

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: VERIZON WIRELESS CELL TOWER - 1122 WEST RAND ROAD - PC# 18-024
LUV FOR COMMERCIAL ANTENNAS, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 27th day of February, 2019 at the hour of 9:22 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- TERRY ENNES, Chairman
- LYNN JENSEN
- MARY JO WARSKOW
- JOE LORENZINI
- BRUCE GREEN
- SUSAN DAWSON
- JOHN SIGALOS
- JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

- SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
- JACOB SCHMIDT, Assistant Planner

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, we have our last hearing. I'm sorry, you've had to be here a while tonight, but Verizon Wireless Cell Tower, Petition 18-024. If you and whoever else might talk would --

MR. DOLAN: My name is Doug Dolan, spelled D-o-l-a-n.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Doug, are you going to be the, no, I guess we're going to have another. So, I'll swear the two of you in. Your knee is working like mine is. Okay, if you would please raise your right hand?

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, and who's going to start off talking about your proposal?

MR. DOLAN: I'll probably start off.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, and then, sir, if you're going to comment, if you would spell your name out for the court reporter also?

KKK: I'm sorry, what?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: If you are going to speak, if you would spell your name out for the court reporter. You don't need to do it yet but if, okay.

MR. DOLAN: Great, wonderful. My name is Doug Dolan, I'm with Dolan Realty Advisers. I'm president, and we are a commercial real estate firm that is representing Verizon Wireless. The reason that I am here is that the network engineers at Verizon Wireless have identified this particular area of Arlington Heights as being a weak coverage and capacity area. If I can move this, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, press the right button.

MR. DOLAN: Wonderful. So, what we have here is a propagation map. This is a map that's prepared by the network engineers at Verizon Wireless, and it shows the existing coverage in Arlington Heights. So, the blue and the dark blue is the best coverage. The green, light green, and yellow is progressively worse coverage.

Now I'll show the map once the site is in place. This is the facility, the pole that we plan to place at the Cross and Crown Church, you know, subject to the approval of the board. It is a 75-foot pole. I'll go back one more time just to show the coverage gap.

So, the network engineers are trying to bridge these two sites. There's an existing site to the southwest and there's an existing site to the northeast. So, we have a gap inside here which the network engineers have said will continue to grow and get worse over time as more and more data, as more and more capacity comes on to the network.

This is a justification memo from the Verizon engineers. One of the big items that the engineers are trying to reach is in-residence coverage, which means that residents in Arlington Heights who use their phone as a primary phone which is close to 60 percent now and growing, that they'll have that capability.

Again, as was mentioned, we're trying to bridge a gap between two existing sites. One of the primary benefits of having additional cell phone coverage and capacity in Arlington Heights is 9-1-1 coverage. Police, fire, first responders rely on the caller's identity, the caller's location, and this additional cell site will allow the first responders to get a better identification of where the call is coming from.

So, that's 80 percent of 9-1-1 calls are made on cell phones. 55 percent of American homes are wireless only and this grows by each month. By the generation younger than me, it's close to 80 to 90 percent, and those are the new buyers, the new home

buyers, the new residents are strictly cell phone only.

We do get questions about RF safety. So, we are in full compliance with the FCC. They heavily regulate all cell phone sites. We measure about one percent, less than one-tenth of one percent of the FCC limit. These are very low powered as compared to say a TV station or AM radio station. These are, at any of the neighboring residences, if you measure the coverage, it would be equivalent to a home WiFi service or a baby monitor.

This is the proposed site at Cross and Crown Church. We are in the corner of the lot closest to the public, or not the public right-of-way but the ComEd right-of-way. This is the area with the large transmission towers that operate about a 200-foot right-of-way area.

We looked at several locations in this area. We looked at other neighboring properties. We have a lot of residential in this area. We felt that this area, especially to the north lot adjacent to the ComEd transmission towers, would be the least intrusive to the community.

This is a photo of the existing without the cell site, and then we've superimposed, in the next shot we've superimposed the pole. This is a 75-foot pole. It's been reduced from a 95-foot pole to comply with Arlington Heights ordinance. If the network engineers had their druthers, it would be a taller pole. But in compliance and also to address some neighbor concerns, we did have a neighborhood meeting, and so based on that neighborhood meeting, we did take into account the size of the pole, the landscaping, the design of the fence, in working closely with Arlington Heights Staff.

This is another view from Rand Road. You see the Cross and Crown Church on the right, and then we've superimposed the pole. This is similar to, it would be thicker than a flagpole because all the cables and antennas are contained inside this pole. So, there will be no other platforms, no other antennas or cables outside this pole. The canisters at the very top, the 10-foot canister, it's made out of fiber glass, so it's designed specifically for wireless antennas to propagate.

This is a closer shot, this is from the parking lot of the church. Again, a couple of things to point out here is that we went with this particular design, you know, a traditional cell tower has platforms and antennas. A traditional design which maybe you're used to in other parts of the town or in other neighboring communities is that it does allow for additional antennas, more cables, additional boxes up on the tower which does help the propagation of the site. But due to the site and due to the sensitivity of the community, we did go with a stealth type of design. As far as the equipment at the base, we will screen it with a, as opposed to a chainlink fence or a wooden fence, we went with a brick masonry wall which will match, as you can tell from the photo, which will match or designed to match the exterior of the neighboring church.

This is the site plan. Going to details here, but Verizon Wireless equipment here is on the left part of the site plan and you can see the circumference of the tower. We did place this as close as we could to the ComEd line, and that's one of the variances that we're seeking is a setback variance. The reason for that is we wanted, we originally had it in the parking lot about 50 feet to the east, and due to the neighborhood meeting that we got, they felt that that was too open, it was too out in the open. We actually walked out to the site and a couple of the neighbors mentioned, gee, if it was pushed over here more in the corner, it would be a more palatable sight. So, we took that into account, we squeezed down our

compound and made it much smaller, and we tucked it into the corner of the property along the right-of-way.

Again, two overviews, basically the same image of what we saw earlier. This is just a diagram of what we saw earlier.

A quick note on the masonry wall, we originally designed it to be a six-foot wall. Through Staff review of the drawings, it was clear that it wouldn't cover the very top parts of the equipment, especially the generator would stick up above that wall. So, we have agreed to either go with a seven-foot wall which would cover everything but seven inches of the top of the generator, or to go to an eight-foot wall. So, we're agreeable to it in either case.

Here are some dimensions of the tower, 75 feet. The proposed antenna for Verizon is 70 feet. You can see in the top canister, you see where the antennas and the equipment are.

We do design these to be compatible for another tenant so if AT&T or Sprint or T-Mobile were to come in this area, rather than them making a petition for an additional tower, we do design it for compatibility with the other carriers. So, they'd have room at the base of the tower and we design the tower to contain their antennas.

The color of the tower, you know, a traditional flagpole is white and the flag, the US flag is lit. There's noise associated with that, it has to be lit all night long. There will be no lighting on this tower; from an FAA point of view, you have to reach 200 feet before you need any FAA lighting. So, we are proposing a darker color which basically doesn't reflect the light and we found it to be a more pleasing color.

Again, we've talked about a seven-foot wall. It's been a little, we've been going back and forth on the size of wall, but I just want to make it clear that we're fine with a seven-foot wall or an eight-foot wall.

So, I mentioned earlier a stealth design was specifically chosen for this community as opposed to a traditional cell tower. The stealth will be built to accommodate two carriers which will allow for future growth.

Reliable cell phone service, I've been doing this for many years and in the early part of the years, there was a low adoption of cell phones and it's just accelerated. So, you know, my kids, and most of us, period, will never have a landline and that movement has just accelerated. There's more and more devices that are coming online. The new 5G is coming, again we went 2G, 3G, 4G, 5G, that's 10 times faster than 4G. So, more and more, what happens is you build a superhighway and then more and more cars start to go on it. So, because of the capability that's coming with 5G, where you talk about smart cities and all the devices that will be attached to the network, the network engineers are planning for that capacity now. This is an essential site for that which gives basically Verizon and another carrier the ability to provide that service.

That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. So, I'm not sure who has this. Is this you, Sam, or Jake? Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: So, the subject property is located at 1122 West Rand Road. It's zoned R-1 One-Family Dwelling District, and it's currently occupied by the Cross and Crown Church. On the Comprehensive Plan it's classified as Institutional which is compatible with the principal use of the property as a church.

The requested action this evening is for a land use variation to allow

a commercial antenna within an R-1 Zoning District. A commercial antenna is not a permitted or a special use in the R-1 District. Therefore, the land use variation is required.

There are two variations needed in conjunction with this application. First, to allow the equipment including the generator and antenna to be a minimum of four feet from the side lot line, and code requires a 30-foot side yard setback that's on the north. The second variation is to allow the eight-foot tall masonry enclosure walls which are considered a fence, and fence heights are restricted to six feet.

So, the Petitioner has taken two actions to get them to the point where they're at this evening. The first was a meeting with the Conceptual Plan Review Committee on March 22nd of last year. Discussion at that meeting centered around a monopine option which would have been to disguise the tower as like a pine tree, or the stealth option as proposed this evening which is just a singular pole and would conceal all of the antenna equipment and cables within the pole. Staff was, you know, wondering if the Conceptual Plan Review members had any preference. No one except Commissioner Green seemed to prefer the stealth option. So, you know, we're comfortable moving forward with the stealth option and we believe that both the Petitioner and the church would prefer the stealth option as well.

The Petitioner did hold a neighborhood meeting on June 20th of 2018. According to the Petitioner, most of the concerns expressed there related to effect on property values and the general appearance of a cell tower. At that time, the cell tower was proposed at approximately 100 feet, and as you heard it was proposed, you know, a little bit to the east and closer to the townhome residences to the east of the subject property. As a result of the hearing or the neighborhood meeting, that was adjusted and pushed a little bit farther to the west.

So, here's an aerial of the property. You can see on the north, well, first, you can see the subject property outlined in red, and the red square there represents the approximate area where the cell tower will be constructed. To the north is the ComEd property which uses the property for their transmission lines; approximately 140 feet in height are those transmission lines. Additionally, there's some power lines, low-line power lines or telephone lines which is on the southern border of that property. To the west is the Greenwood Place Townhomes and their detention facility. To the south is the Huntington Square commercial strip center, and to the east is the Huntington Square Townhomes. I would mention that the proposed location of the cell tower is almost equidistant between the nearest residential home to the north and the townhomes to the southeast, approximately about 260 feet from both of those nearest residential buildings.

Here's the cell tower site again. I would just point out here is the location of the closest ComEd transmission tower. It's about 140 feet in height. Here you get a sense of where the cell tower compound is proposed on the subject property.

Here's a zoom in of the compound area. Again, the first variation is for the cell tower equipment to be four feet set back from that north property line where code requires a 30-foot setback. Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation because the property to the north is not used residentially. It is a 180-foot wide area for ComEd transmission lines. Again, the nearest residential home to the north is approximately 260 feet away.

I would also mention that the location of the compound encroaches on an existing parking space right here. So, one of the conditions of approval that we're

recommending is to have the Petitioner stripe in another space on the site. Likely, you know, they could fit in either a space here or perhaps here or there or maybe even down there.

Here's the elevation of the equipment, and this outlines the second variation they're requesting which is for the height of the enclosure walls. We're supportive of this variation, again because it helps to screen the equipment and because there is no residential use directly abutting where these walls would be located. We are recommending another condition of approval to add landscaping on the west side of the compound area. You'll see the Petitioner was able to incorporate some landscaping in here. We believe there is room for them to incorporate additional landscaping in here and that's a recommended condition of approval that they have indicated they will comply with. We had originally asked the Petitioner to relocate the compound area a little bit farther to the south to allow some landscaping on the north side of the site. But you know, that would require the removal of an existing air conditioner unit and mechanical equipment here which, you know, we understood was cost prohibitive.

So, in reviewing a land use variation for approval, the Petitioner has to demonstrate that it is compliant with the four standards of approval. Staff Development Committee has evaluated the Petitioner's response. We do believe that the necessary criteria has been met for several reasons. First of all, the proposed cell tower we don't believe will alter the essential character of the locality in that there's an existing approximately 140-foot tall ComEd lattice transmission tower located about 160 feet to the northwest of the proposed cell tower, and there are two about 40-foot tall utility poles within 40 feet of the proposed 75-foot tall.

We also believe that the subject property is unique in that it is located along Rand Road where there's a high demand for cellular service. We are seeing these locations on the street generating a high demand for service as people are driving down the street and using their cell phones for, you know, streaming of music or podcasts or, you know, GPS, or if their passengers are in the car watching videos on YouTube or what have you. There is a demand we seen on these high-traffic corridors for increased cellular capacity. Additionally, there are no transmission or there's no structures above 50 feet in the immediate vicinity that provide a viable option for collocation.

One of the intents of the zoning ordinance is to protect the public health, safety, comfort, and general welfare of the Village. We believe the proposed cell tower will provide better cellular capability for emergency calls which will enhance the safety and welfare of the Village. Additionally, the Petitioner did reduce the height of the cell tower to 75 feet in height which according to them is the minimum necessary height to provide enhanced cellular service needed by Verizon. In this regard, we believe that the variation is the minimum necessary to allow reasonable use on the property.

So, again you saw the propagation maps. Here they are side by side, the current coverage showing a gap in the vicinity of the subject property, and then the second map showing the enhanced service as a result of the proposed cell tower.

Therefore, we are recommending approval of this application subject to four conditions. One, that any antenna and cables to be mounted on the proposed tower be concealed within the tower. That would not only apply to the Verizon equipment but any future collocations on the tower as well. Additionally, as I mentioned, the Petitioner should add the additional landscape screening on the west side of the enclosure area for review and approval by Staff. The Petitioner shall stripe in an additional code-compliant parking space within the

paved surface area on the subject property to mitigate the loss of the parking space that was necessary to accommodate for the compound. Then our standard condition to comply with all federal, state, and Village code, regulations and policies.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Sam.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can we have a motion to accept the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, does anybody in the audience want to make a comment about this? Would you please come forward?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, just before we start that, it might be helpful just to remind that we cannot speak to or vote on the health-related issues when coming up with an antenna.

MRS. GORDON: No health-related issues, okay.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Just wanted to make sure. We've had other antennas come before us and --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We're not allowed to consider it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We are not allowed to consider anything related to the health issues.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, if you would tell us your name, spell it for the court reporter.

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MRS. GORDON: Barbara Gordon, B-a-r-b-a-r-a, and the last name is Gordon, G-o-r-d-o-n. I live at --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Barbara, if you don't want to tell us where you live, that's fine. But if you do, that can be helpful to us.

MRS. GORDON: Oh, no, I'll be happy to. I live right over there at 902 West Essex Place in Huntington Square which is why I'm here, and I want to thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to the Committee.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, sure. Thank you for staying around so long this evening. Sorry.

MRS. GORDON: It's important.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MRS. GORDON: I'm here tonight to voice my opposition to the proposed cell tower and urge the Committee to do the same. I did attend along with my husband and others from our community, I did attend the meeting that was held. But here are my reasons.

I know we all need, you know, we need good wire cellular service. I will say I find it interesting that I have such terrible cell service because I've never had a phone

call drop. We no longer have a landline and we have great download speeds, but then I don't use Verizon. However, the thing is I am against having a cell phone tower in our backyard.

We oppose this project as much as we would for a landfill, a prison, or any other commercial development. The tower has repeatedly been referred to as stealth, referring to the fact that all of the transmission equipment is located inside versus outside. Regardless of the description, stealth or not, we are still going to see a 75-foot tower.

When we met, when we were at the, you know, meeting with, I think Mr. Dolan? Okay, we asked if there were any additional sites that had been considered. We were told yes but were told that this site was optimum for their purposes, but yet they did not provide any information for any of the other sites that were investigated or considered. There are other parcels of land in the area that would not have as much of an impact as the one chosen, but we have not seen any evidence that any other sites were really investigated. There's a large, you know, there's a lot of commercial as you start going north, you know, as opposed to where we are living, okay.

There's definite winners and losers with the approval of this project. Verizon wins, they get a new tower. The church wins because they get a fee every month from Verizon. The homeowners lose with the very real potential of lower property values. Yes, we live near the ComEd high-tension wires and we're told that the tower should not impact us in any way. However, we purchased our homes knowing that those high-tension towers were there. That was included in the cost, that was included in the price. We got a better price for our property because of that. But now this new cell tower will negatively affect our real estate values. We have had more than one unit go up for sale since this discussion, and people ask, they ask their realtors, you know, if this tower were here, could we still ask this amount and they said no, it's going to devalue your property.

We were also told that only a few units would be directly in sight of the tower. Well, the reality is what affects one unit affects all of us, all of the other 32 units, because when you're pricing a home, when you're selling a home, it's a comparison. So, if my neighbor who is at 941 directly behind the cell tower, if their property is worth \$10,000 less, my property is worth \$10,000 less. We're a townhome, it's a small-unit community, you can see it, 33 units. That's all there is.

So, I don't, I mean, we're part of Arlington Heights. We pay our Cook County taxes so that we can support and, you know, we support the community based on those taxes. You guys, right, we all get the benefit of that. We don't, none of us are getting a monthly stipend from, you know, Verizon for this tower.

We've been asked to view and appreciate the big picture regarding adding the tower to provide better cell service. However, it is difficult to see and appreciate the big picture when it has the potential to directly affect, for most of the unit owners, our single largest asset. We respectfully ask that either the request be denied or at the very least additional sites be explored. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you very much. Okay, do we have any questions? Just anybody who wants to --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I mean, I would just say, you know, I certainly sympathize with Mrs. Gordon. You know, this is a balancing act. I think I've said in the past I think that the Village should come up with some kind of guidance for cell towers because the need is only going to increase in the future with the need for capacity. I don't want to set a

precedent for, you know, we have an R-1 and we kind of need to be particular about what's going on because, right, we do run into issues with optics and, you know, aesthetics. But we also run into an issue with having to serve the infrastructure, and at this point the infrastructure for communications, it's critical to have towers like this out there.

But you know, it seems sort of, I think we're still kind of random in how we approach these. I don't think we have articulated guidelines. I think that hurts us and I don't think it's going to help us going forward as the demand for these become greater.

This particular site, you know, I was at the Conceptual Review meeting and, you know, I think there were a couple of options. You know, it is a stealth tower, but I do think, you know, I would like to see maybe the Village asking for more creativity on maybe different variations of concealment. I think there are more out there maybe than we were just presented with, you know, the color or style or whatever.

But that being said, you know, I don't think there's a huge precedent here by accepting this. I do look at the site specifics and see all the transmission lines and the towers. I think that sort of infrastructure is already there, it's well known to be there, and I think that this cell tower, you know, is like a nominal increase in the infrastructure that's there.

So, I think without wanting to set a precedent of these towers going into R-1 without further guidance, I think that in this very particular instance given the location of it, I'm generally supportive of it. When we talk about the value of the house, you know, of the residences that are maybe viewing being diminished, I'm not sure that, you know, it's hard to really know for sure, and it's also hard to know how much value is offset if this is in a dead area as well, especially going forward if you can't get, you know, sound communications in this area. Maybe there's a value to that.

So, it is a balancing act. I'm not quite sure what it is, but I don't think, you know, it's enough to object to. I do think the need of the community is there for infrastructure and it's not going to get any lighter, that need. I think given the surroundings, I'm generally supportive of it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, anyone else?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I have a question. Will this cell tower affect TV or radio reception or anything to the neighboring --

MR. DOLAN: No. No, they're on totally different frequencies. So, the FCC regulates heavily the TV, radio, and to get every wireless device. So, they're in completely separate frequencies.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Now, I ask this because there was a cell tower near Arlington Heights Road and Dundee Road, and every time I drive past it I lose my radio reception in the car. When I drive away from it, then the radio reception comes back on. So, I didn't know if it's a different frequency or --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's a radio station.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It's a radio station, it's not a cell tower.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Whatever it is. Have you looked at other sites?

MR. DOLAN: When we actually looked at the, we like to locate on existing structures. I was before this board maybe four or five years ago and we went on a rooftop site at the Lutheran Village. So, we like to go on existing structures, we like to go on existing towers, existing buildings, on existing transmission towers like ComEd. So, that was our first option was

to address ComEd. We'd gotten correspondence back from ComEd, that the engineering has looked at it and turned us down. They turned us down a couple of times. So, they planned some additional transmission towers in this area at some point and they had a capacity issue themselves. So, they did not permit us to place antennas.

As far as areas to the north, as you get farther north, if we're going to look back at the map, you'll see that as you go farther north you move into an existing area. So, the two, yes, that's right, the north and I guess along Rand Road I'm thinking where the commercial is, that's where we already have an existing site there. So, that's why this site is equidistant. If we move farther south, we move basically closer into residential areas. We can't place this site anywhere that we can be not seen from a single-family home.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The reason I ask that question, a few years ago, I don't know if it was Verizon or who it was, came to us and they wanted to put an antenna on top of, there's a condominium complex I think farther south on Rand Road, not too far from here, and I remember it's a four or five-story building. There used to be an outdoor nursery there and then they built these condos a number of years ago. That was approved but I don't think they ever built them there, because I have a friend that lives in that condominium. I don't know if you know the one I'm referring to.

MR. DOLAN: I'm not familiar with that site.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But it's not that far from it and it's, again I remember it's a four or five-story condominium building.

MR. DOLAN: So, the proposed height of that maybe would be 40 feet or 50 feet. So, that's, and 75 feet is, we're getting the bare minimum of what the RF --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Well, that's my next question. We had a, and I don't remember who it was at the time and they did put up a cell tower, I think it was on Arlington Heights and Central.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Central.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: At that time, they said they had to have, if I remember right, at least 100 feet, maybe even 110.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: It's in the gas station.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Covering a broader area, too.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: On their facility. Now you're saying you only require 70, that's correct?

MR. DOLAN: Well, our initial proposal was 100 feet. So, we also wanted a taller tower. That would have --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I mean, they made it sound like they couldn't do anything less than 100 feet at that time.

MR. DOLAN: And that's --

MR. HUBBARD: They ended up doing 75 feet.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Oh, they did? Okay, all right.

MR. DOLAN: So, each network engineer, they have their own engineers, Verizon, AT&T, Sprint, T-Mobile, they have different networks and their own engineers. But typically, when you lower the height, you reduce the footprint that it covers.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right.

MR. DOLAN: So, you're going to have people in the edges who don't get the benefit of the coverage.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, 70 is going to give you what you want?

MR. DOLAN: Right. It's a 70-foot antenna height and 75-foot pole, correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, thank you. That's all I have.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, my questions are, we've had so many of these towers come up over the years. Some of them are stealth, some of them are hidden away in other features, right. It would seem at this point, the one at the gas station, that was a stealth tower, wasn't it?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It's just a pole, right?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, it had antennas mounted on the outside.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Got the platform on the top.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, but it's not like the one on the Euclid Church that they hid it in the steeple.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Steeple, no.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That you can't see it. Like you could see the tower.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It would seem to me that by now we would have some data that we could show that it does or does not impact home values. I mean, we've had so many of these, and every time, every time a tower comes, people say it's going to reduce home values. The brokers always say, always say this is going to reduce your home values. But we've never seen anybody show up with data that says that it does, right? Do you know what I'm saying?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, it's difficult to get that data. It's hard to control and then prove.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I know, but it just seems to me there's so many of them and we could, to your point, Jay, that this is only going to increase. I'm not even really necessarily talking about this particular project, I'm just commenting. This is only going to increase. We're only going to be putting in more towers. So, it might be a good idea for the Village to actually get an idea whether or not it is causing any impact so that we can properly address the questions that come up all the time about it impacting, right?

That's all I'm saying. I'm not necessarily saying put this project on hold, let's make sure it's not going to impact. I'm just saying every time it's either the health factor or it's property values, every time. So, we should get to the bottom of it, okay?

That was one question. The other question was did you consider, I mean, the building here, how tall is it? Is there any possibility to have it hidden within a feature on the church?

MR. DOLAN: Yes, no, let's see, maybe we could go back. I don't know if we have photos of the whole church, but there isn't --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I was trying to find one.

MR. DOLAN: Like a traditional steeple, like a very large steeple. There is a small steeple but it's more of a --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I saw the cross. I understand, and I'm not saying you have to redo it. I'm not saying you have to. I was just curious. You know, I saw

the cross and I thought how about a 75-foot cross out there as opposed to a, you know, a pole? I mean, I just, I didn't know how feasible that is. Hey, you know, there's really big crosses out there, they become tourist attractions, I'm just saying.

MR. DOLAN: Well, that's one of the considered methods. There are some churches that --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I mean, there are some that hide them within, so I'm just wondering was that considered? Is that absolutely not feasible here? I mean, again the church would have to, I would guess, invest the money into it, and I'm guessing the church needs the income. This is why we tend to find these things associated with churches, to get the income.

MR. DOLAN: Right. Maybe we can address it this way. We've gone in many church steeples, we've done the cross kit. They call it cross kit, we actually put a cross on, there's divergent thought on that. Some think it draws attention, it draws the eye when you have a big, tall cross in the sky. Some, in my opinion being in this for many years, when you have a pole that's painted a darker color, it blends into the background. Maybe you notice it the first day it's built and it disappears, it disappears.

So, and that's true, there's 150,000 cell sites. My wife never saw cell sites until I was in this business, and then you can start to see them as you drive down the road, but they're part of the fabric of our community now. Part of the reason there's not, we have MAI appraisals that are done. They're dated now but they're many years old especially in the beginning when the big push came to build out all these cell sites that show that there was no diminishment of neighboring property values. But 150,000, you know, there's enough data out there that, well, I can share some here.

This is from Money Magazine that 75 percent of prospective homebuyers say a good cellular connection was important to them. The same study shows that 83 percent of millennials say cell service is a most important fact in purchasing a home. 90 percent of US households use wireless service. Citizens need 9-1-1 and reverse 9-1-1, wireless may be their only connection. So, having a poor cell phone coverage is definitely a detriment in the sale of a home.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right.

MR. DOLAN: Especially with -- home offices now.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We've approved others of these with the questioning of the reduced home value.

MR. DOLAN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I understand the plight of the homeowner behind you but we have moved forward with them before, even faced with that. It just seems to me that it might be helpful to the homeowners because the brokers seem to be riling up fear which may be warranted, I don't know, I've never looked into it. But they seem to be riling up fear and we don't have any data. No one ever comes to us with data or information to make the homeowners feel more comfortable that this won't have this impact. So, that's why I raised that.

I can also see people objecting to a 75-foot cross in their backyard, you know. I mean, there's people who won't like that. So, you can't win. But I just was curious if you had considered that. That was all. I'm good. Am I entertaining you, Terry?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No, from the, since you said that, I'm going to, from

the valuation standpoint, my career is in valuation. I've got to say that on this subject, I find as many appraisers who say there is an impact, there's as many appraisers who say there isn't. It's very difficult to quantify. There's people who want to be close to it. There's people who would never move to high-tension wires, and there's other people who have no problem with it. There's a lot of variables that are involved.

I think in this particular case with the right-of-way, with all the towers that already exist, that I really don't see it being an issue. However, there was mention of a tower disguised as a tree that got one of my fellow Commissioners chuckling. But I was recently out in Napa and I noticed in some of the mountains, in some of the hillsides, they have their cell phone towers disguised as pine trees. I think it's fantastic. Have you done any?

MR. DOLAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: In the Chicago metropolitan area?

MR. DOLAN: Not in Chicago, in St. Louis. We've done monopinies which is the trade name for them, and they do work well typically in areas with other pine trees. So, Napa would be a --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Not just in the middle of nowhere.

MR. DOLAN: Yes, not in the middle of a parking lot with no other trees around.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: You could plant a bunch of trees.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We could, Mary Joe would be in love with this, we could plant some other trees.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: It has to be a real tree I guess.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are they much more expensive?

MR. DOLAN: They are more expensive. There's more maintenance. There's a lot of foliage.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, I noticed that.

MR. DOLAN: The foliage can fall sometimes, you know. It's a different style. I think the biggest item is that, and I've talked to the church about it, too, and they also felt that a tree in a parking lot without any other trees around it, I mean, it would not be compatible with the surrounding environment.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But with those rental fees, maybe they could plant some more trees. It's pretty wide open there. Anyways, are there other questions down here?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, I just want to commend Staff for putting the section in there for the FCC considerations. Because the last few times we've done this, we've spent hours going around and around, and it's good to know what the FCC requires of us. I do want to draw attention to the fact that if someone else asked them to put any more, you know, give them the capacity to handle more signals, they by right can go another 20 feet. So, they can do a 95-foot tower and there's not really anything that any of the villages can do anything about it. So, anyway, I want to commend you because this clears up a lot of things and I'm glad we didn't have to retread all that.

I agree with the Chairman. I don't see how you could, in an area with all of those high-tension wires, 100 and whatever it is, 40 feet or 60 feet high, I can't imagine that you'd notice this. The one down in Central and Arlington Heights Road where Jay and I live, I've never heard anyone say anything about it other than we've had a lot of, we had a lot of talk about it beforehand. So, I don't see that really the aesthetic is going to be that big of an issue.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, I've got a question for Mr. Dolan.

MR. DOLAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, I assume the stealth design, the interior antennas, are those as effective as if they had the exterior ones?

MR. DOLAN: They are effective, and they do get the job done. Again, if we had our druthers, it would be a 100-foot pole with exterior antennas, a full platform, and nine antennas. So, it would be limited to three antennas.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That would be more effective?

MR. DOLAN: It would handle more calls. It would handle, it would propagate farther. In other words, it would have a larger footprint that it would handle, but this is a nice tradeoff to the community standards. We're in a residential area, we're not in a, you know, an industrial park and such. So, it's not uncommon to make that tradeoff in neighborhoods like this.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And you said you originally had a 95-foot but reduced it to 75?

MR. DOLAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Because of code or because of the community's concerns?

MR. DOLAN: For two reasons. Code was definitely one of them, it would be one less variation that we would need, and because of the neighborhood meeting that we took into account. A shorter pole is a less visible pole.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Sam, a question for you. So, I mean, I can see the reason for having limits on pole heights. But that really doesn't take into concern where the pole is at, right? Because you've got 100 and some foot transmission towers and I don't know that a larger pole would really matter that much here. But the Village, but our code doesn't take that into account?

MR. HUBBARD: It doesn't. It's actually a building code requirement, it's nothing in the zoning code. So, they would have had to have gone to the Building Code Review Board for a variation.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And I do agree with Commissioner Cherwin's comment earlier about we should try to get some more guidance on cell towers because it is getting to be a more important thing. But as far as trying to get data on home values, I think that, you know, it's like talking about politics and religion, I think it would be hard to prove one way or the other. All right, that's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Bruce, did you have anything?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Oh, yes, I have something. So, I'm glad that nobody stole my punch line here, but if we have a 75-foot ordinance in the Village and the next line in your report says however, if and when a request is made to collocate another user on the tower under the FCC order Section 6409 or whatever that is, the height of the tower can be increased to 20 feet as a matter of right. Is that correct, Mr. Dolan?

MR. DOLAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, if we wanted 75 feet, why wouldn't we just give you a 55-foot pole?

MR. DOLAN: Well, we have no plans to expand it. We have accepted the

75 feet and we're going to live with the 75 feet. The FCC, the federal regulations preempt some local zoning codes because they do want the ability, rather than a new tower going up or the inability for a new carrier to locate on a tower, they have granted, the FCC has granted the ability for tower owners to raise the height to a maximum of 20 feet. It's 10 percent of the tower height to a maximum of 20 feet. That's to accommodate a collocation.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: 20 feet additional.

MR. DOLAN: Additional, correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: 20 feet additional. So, we're taking whose word for it? Are you the owner of this pole? Are you just the --

MR. DOLAN: The owner, I'll be the owner, too.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, we're going to take your word for it that you're not going to want a 95-foot pole?

MR. DOLAN: We're going to build a 75-foot pole.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And if you wanted to make it 95 feet, would you?

MR. DOLAN: If another tenant came to us, whether it be AT&T and they demonstrated, we still have to go through a building permit, administrative zoning review, have to go through Sam's office, and they demonstrated that they needed the additional 10 feet to provide coverage to Arlington Heights, that will be a bridge that we'd cross at that time.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, what you're saying is that if the money was there you'd do it. So, then you'd have Mrs. Gordon after you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: If the Village lets him do it.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: If the Village lets him do it. But what I'm saying is you just said here in your report, Sam, which we're going to, which we entered into the record, that no matter what happens they can get another 20 feet. It overrides the Village requirement.

MR. HUBBARD: That's true, and the same applies to that tower on Central and that's been up since I think 2012 I want to say.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right, it doesn't make it right.

MR. HUBBARD: But that, they never did.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's just that when you come in for 75 you end up with 95.

MR. HUBBARD: They never did raise it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, but isn't it better if we have fewer towers and the service providers share those towers?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm just posing the question.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No, I know, I know.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: If you want the pole to be 75 feet, then we should approve 55 feet.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, but I think, Bruce, isn't our ordinance, I mean, is it, well, like it kind of goes back to my guidance principle which is I'm not quite sure what they are, but we allow up to, what's the limit on the Village ordinance?

MR. HUBBARD: The Village code has a limit that caps the height of a tower to 75 feet.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: To 75. So, I guess we'd say what's the basis for going, you know, I mean, I don't know how much latitude, I don't really know what the

guidance is on how to do it, but if they're trying to fill a gap, 55 may not serve that purpose.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I agree with what you said totally, Jay, that we need some guidelines. I agreed with you the last time we did this.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But we're really kind of, it's just late and, you know, I'm getting a little punchy here.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I agree.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, what I'm saying is that we really have nothing to say about this if they want to go 95 feet.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, there's a preemptive --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I just want Mrs. Gordon to hear this because she's going to think we did it.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Oh, right, yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, and we didn't, Mrs. Gordon, that's not us. It would be them.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I've got to tell you, if we went another decade or so down the road and we go to 5G, 6G or whatever, and we need towers and capabilities and height, somebody is going to say what in the world was that Plan Commission thinking about when they decided to build a three-foot-high tower that didn't cover anything. So, why, I mean, we're not going to go in the reverse direction on this.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Mr. Dolan, or Sam --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I withdraw my question if it's too much.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Point of clarification. So, if the FCC wanted to give your competitor an antenna on the tower, you'd have to abide by it?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You'd have to accommodate your competitors if they want to --

MR. DOLAN: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I just find that a little shocking that they could make you do that.

MR. DOLAN: Well, that applies to all cell towers. Now, you know, if there's a structural problem and they can't, you know, some of the older towers have structural problems and you can't collocate additional antennas.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right. So, I mean, if this came forth 10 years from now but your tower's base isn't strong enough to handle another 20 feet, you couldn't do it?

MR. DOLAN: Well, we will design it for a 20-foot extension. We will design it that way now because it's very small money now. To try and put a 20-foot extension on after designing for 75 feet is triple.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I guess, just guessing here, but maybe the Village settled on that 70 feet thinking that 90-foot could be there some day. Who knows? Okay, all right, that's all I had. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Good thing we don't have three of these in two weeks. Okay, are there any other questions? Do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I can move.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You know what, before we do that, Mr. Dolan, one thing I forgot to ask you. There's four conditions on the Staff's report. You agree with those four conditions?

MR. DOLAN: I do agree with all of them. A note on number one, it mentions that all of the antennas will be concealed within the tower which they will, the primary antennas will all be concealed. But all cell sites use GPS antennas, global positioning system, and those will be just over like at the nine-foot level. They'll be at the ground level but they need to be up above that screen wall. They're small antennas about coffee-cup size, but they're two antennas. Those antennas are important to detect the location of the caller.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And we are going with an eight-foot wall.

MR. DOLAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I will move.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC#18-024, a Land Use Variation to allow a commercial antenna within the R-1, One-Family Dwelling District, and the following variations:

- 1. Variation to Chapter 28, Sections 6.14-2.1(A) and 6.6-5.1, to allow a commercial antenna structure and associated equipment (including a generator) to be set back a minimum of four feet from the side yard lot line where code requires a 30-foot setback.**
- 2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3(B), to allow an eight-foot tall fence where the maximum fence height is restricted to six feet.**

Approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All antenna and cables to be mounted on the proposed tower shall be concealed within the tower structure.**
- 2. The Petitioner shall add additional landscape screening along the west side of the enclosure area, for review and approval by the Village.**
- 3. The Petitioner shall stripe an additional code-compliant parking space within the paved parking area on the subject property to mitigate for the loss of the parking space that was necessary to accommodate the compound area.**
- 4. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: With the caveat that number one should include some flexibility for the modest GPS antennas that Mr. Dolan referenced.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have a second. Can we have roll call?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, you received unanimous approval. Your next step, as you know, is to proceed on to the Village Board, and think about that pine tree. Thank you, good luck with that.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above petition was adjourned at 10:18 p.m.)