# HARDING TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES REGULAR MEETING <br> FEBRUARY 17, 2022 <br> 7:00 PM 

## CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Board Chair, Mr. Flanagan called the regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment to order at 7:00 and announced that adequate notice of the meeting had been made in accordance with the New Jersey State Open Public Meetings Act and State Executive Order 103.

## REGULAR MEETING

## ROLL

Ms. Taglairino called the roll. It went as follows:

| Mr. Cammarata | Present | Mr. Newlin | Present | Mr. Maselli | Present |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mr. Addonizio | Present |  | Ms. Sovolos | Excused | Mr. Boyan | Present |
| Mr. Rosenbaum | Present |  | Mr. Symonds Present | Mr. Flanagan | Present |  |

Board Attorney, Mr. Hall, was on the phone for the memorialization of a resolution. Board Engineer, Mr. Fox and Board Planner, Ms. Mertz and Ms. Taglairino were also present. Attorney, Mr. Mlenak was present for the Verizon application.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Flanagan announced the following scheduling \& procedural matters:

| Application BOA\# 14-20 | Donald \& Eliza Murphy <br> 49 Meyersville Road, B55/L5 <br> Status update: (Pending completeness) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { Application BOA\# 16-21 }}$ | Ronald \& Judith Preiss <br> 110 Village Road, B15/L10.03, R-1 Zone <br> (Pending Completeness) |
|  | Application BOA \#18-21 Waterfront Properties, LLC |
|  | 595 Van Beuren Road, B5/L8 <br> Appeal of Tree Officer Decision (Pending Completeness) |
|  | Dr. James Wittig <br> 34 Kitchell Road B1/L5 R-1 Zone <br> (Adjourned to the March 17, 2022 meeting). |

Application BOA\# 19-21 Andreas \& Wendy Kertesz

19 Wildlife Run, B15/L22.04
(Adjourned to the March 17, 2022 meeting).

Mr. Flanagan reported on an administrative change in the municipal staff. He noted that zoning and land use will now report to Mr. DeNave, the Assistant Adminstrator.

RESOLUTIONS-Mr. Flanagan
Resolution BOA\# 17-21 Timothy and Rebecca Daniels
10 St. Clair Road, B 26.01/L33, R-1 Zone
Mr. Rosenbaum made a motion to approve_Resolution BOA\# 17-2021 Daniels. It was seconded by Mr. Newlin. On a voice vote all were in favor of approving the resolution.

## MINUTES <br> January 20, 2022 Minutes

Mr. Rosenbaum made a motion to approve the January 20, 2022 minutes as written. It was seconded by Mr. Flanagan. On a voice vote all were in favor of approving the minutes.

## OLD BUSINESS

Application BOA\# 17-18
New York SMSA Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon
Wireless
8 Millbrook Road, B17/L1, PL Zone
Applicant requesting variance relief for use, per N.J.S.A.
40:55D-70(d) for a cell tower.
Presenting:
Richard Schneider, Attorney
Mr. Mlenak, Acting Board Attorney for this application.
Robert Simon, Objecting attorney for this application.
Dr. Bruce Eisenstein, RFP Specialist
Ms. Boshulte, RF Specialist for Verizon
The applicant re-presented a proposal for a reduced tower of 80 feet in height.
Discussion ensued.
The application is carried until to a March 31, 2022 meeting with no further notice and an extension of the FCC Shot Clock.

A transcript of the testimony is appended to the minutes.

## OTHER BUSINESS

None

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Flanagan adjourned the meeting at 9:30

# Respectfully submitted by Lori Taglairino, Board of Adjustment Secretary 

HARDING TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT RESOLUTION<br>Timothy \& Rebecca Daniels - Application No. BOA 017-21<br>10 St. Clair Road - Block 26.01, Lot 33<br>Adopted February 17, 2022

WHEREAS, Timothy and Rebecca Daniels applied to the Harding Township Board of Adjustment for variances from Section $225-115(B)$ of the Land Use and Development Ordinance, which prohibits the enlargement of certain nonconforming structures, and Section 225-122(F), which requires 100' side setbacks, to permit construction of a rear deck addition to the residence on property located at 10 St. Clair Road and designated on the Township Tax Map as Block 26.01, Lot 33; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment conducted a public hearing on the application at a meeting on January 20, 2022 at the Harding Township Municipal Building, for which public notice and notice by applicants were given as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment determined that a site inspection was not necessary due to the characteristics of this property and proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment considered the testimony and exhibits presented during the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the meeting on January 20, 2022, the Board of Adjustment adopted an oral resolution approving the variance application, subject to certain conditions and based on findings and conclusions as memorialized herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Harding Township Board of Adjustment, this 17th day of February 2022, that approval of the variance application of Timothy and Rebecca Daniels is hereby memorialized as follows:

## Findings of Fact and Statement of Reasons

1. The applicants' property is located in a R-1 Zone at 10 St . Clair Road. It is improved with a single-family residence, swimming pool and related residential improvements.
2. It has a lot size of 3.326 acres that exceeds the 3 acre minimum. The lot fronts on the cul-de-sac bulb at the end of St. Clair Road. The lot frontage of $81.7^{\prime}$ is nonconforming relative to the 300 ' minimum.
3. The residential improvements are nonconforming as to setbacks from the right side lot line for the residence (82.5’ vs. 100 ' minimum) and the pool deck ( $53.4^{\prime}$ vs. $100^{\prime}$ minimum). A nonconforming shed that straddles the right side lot line would be removed from the property or moved to a conforming location.
4. The applicant proposed to construct an elevated deck addition to the rear of the residence, with a stairway to the rear going down to grade level. Due to the downward sloping topography, the elevated deck would be accessed from the first floor of the residence containing the primary common living areas. An existing stairway to the right side of the residence would be removed.
5. The existing and proposed improvements were shown on plans prepared by John Ferrante, P.E., dated September 23, 2021.
6. The deck addition would have a minimum setback from the right side lot line of 77.7 ', requiring a variance from the 100 ' minimum setback requirement in Section 225-122(F).
7. Variance relief is also required from Section 225-115(B) to permit enlargement of the nonconforming residence.
8. The applicant was represented in proceedings before the Board of Adjustment by David Scalera, Esq.
9. Testimony in support of the application was provided by the applicants, who explained the proposal.
10. The present low profile appearance for the front of the residence would not be altered, since all improvements would be to the rear. Even though a side setback variance was requested, the deck would mainly expand the residence to the rear, with only a modest increase of about 4 ' in the side setback relative to the building façade for the residence. Any potential impact would be offset by elimination of a stairway along the side of the residence with a similar nonconforming setback.
11. There was a discussion of the proposed elevated rear stairway that would project into the rear yard. The applicants agreed to reconfigure the stairway so that it would run parallel to and abutting the deck.
12. The applicants also agreed to move the nonconforming shed to a conforming location on the property or remove it.
13. No neighbor or member of the public objected to the application.
14. The need for setback variance relief for the proposed deck is due to the nonconforming location of the residence and the interior layout of existing improvements. The proposed deck and patio are modest in size, and it would not be practical to site them at a more conforming location on the property.
15. Reconfiguration of the proposed rear stairway, relocation of the shed, and removal of the existing stairway at the side of the residence would mitigate any potential adverse impact of the requested variance relief.
16. The proposed improvements will not result in any adverse impacts on adjacent property, particularly since all improvements will be to the rear and there will be no change to the low level front appearance of the residence.
17. In the case of this specific property and the location of the existing and proposed improvements, strict application of the zoning requirements would impose peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties on the applicants by precluding the
proposed rear deck, thus making variance relief appropriate pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(1).
18. The variance relief requested by the applicants can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance of the Township of Harding.

## Description of Variances

1. A variance is hereby granted from Section 225-115(B) of the Land Use and Development Ordinance to allow enlargement of the applicants' nonconforming residence by construction of a rear deck addition, as shown on plans prepared by John Ferrante, P.E., last dated September 23, 2021, and required to be revised as a condition of this approval.
2. A variance is hereby granted from the 100 ' minimum setback requirement in Section 225-122(F) of the Ordinance to authorize construction of a rear deck addition with a minimum setback from the right side lot line of 77.7 , as shown on the plans as required to be revised.

## Variance Conditions

1. The applicants shall obtain any other necessary approvals, including but not limited to a building permit and tree removal permit (if applicable).
2. Any outstanding technical review fees shall be paid prior to issuance of a building permit and certificate of occupancy.
3. These variances are based on and authorize only the specific proposed improvements as set forth in the testimony, application and plans. New or amended variance approval may be required for any materially different improvements.
4. The applicants' plans shall be revised to: (a) show modification of proposed elevated rear stairway to show it running parallel and immediately adjacent to the deck; (2) revise the plan note to state that the nonconforming shed will be relocated to a conforming location on the property; (3) make any necessary adjustments to the zoning table. The revised plans shall be subject to review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit, and shed relocation shall occur prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the deck addition.
5. In accordance with Section 225-35(C)(1) of the Ordinance, these variances shall expire unless the authorized construction is commenced within one year from the date of this resolution and is subsequently pursued in a reasonably diligent manner.
6. Compliance with all approval conditions shall be addressed by the Zoning Officer, who shall provide written confirmation for the municipal records.

## Vote on Resolutions

For the Oral Resolution: Addonizio, Maselli, Newlin, Rosenbaum, Sovolos, Symonds \& Flanagan.
Against the Oral Resolution: None.
For the Form of the Written Resolution: Addonizio, Maselli, Newlin, Rosenbaum, Sovolos, Symonds \& Flanagan.
Against the Form of the Written Resolution: None.
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| Millbrook Road : | 5 | VOGEL, CHAIT, COLLINS \& SCHNEIDER, ESQUIRES |
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| ALSO PRESENT: | 15 |  |
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| DR. BRUCE EISENSTEIN, Cellular Communications | 19 |  |
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| Page 3 |  | Page 4 |
| IN DEX | 1 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Welcome everyone to our |
| 2 | 2 | regularly scheduled meeting noticed in the Observer |
| 3 | 3 | Tribune and other outlets. And tonight is |
| Mr. Paul Fox, P.E...................Sworn Page 5 | 4 | February 17th. Lori, will you call the roll? |
| Ms. McKinley Mertz, P.P..............Sworn Page 6 | 5 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. Mr. Boyan? |
| 5 | 6 | BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Here. |
| 6 | 7 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Addonizio? |
| 7 | 7 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Addonizio? |
| E X H I B I T S | 8 | BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Here. |
| 9 | 9 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Ms. Sovolos is |
| EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE | 10 | excused. Mr. Maselli? |
| 10 | 11 | BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Here. |
| 11 | 12 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Make sure you use |
| 12 | 13 | your microphone, people. Mr. Cammarata? |
| 13 | 14 | BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: Here. |
| 14 |  | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you Mr |
| 15 | 15 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you. Mr. |
| PUBLIC MEMBERS ARE SWORN: | 16 | Rosenbaum? |
| 16 | 17 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Here. |
| 17 | 18 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Symonds? |
| 18 | 19 | BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Here. |
| 19 | 20 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Newlin? |
| 20 | 21 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Here. |
| 21 | 22 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Flanagan? |
| 22 | 23 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN. I am here |
| 23 |  | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I am here. |
| 24 | 24 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: And McKinley and -- |
| 25 | 25 | Ms. Mertz and Mr. Fox are here. We will get to you and |

get you sworn in at some point. All right.
Administrative.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So tonight the
only application we have is Verizon. Before we get to that we're going to do a little bit of housekeeping upfront.
(Whereupon, the Board discusses
Administrative matters at this time.)
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Steve, there was a request just so you know that Ms. Mertz and Mr. Fox were not here at the last meeting and they have not been sworn in as professionals. We were wondering if you can swear them in for the purposes of the application this evening?

MR. MLENAK: Sure. Do you want to do it together? Let's start for the record so we know who's being sworn in for the record, your name.

MR. FOX: Paul Fox.
MS. MERTZ: McKinley Mertz.
MR. MLENAK: Okay. Do you swear that the testimony that you may give during this hearing is the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. FOX: I do.
MS. MERTZ: I do.
P A U L F O X, P.E., is duly sworn.

## Page 7

application that was pending before the Board.
Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet.

Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response.

In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very much sincerely wishes to avoid potential litigation. Therefore, the Applicant in my opinion has made a significant compromise that it wishes to very simply put forward to the Board.

The Applicant is prepared to, as a condition of approval, to lower the height of the

McKINLEY MERTZ, P.P., is duly sworn.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So now we're on Verizon. Mr. Schneider welcome back. Happy New Year. Is it too late to say that?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Make sure you put your microphone on and make sure you speak into it loudly and clearly.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Lunar New Year, is it too late too?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Happy New Year. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. Welcome back. So tonight what are we going to talk about?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think we'll be brief, but best laid plans sometimes go astray.

Good evening. Once again for the record, Richard Schneider of law firm of Vogel, Chait, Collins and Schneider on behalf of the Applicant New York SMSA Limited Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, as you I'm sure all recall when we last convened it was at the Board's December meeting, at which time the Board engaged in its deliberative process as to whether approve -- whether to approve or to deny the

|  | Page 9 |  | Page 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | capacity. | 1 | slang expression, while you may get more bang for the |
| 2 | The Applicant clearly would have preferred | 2 | buck at the higher height the point being that when |
| 3 | the higher height. There was, and I remember this | 3 | you're talking about a flagpole the ten or 20 feet from |
| 4 | vividly, there was a lot of discussion during many of | 4 | the Applicant's perspective is not a significant visual |
| 5 | the public hearings as to whether practically speaking, | 5 | impact when you're using a stealth design verse the |
| 6 | not legally speaking, but practically speaking from a | 6 | increase in coverage. We think it's a fair tradeoff to |
| 7 | visual impact whether the added coverage is appropriate | 7 | have the better coverage at the higher height when |
| 8 | when you're only talking about a 20 -foot increase in a | 8 | you're talking only 20 feet in differences in height, |
| 9 | design mode of a flagpole. That being said, the Board | 9 | especially when you're talking about a flagpole. |
| 10 | collectively had a certainly different opinion as | 10 | I think from the Applicant's perspective, |
| 11 | reflected in its deliberative process in December. | 11 | Mr. Newlin, I had the opportunity to review the photo |
| 12 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Rich, I'm sorry. Can | 12 | sims that we presented. And if you will recall, as I |
| 13 | you re-explain that point? | 13 | know you would, we presented three photo sims: 140, |
| 14 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Sure. | 14 | 120 and 100 early on in the process. As I reflect on |
| 15 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I didn't quite | 15 | it the visual impact between, the 20 -foot intervals is |
| 16 | follow. | 16 | not significant. Once you recognize that there's going |
| 17 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. I'd be glad to, Mr. | 17 | to be a structure of a certain height the 20 feet from |
| 18 | Newlin. I apologize if I didn't make that clear. | 18 | the Applicant's perspective and from my advocacy |
| 19 | I guess what I was trying to say is I think | 19 | perspective is not significant. So we think that the |
| 20 | it was an honest and fair discussion during the public | 20 | additional height justifies the better coverage. |
| 21 | hearing that clearly, and I'm speaking not as an expert | 21 | The Board came to a different conclusion in |
| 22 | RF witness, but based on the testimony clearly there is | 22 | December. I mean, I think that's obvious, and we can |
| 23 | some degree of coverage differences between 80,100 and | 23 | agree to disagree. So what the Applicant is coming |
| 24 | 120. And maybe I didn't say this in an articulate | 24 | back to is saying we can agree to disagree, but in an |
| 25 | manner. What I was trying to say was I think, to use a | 25 | effort to provide still a reasonable degree of reliable |
|  | Page 11 |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | coverage, albeit not what we think is appropriate and | 1 | school that cannot be resolved by an ODAS |
| 2 | necessary, we're prepared to propose an 80 -foot | 2 | implementation. You cannot, I think as Ms. Boschulte |
| 3 | structure with the understanding, and I don't think | 3 | testified, it's not a scenario whereby you could |
| 4 | there's any respectful disagreement about this, that | 4 | install 20 nodes around the Harding Township Elementary |
| 5 | there are some constraints and limitations on the | 5 | School. |
| 6 | coverage that is being offered at 80 . | 6 | But be that as it may, the Applicant has |
| 7 | We have been very, I think, upfront about | 7 | made the internal determination that to provide a |
| 8 | what those differences are. Specifically, Mr. Newlin | 8 | degree of reliable coverage to get a site on air in |
| 9 | and I had a back and forth about that through a couple | 9 | Harding Township and to avoid, with all due respect, a |
| 10 | of public hearings. And A-21 in Section 5 lays it all | 10 | lot of money being spent by a lot of different people |
| 11 | out in terms of what the difference is between 80,100 | 11 | at the taxpayers' expense, that we're prepared to |
| 12 | and 120 both at the lower frequency band that being the | 12 | proceed with what I've offered as a condition of |
| 13 | seven or 850 verse the 2100. And simply stated in that | 13 | approval. I can only sincerely hope in a hopefully |
| 14 | regard, and I quote from the report from Ms. Boschulte, | 14 | civil offer that that is looked upon favorably as an |
| 15 | "80 feet covers the same as 120. I'm talking about the | 15 | appropriate compromise to provide a very -- to provide |
| 16 | higher frequency bands, with the exception of the | 16 | a degree of reliable coverage that will provide |
| 17 | following areas." And the basic point there is it's at | 17 | coverage to a good portion of Harding, albeit not what |
| 18 | the Harding Township School. | 18 | we originally contemplated. |
| 19 | The last comment I'll make in that regard | 19 | And I do not -- I think after 23 hearings |
| 20 | is this. There is no ODAS solution relative to | 20 | we have either informed you, bored you, or somewhere in |
| 21 | capacity that would address the deficiency in coverage | 21 | between with ample RF testimony. You've heard from Ms. |
| 22 | interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at | 22 | Boschulte. You've heard from your recognized expert |
| 23 | the 80 feet. That's something that if the Board -- | 23 | Dr. Eisenstein. And I do not intend to have any |
| 24 | excuse me, that if the Board is inclined to accept | 24 | supplemental testimony, although Ms. Boschulte is here |
| 25 | there still will be a deficiency in coverage at the | 25 | tonight to answer any question. |


|  | Page 13 |  | Page 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Let me make one other comment. Putting | 1 | thing, but one last thing. That collocation concept is |
| 2 | aside the height of the tower every other stipulated | 2 | somewhat different if the Board was otherwise inclined |
| 3 | condition that I offered remains offered as a condition | 3 | to approve a tree design. The reason for that is under |
| 4 | of approval. And I will -- I neglected to make one | 4 | the tree design all of the antennas are at one |
| 5 | other advocacy argument. Not withstanding the | 5 | elevation. So under that scenario Verizon |
| 6 | compromise that's being offered by the Applicant as a | 6 | hypothetically would be at 80 feet and there will be |
| 7 | condition of approval, the reality is, and I say this | 7 | collocation possibilities at 70 and 60 feet because |
| 8 | in full disclosure, going to the 80-foot height, and | 8 | we're only taking one elevation. |
| 9 | I'll play RF engineer for 30 seconds, but just to | 9 | I offer that to the Board hopefully in the |
| 10 | refresh in the year 2022, if we end up with a flagpole, | 10 | spirit of compromise in an effort to bring to closure |
| 11 | flagless flagpole, as you recall we need to take two | 11 | what's approaching a three-year process, albeit |
| 12 | elevations. In other words, because all the antennas | 12 | objectively interrupted by the Pandemic. I would just |
| 13 | can't fit at one elevation. So we would essentially be | 13 | respectfully ask that you give that matter due an |
| 14 | taking 80 feet and 70 feet. | 14 | appropriate consideration based on what I just |
| 15 | The point I'm making in that regard is | 15 | articulated. Thank you. |
| 16 | objectively it significantly limits the collocation | 16 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So two |
| 17 | possibilities of other carriers. That's ultimately not | 17 | questions, and going back to the school and the |
| 18 | a concern of Verizon Wireless other than our offer to | 18 | coverage. I know we had testimony from Chief Heller |
| 19 | make it obviously, and we're required to make it | 19 | and others I think probably from an RF expert, Dr. |
| 20 | available under your ordinance to other collocators at | 20 | Eisenstein, and I remember specifically with Chief |
| 21 | prevailing market rates under both our lease and the | 21 | Heller that even their radios didn't work inside the |
| 22 | ordinance, and we do that -- at 80 feet we do | 22 | building. They attributed it to the fact that it was |
| 23 | practically lose the significant collocation | 23 | masonry walls, et cetera. So I wonder even if the |
| 24 | possibility. | 24 | tower were at 120 would you have had reliable |
| 25 | Never trust a lawyer when he says one last | 25 | in-building coverage at neg 95 dBa ? |
|  | Page 15 |  | Page 16 |
| 1 | MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is | 1 | you're saying? |
| 2 | yes. | 2 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 | 3 | MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 |
| 4 | but when you go to 80 you don't. | 4 | you are getting -- at 120 you are getting interior |
| 5 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest | 5 | coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80 . |
| 6 | of -- I think I've been honest with the Board for | 6 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. |
| 7 | three, for over three years. What you just said is | 7 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. |
| 8 | correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest | 8 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120 -foot |
| 9 | of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 | 9 | tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and |
| 10 | interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at | 10 | low frequency band? |
| 11 | the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency | 11 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. |
| 12 | band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at | 12 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get |
| 13 | the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the | 13 | in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not |
| 14 | narrative says "coverage would be provided to all | 14 | at the high, right? |
| 15 | building structures including the Harding Township | 15 | MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, |
| 16 | School." | 16 | that's correct. |
| 17 | So there's in-building coverage at 120 at | 17 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's |
| 18 | the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency | 18 | probably -- I don't need testimony, but I just want to |
| 19 | band. | 19 | know if you know. We're talking about in-building |
| 20 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But you just said at | 20 | versus out-of-building coverage. Knowing the testimony |
| 21 | 80 , right, the deficiency with 80 is at 2100 , not at | 21 | we have from Chief Heller and Dr. Eisenstein and |
| 22 | the lower frequency band. | 22 | others, given the fact that construction of the |
| 23 | MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. | 23 | building, is it safe to assume one would have coverage |
| 24 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So even at 120 you | 24 | in the parking lots and the outside areas of the school |
| 25 | still don't get in-building at 2100 ; is that what | 25 | at both frequency bands? |

able to do that for capacity reasons at higher --

Page 19
MR. SCHNEIDER: I think the answer is yes, that there would be coverage exterior to the building; correct.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So the tradeoff that we face is between 120 and 80 at the school. They are the same regarding outside spaces. It is the same regarding -- with regard to the low frequency band.

The only difference now between 80 and 120 is you will not get the higher frequency band inside the school. All right.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I have a followup on that. So are modern devices, do they require to support both frequencies? Is there a time frame where one frequency is not --

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think Ms. Boschulte testified to that at length, but the big issue is -let me play out this scenario. When you're dealing with, God forbid, an emergency situation, God forbid, the issue is the -- at the higher frequency band you have -- as Ms. Boschulte testified -- significant greater capacity. So God forbid there was some emergent situation which required in-building reliable coverage, while you may be able to achieve that coverage at the lower frequency bands, you would not be

MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right?

MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter).
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly,
two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap.

The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap. Because if the tower doesn't fill the gap there's no point in approving it. That seems to be the logic to me.

So my question to you is, does this 80 -foot tower you're proposing fill your gap and allow us to answer in the affirmative to that second question?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. With the recognition

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Can we quantify
that? Is it a difference between $10,000-$ at 20,000
poles or is it between five and 50 ?
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There's a difference.
I mean, I don't know, if I want to get into it.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, that's a pretty technical question.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: All right. I'll withdraw it.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You know, okay. That
was my one question regarding the school coverage. And
I know part of our analysis, and you heard it and you've seen it. Actually, Steve had summarized sort of the thought process we went through it I think pretty thoroughly the last time.

One of the questions, or two of the
questions, the first is, is there a gap? Right. Yes.
Let's for argument sake say there is. I don't think anyone disputes that.

The next question is, does the tower propose to fill that gap? And I'm paraphrasing, Steve, tell me. But so my question to you, and I think we need to answer in the affirmative and both. So the question is, does an 80 -foot tower fill the gap that you see?
that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat.

If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering
it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here -- I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want -- in this industry it's very critical to get the coverage to market in a reasonable time frame. Perhaps not made clear during the course of the public hearing process, because ultimately I don't know that it's that significant, but it is worth knowing, and I was involved in it.

The efforts of the Applicant to site a facility in Harding did not commence in 2017 with the public bid process. I forget whether it was you, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Newlin. Somebody mentioned many years ago in the early 2000s --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It was him.
MR. SCHNEIDER: -- that there was actually
a --
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Rich, can I ask you?
What question are you answering? I'm serious. We have got a lot of stuff to go over.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Okay. The point is that Verizon's been making an effort to locate a facility in Harding since the early 2000s. That was my point. And there comes a point in time where you want a hundred percent but you don't get a hundred percent. That was my point.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And that seems logical and reasonable. I asked the question because the law requires me to ask it, so that's why I asked it.

MR. SCHNEIDER: And I was long-winded and I apologize.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One final thing, I guess, for me, or maybe not final, but the next thing on the top of my mind is, we talked about the height.

We have had a lot of discussion about the 20 percent increase and as of right, et cetera, et cetera. So are you proposing an 80 -foot tower that would be prohibited in some fashion from growing taller than 80 feet?

MR. SCHNEIDER: What I'm -- I'm offering an 80 -foot tower, and if the Board sought to impose as a either a recommendation or a condition that I go to the governing body and seek their approval not to authorize an extension I'd be amenable to doing that.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And there's law around
this. As I understood it at one point we cannot impose such a condition, but how does that magic happen?

MR. SCHNEIDER: In -- do you want to go, Steve?

MR. MLENAK: Go ahead.
MR. SCHNEIDER: In my opinion the Board cannot impose that requirement, but the township as a landlord or land owner, acting in a proprietary capacity not in a governmental capacity, would have the right to limit the height of the tower if it was so inclined.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then mechanically how would this happen? We would put, I guess, or could put a condition saying we condition this approval on the Applicant going back to the landlord, and informing
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the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve?

MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could
actually -- the town enters into a lease and if the town -- and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition?

MR. MLENAK: Correct.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in
there, let's say --
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what wasn't in there?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Okay. I'm sorry. So I'm looking at the scenarios so we can cut to the chase.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Alf, I'm sorry. I
can't hear you. I'm sorry.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if -- if that condition is in the lease then --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true?

MR. MLENAK: That is true.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it.

MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do
that and to your point -- at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out.

MR. MLENAK: Theoretically.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So do we put something in our resolution that says the Board recommends that the township amend the lease to prohibit it from being taller than 80 feet?

MR. MLENAK: You can.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can do whatever they want. Second point is --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. And then it goes back to the Township Committee.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Let's look at it with the cases there. Let's say we don't have this in there at all and they enter into a lease at 80 feet. There's nothing in there in the lease that says they can't go above. Wouldn't they have to go back to the town and get approval anyway to go above 80 ?

MR. MLENAK: I believe their lease already permits 140 , right?

MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct.
MR. MLENAK: So they wouldn't have to come back.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm sorry.
Mathematically, what's the add-on?
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think 20 percent as of right.

MR. SCHNEIDER: As a matter of law under FCC regulations for towers located outside the public right-of-way we have a right to increase the height of the tower by 20 feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. There's a percentage in there.

MR. SCHNEIDER: There's a percentage under the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law, but the relevant
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percent or 20 feet, whichever is greater. That's one part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like.

What we could do, and the Applicant seems amenable to it is, if we're okay at 80 feet we would then -- we would in our Resolution say, hey, Township Committee in their role as landlord, we really think you need to limit the height of this lease that the lease permits to 80 feet. And the Applicant has indicated he's willing to go to the Township Committee
provision here would be the FCC order and it's a 20-foot automatic right of extension. So long as it -so long as it doesn't materially defeat any concealment efforts. In other words, which wouldn't be applicable here. In other words, if it's a flagpole or a tree as long as you maintain the same stealth structure you do have the automatic right -- you have the automatic right to increase it by 20 feet, as long as you maintain the flagpole or the tree.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So logistically if this Board was okay with 80 feet, I'm still not saying we are, but if we are, then the way you mechanically get to 80 is you approach 60 , don't you, 60 with the 20 add-on?

MR. MLENAK: No.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Why not?
MR. MLENAK: Because you'll be approving something that's not supported on the record. It's an indirect.

DR. EISENSTEIN: Maybe I can straighten it out. First of all, with respect to Mr. Schneider I think it's in the Middle Class Tax Relief Act, provision 64-9A, that authorizes that the next applicant, not the current applicant, the next applicant can increase the height of the tower by ten

Page 28
and say you know what, your Board of Adjustment wants this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body?

DR. EISENSTEIN: No.
MR. MLENAK: No.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no going above 80 . So you're putting it back in their court a little bit. And I think we make it clear if our view is 80 feet is okay I think we need to make it clear in the Resolution we want it to never be more than 80 feet. And if the lease needs to be amended it should be amended it should be amended. We recommend

1 it be amended to whatever. You know, at the end of the
2 day I think you've got to be -- this is here because
3 the Township Committee sent it. If the Township
4 Committee did not want this tower we would not have 5 been spending three years on this, right?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: If they really wanted the tower, though, they could make it a permitted use.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They could make it a permitted use, but in fairness, and I think there's some logic to it, they said, you know, we don't spend our time thinking about land use stuff. We have a Board that does. Let's let them think about it. I mean, that's logical.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: But we can't make it a condition of approval.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We can't, but if the Township Committee is looking at this Board as the experts on land use, or the best Board to make decisions on land use and we put a recommendation in our Resolution, hey, in our best judgment you ought to change your lease to say 80 feet is the max but we can't make you then I think they would listen to it. All right. I would hope they would. Whether they do or not, I would hope they would.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We have a Resolution
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just for me this is the remaining issue.
MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by -- is there silence or --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond?
MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr.
Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him any authority to do that. I don't know the answer to that. I'm representing that honestly.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So you got no response whatsoever to that inquiry?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And not to pull on that, but I would like to know. So you wrote to --
that has a lot of information why we came up at 80 and not 120 , and historic zone and residential zone. So there should be good information in that Resolution to back that up.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. All right. Those are my first three questions. Who else has --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can I ask about the setback?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ask about whatever you'd like, Alf.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So one of the issues,
Mr. Schneider, is the setback aspect. And that for me and speaking just for me that that impacts the height. So 80 I think is -- all things being said, is a big change from your standpoint. But the setback is a problem because it's pretty close, it's 58 , 57-poinssomething feet foom the propery line, fom the naersest neighor. And T mure $y$ yu did $g$ o back to the owum becases In msure you dont teally want that now setback. But I didn't hear any changes there, which seems to imply there are no changes. So can you talk about that and what can you do to -- that to me is one of the main issues with this location, and there hasn't been a lot of testimony in the screening aspect. To the extent -- there's been some, but not a lot. And
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MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney?

MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he --
MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive -- he
said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made a couple of inquiries. Let me be more clear.

Point two: While I understand your concern about the setback, I think to a certain extent the -- I would hope that the setback concerns are mitigated by the lower height.

Point three: There's a significant legal
issue about relocating the facility, and it has an A

1 and a B part to it. One is, if you significantly 2 relocate it, the facility, you very arguably
public bidding process, because the township bid out a specific portion of the subject property.

Point four --
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So back to that one, quantitative, significantly what?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Quantitative, if you were 10 feet?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think it was 10 feet. I don't think 10 feet would be, but if it was 50 feet the answer is yes. And if it was in a different location on the subject property the answer in my opinion would be yes.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Okay. Thanks.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Point four or 3B: Mr. Simon has made clear that if that was the case his position would be the Applicant would have to go through a completely new site plan review process at the revised location. And frankly, three years after the fact we're not prepared to do that.

Point five: I have limited ability to --
Verizon has limited ability to effectively shield an
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creates issues about responsibility for maintenance and making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that.

MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult -- planting -- doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well.

What I've done in the past is agree -- and
I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do.
MR. SCHNEIDER: -- in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission -- I don't want the responsibility of planting on other people's property, but I am amenable to making a reasonable contribution to the Shade Tree Commission or whatever agency you internally do that.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Catalpa Trees all over.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So nothing can be

80-foot structure in terms of buffering.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Oh, you mean a
landscaping question?
MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Of course.
MR. SCHNEIDER: That being said, as I've
offered, if there was anything within reason that your planner or any other township official reasonably required in terms of supplemental landscaping to help shield the ground equipment the applicant is completely amenable to that. We would -- standard condition would be subject to a supplemental landscaping plan at the reasonable approval of the Township Planner.

Generally what we've done in those circumstances is agree to an on-site site visit with your planner to buttress whatever landscaping plan that we have already submitted.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: While we're on that topic quickly, and again I think we have spoken about it. If surrounding property owners expressed a desire to have plantings on their property within reason would you be amenable to that?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I would take it under advisement. The problem with that, Mr. Chairman, is my experience is putting it on other people's properties
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done on the setbacks, is what I'm saying.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it
somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a -- potentially triggers expense and cost --

MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a manner that doesn't operationally interfere. So then if I move it closer to anywhere close -- anywhere more in the middle of the property I'm creating the potential for operational interference with the DPW in any meaningful manner. I'm not talking about five or 10 feet, but if I moved it 50 feet further away from

1 the property line I'm putting it right in the midst --
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I understand. But
Mr. Steck is not us. We listened to him. And it doesn't mean we agree with him in content or duration, but what about 10 feet? Why can't you give more relief? Surely there's some wiggle room.

Actually, I'm going to ask other Board members, because maybe other Board members don't care.

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I have a question on this topic. Because as we lower the height of the tower it seems like we have eliminated the significant opportunity for collocation.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, maybe.
BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Maybe.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Depends on whether it's a tree or a pole.

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: That's going to be one of the questions. We need to decide that before we go too much further. But the other question is can the equipment pad, equipment shed, equipment area be made smaller in anticipation that there will not be collocation --

MR. SCHNEIDER: Can it be? Yes. Subject
to the approval of the Township.
BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Like in other words,
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what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound.

The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800 -square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be the one --

MR. SCHNEIDER: You know what I think is actually the easiest? You can, but Lori, me and you had a conversation today about that separate exhibit.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: That's the one you want? Okay.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. So if you go to that
if the pad got smaller the Township has to approve that?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, because the Township leased out 1,800 -square feet to Verizon. So we have no issue reducing the size of the compound if the Township Committee is amenable to --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But even if you had use of that 1,800 feet when you build your pad you're going to improve it with stuff. You're going to fence in that stuff. And I forget what you said you actually needed for yourself, let's say 900 feet, just for argument sake. So while you have access to 1,800 feet why build a fence around the whole thing when you don't need the whole thing fenced.

So would you be amenable to just using the portion you needed for your own stuff if and when a collocator comes in then you go take down the fence and put up a new one?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does that answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Yes. You said --
I'm sorry. Just to clear this up. You said you would be amenable to using the smaller footprint?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me relate it back to
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separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this
one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say?

MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting --
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound area. If you go down -- see there's a tree species being removed?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Right above that is a picture of the compound. Okay? So if you enlarge that --

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Are we getting there? More?

MR. SCHNEIDER: No, you're there. So right in the center of that compound is the tower, and to the right of that is the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry. Does everyone see where I'm looking?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Push the yellow button.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's backwards.
MR. SCHNEIDER: So there.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you zoom in on that, Lori?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I can go in. Sure.
MR. SCHNEIDER: So that's the tower. That's the Verizon equipment cabinetry. Right there and there are spaces that have been designed for future collocation, if everyone can follow me. And also there's a third collocator right there.

So if -- to follow up on the Chair's, you could cut the compound such that it's only in that general area and eliminate the portion of the compound originally for the -- which addresses those two -those are 10-by-20-foot areas by the way for each of the future compound. So the way this was theoretically
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designed would be you'd have tower, Verizon equipment
designed would be you'd have tower, Verizon equipment
cabinetry, collocator one, collocator two, collocator three. What you could do is cut the compound essentially right here and eliminate that whole portion of the compound.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Could you eliminate the box for collocator one on the bottom right-hand side?

MR. SCHNEIDER: You could do that.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Say that again, George?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I said could you remove the dotted box on the bottom right-hand side that was designated for collocator one. That would help the setback, because I understand the neighbors on the bottom.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, the setback we're referring to I think is the tower, right, 58 ?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Not the pad?
BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Not the pad. I
think the pad is closer, right, than --
MR. SCHNEIDER: The pad is closer, that's correct.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But the setback that people are concerned about is to the tower. That's 57-something feet?
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could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that.

MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question
for this -- so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so.

MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree kind of to the upper-right portion that's going to be lost if it goes there. And, you know, and I would say if we were to approve this I would ask, I guess it's Paul? I'm not sure, Paul, to help locate that to reduce the number of trees that have to be taken down, if that makes sense. And the Applicant wouldn't have

1 an objection to that?
that's a fair request. I think that's against our standards. on the site plan. also seen some decent ones.

MR. SCHNEIDER: No.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Mike. I know you're
not going to like this at all, but I do think the
Applicant should go back and see what can be done about
the site plan. Yes, I understand it's not at this
meeting, but if you get support for everything else, I
guess that's an if, and do the best you can to address
the setback items, the tree items, the screening within
reason. According to -- we're not looking for things
that are not do able, that are not reasonable. I think

And in terms of our standards, when we go through site plans we look at things in detail and this is probably the biggest application that we've done certainly in a long time. And I think we should be very careful about site plan. I'm not very comfortable just saying leave this to Paul or would you do this or,

MR. SCHNEIDER: May I respond, Mr. Newlin? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Please do.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Subject to what you
prefaced your comments, if there was a consensus that the height was worthy of us going back and doing that I am more than willing to engage formally the Township,
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conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr . Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan.
And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight

MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've

So I think one thing we would like you to come back with if we were to go down this path in addition to site plan is a menu of what these things could look like, right. Because have you driven down the turnpike say Exit 103 there's a really ugly tree, just a raggedy little old thing, but then I think there's also some nicer ones. So would you be able to come back and say these are some of the flavors of
involve Mr. Fox, et cetera, to see what I can do to the maximum extent within my control and the Township to address your site plan concerns to mitigate your reduction in trees and do whatever I could to increase the setback.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And you would then be okay with coming back and running through this with us?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. But I don't want to go on a wild goose chase.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Understood. Also, I was just speaking for myself. I don't know if other Board Members agree with me. So --

MR. SCHNEIDER: But I am amenable to doing that.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So what is it -- we have more questions, but what is it you would envision you would walk out of here tonight with that would get you comfortable you're not going down a wild goose chase? Do you want to have a straw poll like we did the last time?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like a straw poll
to the extent that the Board would be amenable to
approving an 80 -foot tower, and subject to all the conditions that I indicated, including the condition we talked about relative to the Township -- all of the
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trees?
I think a flagless flagpole it is what it
is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees.

MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make -- let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find --

MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have -- let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go -- in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But there must be a catalog, is there not?

MR. SCHNEIDER: There is.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is there not the Sears Catalog?

MR. SCHNEIDER: There's a new one -there's actually one on Route 78 further west.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: West of 287 ?
MR. SCHNEIDER: As you approach
Pennsylvania on the eastbound side that I think actually looks pretty good. So why don't I do this. I will come forward with photographs of three representative vantage points of three in terms of a design. Does that seem like a --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That would be great.
That sound fair. And I'm serious --
MR. SCHNEIDER: But you don't need anymore flagless flag poles?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, I think we have all seen -- unless there's variations. But seriously, are there not companies, though, that design fake trees and can we not go to that company and show me your picture book?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. There are stealth manufacturers. The answer is yes. I will come forward with that.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. Okay. All right. So what else do we want to do tonight?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, Alf keeps asking if he's alone and he's not alone on the setback issue. That's one of my biggest concerns still. So if I was running this town, which I don't run this town
$\qquad$
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I'd put that tower in the middle of those buildings like the wood one that's there now that no one seems to even notice.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry. I had trouble hearing what you said.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Dan, put your microphone on, please?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I've been told I was loud without one.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: But you're even louder.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: If I had my choice I would put that tower in the middle of those buildings where the wood one is, if I had the ability to make all the decisions on my own. And I would house all the equipment in the building, in the shed, just like Green Village. All right. And even if that was at a hundred feet it wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. But that's not what's on -- that's not what's being presented to us.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sorry. What did -- say that again?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Which part?
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The part about even if it were at a hundred feet it wouldn't be as noticeable.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location.

When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of trying to hide something a little bit better than what this one is doing.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: How did they hide that one at Green Village?

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: It looks like a couple of sheds.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So hiding what, the tower or the equipment?
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BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is
inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of -- so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed?

I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what is it you would put it in, two sheds or one shed? Because Green Village is like two.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I think it's just a matter of -- I don't know if they built those sheds specifically for equipment. I have no idea. There's two sheds there.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What would you like?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I just described what I would like to see but I'm not going to get that. If that tower is where the wood one is now that would be ideal for me, but I'm not getting that. So how else can we mitigate this to be less impactful than the neighbor that's closest to that, that's all.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can I ask theoretically, can you actually from an engineering perspective have the tower separated from the equipment with a driveway in between?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We've looked at that. So there's a two-fold answer. There are certain circumstances where you could put the equipment within a -- instead of cabinetry within a shed. I will tell you that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. A lot of people find that the cabinetry creates more of an impact than -- the shed creates more than the outdoor cabinets. That's a different issue.

To answer Alf's question, there is a correlation, the equipment has to be within a certain physical proximity because you're running lines from the tower to the equipment. So there's a proximity number where if the equipment is further away from the tower you start to lose gain. But we've looked at that Mr. Newlin. So I could, in the spirit of time I will
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MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect -- here's the -- I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally -- wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's -- even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper right-hand corner I don't know where the property line is, but the further away you can get it to that.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I can do that.
BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: As far as just to comment on the, you know, enclosures being more obnoxious than a screened fence. The reason why it works well is when you build -- the buildings are something you would see in a neighborhood. There's a couple of little gambrel sheds is all it is. So you
go back and see what we can do to do that within our technical parameters perhaps.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Again, I think the ask is to push the tower away from the property line as much as you can.

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Even 40 feet back from lowering the tower.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Again, my ability to significantly mitigate, to relocate the tower is limited for the reasons --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, as much as you could. So I mean, little steps. What's the distance between the tower and the top edge of your compound there? What's the total size of that compound?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think it's 1,800-square feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What is the width?
BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Even if you look at that it's 35 feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If you were to put the tower on the upper-most edge of your area there you would be moving it 10 feet further from the property line, right.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It actually says right there. It says 60 feet.
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don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings -- yeah, they're pop-ups.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the -- hide the equipment?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe, I understand very clearly what you're trying to achieve. What I will do -- you have my commitment -- I will have my design professionals to the extent work with the Township Official, but most specifically confer with Mr. Fox. I think he would be the perfect point person to try to --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Mr. Fox, do you represent the Board or do you represent the Town in this?

MR. FOX: The Board.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is the fence there for security or is that for aesthetics?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Visual mitigation.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Both.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I would argue then if
you want to further minimize the visual impact get rid of the fence. Right. You're building a big fence. If you're going to put that and a couple of sheds, well, look like Green Village works because there's no fence around that.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Right. Because it goes into buildings.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to do a similar thing here I would get rid of the fence to be honest with you, because it just calls more attention to it. I don't know. Get your designers out, maybe --

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, you can't hide all of it.

MR. SCHNEIDER: But I do remember, Mr. Chairman, out of fairness. Many years ago when we did the original site visit --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I wanted a fence? MR. SCHNEIDER: You wanted the fence even I thought a little higher to shield the equipment.
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BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved -- and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put -- put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at that and say, wait a minute, I didn't bid on the project because I didn't want to put it there. But if I knew it was going in the center of the driveway I would have bid on it. So someone could make the argument that it wasn't properly put out to the public in a bid. It was kind of a bait and switch thing.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's three years later. I've grown.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: There has to be a compromise.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't know what the right answer is, but aesthetically you understand what --

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think you've given me clear direction, the details of which have to be addressed, what you're seeking to achieve. Let me phrase it that way.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And just one more thing. Never trust a lawyer when he says one more thing.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Or architect. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I'd feel more comfortable if we had an answer from who you were trying to get an answer from earlier.

MR. SCHNEIDER: But Mr. Maselli, I want to be clear. Relocating it anywhere else creates a lot of -- it creates a whole new site plan and a whole new public bidding process that I can't go through. I can work within the confines of the equipment cabinet or shifting it in a general location, but putting it in the center of the DPW property --

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think --
MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property."

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW.

MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5,10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it.

MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing the size of the compound. I have no issue with reducing --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, but you don't need their approval to improve a section of the property you've leased, right? So I imagine the way the lease is written is, as it stands you have that 1,800 -square feet, the lease doesn't dictate whether

1 you go and improve it or not, right?
MR. SCHNEIDER: That's probably correct. exercise your option to not improve it or only improve the section you need.

What else does the Board have? Any questions on this?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I've got a lot of questions if I can have a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. Go ahead. sims of 140,120 and a 100 . Were there any photo simulations created at the 80 feet?

MR. SCHNEIDER: No. can be done prior to the March meeting? It's hard to vote on something -- maybe I'm okay with 80 feet, but until I see a simulation of what it's going to look like I'm not sure if I'm a yes or a no without it. ask. Could you do that? I think he wants to walk out of here tonight with -- well, what you said earlier is a straw poll on whether 80 feet could work or not. And I think your answer is you don't know if it works. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think you just BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I remember photo

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Is that something that

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. Well, let me

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm open to it, but I
in that area --
MR. FOX: No there is not.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: -- or know what they
are in relation to 80 feet?
MR. FOX: That is not in the record.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate
based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are?

MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the
Applicant were requested to provide that information.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some
testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I thought there was. There was also discussion -- I went through the record. Just one of the comments you made last time, or Mr. Simon made was about the caliper of the trees. That it actually is reflected on the plans. It's reflected on the original survey submitted with the application.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But not the height?
MR. SCHNEIDER: Not the height, correct.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I thought there was
can't say definitively until I see what 80 feet would look like, and that's a concern. Particularly, if we said we can't approve 60 feet because there's nothing in the record. Well, is there anything in the record with respect to the visual impact at 80 feet? And I think I just got my answer is no.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. There's Mr.
Boyan's answer. And I don't want to get into it, but I think his answer is he's open to it but without seeing it he can't give you a definitive -- but straw poll -in a straw poll he is open to 80 feet?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But I would love to see a simulation at 80 feet. I know we're going to see the pictures of the -- the catalog, but if we could superimpose them at 80 feet I would feel more comfortable about voting one way or another.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you take the existing photograph and with some kind of accuracy --

MR. SCHNEIDER: I will take it under advisement. It's not -- I don't have the ability to confirm that, but your request is noted.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Secondly, Paul, do we
have any idea -- can you enter -- is there anything in the record that says the height of the existing trees
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3
some testimony.
MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation.
I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr.
Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer?
MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds
reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller --

MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My
recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that
there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking
about the site at the school, my recollection is that
you approached them with respect to a tower at 140 ; is that right?

And then I guess a followup to that is, has there been -80 is a material change from 140. And would there be -- would you be amenable to or maybe from a legal perspective are we required to see that there aren't any alternative potential sites for the tower at an 80 -foot height versus the 140 that the school was originally approached with?

MR. MLENAK: One of the things that you're

1 going to have to answer with respect to the first part 2 of this which is the positive criteria is whether or 3 not the Applicant has met its burden in investigating 4 alternative sites that can fill the gap.

> Now, there's been a lot of testimony on that, specifically with the school. I don't recall off the top what the e-mail said about the height, but the Board would consider whether that reduction per the offered condition of approval at 80 feet was properly investigated by the applicant at the school.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. So to follow on that comment -- thank you, Steve. I would love for another overture to be made to the school at the 80 -foot height. And maybe the answer is the same and we're right back where we started, but at least we'll in good conscience be able to check that box of alternative sites at that particular height.

MR. SCHNEIDER: That one I'm not at this point in the proceedings prepared to do.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: With respect to the tree structure, you said that would allow for a collocator. Does that, in your opinion, reduce the chances of another -- maybe this is an unfair question -- but another provider coming in asking for a site? If we were to do the flagless flagpole you wouldn't be
able to accommodate T-Mobile, for instance.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Wait. Wait. That's
not true, is it? You can -- can you explain that again?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Obviously, the lower the height of the structure you limit the structure's ability to meet the technical objectives of future collocators.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Rich, I'm sorry to bud in, but can you -- you need the 20 feet.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll get there. So on a flagpole, as you recall, we take -- and as Dr. Eisenstein explained, we take two elevations: 80 and 70.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So 60 is not available for a collocator?

MR. SCHNEIDER: It's available.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But no one wants it.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, they may or may not. I can't comment on T-Mobile or AT\&T on whether they would or not. But the point I think Mr. Newlin was trying to lead me to is, you increase the collocation possibilities if you go to a tree because you would be able to have 70 feet available for a collocator; whereas, 60 feet would be the next available height on
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MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140 .

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Maybe.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And the Applicant has made it clear tonight that they're not willing to ask the school again for 80 , which surprises me but nonetheless that's their position and they have a right to it.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My recollection is from the testimony we have and the emails we have there wasn't a whole lot heck of a conservation.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Correct. A couple of one line e-mails.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for all the
discussion about -- and hey, listen, I have kids in
that school. I get it. It's important. The School
Board doesn't seem concerned about it because they must
have different plans or whatever it is. I can't force them to --

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Three years later the composition of the School Board has changed substantially, though, right?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Has it?
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Sure. John.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: John Flynn? He's been on there forever.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: He's not on there.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, so there's a change. I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Circling back to the
Route 78 comment. I just want to highlight, I think I know the tower you're talking about. The tower on
Route 78 approximately mile marker 19 in my opinion is the best looking tree tower that I've seen in the state.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think that's the one up
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industry had in years.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water?
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in
the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off
if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps.
MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry?
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right.
So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next?

MR. MLENAK: I was going to suggest. Let Rich say what he wants to suggest for the Board to consider. But I think it's only fair given the amount of discussion tonight and the changes that have been since the last time both attorneys have given closing that I think it's only fair that Mr. Simon gets to say
close to Clinton Township?
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Yes. I work in
Clinton. I pass it every day.
MR. SCHNEIDER: It's near a Cracker Barrel or some restaurant?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not familiar with the Cracker Barrel.

MR. SCHNEIDER: That's how it was referred to me.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: It's on Petticoat Lane.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I know where it is. It's on the eastbound side.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Exactly. The south side.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I will get you a photo of that. I'm familiar with it.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And I guess my final question piggybacking on Dan's comments, I'm envisioning and I'm wondering feasibility, could you put all these cabinets in a lock underground? Like I'm thinking like a doomsday prepper. Can you pour concrete, put them underground and not see any of it?

MR. SCHNEIDER: It was done once in Madison and it turned out to be the biggest problem the
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his peace.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well --
MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that.
MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that -- okay. What
about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not.

MR. MLENAK: So what we're -CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone.
MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial straw poll to the Applicant in a manner that he's amenable to coming back with more testimony next month there's certainly no need to open it up to anybody else at this point because there's going to be new testimony, there's going to be cross-examination, there's going to be questions, and then the public

1 would have an opportunity to comment only on the new material.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So let me say that again, just more simply. We're not voting to approve anything tonight, right, Mr. Schneider?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Agreed.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All Mr. Schneider is asking us to do is to say, you know what, I don't know exactly how he wants to phrase it, but hey could 80 feet work? And if the answer to that is yes Mr. Schneider's going to go away and do all those things we just talked about, site plans and drawings and whatever. And at that point that would be in March, that would be new testimony from whomever. And at that point whenever there's new testimony the gallery can ask questions, the public can ask questions. So does that make sense?

Fear not, we're not voting to approve anything tonight. All we're doing is --

MR. MLENAK: Well, we don't know that. And again the straw poll we want to call it, the Board is deliberating and giving opinions. It's not an advisory opinion. You're giving your opinions right now and the Applicant can interpret those any way he wishes and determine whether to come back or not or ask for a
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Municipal Land Use Law. This case was over. There were summations. Deliberation. Straw poll was taken in terms of the Board's feelings on the application that was submitted that we went through 22 hearings on, and now on the 23 rd hearing, oh wait.

I took copious notes as to the Board's feelings about the application that was submitted 22 hearings ago. And its feelings based on all the testimony, all of the evidence, all of the comments from all of the members of the public, whether it's visual impact, whether it's Historic District, whether it's other concerns. And the Board deliberated appropriately and gave its opinion. The Applicant comes back and says, oh, I took some notes and now I'm going to address or try to address all of those concerns so I can get some votes.

So I'm going to as if it's the only issue in this case, which respectfully is offensive, is I'm just going to just take what was 140 . We provided sworn testimony that we needed 140 -- no wait, we provided sworn testimony that we needed 130 -- no wait, 120. Now we're down to all of a sudden Vwa-La. Eighty feet now works. Surprise, surprise, after 22 hearings we have to wait to find out that that is acceptable as a height. The issue, though, is that it is not just a
vote.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does that make sense?
Does that make sense to everybody in the gallery, the public? You will have another chance to ask questions. We will not make a decision without people having an opportunity to ask a question. Fair enough? Okay. What would you like us to consider?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like to solicit the Board's opinion that subject to all of the direction that it has given to the Applicant this evening relative to the site plan considerations and the design, that the Board believes that the pursuit of those -- that the Board believes that the Applicant's response to those suggestions are worth pursuing in recognition of the offer of 80 feet as a condition of approval. I'm not asking the Board to commit to approval, I'm asking the Board to give the Applicant a -- a reasonable comfort level that those matters are worth pursuing in an effort to gain approval. And it is satisfactorily resolved that the Board would reasonably consider that.

MR. MLENAK: I think Mr. Simon would like to say something at this point.

MR. SIMON: I think requesting a second straw poll is enormously unfair and violative of the
height issue. And the way that Mr. Schneider, with all due respect presented this, and I give him credit for being crafty, he positioned it like it was clear to me that what the concern was was the height.

I took copious notes, too. There were a lot of concerns eloquently, comprehensively addressed by the various Board members with regard to this application that went well beyond what was the proposed height. And I also respectfully submit that a decision should not be based on a threat of litigation at any height, whether it's the Applicant who's threatening litigation, whether it's a member of the public who is threatening litigation. The Board needs to determine the application based on the evidence that has been submitted.

And we submit that certainly, for example, if you are changing and presenting new evidence now as to heights, visual impacts, setbacks based on do we have to take another site visit? Is there new testimony that's now going to be presented? Am I or members of the public now obligated to make our own record to come back before this Board with expert witnesses and testimony as to this new 80-foot tower that is being proposed at an unknown setback at an unknown equipment compound size, but the one thing --
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | and there's questions also actually under the Municipal | 1 | Historic District. And the fact that what's the |
| 2 | Land Use Law, under Section 46 of the Municipal Land | 2 | difference if this is 58 feet away from neighboring |
| 3 | Use Law that if a change to a plan represents a | 3 | properties, or as admitted to Mr. Schneider's credit 68 |
| 4 | substantial amendment in the layout or improvements | 4 | feet away from neighboring properties. |
| 5 | proposed by a developer that has been subject of a | 5 | What did Mr. Masters say? Did he ever see |
| 6 | hearing an amended application shall be submitted and | 6 | a monopole in Historic District? No. Did he ever see |
| 7 | processed. | 7 | a monopole within a hundred feet of residential |
| 8 | So is it substantial? Do we have to start | 8 | properties that were one acre or greater? No. Did he |
| 9 | with this amended application? And in essence start | 9 | ever see a cell tower in a redevelopment zone? No. |
| 10 | again after 23 hearings with new testimony in evidence | 10 | Did he ever see a cell tower on the same property as |
| 11 | as to the impact of this 80 -foot tower given the tree | 11 | one that is on the National and State Register of |
| 12 | line, given the vegetation and trees that are going to | 12 | Historic Places? No. |
| 13 | be removed, given the impact on the Historic District. | 13 | So I respectfully asked you to take into |
| 14 | Given the fact, and you heard my closing statement at | 14 | consideration the fact that we have been down this road |
| 15 | length, the fact that not only is this a prohibited | 15 | for a long time and Verizon was the one who went to the |
| 16 | use, not only are there multiple principal uses on a | 16 | Township. It wasn't the other way around. So they're |
| 17 | lot that are not permitted, not only does it violate | 17 | claiming, with all due respect, that oh, we're |
| 18 | many provisions of the conditional use standard for | 18 | precluding from changing this ridiculous -- my word -- |
| 19 | towers that are only permitted in two separate zones | 19 | setback to residential properties because the town |
| 20 | near Route 202, including the fact that you need to be | 20 | hasn't returned our phone calls or the town won't let |
| 21 | a thousand feet away from a Historic District versus | 21 | us, or oh if we do that Simon's going to start an |
| 22 | the fact that we're right smack in the middle of a | 22 | action claiming that the public bidding process was |
| 23 | Historic District. And we heard testimony in evidence | 23 | wrong. We didn't make that decision. That was the |
| 24 | and I summed it up in terms of the impacts, you heard | 24 | Applicant's decision to make. |
| 25 | it from the members of the public as well, to the | 25 | Did the Applicant to Mr. Boyan's point, |
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| 1 | there's a whole issue about was there a proper | 1 | or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite |
| 2 | investigation of alternate sites and alternate | 2 | growing up here in Harding Township. |
| 3 | technologies given a proposed 80 -foot tower? And as | 3 | We didn't pick this property not only that |
| 4 | Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise | 4 | is subject to a bidding process as being a public |
| 5 | you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is | 5 | property, but one that has all these different uses. |
| 6 | the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental | 6 | We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, |
| 7 | impacts, and then you balance and you determine on | 7 | oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can |
| 8 | balance whether there's a substantial detriment. | 8 | agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I |
| 9 | Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's | 9 | have been involved in litigation over the issue of |
| 10 | memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower | 10 | either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. |
| 11 | that was 140 -feet tall and was providing all this | 11 | I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. |
| 12 | coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we | 12 | I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, |
| 13 | can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any | 13 | and that's what I'm doing. |
| 14 | sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, | 14 | I've also been involved in cases where the |
| 15 | well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do | 15 | governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed |
| 16 | you compare that less coverage in the balancing test | 16 | the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years |
| 17 | against the detrimental impacts to residential | 17 | later just like we talked about with the Board of |
| 18 | properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to | 18 | Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all |
| 19 | bore you with the many, many, many, many instances in | 19 | of a sudden that new governing body says, well, look, |
| 20 | the zoning ordinance, in the wireless | 20 | they said what they're going to say. How can they bind |
| 21 | telecommunications ordinance, in the redevelopment | 21 | us seven years later? What, are they binding us till |
| 22 | plan, in the Master Plan that talks about the need to | 22 | the end of time just because they were of a certain |
| 23 | protect the Historic District and residential | 23 | political persuasion or had a certain opinion as to a |
| 24 | properties. Information, and I know Mr. Schneider and | 24 | particular issue? We're not going to do that. We're |
| 25 | I have this disagreement, that incredibly Mr. Masters | 25 | going to undo that because we don't want a second cell |

tower 200 yards away and let them sue us. Let the neighbors or whomever sue us.

So this is not simply, oh, we're going to go to the governing body with a condition that they need to agree $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ or Z . It is not as simple as that. Whether you want to talk about the public bidding process or whether you want to talk about the law, just generally. So, you know, again, there are a lot of complications associated with, in essence, opening this case back up again after you've heard from all the evidence and you've heard the testimony, based on the application that was submitted. Hey, we didn't have this discussion in the third hearing or the first hearing or the fourth hearing. You know, come on guys, it's 140 . Can't you reduce it to 80 and we can eliminate some of these equipment cabinets, et cetera, et cetera, right? It's not until the 22nd hearing or the 23 rd hearing, I'm sorry, Rich, that all of a sudden it's, oh, well, we're going to go in a different direction now. Why are they going in a different direction? Because they were going to lose the vote. And we submit that making this type of change that's going to open the case up to additional proofs that are going to be required, evidence that's going to be required we believe, because a record needs to be made
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alleged stealth tree.
So, you know, with all due respect to the
Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80 -foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from $140,130,120,100,80,80$, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if we can move it 10 more feet, as if it's going to make a difference, frankly, right, within the compound.

So again, and I apologize if I seem a little animated. And you know, it's just unbelievable to me, and I put like three exclamation points on my notes here, that three years later Verizon suddenly has an epiphany, yes, we will go back to the Township Committee and we'll ask them about the setback and see if we can move the setback a little bit. Three years
one way or another. And certainly a threshold issue here -- again, I took really pretty good notes on your excellent intelligent comments the last time we were together as to your concerns, and it wasn't just, hey, if they lower this to 80 feet, you know, I'm good. Did we say the word -- we, we, did we say the word "historic" once in two hours? The answer is no. As if we're ignoring, we, are ignoring the evidence and testimony and commentary regarding the impacts to the Historic District. Have we heard once about the impact of taking a tower and lowering it to 80 feet and how that works with alternate technology including outdoor DAS, Distributed Antenna Systems, along roadways in light of models that are conceptual, potential models, how that works, how this is all interplayed with the telecommunications ordinance in the Township, as well as the small cell public right-of-way ordinance that we talked about last time, or at least I talked about last time, where the height is 35 feet, right, and placing them along the right-of-way. And what's the delta, what's the difference in the coverage? And how that plays into a balancing with the consideration of the impact to the neighbors and the impact to the Historic District. Whether this is a hundred feet, or 80 feet, it's big. It is wide as a flagless flagpole, as a
later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go.

So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all -- 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board.

And I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to -- with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and potentially boxing in the Board where we're going to have just an amended application and it's going to go on so that a record can appropriately be made by any interested party.

I thought we were there. I thought we were at the end. That all the testimony was done. Applicant rested, public rested, and now it seems like we're entering a new phase of this that I respectfully
believe is possibly inappropriate given where we are procedurally with regard to the case. Thank you. (Applause from the public.)

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. How about we take a five-minute break. We'll come back and when we come back remind me I think I have to ask the Board if they have any questions for Mr. Simon. We'll take a five-minute break.
(Whereupon, a brief recess is taken at 9:05 p.m.)
(Back on the record at 9:10 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Lori can you put us back on?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: We're back on. Can everyone please have a seat? We're back on. We're recording.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can we dot roll call?
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. Mr. Boyan?
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Here.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Addonizio?
BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Here.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Ms. Sovolos is excused. Mr. Maselli?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Here.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Cammarata?
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discussion tonight. I don't see anything
inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find
that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate.

I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring suit to a higher tribunal to adjudicate what they thought was a wrong decision by this Board. And any cost associated with that should not be considered by the Board. You have my memo which sets forth what you should consider.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody on the Board have any questions for Mr. Simon? (No response.) All

BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: Here.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Rosenbaum? BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Here. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Symonds? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Here.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Newlin? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Here. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Flanagan? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Here. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: And Mr. Fox and Ms. Mertz are still here, and Mr. Mlenak.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We're waiting for Mr.
Schneider. Is Mr. Schneider in the hallway?
We're back on the record. Everyone's back in the room. So Mr. Simon, thank you. My first question is Steve, is there anything procedurally inappropriate about us taking a straw poll tonight?

MR. MLENAK: In my opinion it's not. The fact that the Board is doing what its designed to do. You're evaluating a case under a standard where one of the prongs specifically requires the Board to evaluate what conditions can be proposed to mitigate certain detrimental effects. That process is often undertaken in consultation with the Applicant as to what they would consent to, and that's been the basis of the
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## right. Thank you, Mr. Simon.

So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in
no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: You said last time you were going from the left.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, I lied. Tom, you're up.

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: I'm -- so I've
heard both sides. I'm still -- what I said last time in December. My feeling is that this town works very
$\square$
my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but
I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me.

And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height. Early on several months ago when I realized you could get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to object.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Mr. Cammarata?

1 hard to keep it the way it is. I understand that there 2 is -- there's some benefit to those, to cell phone use and cell phone tower, but at the same time there's a lot of language in these books that we get that we're supposed to follow that says that this place, this location is not the right place for it. So with that said, I'm not for it.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough.
Alf, do you want to go next?
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So Mike, I mostly, I do agree with your summary. I do think that there's been proven a need, a gap in coverage. As you said before I'm going to add that. I do think the height is the impact. So if that height can be reduced is a good thing.

I am also very concerned about the setback and depending on what Mr. Schneider comes back with that's going to be an important consideration for me.

Lastly, I will complain that I just don't understand why the Town didn't try hard to locate the tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any information on that aspect, because that would potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms of setbacks.

The other site, I mean, I think you've
proven that you reached out to the school, barely, but it's very minimal. And I guess barely. That's it, Mike.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Aric? BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm not going to reiterate everything I said last time, but this is a reminder my biggest deterrent was the visual impact. Obviously, lowering it from 130 feet to 80 feet goes a long way towards minimizing that visual impact. So I would definitely like to see the Applicant take into account all of the conversations we had today and all the points that he said he would take back to his clients. So that's my comment.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you understand what that answer is from Aric?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Until the last sentence.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is it worth proceeding at 80 feet?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's worth proceeding.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Personally, I'm on
the fence. To me it's not just the height because
there was a number of items that I didn't feel
comfortable with. Historic is definitely on the top of

BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower.

I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you?

## BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.

 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information on the record today in order to be able to complete the balancing test required in the negative criteria without more information on the actual visual impact at 80 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony and to look at it and make a determination at that point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding, but with the information that I have today I don't have1 enough information to make that determination.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But it's not dead on arrival?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: It's not dead on arrival, no. That being said, I want to highlight again I am disturbed by the Applicant's unwillingness to reapproach the school at 80 feet. And I'm not sure that I could in good conscience check the box that says that we have looked at alternative sites without making that overture at this new height. So not dead on arrival, but I'm just not sure.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. All right. Mr. Schneider? That's -- I don't know how to categorize a couple of those. It sounds like -- well, you heard what everybody said. What would you like to do?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll review the matter with my client. Take it under advisement, and advise the Board of -- I'd like to carry it to the March meeting to review with my client your comments and make a determination as to how to address your comments.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So this is carried. This is carried -- hold on. Go ahead.

MR. MLENAK: I just want to, before you carry it. If you decide, if your client decides to bring new exhibits or revised plans, do you agree to
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after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue?

MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe --

MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter.

MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second summation tonight. So I think I should be afforded the courtesy to comment. I don't think it's fair to comment on what may have happened on third hearing or what we should is have done. The issue before the Board is scheduling, okay, with all due respect. And frankly, for 23 public hearings I think I've made pretty fair compromises to accommodate a lot of your scheduling concerns, not my scheduling concerns. So
present them and provide them ten days before the next hearing?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that it? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: The meeting is March 17th.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll wear a green tie. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Happy St. Patrick's
Day. So it's carried. No further notice is required. We'll see you on the 17 th.

MR. SIMON: I have a hearing that night. I assumed -- I think -- I thought accurately that this matter was going to end tonight, and I have been putting off many different applications on the third Thursday, okay. Right now I have a hearing on March 17th that I cannot -- I will not get coverage for. It's a big case. Not to mention the fact that if new evidence and information is going to be presented, what are those witnesses? And do I have to bring witnesses that night? And, you know, I mean -- I've said my peace on that. I'm just saying that it raises a lot of issues. That's all.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't know. I don't think it's fair at this point to schedule it on a date that Mr. Simon can't be here, to be honest with you,
with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot.
That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think --

MR. SIMON: Rich --
MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop.

MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll
throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Under the circumstances I'm open to it, Mike.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, we wouldn't do two meetings all in the same month, right?

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Well, we have a lot of residentials that have been waiting in the wings that are coming forward.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, yeah.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not here | 1 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: No. I can't do |
| 2 | tonight. They keep pushing their agenda, so they have | 2 | the 10th. |
| 3 | to wait, too. | 3 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: The room is not |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So we push everybody to | 4 | available the 10th anyway. |
| 5 | the 31 st? I'm with you. I don't want to have the | 5 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The 31st. Does that |
| 6 | Board show up two nights in one month if we don't need | 6 | work with everybody's calendar? Mr. Simon? |
| 7 | to. | 7 | MR. SIMON: I actually have a hearing, but |
| 8 | Alf, what do you think, do you want to do | 8 | I'll accommodate this Board. |
| 9 | the 31st? | 9 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So we're going to carry |
| 10 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I support whatever | 10 | this to 7 p.m., March 31st. No further notice |
| 11 | you want to do. | 11 | required. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If we're moving the | 12 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. |
| 13 | week we're doing it for everybody. | 13 | BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Is this in lieu of the |
| 14 | MR. SCHNEIDER: I only suggested the fifth | 14 | 17th, not in addition to the 17th? |
| 15 | Thursday because it's usually a month where the other | 15 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: This is in lieu of the |
| 16 | professionals don't have a conflict. I'm amenable to | 16 | 17th. Unless you guys want to do two meetings? I |
| 17 | another dates. | 17 | realize it's a lot, right. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What do people think? | 18 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: What does the deck |
| 19 | So we shift it a week? Which one? Do you want to go | 19 | look like for -- |
| 20 | to the 31st? I'll be honest with you, why not the | 20 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Lori says it's busy. |
| 21 | 24th? | 21 | There's a lots of residentials. |
| 22 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I can't do the | 22 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: We're going to have |
| 23 | 24th. | 23 | Whitig and we're going to have Cortez and we're going |
| 24 | MR. MLENAK: I can't do the 24th. | 24 | to have Cotter and there's another one in there that I |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What about the 10th? | 25 | can't remember the name of that's going on. So -- and |
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| 1 | I think we're going to -- so that's where we're going | 1 | the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here |
| 2 | to be. | 2 | revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? |
| 3 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, | 3 | I'm a supporter of them and I know they |
| 4 | would be I don't want to time box this application, but | 4 | need the revenue so why not visit them also? |
| 5 | if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time | 5 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. |
| 6 | then you have to punt the residents. | 6 | Thank you. Any other business? |
| 7 | BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be | 7 | BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want |
| 8 | here April. | 8 | to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want | 9 | to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st |
| 10 | to do two meetings? | 10 | meeting, which there will be cross-examination and |
| 11 | BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. | 11 | potentially public comment? |
| 12 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. | 12 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll do it. That's | 13 | there's testimony -- correct me if I'm wrong -- if |
| 14 | four. Alf? | 14 | there's testimony Mr. Simon and any member of the |
| 15 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. | 15 | public has the right to ask questions. |
| 16 | BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I think we have to | 16 | BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine |
| 17 | get the work done, so fine. | 17 | there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right? |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So | 18 | MR. MLENAK: They would have that right, |
| 19 | residential stuff happens on the 17th, or non-Verizon | 19 | which is why I made sure before that anything new |
| 20 | stuff happens on the 17th. Verizon's happens on the | 20 | that's coming in has to be available ten days before, |
| 21 | 31st. | 21 | which is the exact same time frame under the MLUL and |
| 22 | Before you go, Mr. O'Donnell, you were | 22 | which an Objector would have for the original |
| 23 | raising your hand? | 23 | application. |
| 24 | MR. O'DONNELL: Mr. Chairman, I thought | 24 | BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So potentially |
| 25 | George brought up a great question. So the 80 -foot at | 25 | reopening the whole thing, right? |
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| 36:10 57:21 | $83: 1391: 21$ $\mathbf{1 2 0 - f o o t ~ 1 6 : 8}$ | 3 | 11:11,15,23 |  |
| 58:1 69:9 71:1 | 130 75:21 83:13 | 30 13:9 64:9 | 13:14,22 14:6 |  |
| 80:16,21 83:22 | 1307.9 90:9 | 30XI 102:20 | 15:4,21,21 |  |
| 83:25 | 140 8:2 10:13 | 31st 97:5,9,20 | 16:5,12 17:5,8 |  |
| yellow 41:7 | 25:10 61:12 | 98:5,10 99:21 | 20:5 22:4 23:2 |  |
| 83:10 | 64:16,19,23 | 100:9 | 23:4 24:7,22 |  |
| York 1:4 6:19 | 68:16 75:19,20 | 35 54:19 82:19 | 25:5,8 26:11 |  |
| Z | 81:15 83:13 | 3B 33:18 | 26:13 27:16,20 |  |
| Z 6:1 81:5 | 91:21 | 4 | 28:20,22,24 |  |
| zone 1:6 30:2,2 | 171.6 | 40 54:6 | 29:21 30:1,14 |  |
| 78:9 | 171:6,7 17-18 $1: 4$ | 45 67:13,14 | 51:6 52:16 |  |
| zones 77:19 | 17th 4:4 94:6,10 | $4677: 2$ | 61:13,17,23 |  |
| zoning 79:20 | 94:16 96:3 | 46.2 80:11 | 62:1,5,11,13 |  |
| zoom 41:11 43:4 | $98: 14,14,16$ |  | 62:15 63:4 |  |
|  | $99: 19,20$ | 5 | 64:19 65:9 |  |
| 0 | 1820.17 | 53:3 11:10 | 66:13 67:17,23 |  |
| 00162800 | 18 20:17 | 60:10 | 68:3,20 73:10 |  |
| 102:20 | 19 69:22 | 50 18:3 33:13 | 74:15 79:13,13 |  |
| 07976 1:9 | 1st 40:6 | 36:25 60:10 | 81:15 82:5,11 |  |
| 1 | 2 | 64:4,13 67:10 | 82:24 83:9,13 |  |
| 11:6 | 20 10:3,8,17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57-point-some... } \\ & \text { 30:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:13 84:9 } \\ & \text { 88:5,11 90:9 } \end{aligned}$ |  |

