

**MONTGOMERY TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD**  
**MONTGOMERY TOWNSHIP, SOMERSET COUNTY, NEW JERSEY**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**MARCH 27, 2012**

**MINUTES**

Chairman Walker called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. and read the opening statement which affirmed that adequate notice of the meeting had been posted and sent to the officially designated newspapers.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Walker; Mr. Drift; Mr. Petraske; Mr. Sugden; Mr. Weitach; Mr. Francolini, Alternate #2, Mr. Thompson, Alternate #3

**ALSO PRESENT:** Jonathan Drill, Esq., Board Attorney; Richard Coppola, Board Planner; Jason Cline, Board Engineer; Joseph Palmer, Zoning Officer; Patricia Graham, Township Committee Liaison

**I. APPLICATIONS**

**Case BA-13-09**                                    **Applicant: T-Mobile Northeast, LLC**  
Block 20001 Lot 6  
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Use Variance  
Expiration Date – 4/30/2012  
Affidavit of Notification and Publication Required and Previously Submitted

Dean Stamos, Esquire represented the applicant. Mr. Stamos granted an extension to May 31, 2012. The applicant was before the Board on February 28, 2012 and the Board asked the applicant to return with additional propagation plots, to consider moving the tower closer toward the building. The Board also asked the applicant to submit the TIA TSB88B document. Mr. Stamos has not received permission to submit the document yet but it will be submitted once permission is received.

Nicholas Barile with ComEx Consultants remains under oath. Mr. Barile referenced Sheet Z2 revised through 3/26/12. The location and orientation of the compound have been revised. The size of the compound is shown as a 20' x 20' fenced in compound just for T-Mobile's build. The dashed line to the north and south represents possible future expansion for other carriers. At a full build the compound would be 20' x 60'. The plan shows the tower in the middle of the compound with a possibility of 2 carriers to the north and 2 to the south. With this configuration there is a loss of 12 trees instead of the 16 shown on the previous configuration and 24 on the original plan. The setback for the tower off the pavement would be approximately 143'. The compound itself would be 147.5'. The compound sits 10' off the building and would require a small retaining wall through the western perimeter of the compound. The tower is 18' from the building. Mr. Barile spoke to both T-Mobile Construction and Valmont, a tower manufacturer. T-Mobile Construction was not familiar with the powder coating. The manufacturer does not provide that type of coating but they could provide baked on enamel which has similar characteristics as a powder coating. The towers are typically repainted every 5 years if the paint is deteriorated.

Mr. Stamos said that T-Mobile would agree to a condition that it would be maintained and if the paint deteriorates or is flaking they would be required to repaint.

Mr. Cline asked if there are other options since this goes to limiting corrosion and minimizing maintenance. Mr. Barile said another option is galvanized steel. Mr. Cline suggested annual inspections or every other year inspection of the paint or site. He does not recommend galvanizing since it is impossible to field touch up.

Chairman Walker noted that the temporary gravel access drive needed to construct the tower would be removed after completion and asked if a new gravel drive for equipment would be needed if the tower had to be painted. Mr. Barile said it might be needed. Chairman Walker suggested an area be designated so that future plantings don't take place in the area. Mr. Cline suggested grass pavers. Mr. Stamos said that the grass pavers are a common choice and would agree to it as a condition.

Mark Rosenstock, the RF Engineer, remains under oath. Mr. Rosenstock was asked by the Board to provide propagation plots at various heights. Mr. Rosenstock referenced Exhibit A-1 which is identified on the actual exhibit with a notation that says "Exhibit H: Coverage of Existing On-Air Sites". Exhibit I is the same as Exhibit A-2 which is a depiction of the coverage achieved at 120'. Exhibit A-2 is "Exhibit I: Coverage of Existing On-Air Sites and Subject Site at 120' ". "Exhibit J: Coverage of Existing On-Air Sites and Subject Site @ 110' dated March 14, 2012 prepared by Mark D. Rosenstock was marked as Exhibit A-9. The original dates on both A-1 and A-2 are August 18, 2011. Exhibits H and I are dated March 14, 2012.

Mr. Rosenstock said Exhibit A-9 is a new plot showing the coverage of the existing on-air neighboring sites and the proposed site at a 110' rad center. Although it is not as noticeable, the coverage becomes a lesser area. At

120' they cover 4.2 square miles total area and at 110' they cover 3.5 square miles total area. On the 100' plot they lose even more. The 2010 census data shows population coverage at 120' as 2,111 people and at 110' as 1,928 people. This data is for residents within the coverage areas and does not count the travelling public or others in the area. The GIS program MAP INFO is an industry standard program with different layers to prepare these plots.

Exhibit A-10 is Exhibit K: Coverage of Existing On-Air Sites and Subject Site at 100' dated March 14, 2012 prepared by Mr. Rosenstock. This plot depicts different coverage areas of different heights for antennas. There is a significant decrease in coverage area versus the proposed 120' height. At 100' the total coverage area is 2.79 square miles. The population covered will be 1,412 people. At 100' there probably would not be a reliable handover to the south. As the tower height is lowered, the probability that another tower is needed within proximity increases. They try to optimize by building the fewest sites at the ideal heights.

Chairman Walker noted that he did not see much of a difference between 100' and 120' in the area of Hastings Road. Mr. Rosenstock said he sees a more substantial and reliable coverage coming off the road at 120'. There is a concern to the south because of the dip in terrain.

Mr. Coppola pointed out to the Board that in a portion of the area at the 120' level, near Route 518, there is a new development that has not been built. Mr. Coppola asked Mr. Rosenstock what the likelihood that other carriers will be able to go below T-Mobile. Mr. Rosenstock said he does not have knowledge of the location of the specific antenna sites but companies such as AT & T and Verizon operate at both the same frequency and a lower frequency where there are better propagation characteristics and could go lower. A carrier that has the same frequency but more proximate spaced sites would also be able to go lower. A taller structure leads to more opportunities for collocation.

Mr. Coppola said there was discussion of having a cluster mount at the last meeting. Mr. Barile said that typically on a cluster mount type of installation the antennas are roughly about 18" off the pole. There are usually three antennas around the pole. Mr. Rosenstock said they would still prefer two levels for flexibility for the operating frequencies and technologies. Mr. Coppola said one advantage of a cluster mount is that the pole itself is easier to extend if that is the desire of the Board versus the unipole. If it is not going to be extended it really does not increase the advantage for collocation. Mr. Barile said monopoles are typically extendable if they are designed from the beginning and typically they have a larger diameter up top than a flag pole.

Mr. Stamos questioned Mr. Rosenstock. Since there is no testimony on the record in this case about other signal strength standards the applicant is going to stick with the standards that have been put on the record by T-Mobile. From a radiofrequency standpoint there is a gap in service and the proposed facility at 120' fills the gap.

Mr. Cline asked if 6 antennas are the minimum number T-Mobile would need in terms of coverage. Mr. Rosenstock said 9 is the most desired option, 6 are less desirable and 3 is the least desirable. Mr. Cline said that using a tower design that would allow 6 or 9 antennas to be mounted at one level would appear to be the most efficient use of the available height of the tower. Chairman Walker said the tradeoff is the visual effect. Additional information, including pictures of the various options, will be provided to the Board.

Mr. Petraske asked Mr. Rosenstock what his conclusionary statement regarding the gap in service is based on. Mr. Rosenstock looked at a map that was not identified into the record and said there was a gap because it is white on the plot. The white areas on the map show that there is not reliable in-house or in-vehicle coverage. Mr. Petraske asked if there was any data about dropped calls within the white areas on the map to show that it truly is unreliable. Mr. Rosenstock said there should be data that could be pulled up.

Chairman Walker asked if there are separate antenna used for the different technologies, i.e. 3g and 4g. Mr. Rosenstock said there are. Antennas have different radiating elements in them. Typically they can operate different frequencies and different technologies from the same antenna but the capacity is limited as they do so. Overall the technologies look roughly the same on the propagation maps but there would be variations.

The Board took a five minute recess.

Mr. Coppola asked Mr. Barile about the diameter at the base versus at the top of the various types of poles. Mr. Barile replied that a unipole at 120' would have a base diameter of 36"-40" and the diameter at the top would be about 30". A monopole at 120' would have a larger diameter than a unipole, typically it is a minimum of 48" and the diameter at the top is estimated to be about 36". Mr. Coppola asked if they could do a cluster mount with less than 2' away and get 6 antennas on one level. Mr. Barile said they should be able to accommodate that. Mr. Coppola asked what the differences in the difficulties of extending the tower later for a

unipole versus a monopole. Mr. Barile said he is not familiar with the capability of a unipole being extendable. If a monopole is designed to be extended from the beginning it could be.

Mr. Aaron Myl, 4 Sylvan Way, was sworn in. Mr. Myl is a site acquisition specialist for T-Mobile in the capacity of search ring release where they identify and ultimately lease sites for the construction of a cell tower. Mr. Myl referenced Exhibit A-3 dated February 28, 2012. Mr. Myl said they had tried to contact the owner of record, CFC Associates by phone and were unable to reach anyone. There was also an effort to contact Bristol Myers Squibb. There was previously no interest so a letter has been sent to establish that fact. There has not been an attempt to call Bristol Myers. A letter has not sent to Tusk but a phone call was made and a message was left with the person on duty at the time.

The Board questioned what the search ring would be if it was drawn now.

Mr. Drift commented that the elevation on the south side of the Tusk Restaurant property seems to be the highest point on Route 206 in that area. He wondered if it were a better site. Mr. Stamos said there has not been testimony on site suitability but he will reach out to them before the next meeting to see if they are interested.

Mr. Stamos discussed the scheduling of the crane and balloon test on April 21<sup>st</sup> from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. with a rain date of April 22<sup>nd</sup>. Notice does not need to be provided because the Board is not going out as a group.

The hearing was continued to the April 24, 2012 Zoning Board meeting and the May 22, 2012 Zoning Board meeting. No further notice will be sent.

Mr. Stamos agreed to an extension to June 30, 2012.

## **II. MINUTES**

### **February 21, 2012 – Closed Session (Personnel)**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Sugden, which was seconded by Mr. Woitach. This was carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Walker, Drift, Petraske, Sugden, Woitach, Francolini and Thompson

Nays: None

### **February 21, 2012 – Closed Session (Resolution)**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Petraske, which was seconded by Chairman Walker. This was carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Walker, Drift, Petraske, Sugden, Woitach, Francolini and Thompson

Nays: None

### **March 20, 2012 – Closed Session (Resolution)**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Chairman Walker, which was seconded by Mr. Sugden. This was carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Walker, Drift, Sugden, Woitach, Francolini and Thompson

Nays: None

### **March 20, 2012 – Closed Session (Personnel)**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Chairman Walker, which was seconded by Mr. Woitach. This was carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Walker, Drift, Sugden, Woitach, Francolini and Thompson

Nays: None

## **III. CLOSED SESSION**

Mr. Drill suggested the Board go into closed session for a further discussion on personnel. He read a resolution to go into closed session. A motion to go into closed session was made by Mr. Sugden, which was seconded by Chairman Walker. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion to reopen the meeting was made and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Walker made a motion that the Board hire Charles Hecht as RF Engineer for the current T-Mobile/Omnipoint case (BA-13-09), which was seconded by Mr. Petraske. This was carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Walker, Drift, Sugden, Woitach, Francolini, Thompson and Petraske

Nays: None

Mr. Palmer is to request Mr. Cline take pictures from various vantage points on the date of the balloon test and crane test. The Board felt this falls within the area of the Board Engineer.

Chairman Walker moved the foregoing comments, which was seconded by Mr. Petraske. This motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.