



**PLANNING & ZONING MEETING  
Minutes of March 21, 2023**

Chairperson Nick Reitman opened the regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on the above date, with the Pledge of Allegiance and the following members answering roll call:

- |               |                                  |                                   |               |
|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Present:      | Nick Reitman, Chair              | Sonny Markus                      | Adam Lisowsky |
|               | Michele Nelson                   | Sam Ruebusch                      |               |
| Absent:       | Randy Nehus                      | Derek Moore                       |               |
| Also Present: | Stephanie Tarter, City Clerk     | David Plummer, City Administrator |               |
|               | Andy Schabell, Mayor             | Mike Duncan, City Attorney        |               |
|               | Robert Seitzinger, CT Consultant |                                   |               |

Nick Reitman opened the public hearing at 7:01pm.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

***To hear and gather evidence and public comment regarding the application of Verizon Wireless to install a small cell tower at: 1000 Arcadia Blvd.***

**Christopher Bernardo, Peaknet:** They are proposing a decorative pole as there are no available Duke poles for colocation in the area. It will be a small stealth cell tower located before the entrance to the Arcadia Subdivision. The pole is in the public right-of-way and will be only for 4G and there will be coverage for the general area in Arcadia, the surrounding businesses and those traveling along US 27. The proposed pole is a 40-foot smooth black pole, and it will accommodate two carriers.

Mr. Ducan gave general instructions for the public hearing stating anyone can ask questions and can also cross examine anyone who speaks.

**Lisa Mann, Arcadia:** She is concerned about the medical issues related to EMF radiation.

Mr. Duncan explained Federal and State law prohibit the board from making any decisions related to health concerns and can only make decisions related to zoning.

**Eric Jefferies, 7481 Flintshire Dr:** He expressed concern over whether there are regulations that would stop other poles or carriers from being put in that same area and becoming an eye sore. He notices them in more rural areas and not in residential areas.

Chairman Reitman stated the reason for these smaller poles is so there are not more of the large poles installed. Mr. Bernardo explained the small cell and the macro work together and the small cell towers help to extend the coverage area for the affected area. There is no need for concern regarding generators, as it would not be cost effective.

**Lynn Griffis:** She expressed concern over multiple towers being placed there and nothing to stop it. It was explained that as the network grows there will be a need for more. There was further conversation on why the board is not able to make decisions based on health concerns; cell towers are regulated by FCC and cell carriers must stay within the guidelines set forth by federal law. There was also concern about property value being negatively affected and the ability to resell. The cell towers cannot negatively impact the value of the home, but the ability to resell would depend on the person interested in purchasing. There was a question as to whether the city has language in place limiting the number of poles and distance between poles. It was explained the commission is currently working on all of that.

**Dave Moerhing, Palaside Dr:** He expressed concerns related to health and radiation from the tower. He also asked if this tower would have any effect on the future development of the vacant lot.

**John McCellan, 526 Inverness Way:** He asked some general questions regarding the size and height of the pole and if there are current height restrictions for the small cell towers.

**Trish McCellan, 526 Inverness Way:** She asked about the height of the pole in relationship to the light poles located at the bank. The cell tower pole will be 40-feet and the light poles are 20-feet.

There was general conversation in regard to moving it back a 100-feet toward the commercial area, but how would that affect the service coverage.

**Nick Stevens, RF engineer, Verizon Wireless:** The pole is situated for the best coverage for Arcadia and traffic on US 27. He explained the terrain and the coverage would be shadowed and the proposed location will help improve coverage even with the terrain.

There was general discussion regarding moving the pole 10-feet back and how that would affect the signal. Mr. Duncan asked Mr. Stevens to answer the question about moving the pole back the 10-feet. He explained every move will impact the signal and he would look at the data.

**Trish McCullen:** She asked if there is a push from the federal government for more cell towers. The board responded it is the result of more usage as more and more people are working from home.

**Justin Cloyd, 8077 Arcadia Blvd:** He had procedural questions for the board regarding if the height were changed would they have to come back for approval and asked what the height restrictions are for Alexandria. It was explained they would have to come back before the board if they desired to increase the height of the tower and while there is not height restriction for small cell towers specifically there are height restrictions for any type of structure with the different zones in Alexandria. He also asked who had final approval for the decision and it was explained Planning & Zoning makes the final decision.

**Eric Jefferies:** He sees this as an opening for other carriers to come in and he has perfect coverage. He also asked if the city is making any money from the placement of the tower.

Mr. Ruebusch asked about communication from the tower to the phone and if there is RF radiation from that as well. It was explained it is the same frequency from the phone to the tower.

**Cindy Shetterly, 520 Inverness Way:** Her concern revolved around the number of carriers to one pole and how to limit the number of poles in an area. She too would like to see the pole moved back toward US 27.

Mr. Markus suggested giving Verizon time to review how the coverage could be affected with it being moved back. Mr. Stevens indicated that while any move would impact on the signal it would not have a significant impact.

Mr. Duncan asked if the applicants would agree to move the location of the pole as it has been suggested back towards US 27.

**Terry Shumate, Real estate manager, Verizon Wireless:** He spoke to the location choice and how it was to respect the city's decision of not having them in the neighborhoods. He does not believe the move back 20ft will do anything for the look but will negatively impact the coverage for the area. This site was chosen to cover areas of Arcadia and US 27 and moving it toward US 27 will only negatively impact the coverage in Arcadia.

**Rachel Schwab:** She was concerned, as were others in the audience, regarding the liability of when the pole falls into the road or the bank and someone gets injured. There was also concern regarding the car hauling semis that use the vacant lot as their turn around and will knock down the pole. There were questions about who owns the gravel lot and the usage for the trucks to unload.

**Justin Cloyd:** He asked which coverage area was the driving force for the pole and it was explained the main coverage area is US27 and Arcadia is secondary.

**Doug Neack, 7533 Devonshire Dr:** He asked about how many poles are allowed in a location. The board explained they are working on the regulations to dictate how many are allowed and they do not have plans of allowing multiple to be placed in one area.

It was asked if the vote could be held until after the regulations were in place and since the application was submitted under the current regulations the board must use those to base a decision.

There was conversation about the placement of the pole and Mr. Shumate of Verizon wireless agreed to move the pole back 10 feet.

Mr. Reitman closed the Public Hearing at 8:13pm.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Ruebusch believes the aesthetics is fine but does not feel the location is correct. Mr. Reitman explained it meets all the current requirements, the applicant is willing to move the pole away from the entrance and there is an established need for the area.

**MOTION:** Nick Reitman made a motion to approve the pole as presented, moving the location back 10 feet toward US 27, seconded by Michele Nelson. The motion passed 4-0-1, Sam Ruebush abstained.

Mr. Reitman recessed the meeting at 8:17pm for a short break.

Mr. Reitman resumed the meeting at 8:20pm.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 7, 2023**

**MOTION:** Sam Ruebusch made a motion to approve the minutes of March 7, 2023, seconded by Sonny Markus. All in favor, the motion passed 5-0-0.

**VISITORS AND GUESTS – None**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Training hours:** For record purposes it was noted all members of the board received 1hr of training on cell towers on March 7, 2023.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Cell tower regulations:** Mr. Reitman asked to have height limitations, number of poles per site and distance between poles, be part of the conversation. Ms. Minter is working on the draft to be presented at the second meeting in April.

**INTERNAL BUSINESS**

**Treasurer's Report:** Mr. Reitman presented the Treasurer's Report for March 21, 2023, prepared by Randy Nehus.

<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>\$3,162.70</b>	
Receipts		
Expenses	-1,328.25	CT Consultants, Inv# 230283-302
<b>Ending Balance</b>	<b>\$1,834.45</b>	

**MOTION:** Adam Lisowsky made a motion to pay the invoices, Mr. Markus asked about the ending balance and what happens when they run out of money, seconded by Sonny Markus. All in favor, the motion passed 5-0-0.

**MOTION:** Michele Nelson made a motion to approve the Treasurer's Report dated March 21, 2023, seconded by Adam Lisowsky. All in favor, the motion passed 5-0-0.

**City Council Report:** Mr. Plummer stated there is nothing to report at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Adam Lisowsky made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Michele Nelson. All in favor, the motion passed 5-0-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Attested to and submitted by:

  
 Stephanie Tarter, City Clerk

Dated 4-18-2023

  
 Nick Reitman, Chair

Dated 4-18-2023