Albemarle County Planning Commission
May 13, 2008

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting, work session and public hearing on Tuesday, May 13, 2008, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Marcia Joseph, Bill Edgerton, Eric Strucko, Thomas Loach, Jon Cannon, Vice Chairman; Linda Porterfield and Calvin Morris, Chairman. Julia Monteith, AICP, non-voting representative for the University of Virginia was absent.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; Joan McDowell, Principal Planner; Mark Graham, Director of Community Development; Bill Fritz, Chief of Current Development and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Mr. Morris invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – May 7, 2008.

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on May 7, 2008.

Public Hearing Items:

SP-2008-07 Lebanon Evangelical Presbyterian Church (Sign # 8)
PROPOSED: Special Use Permit to bring an existing church into conformance with the zoning ordinance and to allow the construction of a storage building
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA -- Rural Areas: agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre)
SECTION: 10.2.2 (35) church building and adjunct cemetery
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Rural Areas - preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (.5 unit/ acre); Entrance Corridor Overlay
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes
LOCATION: 8312 Brooksville Road; north side of Route 250 West; approximately .10 mile east of Plank Road; in the Greenwood area
TAX MAP/PARCEL: TMP 70-2; TMP 70-2A; TMP 70-3A
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: White Hall
(Joan McDowell)

Ms. McDowell presented a power-point presentation and summarized the staff report. (Attachment A: SP-2008-07 Lebanon Presbyterian Church Power-point Presentation)

The request is to bring the existing church and cemetery into conformance with the zoning ordinance and to allow the construction a new storage building. The only change proposed is the storage building to the rear of the property.

Factors Favorable:
1. The special use permit will bring the non-conforming church into conformance with the zoning ordinance.

2. The proposed storage building will be located in an area of the property that will not affect the existing historic church and would be constructed using colors that will be less visible from Route 250.

Factors Unfavorable:

None

Staff recommends approval of this Special Use Permit with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Mr. Morris asked if there were any questions for staff.

Ms. Joseph asked if there is any reason they are not combining the three parcels with the special use permit.

Ms. McDowell replied that staff did not bring that issue up because the storage unit would be entirely on one parcel.

Ms. Joseph noted that many times they ask that parcels be combined because of setbacks. She asked if staff looked at the shed to see if it met the setback lines.

Ms. McDowell replied that zoning staff reviewed the proposal and it meets the setbacks.

Ms. Joseph asked the size of the current congregation or the area of assembly since they are asking to bring the church into compliance. She questioned if they should set a number for this.

Ms. McDowell noted that the applicant was present and could answer that question. She noted that they are not enlarging the sanctuary.

Mr. Morris opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Irene Woodward, member of Lebanon Church, said that Frank Birdsaw, Trustee, was also present. She noted they are both on the Building and Grounds Committee.

Mr. Morris asked the size of the congregation.

Mr. Frank Birdsaw said that the average attendance is about 100 persons per week. Over the years they have had some splits in the church and lost a lot of children. A lot of the classrooms for young people were used for storage for the church. But, now that they find they need the inside rooms for classrooms, which was why they needed the storage building.

Ms. Joseph asked if they have the square footage of the sanctuary.

Mr. Birdsaw replied that they did not measure the sanctuary. It is just one large open room. They took the pews out to put in moveable cushioned chairs so that they could move those around for added guests and members for church and other functions.

Ms. Joseph pointed out that she was looking for a number so that the approval would be for the current size of the church and the number of the congregation. The only reason she was asking for these numbers was so it would be set.

Mr. Birdsaw said that at the present time they have about 100 people attending each Sunday. But, the church will hold about 200 people.

Ms. Joseph noted that was the number she was looking for because as the church grows nobody is going to be concerned because they have 200 people coming.

Mr. Morris noted that the request was for the storage building and to bring the church into conformity, which was why the Commission was concerned that the church was covered.

Ms. Porterfield asked if there is a benefit to the church that they would require them to become one parcel as opposed to three different parcels.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that there is no advantage unless the church has some type of problem.

Mr. Kamptner said that the one advantage, which did not exist here, would be that the storage structure is on one of the two parcels and it is an accessory structure and an accessory structure needs to be on the same parcel as the primary use. But, the church use really does extend to both parcels. Therefore, he was comfortable concluding that the storage structure can stay where it is and there is no accessory use.

Mr. Morris invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Commission.

Mr. Cannon questioned if there should be a note added about the congregation being 200 persons.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that normally when a church is established they want to establish its limits based on the area or a plan that is going to be put into play whereas this exists. Condition 4 notes that there shall not be an increase in the sanctuary without prior approval of an amendment to the special use permit.

Motion: Mr. Strucko moved and Mr. Loach seconded to approve SP-2008-007, Lebanon Presbyterian Church, with the conditions recommended by staff, as modified.

1. Special Use Permit SP 2008-07 Lebanon Presbyterian Church shall be developed in general accord with the concept application plan, provided by the applicant and received February 11, 2008 (Attachment A.) However, the Zoning Administrator may approve revisions to the concept application plan to allow conformance with the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The color of the storage building shall be brown and the roof color shall be charcoal, as agreed by the applicant.
3. There shall be no day care center or private school on site without prior approval of a separate special use permit.
4. There shall not be an increase in the sanctuary without prior approval of an amendment to this special use permit.
5. All outdoor lighting shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from the abutting properties.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris said that SP-2008-007, Lebanon Presbyterian Church will go before the Board of Supervisors on June 11 with a recommendation for approval.

Work Sessions:

Personal Wireless Service Facilities (Continued from April 22)
Presentation and discussion of Albemarle County's Personal Wireless Facilities Policy. (Bill Fritz)

The Planning Commission held a continuation of the 4-22-08 work session to review the Albemarle County Personal Wireless Facilities Policy. Greg Kamptner presented a Power-Point presentation on personal wireless service facilities in response to the Commission's interest in being briefed on the Telecommunications Act after the last work session. Bill Fritz presented a Power-Point presentation, summarized the questions and concerns expressed at the last meeting and asked for input and direction from the Commission and public. Public comment was taken. The Commission provided comments and suggestions. No formal action was taken.

Personal Wireless Service Facilities (Continued from April 22)
Presentation and discussion of Albemarle County's Personal Wireless Facilities Policy. (Bill Fritz)

The Planning Commission held a continuation of the 4-22-08 work session to review the Albemarle County Personal Wireless Facilities Policy.

Greg Kamptner presented a Power-Point presentation on personal wireless service facilities in response the Commission's interest in being briefed on the Telecommunications Act after the last work session. (Attachment B – Personal Wireless Services Facilities – Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney, County of Albemarle – May 13, 2008)

Bill Fritz presented a Power-Point presentation, summarized the questions and concerns expressed at the last meeting and asked for input and direction from the Commission and public. (Attachment C – PowerPoint Presentation dated May 13, 2008) He reviewed the questions and the Planning Commission provided comments as follows.

1. **Distance from the reference tree – They talked about whether the 25' was measured from the trunk, the drip line, the crown or from the highest point. What is the 25' measured from?**

Mr. Fritz noted that at the May 7, 2008 Board meeting they were reviewing an application that was located 24' from the drip line of the tree. Based on the conversations at that meeting it was clear that the Board's desire was to have the facility located as close to the reference tree as possible so as to mitigate the view. There was some conversation about whether or not it should be from the trunk or from the drip line. They ultimately decided in the case last week to do it from the drip line citing that there are going to be cases where getting that far away may be appropriate. In that particular case they were citing that part of the reason was the terrain or slope. By being farther down the slope they were actually getting closer to some of the other trees and mitigating the impact that way. The real key that the Board had on this, which is what the Wireless Policy is about, was that it is about the visibility. Just because it may be allowed to be 25' from the drip line, trunk or whatever distance they pick does not mean that it has to be. Twenty-five feet may be too much and may have an increase in the visibility. That is the advice he can give on that issue. They clearly don't want to have the pole within the drip line of the tree due to the impact that has on the tree. The closer it gets to the tree obviously the better mitigation will occur in most cases. There may be a few cases due to the terrain that getting farther away may actually improve the mitigation.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff has gone out at any time and looked at any of these poles that have been put in to see if they are as close as the drip line to the tree if the tree still exists.

Mr. Fritz replied that at the time of installation of the facility there is both a preliminary zoning inspection and a final zoning inspection that occurs. As part of the final zoning inspection what they are doing is looking to see was the facility actually constructed as proposed in terms of its location. If for some reason the Code Enforcement Officer is not able to tell, then they ask for a physical survey. The survey can include many things, such as the physical location of the pole and the equipment in relation to the reference tree to make sure it is located properly. Also, it could include a recertification of the tree and pole height to make sure that it matches what the applicant said it would be. In some cases they can go out and look and be clear that it is roughly the same height. In other cases that they can't tell, then they require a certification.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff has ever gone back six months later to see if the reference tree is still healthy.

Mr. Fritz replied that they have gone back out, but it is always done on a complaint driven basis. Resources are not available to do an annual check. One of the conditions of approval is that the applicant needs to provide to staff that they are still using the facility. There is no monitoring program other than on a complaint driven basis, which is how zoning enforcement works in the county.

Mr. Edgerton agreed with staff's summary, "that the pole should be 25 feet from the tree trunk or just OUTSIDE the tree drip line, whichever is greater" is a reasonable compromise.

Ms. Joseph and Mr. Cannon agreed with Mr. Edgerton.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Mr. Hoza noted that he had nothing on this particular issue. His comments dealt with the entire policy issue.

The Planning Commission decided to hold public comment until Mr. Fritz's presentation was finished.

2. Amendments to Facilities with Older Special Use Permits

Mr. Fritz noted that there have been a number of facilities built over the years using wood poles. Those wood poles are now decaying or infested with pests. The way the ordinance works now is that the applicants have to go through the full Tier II review even to put back a pole of the same height as approved before in the same location. The question the Commission asked is how many of these things are there out there. The answer is that it would take a few months to figure it out. But, since February, 2004 there have been a total of 31 facilities that have been brought to the Commission. Of those 31 facilities, six were wood poles. There has been a gradual shift towards the metal poles over the years. Therefore, everything done before 2002/2003 is probably wood.

It was the general consensus of the Commission that this was something that should be done administratively so the applicant would not have to go through the full review.

3. **Notice to Neighbors for Balloon Tests**

Mr. Fritz noted that at the previous work session there were five main topics discussed.

- Balloon tests should occur for 12 hours.

Staff's advice is that they can try to leave the balloons up as long as possible, but to guarantee a 12-hour time period is impractical. The height will not be true and it will probably get captured or popped within the trees.

- Provide notice to those in Magisterial District

Staff noted that notification to everyone in a magisterial district would be rather extensive. If a facility was located on an edge of a district, they might have to notify more than one district. This would be a significant notification and would likely generate significant contact to the staff.

- Provide notice to the viewshed of the proposed facility

Staff currently does not have the resources to accurately calculate the viewshed.

- Provide notice to properties within one or two miles

In the Herring application, staff found that 24 abutting property owners were notified. Within one mile there were 292 parcels. This would obviously be an increased cost in postage, which could be covered through an alteration of the fees. Again, there is the potential of additional staff contact by notifying more people. It is just a comment on staff resources.

- Provide detailed signage to advertise the fact that an application for a PWSF has been made.

Currently there is no signage currently done. Therefore, it would be an amendment to the ordinance. Part of that would be figuring out what the posting process would be and the cost associated with that and the impact of increased public comment.

Of the proposals that have been outlined the easiest one to implement would be to simply do notification for a radius or the signage if they were not going to do just the abutting properties. Both proposals have pros and cons associated with them and would require an amendment to the ordinance.

Ms. Joseph questioned how difficult it would be to just get the information that a tentative balloon was being flown on AMail. It would have to be tentative due to inclement weather conditions.

Mr. Fritz replied that would not be a terribly complicated thing to put on an AMail notice that there is a balloon test scheduled for a certain date.

Mr. Edgerton asked if it would be possible to put some sort of notice or standard announcement in the newspaper about the application and balloon test.

Mr. Fritz replied that there could be a notice in the newspaper or by AMail that could say simply that an application has been received on this particular parcel and it is anticipated that a balloon test will occur between May 15 and June 3. It would have to be a window of time. Staff could do that. On Tier III applications there is a notice that is mailed and put in the newspaper because it is a special use permit. Notice is not put in the newspaper for the Tier II facility because they are processed the same way as a site plan.

Mr. Edgerton noted that the regional impact of a tower can be so much more significant than the regional impact of a site plan. Therefore, he did not see them as being comparable issues. He liked the AMail concept, but did not know it that would be available to all folks.

Mr. Loach agreed that it would be helpful to have it on the website, but that the website needs to be made more user-friendly or easier to find. He suggested that the website be divided by magisterial district and category. The images of the balloon test could be left on the website so that people can get a longer time to look at the images and evaluate them.

Ms. Porterfield felt that they should be working to have the applicant do the notification to the abutting property owners and bear both the expense and time of doing that. Staff could show the applicant who they are. That is how they ran it on the board she sat on before and it worked.

4. Disturbance of Critical Slopes

Mr. Fritz noted that there have been a number of these facilities that have been on critical slopes. The Board of Supervisors on the most recent special use permit focused on the visibility impacts of the facility more than the critical slopes. They saw that as an engineering issue as opposed to a waiver issue. The Board did approve the special use permit from last week.

Mr. Cannon asked staff if in the case of towers if the presumption shifted that critical slopes may have to be disturbed and as long as engineering assures us that the disturbance is being managed well that they should generally be predisposed to grant the waiver. Or, does he not read any presumption one way or the other into the ordinance.

Mr. Fritz replied that the presumption that he was going to read into it was that the Board at the time of the adoption of the Wireless Policy and what they restated last week is really keyed on the visibility impacts of the facility. That really is the key issue for them. The Board acknowledged the critical slopes and commented on it, but it was not their primary concern. The primary concern was the visibility of the site. Staff reviews these requests as a facility and not just a tower. They look at the access road that goes into the site. Disturbance of critical slopes can sometimes work against or for you in terms of mitigating visibility impacts.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Valeria Long, representative for Intelos Wireless and other clients, asked to provide comments on a few of the questions.

- Speaking for her client on the issue of how to measure the referenced tree at the 25', she felt that the proposal that Mr. Edgerton referenced and was discussed at the Board meeting last is very reasonable from the applicant's perspective. They would like to be able to get as close to the trunk of the reference tree as possible because it helps with the visibility. But, they are also very

cognitive of the health of the reference tree. If the reference tree dies the facility has to either be removed or reduced in height such that it is then 7' to 10' above the top of the next tallest tree within that 25' distance, which might require physically moving the facility. It is a challenge and the competing interests are the visibility versus the protection of the referenced tree. The proposal of as close as you can to the reference tree without being inside the drip line is a reasonable compromise. They need to keep in mind that there may be reasons to preserve additional flexibility because the sites are unique.

- She echoed Mr. Fritz's comments about the challenges of the balloon test. She agreed that a 12-hour time frame is not realistic. It really depends on the site, but it is hard to fly a balloon for 30 minutes.
- Regarding notification issues, she agreed that they should put some burden on the applicant. It is not unreasonable to have the applicant notify adjacent owners. They want to know what the visibility will be from the adjacent properties.
- She strongly asked that the Commission support a zoning text amendment to allow some of the older wood pole facilities to be administratively replaced. Intelos was the first wireless provider in Albemarle County to work with the County's policy. They have 25 wood pole facilities in the County and several of them need to be replaced. They have some building permits pending in the County to replace a wood pole. A steel pole can provide a lot more stability and would be easier to install and maintain. Part of that also might involve some flexibility to put it a few feet in one direction provided the visibility is okay to avoid having to shut down a site for any period of time. Intelos wants to be able to build the new site before they take the old one down and then immediately do a switch so the site does not have to go off the air. The special use permit conditions say it has to go in the exact same place. They would ask for flexibility on some of those issues as well.
- Finding good sites in Albemarle County for facilities that comply with the ordinance requirements and can result in the minimal level of visibility that the policy requires is a significant challenge.

Stephen Blaine, representative for Verizon Wireless, said that he had a few additional remarks, but that Ms. Long covered much of the same experience that his clients have had.

- On the reference tree and drip line there is always a tendency to try and find a solution to make it cut and dry as sort of a one size fits all. As they have seen in these application there has to be some reserve of flexibility. It is always good for the applicants to have a rule of thumb. What they have talked about here should be viewed as a rule of thumb as opposed to a prescription. As seen in the Herring case there is other countervailing factors, such as the slope and so forth. In fact, many times the reference tree is not the tree that is providing the predominant screening. They may find themselves all wrapped up about protecting one tree when they are actually trying to find sites where they are providing other methods or ways of screening. It is a holistic approach in that they are trying to look at the whole site. They have 20 applications in under the previous interpretation from the zoning administrator. Some of those are in various stages of review, including the Architectural Review Board. They have a rule of thumb going forward. But, if the Commission sees applications that have a former approach they ask that they take a holistic view to those. It is up to the applicant to explain why the site works from a holistic standpoint.
- He noted that good judgment and common sense are needed on the notices. It would be a complicating factor when the procedure was not followed, but not a reason to deny the request.
- Regarding critical slopes he would not recommend any changes. The policy seems to have a conflict between the visual impact and protection of critical slopes. He thought they can sustain both of those as long as they follow the analysis that is in the ordinance. They think what that boils down to is a balancing of how they further the purposes of the ordinance and have the applicant provide a way of addressing the impacts to the critical slopes.

Stephen Waller, consultant with Wireless Resources on a Verizon wireless project, asked for guidance on the interpretation of the ordinance. When they lay these sites out they don't have all of the information at the time. The first site visit is with their team and landlord to find the location. They move around the property a lot on the first visit to find the appropriate site Last time he tried to point out that a lot of the things they use to make this determination comes from prior examples on other sites approved. They need some further guidance on Section 5.1.40.3.2, which states that the site shall provide adequate opportunities for screening of the facility and shall be sited to minimize visibility from adjacent parcels and

streets regardless of their distance to the facility. In a prefect case they end up having an area of existing trees that surround the site that actually fill up the same area of the fall zone. That does not always work. He asked for guidance on what they can use to determine what may be adequate screening when they first lay the site out and the construction standards as far as what needs to be removed.

John Hoza, a resident of Earlysville, noted that the need for the facility, coverage area and possible alternative locations are not factors in the review of any application. Instead, the focus is on the visibility of the site and it is that factor that determines the appropriateness of any proposed facility. Albemarle's County's Wireless Policy was based solely on visibility and not considering need, service area, and possible alternative locations in the decision making process which severely limits the ability of County residents from having any meaningful participation in the decisions concerning the proposed facilities impact on their residential area. The policy places the desires of providers above the best interests of the citizens of Albemarle County.

Mr. Hoza noted problems with the Albemarle County Policy implementation encountered with SDP-2008-42, Buck Mountain Episcopal Church (Verizon Wireless), which would be adjacent to their housing area. There are numerous alternative sites in the area that are not near residential areas, which were never considered. He felt that up until recently they had been kept in the dark about this procedure. This proposal has been ongoing since 2007. No one was notified of the balloon test that took place on March 26. He found out by accident that the balloon test was taking place and was able to notify the neighbor. He noted that there were several problems that need to be addressed including making sure that proper notification is given. They had filed a written request on April 10 for Planning Commission review after attending the site review meeting and hearing the concerns expressed. He felt that area coverage and alternative sites need to be included in the plan as key elements in the planning process. Visibility is important. However, the other three elements are every bit as important and should be included in this decision making process. He asked the Planning Commission to take a look at that. At this point SDP-2008-42, Buck Mountain Episcopal Church had been deferred, postponed and not rescheduled at this time. (Attachment D: Information submitted by John Hoza including a map of tower locations in Charlottesville area)

Mr. Morris commended the applicant for the meeting scheduled with the public because the Planning Commission feels that public notification is extremely important.

Mr. Blaine asked to clarify for the record that the applicant requested a deferral because they were made aware of the neighbors' concerns and questions about the application. That is why they scheduled a neighborhood meeting for tomorrow night. They hope Mr. Hoza will be attending that meeting. They intend to conduct a balloon test at a time that is convenient to the neighborhood. He noted that they are not hiding anything because they don't bring an application forward until determining it is appropriate. They look forward with further dialogue with the neighborhood.

Ms. Long pointed out the importance of every foot in height of these tree-top facilities. She supported allowing the wireless facilities to be 10' above the top of the trees in order for better service. It is a tremendous benefit to the industry to have the 10' versus 7' above the top of the tree. She asked that the Commission take that into consideration that as well. Regarding existing structures, she noted that co-locating on an existing structure was the quickest and easiest route to take. If there were no existing structures around providers were forced to look for a site for a tree-top facility. The goal is to get on air as quickly as possible to provide service to their customers. She asked the Commission to consider whether it is necessary for these wireless facilities to go through the review of the Architectural Review Board since their review if exactly the same as the Planning Commission review.

Ms. Lisa Harmon pointed out that there is a Neighborhood Homeowner's Association in Earlysville that everyone is invited to join. They have a newsletter that comes out several times a year. Sending notices to the Earlysville Residents League at P. O. Box 684 in Earlysville is a way to get information to their newsletter. Also, anyone could call her at home. They have not taken a position on the church's application. She questioned the visual impact of the pole and if the equipment shed would be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Fritz noted that the entire facility and equipment would be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Morris noted that getting the word out is difficult in this type of situation particularly because there is no standard homeowner association list for the County.

Mr. Loach stressed the importance of timely notification, which was something they need to work on.

Mr. Morris noted that it has been a very informative session. He thanked everyone for their input. He said that hopefully it will lead to some positive things.

In summary, the Planning Commission discussed the comments and concerns noting that all of the comments would be taken into consideration. No formal action was taken.

The Planning Commission took a break at 8:16 p.m.
The meeting reconvened at 8:26 p.m.

Wind Turbines – Possible Zoning Text Amendment (Mark Graham)

In summary, a work session was held to provide the Planning Commission information on wind turbines and seek direction on a possible zoning ordinance amendment to allow wind turbines. Currently, wind turbines are not considered an accessory use, meaning they can't be used in conjunction with another use on the property, and are not allowed as a stand alone use in any zoning district. Recognizing the County's interest in promoting renewable energy sources, the Board has expressed interest in considering changes to the Zoning Ordinance that would allow wind turbines to be allowed.

Mark Graham presented a Power-Point presentation and summarized the executive summary regarding common issues with wind turbines, commercial wind turbines, which are used to generate electricity that is sold, and small wind turbines, which are intended to wholly or partially satisfy the demand for electricity by a use on the property. (Attachment E – PowerPoint Presentation on Wind Turbines dated May 13, 2008) (Attachment F – Executive Summary dated May 13, 2008 – Wind Turbines)

Mr. Morris invited public comment. There being none, the Planning Commission discussed and provided comments on the issues and questions raised by staff as follows.

It was the general consensus of the Planning Commission to support small turbines, but with the recognition that to be effective the turbines are going to have to be significantly higher than trees, which creates visibility issues that would be treated differently than wireless facilities.

Old Business:

There being no old business, the meeting moved to the next item.

New Business:

There being no new business, the meeting moved to the next item.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m. to the Tuesday, May 20, 2008 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, Auditorium, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)