

**SITE PLAN AND APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (SPAARC)
MEETING NOTES
March 31, 2010**

Attendees:

Committee Members: P. D'Agostino, D. Argumedo, R. Dahal, I. Eckersberg,
W. Hallen, M. Rons, P. Schneider

Citizen Member: S. Valavanis

Other Staff: J. Enerio

Presiding Member: W. Hallen

A quorum being present, acting Chair Hallen called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Projects Reviewed:

SPAARC	AT&T VRAD (various locations)	Process Approval
---------------	------------------------------------------	-------------------------

Representatives from AT&T will present plans for the installation of their Project Lightspeed facilities in the public right-of-way and easements adjacent to the following listed:

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY:	Matt Pinkington	AT&T Design
---------------------------	-----------------	-------------

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Pinkington requested approval to place VRAD boxes at the following locations. The following was discussed:

820 Foster Street

- The committee previously reviewed this location and held it for further discussion, with a question as to whether the proposed location is on private/public property.
- AT&T provided a plat that shows the north half of the site is private with the south half public, where the box would be located.
- With this information, no objection arose from the committee.

Action:

The Committee unanimously approved the request.

1514 Elmwood Avenue

- Paul Schneider led discussion and stated the original proposal was to be north of the parking lot, which impeded the view of a neighbor across the street.
- An alternative location was found behind a series of bushes to the south.
- This new location would not impede access to the railroad.

Action:

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request for the revised location.

1551 Wesley Avenue

- Paul Schneider led discussion and stated the box location would be moved to an alley, a screenable location.
- Committee members inquired if the box could still be serviced at the revised location.
- AT&T confirmed the location could be serviced.

Action:

The Committee unanimously approved the request of the revised location.

319 Ridge Avenue

- Applicant stated the box would be located in a vacated right of way easement, issues from the previous meeting were alleviated.
- The committee agreed the position allowed for good landscaping.

Action:

The Committee unanimously approved the request of the revised location.

602 Mulford

- Paul Schneider stated staff went and examined potential locations
 - Staff feels the original location is the most appropriate
 - The proposed community garden location is beyond the technical capabilities of the box
 - Staff also looked at east grove of trees, however, the site is pushed beyond the technical limits of the box.
 - Movement of the proposed location 70' to the north would lose some customers temporarily.
 - However, in talks with Brian Rozinski of Parks Department, this site would not be an issue. The Parks Department board that could grant approval of a site 70' to the north of the proposed location meets in April.
 - Committee members are not sure if the location, resulting in an easement, on the parks site would require a fee
 - D. Marino is not comfortable with the original location and would prefer it moved 70' to the north.

Action:

The Committee voted unanimously to provisionally recommended approval of the revised site 70' to the north per agreement on the location's cost and technical capabilities being acceptable to applicant and approval by the Park Department Board.

1710 Sherman Avenue/1712 Sherman Avenue

- Paul Schneider stated the initial location conflicted with the downtown plan
 - Original concern was that the location was next to Varsity
 - New location is up the alley to the north
- Committee members remarked there was a concern of truck maneuverability at that location when originally proposed

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Amrquez requested approval for installation of the kw photovoltaic system. The following was discussed:

- Dennis Marino asked if the project had been to preservation.
 - Applicant responded, “Yes”.
- Committee Chair remarked that the committee is concerned about sight and appearance, with the project only 12” above roof surface surrounded by a 20” parapet—it is impossible to see from the street.
- Applicant explained that the project will install on the roof of the water-street building, above the north side, the system is ballasted so there will be no penetration of the roof, further, it is assembled off site in sections so time spent installing it will be minimal.
- Committee asks if this is being funded by grants.
- City staff responds yes, funding for 2 projects comes from 2 grants, the City’s out of pocket cost will be \$55-60,000.
- First Committee staff asks if there will be space to access on roof.
 - Applicant says there will be a foot walkway.
- Committee asks if there will be someone at site to maintain the system.
 - Applicant says yes, and also contact calls for

Action:

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal.

Other Business:

The meeting notes of the March 24, 2010 SPAARC meeting were approved by majority.

The meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m. The next SPAARC meeting will take place on Wednesday, April 7, 2010 unless otherwise noted.

Respectfully submitted,
Dominick Argumedo