

**PENNSBURY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
OCTOBER 26, 2021**

Chairman Dennis Smith opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. Present were Dennis Smith, Lynn Luft, Corinne Murphy, Jeff Streitl and Mike Clements. The minutes of the September 28, 2021 meeting were approved as submitted.

McCloskey Solar Conditional Use – present were Pam Dean McCloskey and Richard McCloskey, homeowners of 113 McFadden Road. A representative from Vision Solar was notified of the meeting and did not attend.

Mr. and Mrs. McCloskey explained the history of the project to install solar panels on the back roof of their house. The initial visit from Vision Solar to their house occurred July 8, with installation taking place around August 11. The system was supposed to be activated within 60 days. The McCloskeys were told all permitting was taken care of by Vision Solar. Two different design plans exist and were submitted to the township. One matches what was installed, one does not.

The commissioners did not have enough information to make an informed decision and no motion was made and no vote was taken. The application should proceed to the supervisors for review.

Shipe Solar Conditional Use – present was Ron Baker, PowerHome Solar District Manager to explain the proposal at 5 Whitestone Lane. Also present were Irene Pucci, neighbor at 6 Whitestone Lane, and her attorney, Charles Proctor.

Mr. Baker explained the proposed ground mount solar system and commissioners asked the following questions:

- Mr. Smith asked about the status of PECO authorization. Mr. Baker responded the authorization is in process and is currently awaiting CU application approval.
- Ms. Luft asked if the proposed system will supply power to any separate buildings. Mr. Baker responded that the system will supply power to anything connected to the main electrical panel, including a separate building, if connected to the panel.
- Ms. Murphy asked if there were plans to shield the solar panels from view by neighbors. Mr. Baker answered PowerHome does not have plans, and he was unsure if the Shipe's had plans to shield it from view.
- Mr. Smith asked if the system would be visible from Ms. Pucci's home. Mr. Baker responded that it would be visible.

Mr. Smith asked for a visual sample in context of the property to understand the visual impact from the adjoining property. Mr. Baker did not have a sample and Mr. Smith explained that this is a requirement in the ordinance. Mr. Smith further explained that if the system was visible, then a remedy is also required, such as vegetation screening.

Mr. Baker noted that the aerial site photograph in the plan is for system location purposes only and the vegetation seen in the photograph is inaccurate as the bushes are no longer on site.

Mr. Smith asked about glare and explained the ordinance calls for application of information showing there is no offsite glare.

Ms. Murphy made a motion to take a neutral position with the following conditions:

- View of the installation from neighbors' property to be submitted
- Screening from neighbors' property is required
- Satisfaction of the zoning ordinance requirements regarding glare

The motion passed with five members in favor, zero against.

The meeting adjourned 7:05 p.m.