

1. BUILDING

Comment: All Codes and ordinances of the village shall be addressed at the plan review stage. Not enough detailed information.

Response: Please describe what detailed information is missing so that we can provide.

1A. INSPECTIONAL SERVICES

No comments

2. PUBLIC WORKS

Comment: A maintenance agreement should be provided. Often these remote areas are not maintained and become an eyesore after a few years. Maintenance agreement should dictate who will be responsible for maintaining the area.

Response: We note that this agreement is within the executed lease between the landlord and APC Tower.

Comment: The landscape area needs to be properly defined by curb or retaining wall block so mulch does not wash away. Soil for planting area needs to be properly replaced for health of arborvitae.

Response: This will be addressed within the landscaping portion of the construction drawings.

3. ENGINEERING

No comments

4. FIRE DEPARTMENT

No comments

5. POLICE

Comment: Lighting should be up to Village of Arlington Heights Code.

Response: It is our understanding that no lighting is required.

Comment: Agent contact information must be provided to the Arlington Heights Police Department during all construction phases. Emergency contact cards can be filled out at the Village of Arlington Heights website (vah.com). This allows police department personnel to contact an agent during emergency situations or for suspicious/criminal activity on the property during all hours.

Response: National Wireless Ventures, LLC is the agent and please reach out to Bob Stapleton at 847-833-5448.

Comment: Barriers such as fencing, etc. should be erected to deter access, theft and trespassing to site after tower is built.

Response: This will be adhered to during the construction phase via a temporary fence which will be erected at the end of each construction day.

6. HEALTH DEPARTMENT

No comments

7. PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Comment: Owner Signature is required on the Application form.

Response: This has been completed and provided to Jurisdiction on 4/9/15.

Comment: The property is zoned B-2, General Business District. The Plan Commission must review and the Village Board must approve: A Special Use for a Wireless Antenna Tower in the B-2 district.

Response: We are aware of these needs and have a ZBA Public hearing Scheduled.

Comment: A written justification has been provided for the special use. However, the justification must specifically address the following special use criteria:

Response: See below

a. That said special use is deemed necessary for the public convenience at this location.

The proposed use will fit in with the immediate commercial surroundings of the neighborhood and will provide a service needed by residents in that area of the community. This is also shown in the submitted propagation and coverage maps. The special use is necessary to provide existing and new wireless customers with expanded coverage and data capacity in a constantly growing network. Please refer to the submitted coverage and propagation maps. The proposed site will merge with the existing emergency services network per FCC guidelines. As a result, location based E-911 service will be improved for the surrounding community.

b. That such case will not, under any circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity.

The FCC states that wireless antennas will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort or general welfare. Approval of this special use would not endanger the health of the community as the facility will operate within the FCC public safety guidelines.

c. That the proposed use will comply with the regulations and conditions specified in this ordinance for such use, and with the stipulations and conditions made a part of the authorization granted by the Village Board of Trustees.

The proposed Special Use will not affect the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, but rather will provide enhanced data capacity and wireless infrastructure to the surrounding community. The proposed facility will operate and comply with the regulations and guidelines set forth by the village specified in the ordinance for this particular use.

Comment: The Plan Commission must review and the Village Board must approve the following variations: Chapter 28, Section 6.13, from the requirement that fences in the side and rear yard not exceed five feet to allow a 6 foot tall fence. Please provide a written justification for the zoning variation.

Response: We will alter the plans to provide a 5 foot instead of the 6 foot tall fence as originally provided.

Comment: The Building Code Review Board must review and the Village Board must approve the following variation: Chapter 23, Section 203, Restrictions, from the requirement that ground base antenna cannot exceed 75 feet above the grade level to allow 100 feet tall monopole. Please coordinate with Charles Craig, Assistant Building Official for requirements for the BCRB hearing. The BCRB hearing must be held prior to the Plan Commission hearing.

Response: BCRB meeting scheduled for 4/30/15.

Comment: The Code required parking for this site is as follows....

Response: We need to confirm how many service bay's but believe that there are only 2 or 3 bays, which would lower the total need.

Comment: Parking counts for the site are required. Parking counts should be provided for peak times on two weekdays and a Saturday. When staff visited the site on April 8, 2015, there were 42 cars, 1 trailer and 2 truck cabs in the parking lot. Several vehicles were tandem parked – 2 cars in depth. The proposed loss of 8 parking spaces (4 spaces indicated as striped on the plan and 4 spaces on the south side of the building) will further negatively affect the site. Also, not all parking spaces are striped.

Response: Parking counts were provided on 4/9/15. Also we only believe that 4 total parking spaces will be lost as the footprint only takes of 4 parking spots.

Comment: The existing parking does not meet the requirements of the Ordinance for landscaping. The ends of all parking rows must include a landscape island equal in area to one parking space. Provide landscape islands at the ends of all parking rows

Response: We believe that if this is the requirement then why hasn't the jurisdiction enforced this code violation in the past. We also believe that this should be taken up with the land owner as this is outside of our lease area and does not pertain to our application related to a cell tower.

Comment: The proposed wood fence is 6 foot in height and will need a variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.13, from the requirement that fences in the side and rear yard not exceed five feet.

Response: We will alter the plans to provide a 5 foot instead of the 6 foot tall fence as originally provided. We will not pursue a variation of Chapter 28 Section 6.13 as a result.

Comment: The fence along the west property line is in poor condition. It is recommended that the fence is replaced or repaired.

Response: We have advised the landlord of this request. The height of the base station is 5 foot.

7A. PLANNING DEPARTMENT/LANDSCAPING

Comment: Indicate the size (at time of planting) of the proposed Mission Arborvitae on sheet LE-2.1.

Response: Between 3-5 foot at time of planting.

Comment: Provide a 3' high drought/salt tolerant screen along Central Avenue and Arlington Heights Road in order to buffer the parking lot along the street frontage (Chapter 28, section 6.15-1.2a). Providing a 3 foot high screen may require IDOT's approval for landscaping located in the IDOT right-of-way.

Response: This will be provided assuming that IDOT will approve and we have told by the Jurisdiction not to contact IDOT until we get recommended after the first hearing date.

Comment: The ends of all parking rows must include a landscape island, which contains a 4" caliper shade tree (Chapter 28, section 6.16-1.2b). Provide landscape islands at the ends of all parking rows.

Response: We believe that if this is the requirement then why hasn't the Jurisdiction enforced this code violation in the past. We also believe that this should be taken up with the land owner as this is outside of our lease area and does not pertain to our application related to a cell tower.

Comment: Along the west property line, the existing 6 foot high wood fence is in poor condition. It is recommended that the fence be replaced.

Response: We have advised the landlord of this request.