

**Borough of West Reading – Public Hearing
Wednesday, October 16, 2019 – 6:00 p.m.**

Conditional Use Hearing – AT&T Wireless Communication Facilities

A public hearing was held at Borough Hall on Wednesday, October 16, 2019 for a conditional use hearing pertaining to two wireless communication facilities proposed to be located at 201 Walnut Street and 300 S. Seventh Avenue. Present were Council President Philip Wert; Council Members Jennifer Bressler, Patrick Kaag, and Jack Gombach (arrived 6:32 p.m.); Engineer Tom Unger; Borough Solicitor Keith Mooney; Mayor Andrew Kearney; Borough Manager Nicholas Imbesi; Code Department Manager Cathy Hoffman; Borough Secretary Cynthia Madeira.

VISITORS:	Oswald Herbert	Resident
	Harry Eisenbise	Masonic Lodge
	Charles Heydt	Masonic Lodge
	Douglas Cowan	NB+C Engineering Services, LLC
	Raissa Simchak	NB+C Engineering Services, LLC
	Andrew Petersohn	Radio Frequency Engineer
	Ali Shahid	Structural Engineer

Council President Philip Wert called the hearing to order at 6:33 p.m., which was delayed due to the lack of a quorum and announced the continuance of a hearing for two proposed Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF).

Borough Solicitor Keith Mooney noted the date and time of this continued conditional use hearing, as announced at the adjournment of the September 17, 2019 hearing for AT&T Mobility Corporation's proposal to locate two WCF within the Borough. Mr. Mooney stated that the applicant, ending at 8D, entered ten board exhibits into record with eight subs. The entry party status of the applicant and Borough witnesses that were sworn-in include Douglas Cowan, Raissa Simchak, Andrew Petersohn and Ali Shahid whom are still under oath today.

201 Walnut Street Location

Mr. Cowan referred to the previous exhibits of the proposed WCF near 201 Walnut Street and noted the submission of a structural report to the engineer. Tom Unger acknowledged receipt of the structural report and did not have any questions.

Mr. Mooney noted plans to collocate a WCF on an existing Verizon pole and inquired as to authorization from Verizon to do so. Mr. Cowan stated they do have permission from Verizon through a master license agreement. Mr. Mooney inquired as to the intended access to the existing pole, Mr. Cowan indicated that overhead power and fiber optic cabling is planned for this facility.

300 S. Seventh Avenue Location

Mr. Cowan noted that ownership and design questions were remaining from the hearing held on September 17, 2019 and the submission of revised plans for this location. The AT&T engineer has decided on a 5G antenna for this location due to an increased light pole height of 32' to match the existing poles in this vicinity, which would have an overall height of 37'6" to the top of the antenna. Mr. Cowan stated that a neighboring property owner expressed interest this evening to place the WCF on an existing pole on their property approximately 50' from this proposed location. It was decided to continue this hearing with the plans as submitted since a separate application and drawings would be required for an alternate location.

Mr. Cowan marked and entered the revised plan as Exhibit 9A and noted that 5G technologies are still evolving and would be installed on this light pole upon availability.

Mr. Cowan also marked and entered the following photo simulation exhibits:

- Exhibit 10A: Proposed light pole with 5G antenna installed;
- Exhibit 11A(1): Existing street view north to south;
- Exhibit 11A(2): Proposed street view north to south following WCF installation;
- Exhibit 12A(1): Existing streetscape;
- Exhibit 12A(2): Proposed streetscape following WCF installation.

Mr. Mooney asked the following questions:

- Confirmation of the overall pole/antenna height of 37', Mr. Cowan confirmed;
- Would this be located within 10' of underground utilities? Mr. Cowan indicated that a stipulation can be made to avoid construction within 10' of any such utilities;
- The proposed location is not located in a residential area, nor near a building's front façade, Mr. Cowan confirmed;
- The proposed facility does not pose a physical or visual obstruction to pedestrian or vehicular traffic or otherwise create a safety hazard to pedestrians and/or motorists. Mr. Cowan confirmed;
- Will there be any ground-mounted equipment within 18" of the face of the curb or within 2' of the edge of the cartway? Mr. Cowan indicated that no ground-mounted equipment is proposed for this location other than the light pole.
- Are there any electrical meter cabinets? Mr. Cowan stated a meter would be attached to the pole at a height of approximately 7' above ground level.
- Does the applicant agree to remove any graffiti that may be placed on the pole or the tower upon notification from the Borough of the same? Mr. Cowan agreed.
- Are there any underground vaults related to the tower that would be placed by the applicant? Mr. Cowan stated that nothing is planned underground.
- Would you agree that disguising the tower as a light pole is employing the stealth technology that is available at this time? Mr. Cowan agreed.
- Does the applicant agree to pay any fair and reasonable fee affixed by the Borough in connection with placement of the tower within the right-of-way, understanding the current maximum amount is \$270 annually? Mr. Cowan agreed.

Mr. Petersohn, a certified radio frequency engineer provided information regarding the decision to modify plans to install a 5G antenna, which would be necessary to absorb the additional traffic caused by the added height of the pole. This technology may or may not be installed with the pole dependent on the timing of pole installation. The antenna is a clamshell type antenna with a 39GHz frequency band. The revised Federal Communications Commission (FCC) report was provided with similar results and marked by the applicant as Exhibit 13.

Mr. Shahid, a certified structural engineer provided a revised structural analysis with adequate revisions to handle the additional loads caused by the increased size of the pole, which was entered as Exhibit 14. Structural information was also provided for the concrete foundation as Exhibit 15.

In closing Mr. Cowan stated that an aluminum pole option would not be a viable option due to thickness requirements and the suggestion to utilize a galvanized steel pole.

Mr. Mooney asked the following questions:

- Do you believe that the proposed facilities are in accordance and inline with the Borough's Comprehensive Plan? Mr. Cowan stated he believes so.

- Do you believe that the proposed facilities are in the best interest of the Borough and are being provided for the convenience of the community and are inline with public welfare? Mr. Cowan stated that he felt strongly that this were the case.
- Do you believe that the proposed facilities are suitable for the property in question and designed to be constructed in harmony with the communities that they would be located in? Mr. Cowan stated, yes he does.
- Do you agree that you will construct the facilities in conformity with all other applicable municipal requirements as they relate to the building code? Mr. Cowan stated, yes they agree.
- Do you believe that the proposed facilities do not have any detrimental affect on highway traffic and safety or access to the streets that they will line? Mr. Cowan stated that would be correct.

Ms. Simchak, site acquisition specialist inquired as to pole ownership. Mr. Mooney stated this could be handled one of two ways: 1) Agree to take ownership at the time of building permit application; or 2) a licensing agreement, which could also be decided at the time of building permit application. Mr. Wert indicated that Council is not objectionable to pole ownership with a maintenance agreement.

A motion was made to move all Borough Exhibits into evidence by Jack Gombach and seconded by Patrick Kaag. **Motion carried 4-0.**

Mr. Mooney requested that the record reflect the Borough Zoning Ordinance, in its totality, as part of the record by reference. Mr. Mooney then requested public comments.

Charles Heydt expressed concern regarding visual obstruction from the Masonic Lodge driveway and the differences between 4G and 5G technologies. Mr. Heydt also recommended alerting Reading Hospital as to the use of 5G technologies for reasons of potential interferences. Mr. Petersohn indicated that there would be no interference with the 39 GHz radio frequency energy channel as studied by the FCC, which covers frequency bands up to 100 GHz.

Mr. Wert closed the hearing at 7:16 p.m. and stated that a potential vote would be taken by Council during the regular meeting to be held following this hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia Madeira
Borough Secretary