

DRAFT

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: VERIZON WIRELESS ANTENNA AT LUTHER VILLAGE; PC# 15-009

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
22nd day of July, 2015, at the hour of 8:19 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JOE LORENZINI, Chairman
LYNN JENSEN
TERRY ENNES
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

LATIKA BHIDE, Development Planner

DRAFT

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, there is another public hearing on the agenda, Verizon Wireless Antenna at Luther Village, 800 West Oakton Street, PC# 15-009. Have all the proper notices been given?

MS. BHIDE: They have.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Is the Petitioner here? Would you please come forward and anybody else who may be testifying? Raise your right hand, I'll swear you in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Could you, who's going to speak first? Okay, would you please state your name, spell it for the court reporter and give your address?

MR. DUEHREN: Dan Duehren, last name is D-u-e-h-r-e-n.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Address please?

MR. DUEHREN: 144 West Lockwood, Suite 200, Webster Groves, Missouri 63119.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Would you now give us your name and address, too?

MR. DOLAN: My name is Doug Dolan, D-o-l-a-n, the same address, 144 West Lockwood.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Has the Petitioner read the conditions in the Staff report?

MR. DUEHREN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Do you agree with them?

MR. DOLAN: With one exception.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. So, why don't you give us a brief presentation on what you're going to do, what your project is?

MR. DUEHREN: Thank you. So, Verizon Wireless has proposed this wireless communication site to address a gap in coverage and capacity that we have in the vicinity. Initially we start this process with what we call a search area. Essentially, we're given basically a circle on a map that says this is where we need to improve coverage.

As you'll see from some of the materials that we submitted, this is an extremely challenging ring. The overwhelming majority of this search ring is densely residential. In fact, there are only three potential locations where we could place a wireless communications facility within this search ring and meet the Village of Arlington Heights' ordinance. That was the site that we chose which is zoned Institutional and then two B-2 Districts kind of on the southern portion of the ring.

We opted for the Institutional for a couple of reasons. First and foremost, we always seek out existing structures whenever we can. That allows us to mount antennas with basically, you know, the least visual and aesthetic impact to the surrounding community rather than having to construct a new cell tower. Had we gone in either of the two B-2 Districts, it would have required a brand

DRAFT

new cell tower of 75 feet. In our case, we are able to mount antennas on the existing rooftop that will blend in seamlessly we believe with the existing architecture. For that reason, we narrowed our focus and chose this site.

Another reason of course was that that B-2 District that you'll see on the zoning overlay map that we provided backs up very closely to residential homes. So, it would have been much closer to residents in terms of, you know, just sheer distance.

The building that we're located on is actually in the center of a very large parcel. So, when you look at the distance between where our antennas are actually going to be located and the nearest homes, it's several hundred feet in all directions.

The other aspect that we took into account of course was how can we make these essentially as invisible as possible. So, our antennas in fact will be hidden entirely behind a stealth enclosure. So, what that means is, you know, from the naked eye, you won't even see the antennas at all. You'll notice there are antennas already on this building that are mounted to the exterior of the penthouse below us which are visible. But I wanted to make that point of emphasis that ours will not be visible at all.

So, I think that was really kind of the crux of why we chose this site. As you can see, you know, addressing coverage and capacity needs is getting more and more challenging as more and more people are relying solely on wireless communications and moving away from land lines. So, what that means is that demand is increasing the most in residential areas, which is of course the hardest place to provide coverage as far as, you know, new towers. They're typically the most highly restrictive districts.

So, that was really our rationale. We feel like, you know, where we needed to be to meet our needs, we found an extremely compatible site and for that reason we are seeking your approval. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Which recommendation do you take exception to?

MR. DUEHREN: So, the recommendation that we have to provide a letter of concurrence from Northwest Central Dispatch prior to Village Board consideration. We'd like to have that amended to having that provided before issuance of a building permit, the reason being is that the FCC highly regulates our industry and wireless communications, as was alluded to in the previous presentation, are spectrum-based. So, for that reason, Verizon has license to the spectrum that it utilizes. For that reason, we have confidence that it's not going to interfere with any of the existing wireless communications in the Village.

So, having said that, we will provide that letter, you know, prior to having the BP issued, but we don't see any reason for that delay.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Latika, Staff report?

DRAFT

MS. BHIDE: Thank you. The Petitioner is seeking a special use permit for a rooftop wireless antenna. Along with it, they are seeking two variations, one from the requirement to provide a parking study, and second, to allow for a screen wall of eight-foot 11 inches and a six-foot tall fence for the equipment shelter.

As you can see, the property is located at 800 West Oakton. This is an Institutional zoned property, it's approximately 73 acres in area. The northern portion of the site is an independent senior living development, the Luther Village. The southern portion where the antenna is proposed to be located has various components including a skilled nursing facility, a memory support wing, senior assisted living, daycare, and a chapel.

So, Verizon Wireless would like to install a rooftop cellular antenna at Lutheran Home. As the Petitioner stated, the antenna will be within a fiberglass enclosure, which would be an extension of the elevator shaft for the penthouse. The proposed enclosure is 10-foot in height, and the overall height of the building, the lower penthouse, the elevator shaft, and then this extension will be 70 feet to the highest point. The antenna will be located approximately 350 feet inside from Oakton Street, and approximately 465 feet from Kennicott Boulevard to the west.

In addition to the rooftop antenna, there's two pieces of equipment on the ground. One is a generator, which is screened behind the screen wall, which needs a variation. Then there is an equipment shelter on the west side of the building. It's kind of hard to see the site plan but it shows both the ground shelter or the ground equipment and the generator as well as the rooftop mounting. This is --

So, the Petitioner had initially applied for what's called a special use waiver, which is something they can apply for for antennas for co-location. But the Department rejected the waiver because the number of antennas was increasing substantially which is one of the criteria in the waiver. It will project more than 12 feet from the highest point of the roofline of the building and we were not sure if it would blend with the building.

Verizon then indicated to us that they have evaluated other alternatives, you know, including existing buildings, a new tower or locating it on the water tank. They feel that this site provides the most concealment as the antennas are behind the screen wall, which could match the paint on the penthouse.

As the antennas are located deep within the site, they're far away from the right of way. Because of the stealth application, the Staff Development Committee does recommend the approval of this special use. As you can see on the elevations here, you know, the antenna shroud as it's called is on top of that penthouse, but you wouldn't really see the antennas because they would be behind that wall.

For the criteria, in addition to the special use criteria, the Petitioner has to demonstrate there is not space

DRAFT

available on an existing tower. As the Petitioner indicated, they had only three potential locations. One was this site and the others were two B-2 properties, which were directly adjacent to R-3.

The landscaping, since this is a rooftop stealth application, there doesn't need to be any landscaping around the antenna shroud itself. But Staff is recommending that they add additional landscaping along the perimeter of the screen wall to soften the impact of the tall wall. Petitioner has agreed to that.

So, just the coverage plats that were presented by the Petitioner, this is without the existing site. As you can see, it doesn't provide for any reliable coverage in residences. Then the center blue spot there, as you can see, is with the addition of this site and would upgrade what coverage would be available.

The Petitioner did provide some photo simulations. On the left is existing, and the right is how it would look with the proposed antenna shroud. So, this is before and after shots from the street where, because it's so far deep inside the site, it's not really visible. This is along, not Kennicott, Oakton. As you can see, you can see the shroud there and then along Kennicott there.

There are two variations, one is from the requirement to provide a traffic study which is required for a special use. But this has none, the rooftop antenna wouldn't have any impact on the parking spaces, so Staff supports this variation. The second was, you know, the requirement that fences not exceed five feet to allow eight feet 11 inches for the wall for the generator and then six-foot for the equipment shelter.

That being said, the Staff Development Committee does recommend approval of the special use subject to that the stealth wall enclosure/antenna shroud should be designed to match the existing brick facade of the building. Condition number two, which Petitioner has indicated an objection to, is providing a letter from the Northwest Central Dispatch. Third is prior to receiving a permit, submitting any state or federal approvals. Because three trees would be removed, there would be six four-inch caliper replacement trees that would be required, and the Petitioner has indicated they are working with the property owner to provide a good placement for that. Then additional landscaping along the screen wall, and then comply with all federal, state and Village regulations and policies.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Latika. Do I have a motion to approve the Staff report into the public record?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So moved.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, let's go to the questions from our Commissioners now. Jay, do you want to start this time?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No, I really don't have any

DRAFT

questions at this point. I think this, you know, contrasts with the other one and is a perfect example of how we can improve infrastructure in a way that is totally reasonable and isn't obstructing at all to other interests, so I'm not concerned. So, I'm totally supportive.

The one thing I would say is it seems like the Petitioner's request for some relief on the timing for the FCC, I would be in favor of. As long as they get it before the building permit, that would be just fine.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I also would like to commend you for, you know, the aesthetic nature that you're going, the path that you're going down rather than just sticking another antenna up on the roof. So, I am very supportive.

Will there be other antennas within this fiberglass structure or just the one for Verizon?

MR. DUEHREN: It will just be Verizon.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Just Verizon. So, you're going through a considerable expense to camouflage and hide the antenna. I commend you for it and I'm in favor of the project, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: From the last petition, this really brings up the point of a need to really look at our telecommunication tower ordinances because having a traffic study for a tower, I mean that is --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It was air traffic, George, air traffic.

COMMISSIONER DROST: The other point about landscaping on a 60-foot building, on the rooftop, that may be okay in some circumstances. But I think it is not intuitive really from that standpoint, and that's not to affect your project but I think it makes a greater point that we need to really look at these towers.

The question I do have for the Petitioner, and we had aesthetics as part of it and looking at some of the photographs, when you're dealing with Lutheran Life Communities, did they negotiate a cross on the enclosure or put a cross on top of the shroud?

MR. DUEHREN: They did not. No, so it will just be blended to match the existing.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, so there's no cross, because there's a number of crosses on campus, and this one will be a higher one to affix.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: They should have hired you, George.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, just tongue in cheek there. I have no further comment.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Just to make the same comment, I think you guys have done a wonderful job. When we first heard about this in Plat & Sub, it was really sort of a no brainer. It was a good idea, what you're doing, and again good job.

DRAFT

I agree with Jay that the issuance of a building permit should be substituted for Village Board consideration.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: A couple of quick questions, Mr. Dolan. Will you be doing the construction? Will your company be doing the construction or will Lutheran Home do the construction of the shroud?

MR. DOLAN: So, Verizon Wireless will contract out to do the construction.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, as the tenant to them, you'll be responsible for building out the shroud?

MR. DOLAN: Yes, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: There will be no antennas up above it, so it will be totally hidden and enclosed?

MR. DOLAN: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Bruce, I'm not sure if I understood you when you say that you're agreeable to having the letter from the Northwest Dispatch provided with the building permit, or prior to?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, prior, yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The number two, the one that they requested.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Latika, on number three, that permit that you're referring to, is that also the building permit?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay. Then I would agree with that also, and I do think it's a good project.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I think it's an excellent project. I commend you and I certainly agree with delaying, using as the trigger point getting your building permit as opposed to going to the Village Board. So, I think it's a great project.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I think it's a good project also. But one question, is your 70-foot tower going to work when the other guy needed 100?

MR. DOLAN: So, it is. I mean I'll be honest, initially Verizon was looking for more height. That's sort of the nature of the business is, you know, the taller the better. But at the same time, you know, we understand that you have to take into account the context of where you're locating. You can't just put a tower anywhere. Within those limitations, you know, 65 feet will more than suffice.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Okay, any comments or questions from the audience? Anybody? No? Okay, if not, we'll close that portion of the hearing and go back to the Commissioners for more questions or recommendations.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'd like to make a motion.

DRAFT

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #15-009, a Special Use Permit for a rooftop wireless antenna; a Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1, from the requirement to provide a traffic study and parking analysis prepared by a qualified professional engineer; and a Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.13, from the requirement that fences shall not exceed a height of five feet to allow eight feet 11 inches and a six-foot fence for the equipment shelter.

This approval is contingent upon compliance with the recommendation of the Plan Commission and the following recommendations detailed in the Staff Development Committee report dated July 17, 2015:

Recommendation

The Staff Development Committee has reviewed the Petitioner's request and recommends approval of the Special Use request for a rooftop wireless antenna, subject to the following conditions:

1. The stealth wall enclosure/antenna shroud shall be designed to match the existing brick facade of the building.
2. Prior to issuance of the building permit, provide a letter from the Northwest Central Dispatch indicating that the proposed frequencies are compatible with Village and other public and private telecommunication frequencies.
3. Prior to receiving a permit, submit any required state or federal approvals.
4. Landscaping along the perimeter of the proposed screen wall for the generator pad shall be provided. Six four-inch caliper replacement trees as required per the ordinance shall be provided.
5. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Roll call vote please.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Aye.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

DRAFT

MS. BHIDE: Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes. Congratulations, you've got a unanimous approval. Is there a date this is going to go to the Board of Trustees?

MS. BHIDE: Again, I will communicate with the Petitioner but I don't have a date for that yet.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Congratulations.

MR. DOLAN: Thank you.

MR. DUEHREN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Any other business? Additional items, Latika? Our next meeting, do we have a date for that?

MS. BHIDE: August 12th will be the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, very good. Okay, do I have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Good night. Thank you, everybody.

(Whereupon, the meeting on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:39 p.m.)