

compares it to homes that sold in the same market area. After making typical and ordinary adjustments for all other factors except the existence of the towers, it shows the home sold within the range of what the market suggested it should have sold for irrespective of the existence of and view of the nearby towers. The conclusion is the nearby towers had no impact on the value or marketing of the home. Sales Comparison Analysis "Rohill" neighborhood comparison subject/control property within proximity to a 150' monopole was marked as Exhibit A-19. The neighborhood in this comparison is adjacent to the municipal facility in Hillsborough that has a monopole. The home was compared to other homes in the neighborhood. The house sold over list price. The conclusion is that this property was not impacted in any measurable way by its proximity to and/or view of the nearby monopole. Sales Comparison Analysis "Glen Eyre" neighborhoods comparison subject/control property within proximity to a 120' monopole. The property backs up to a monopole. The home was compared to other homes in the neighborhood and nearby neighborhoods all known as Glen Eyre. The first three homes in the comparison had a partial view of the pole while the second three had no view. In each of these cases and in others Mr. Tinder has studied throughout the state he has not seen the residential marketplace reacting in any measurable way to these installations.

Mr. Drollas asked Mr. Tinder how many of the comparable sales he has analyzed are located in historic preservation areas. Mr. Tinder did not know for sure but didn't think any were. Mr. Drollas asked what the impact would be to properties already in a historic district. Mr. Tinder's opinion was that there would not be any effect.

Mr. Post looked at 48 Oak Terrace (Exhibit A-19) on Zillow and noted that the listing price dropped from \$529,000 in September 2014 to a sales price of \$460,000 in August 2015. Mr. Tinder replied that he looks at the listing that pertains to the property at the time it was marketed. There is not necessarily any accounting for the fact that someone started off at an unreasonably high price. If that listing was expired or withdrawn when it comes back on the market it is a new listing. Mr. Post asked when the tower was built since his focus would be on any change in home value from when it was initially built to after the tower was built. Mr. Tinder replied that the tower was built in 2007. The price drop is due to market changes. He has not been able to find a situation where a house sells just before and then again just after a tower is constructed in the vicinity.

Mr. Wu questioned Mr. Tinder. Mr. Wu thought perhaps the property value of the entire area is impacted by the tower and Mr. Tinder did not prove that it did not. He thought the study should include a wider study area than just a quarter mile. Mr. Tinder disagreed. What was looked at were homes that are within proximity to a monopole that clearly have views of them and then comparing them to homes in the same neighborhood but further away or in other neighborhoods completely removed. Mr. Tinder said that exhibit A-20 has a comparison range in distance from .18 miles to 2.13 miles. It doesn't do any good to go further away to find a neighborhood that is not at all comparable.

Mr. Tuosto asked Mr. Tinder if he considers cell towers in the immediate area when he is appraising a home. Mr. Tinder says he does not because he has found that he has not seen market value impact.

There was further discussion about the way the studies/appraisals were done.

The Board took a five minute recess.

Chairman DeRochi opened the meeting to the public to question Mr. Tinder.

Donald Matthews, Rutland Road, remains under oath. Mr. Matthews asked if Mr. Tinder took the noise generated from the facility into consideration. Mr. Tinder replied that the testimony has been that the noise is relatively de minimis. Mr. Matthews said there was a question earlier about how tall silos typically are. He has three on his property and they are fifty feet (50').

Candy Willis remains under oath. Ms. Willis asked if Mr. Tinder could comment on the fact that he thinks the silo would have a de minimis effect on surrounding properties while the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office in 2014 determined it would have an adverse visual effect. Mr. Tinder replied that he does not believe it has any impact on market value.

Liz Palius remains under oath. Ms. Palius asked why Mr. Tinder did not study other historic districts with proposed cell towers as how that affected the real estate values. Mr. Tinder said he is not aware of any.

Barbara Ten Broeke remains under oath. Ms. Ten Broeke asked Mr. Tinder if he were to sell property in the area would he advertise it as a pristine area. Mr. Tinder said he is not a real estate agent so he does not sell or list properties.

Judy Peters, 43 Dead Tree Run Road, was sworn in. Ms. Peters asked if Mr. Tinder had any experience with stealth towers that pretend to look like something it isn't, in this case a silo. Mr. Tinder said the applicant provided him with a list of different places but each was in a more rural area where there were no homes very close by. The studies he has provided in some cases are a much worse case scenario because they are clearly identifiable as towers. If a tower in general were to have an impact on value he would have seen it in these locations and others that he has studied.

Ms. Willis commented about the posting of the agenda on the Township website.

The hearing was continued to the October 25, 2016 Zoning Board meeting. No further notice will be provided.

III. MINUTES

September 20, 2016 – Regular Meeting

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Post and seconded by Mr. Tuosto. The motion carried on the following:

Ayes: DeRochi, O'Brien, Fedun and Post

Nays: None

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