Maidencreek Township
Board of Supervisors
PO Box 319
Blandon, PA 19510

Maidencreek Township
Zoning Hearing Board
PO Box 319
Blandon, PA 19510

Gentlemen,

The Maidencreek Township Planning Commission reviewed the Cellco Partnership conditional use and variance application at their meeting on October 5th. The Commission recommends the granting of the conditional use subject to the requested zoning relief being granted and satisfaction of the items brought forth in the Great Valley Consultants review letter dated September 30, 2016, which is attached. The Commission also had no objection to the requested zoning relief to section 220-48.A(6) Landscaping. The Commission suggested that an additional variance is needed to Zoning section 220-48A.(16) to allow more than one tower on a site. They had no objection to this variance if requested.

Sincerely,

Diane Hollenbach

Diane Hollenbach
Manager
Maidencreek Township

CC: Kate Durso, Fitzpatrick, Lentz & Bubba P.C.
Eugene Orlando, Orlando Law Office
Joan London, Kozloff Stoudt P.C.
Thomas Unger, Systems Design Engineering, Inc.

GREAT VALLEY CONSULTANTS
75 COMMERCE DRIVE ♦ WYOMISSING, PA 19610-3323
PHONE: (610) 375-8822
1-800-733-4821
FAX: (610) 375-8977

September 30, 2016

Diane Hollenbach, Township Manager
Maidencreek Township
P. O. Box 319
Blandon, PA 19510

Re: Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
1 Quarry Road Cell Tower
Conditional Use and Variances Request
GVC File No. 4026-008

Dear Mrs. Hollenbach:

We received for review Plans from Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless titled, "RDG Blandon" submitted by Maser Consulting P.A. The Plans propose the construction of a wireless communications facility/tower on the Maidencreek Township property located at 1 Quarry Road. The location of monopole and related improvements is along the south end of the existing Township building.

These Plans were reviewed per the Applicant's request for conditional use approval per the Zoning Ordinance Section 220-48, and for variances from the setback and landscape requirements of Section 220-48(6) and 220-48(16). Please note comments in **bold** typeface require action by or consideration from the Planning Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors. The remaining comments should be addressed by the applicant or his consultant directly with Township staff or our office. We offer the following comments for your consideration:

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

1. Plans for Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, titled "RDG Blandon", prepared by Maser Consulting P.A., consisting of seven (7) plan sheets as listed:

Plan No.	Date		Description
	Originated	Revised	
T-1	8/26/16		Title Sheet
Z-1	8/26/16		Zoning Information
Z-2	8/26/16		Compound Layout and Elevation View
Z-3	8/26/16		Partial Site Plan
A-1	8/26/16		Construction Details
A-2	8/26/16		Construction Details
A-3	8/26/16		Construction Details

2. Copy of the letter from Fitzpatrick Lentz & Bubba, P.C. dated September 1, 2016 to Maidencreek Township for the Zoning Hearing Board regarding the conditional use and variance requests.

3. Copy of the Supplemental Statement submitted with the September 1, 2016 letter.

4. Copy of the Zoning Hearing Board Notice of Appeal dated September 1, 2016.

ZONING ORDINANCE (CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MAIDENCREEK, CHAPTER 220)

1. The communications tower, and associated facilities, is a use permitted by conditional use in the Industrial Zoning District. (Section 220-48.A)

2. The Supplemental Statement affirms the tower will be designed and constructed in accordance with the industry's structural design standards as certified by the registered professional engineer whom sealed the Plans. However, a similar note must be added to the Plans to certify the communication tower's structural capacity and overall safety. (Section 220-48.A(4))

3. Sheet Z-3 indicates a fence seven feet (7') in height will surround the communications tower and associated facilities. The fence must be eight feet (8') in height. (Section 220-48.A(5))

4. **Landscaping is not proposed to screen the ground-level support structures including the fence. The location of the tower and support structures utilize the south end of the existing Township building so landscaping would not be necessary at that location. Also, the existing communications tower on the property does not have a landscaping screen surrounding the perimeter fence currently.**

   The applicant has requested a variance of the landscape screen of Section 220-48.A(6).

5. The Supplemental Statement indicates that the design of the tower includes collocation accommodations. It is recommended the Applicant formally acknowledges on the plan that space for Township communication systems shall be made available at no cost to the Township. (Section 220-48.A(9))

6. **The tower is only forty-two feet (42') from the southern property line. The setback requirement of the tower from all property lines and existing street right-of-way lines shall be no less than the height of the tower which is one hundred thirty feet (130'). The tower is in compliance with the setback at all other property lines and existing street right-of-way. The proposed setback of this new pole is eight feet (8') further from the southern property line than the existing communications tower.**

   Also included in the setback requirement is the statement of no more than one tower shall be permitted on a site. Provided a communications tower is already located on this site, a variance would be necessary for this requirement as well.

The applicant has requested a variance of the setback no less than the height of the tower of Section 220-48.A(16), but must also include in the variance request a second tower be permitted on the site.

7. The Plans must also be prepared in accordance with all applicable sections of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. (Section 220-48.A(18))

8. The existing easement along the access drive is fifteen feet (15') in width. This easement shall be a minimum of twenty feet (20') in width. (Section 220-48.A(20))

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The Plans do not indicate whether the communications tower will be setback no less than the height of the tower, specifically one hundred thirty feet (130'), from the existing Redner building. We recommend that this measurement is shown on the plan and the setback is satisfied.

   Also, the Planning Commission should note that if the communications tower satisfies the one hundred thirty feet (130') setback from the Redner facility building, it would appear that this setback would extend beyond the side yard setback of the Redner Development Company at this property line. The proposed tower setback may impact future development on the Redner Development Company property. We recommend the Planning Commission Solicitor review this concern.

2. There is a "Gravel Driveway Surfacing" detail on Sheet A-3. It appears the only driveway needed for the proposed tower and facilities will be the paved driveway that services the existing tower. If so, then the gravel driveway detail is unnecessary and can be removed. If not, the detail shall clarify the location on the Plans the detail is applicable.

Please do not hesitate to call our office with any questions regarding the above review.

Sincerely,

SCOTT C. ANDERSON
Project Manager

SCA:bjc
cc: Maidencreek Township Board of Supervisors
Eugene Orlando, Esquire
Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
Maser Consulting P.A.
Catherine E. N. Durso, Fitzpatrick Lentz & Bubba, P.C.