

WALES TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
PUBLIC HEARING FOR HEIGHT VARIANCE FOR A
PROPOSED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICAITONS TOWER
OCTOBER 26, 2006

Hearing opened by Chairman John Minor at 7:35 P.M.

Present: John Minor, Dave Shannon, Terry Maki, and Richard Hart. Also present: Twp. Planner Richard Smith, Twp. Supr. Eugene Jakubiak, Rec. Sec. Marie Muller and 2 persons.

Chairman John Minor reluctantly called the meeting to order. Gave a brief statement of procedures that would be followed. Asked if there was any representation of applicant. None were present. Supervisor E. Jakubiak informed chairman that he had contacted applicant by phone and they were on their way. J. Minor then recessed to await their arrival. Meeting recessed 7:40 P.M.

Representative of applicant arrived and meeting was reconvened 7:45P.M. J. Minor again gave statement of procedures and noted variance request pertains to Zoning ordinance Sec. 18.50 # 2, #10, #20 and # 21.

Kathy J. Webber Site Acquisition Specialist of Pyramid Network Services LLC, as consultants for Motorola, gave presentation. Noting that this project if funded by a federal grant because of its use for security purposes. The 350 feet is needed for equipment that will be placed on tower. There will be 16 elevations with separation of each stage. It will have guy wires on the self-supporting tower. Q.- J. Minor, Could this tower be placed in other area than this site? A.- K. Webber, No. This engineered location is needed as a shoot off for other connections owned by the County. Q.- J. Minor, looking at page 5 of the drawings (Document # 1) Can the tower be reduced in height? A.- K. Webber, No, because 5 antennas are needed and there needs to be a certain space between each antenna. Q.- J. Minor this is not private but County use, correct. A.- K. Webber, This is only for government use. Q.- J. Minor Has lighting been addressed? A.- K. Webber, The FAA designated that anything over 200 feet have lighting. We have engineered into drawings lighting assuming it is necessary. Q.- J. Minor, Why can't the existing tower be used, and what will happen to that tower? A.- K. Webber, The existing tower is not tall enough and it does not meet your ordinance. It will be removed after the transfer of services is done. Q.- R. Hart, The distance between stages is for interference purposes? A.- K. Webber Yes, exactly. Q.- J. Minor, Is this a district tower not only St. Clair County but also State Police? A.- Fire departments, State Police, all local jurisdictions will connect as well as County systems. Q.- R. Hart, Than this is for everyday use not just emergencies? A.- K. Webber, yes. Q.- J. Minor is this part of Homeland Security? A.- Yes, it is directly funded through a grant. Q.-Dean Marlar, 2936 Castor Road, since this is going to be located on County property why don't they put it in the NW area away from our homes, so not to bring down our market values? A.- K. Webber, This was geographically engineered. We are actually moving it further in than the existing tower. Q.- J. Minor so your saying for engineering reasons it must be in that area? A.- K. Webber yes it was studied. Q.- Mary Lowell 2936 Castor Road, most towers

are made of steel no solid walls. Is this tower that same type? A.- K. Webber yes galvanized steel. It is not solid you can see through it. Q.- J. Minor the first antennas are 20 feet off of ground. Most give off some interference that low to the ground. What is the regulation? A.- K. Webber The FAA issues frequency to users. Every antenna will be 800 megahertz. Township planner Dick Smith gave presentation of recommendations. Q.- D. Shannon who is owner of tower? A.- K. Webber the St. Clair County Sheriffs Department. Q.- T. Maki who maintains this tower? A.- K. Webber the county. D. Smith, Section 18.50 #2 addresses guy wires, #20 addresses height, # 21 addresses FAA required lighting, # 10 although somewhat related in my opinion does not apply. The need for the height is unique, and it has the practical difficulty to be able to transmit at a lower height. J. Minor I have concerns with safety of the distance of tower collapsing. D. Smith, your ordinance says set back equal to height, which they have met that limit. Q.- K. Webber can the issue of the road be discussed? A.- J. Minor no since it wasn't part of original variance request. Q.- J. Minor, what is set back? A.- D. Smith it is 350 feet from edge of right of way. J. Minor read (Document # 2) a letter from Planning Commission advising of there approval of site with recommendations of township planner. That a variance be obtained for the height, that the driveway be addressed, and removal of the existing tower upon completion of new tower. Also submitted as part of record (Document # 3) October 23, 2006 Planning Commission minutes, not yet approved, regarding public hearing for tower site. No further questions the board went into deliberation 8:20 P.M. Discussed facts that were presented as pages are attached. J. Minor reviewed requirements of hardship and uniqueness. **Motion** by Dave Shannon to grant variance, supported by Terry Maki concurring with planners perception that the Ordinance in Section 18:50 # 2, # 20 and # 21 have been satisfied and that # 10 is dealing with private towers. Roll Call Vote: Dave Shannon, yes, Terry Maki, yes, Richard Hart, yes, John Minor, yes. Height variance granted. Hearing adjourned 8:35P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary
Marie J. Muller