

CITY OF AUBURN PLANNING BOARD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2016 6:30 PM, MEMORIAL CITY HALL

Present: Sam Giangreco, Anne McCarthy, Andy Tehan, Crystal Cosentino, Theresa Walsh

Absent: Tim Baroody, Frank Reginelli

Staff: Stephen Selvek, Senior Planner; Greg Gilfus, Traffic Officer APD; Stacy DeForrest, Corporation Counsel

Agenda Items: Special Use Permit for 12 Mattie Street; Site Plan Review for 14 Allen Street; Site Plan Review for 44 York Street; Site Plan Review for 68 North Division Street.

Items Approved: Special Use Permit for 12 Mattie Street

Applications Denied: None

Applications Tabled: Site Plan Review for 14 Allen Street; Site Plan Review for 44 York Street; Site Plan Review for 68 North Division Street.

Chair calls the meeting to order. The Pledge of Allegiance is recited. Roll is called.

**Agenda Item 1: Approval of January 5, 2016 Meeting Minutes.**

Chair asks for a motion to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2016 meeting. So moved by Crystal Cosentino, seconded by Andy Tehan. All members vote approval. No members opposed. Motion carried.

**Agenda Item 2: 12 Mattie Street: Special Use Permit to conduct a dog grooming business as a Home Occupation. Applicant: Stephenie Perry.**

Chair invites applicant to present the application.

Stephenie Perry, 12 Mattie Street- Looking to operate a small dog grooming business out of home.

Chair opens public to be heard portion of the meeting.

Marilyn Day, 25 Florence Street- Would like to ask a few questions regarding the business. Is this going to be a big business, small business, where is the parking, where are the (client's) dogs going to be during the two hour period. Where are your dogs while you are attending a client?

Chair asks applicant to address the questions.

Stephenie Perry- It is going to be a small business. I will only have one dog at a time. I have two parking spots in my driveway. The client will park there and drop the dog off. The dog will be in my care the entire time. Appointments will be 2 hours long and there will only be one person at a time. I will only take two dogs per day. I would like to keep it small and manageable. My dogs will be in my bedroom when I have an appointment.

Marilyn Day- It is a very small area and there are about 22 dogs in the area. I am worried people are going to be coming and going all day long and am worried about how big the business is going to get.

Stephenie Perry- The dogs (client dog) will not go outside and will be in my care inside the grooming area.

Marilyn Day- Our neighborhood has a number of businesses and it is getting unbearable. I have been there since 1973 and it used to be a quiet street. I would also like to know how this will affect house values.

Chair asks for comments or questions from the Board.

Andy Tehan- Will you be boarding dogs? And the average stay would be about 2 hours?

Stephenie Perry- No, I will not be boarding dogs. Yes the average stay would be about two hours.

Anne McCarthy- Where will the business entrance be? Do you have clients lined up right now? Do you anticipate appointments to be every day?

Stephenie Perry- The entrance will be around back of the home. There is a separate room off the back of the house that has its own entrance. I do have appointments lined up but I am doing them at a friend's business on Turnpike Road. I do not anticipate having appointments every day. I do not want this to become a large business. I do this because I love it and like the relationship with the dogs and their owners.

Chair asks for staff comments.

Stephen Selvek- A Home Occupation is an allowed in any zoning district. A Home Occupation is one that is conducted by the resident of the home and within that home. They are limited in size and scope. A home Occupation does not employ more than one employee and Stephenie is the only employee. The space of the business may not exceed more than 25% of the dwelling unit. These are the items that are looked at to ensure that the home can be utilized and generate income but it cannot be turned into a large business. There cannot be any outdoor storage or displays, with the exception of a single identification sign not exceeding two (2) feet. This business does require off street parking and the applicant has made two parking spots available. One vehicle is associated with the residence and one available to clients. In the past that has had concerns regarding hours of operation and therefore in the resolution it is noted that the business must operate between the hours of 7am and 9pm. Clients are by appointment only.

Stephenie Perry- The hours are acceptable and I will only groom between 10am and 3pm.

Stephen Selvek- A Home Occupation Permit is valid for 2 years and therefore come back in front of the Board. Reviews SEQRA, The Short Environmental Assessment Form and answers to part II were all no or small impact. In addition it is noted that the action is limited to the use of an existing residential property to conduct a small home occupation, a dog grooming business. No physical alterations to the land are anticipated and the requirements in the code governing home

occupations are met. Staff recommendation is a Negative Declaration and granting the Special Use permit with the conditions mentioned earlier.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the SEQRA Negative Declaration Resolution for 12 Mattie Street so moved by Crystal Cosentino, second by Theresa Walsh. All vote to approve. None opposed. Motion carried.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation at 12 Mattie Street so moved by Anne McCarthy, second by Crystal Cosentino. All vote to approve. None opposed. Motion carried.

**Agenda Item 3: 14 Allen Street: Site Plan Review for the installation of a telecommunication tower and facility. Applicant: Crown Castle.**

Chair provides clarification on the public comment period, stating that the public has had two meetings on this agenda item with the opportunity for public to be heard and at this point written comments or questions may be submitted to the Planning Office or Corporation Counsel.

Chair invites City consultant William Johnson to summarize his findings.

William Johnson- Professor at RIT College – I provide review of similar types of application for a telecommunication tower such as this one. I submitted a report on January 27<sup>th</sup> and will review the major findings of the report. My review generally entails looking at several broad aspects including whether an applicant for a telecommunications tower has demonstrated need such as identification of the coverage gap and the lack of capacity in an area. This is based upon a radio frequency link budget that has to do with all of the gains and losses that occur while delivering a wireless signal. There has to be a two way communication between the devices (cell phone and tower) and that is the link budget. Now when the link budget requirements are not met there will be a coverage gap. In the application materials you have maps that will show areas where coverage is achieved and not achieved or where there are gaps or holes in the coverage area. With that the proposed site is activated on the computer as a simulation, you can see where the gaps are filled in and where there is overlapping coverage with some the existing site. What that will do is draw off subscribers on existing sites, which are overloading and the proposed site will relieve some of that capacity. When a cell is overloaded, calls cannot be placed or received and calls may be dropped. The link budget that Verizon operates under has been submitted in other municipalities, it was not in the application material and it is not necessary to submit. I have looked at the link budget in other municipalities and this application is consistent with the details that I have reviewed in other places. The second item is that they have demonstrated a need for RF coverage. The filling of coverage gaps with the proposed new server that can draw the capacity off of existing cells. Crown has proposed the installation of a 150 foot tower but as one goes through the application materials you can see that Verizon wireless is proposing a height of 120 feet for the antenna. The extra 30 feet is not needed for the present application but does offer the opportunity for co-location. You may have seen towers with multiple antennas stacked vertically on a tower. The extra 30 feet will be for other service providers. The 120 feet for the tower is appropriate for filling in the coverage gaps but it is an approximation. If there was opposition to the tower height, a solution could be making the foundation and the lower part of the structure designed to hold a 150 foot tower and the extra height could be added at a later date. It is difficult to design a tower at 120 feet and extend the tower, but it is always a good idea to have that option. A new service provider may not need to go higher than 120 feet but we do not

know that until they provide the coverage plots. So the options are to build the tower at 150 feet as the application suggests or to build at 120 feet and add 20-30 feet when the need has been proved before this Board.

The issue of nonionizing radiation exposure, the FCC (Federal Communications Commission) has established some thresholds that has been codified into law that humans can't be exposed beyond a certain threshold. This particular site is one of the types of sites that FCC categorically excludes from analysis and what that means is that it meets certain criteria. That is that the antennas are at least 10 meters (30 feet) above ground, as they are in this particular case at 120 feet, there is no need to do the analysis because one is not exposed to any significant amounts of exposure. In fact you have more exposure by holding your cell phone next to your head.

The Board asked for an analysis of a site called candidate C, which is what it is referred to in the materials. Candidate C is owned by the City. The question was if the tower could be installed at that site and work. Verizon provided a propagation plot at the height being proposed at the current site and the coverage was too far to the northwest for the coverage gaps. Therefore, candidate C does not work.

The last three comments are general comments. As you saw in the application a wireless provider has to connect the system to existing sites. Future sites will connect to this site and moving forward you may be able to tell approximately where the new sites would be. If it was for RF coverage because of the coverage gaps shown in the maps the location would be in the Northwest. If it was for capacity offloading we would not know because of the variables like traffic on roadways, number of users and capacity demand. It is difficult to determine where capacity sites would be.

Last comment is that when you have multiple impacts like this, a wireless network is a combination of hundreds of smaller sites and you can expect that a provider must fill in their network in order to provide service to their subscribers. By approving this site it is just the next step in what would be multiple steps in building a larger network and filling in the coverage gaps. It is not possible to predict what the implications would be but I think that you are well aware that over the past several years that there has been dramatic changes to networks.

Chair asks for Board questions and comments.

Andy Tehan- In pages 7-19 of the analysis there is mention of a bay station. What are the impacts of a bay station?

William Johnson- This is considered a bay station which is a wireless facility that consists of the tower, base materials, and transmitters. Each tower is an independent bay station facility.

Crystal Cosentino- You referenced stealth structures in the report and referenced a 120 foot tower is reasonable for the propagation map, but a stealth tower not recommended because it does not meet this need?

William Johnson- A stealth structure is something such as an artificial tree which is about 65-70 feet tall or a clock tower. These may be used to disguise a tower. However, this would not be

recommended for this site because of the tower's height at 120 feet. You cannot make this tower shorter either because the coverage will not happen.

Theresa Walsh- Asks for a definition of coverage gap.

William Johnson- If you have very large a signal you have very good reception and transmittal to the bay station. When trees and buildings are in the way of the signal it weakens the signal which is called attenuation. As the signal attenuates, there is a level at which we get into unreliable coverage. The signal may drop. A link budget is designed to make it reasonably safe so that you can achieve the two way communication between the phone and the bay station. Coverage gap means that you are in that area that you're really not sure if it is going to work. If one is in a gap area (on the map identified as white areas for existing coverage) you may or may not be able to place a call.

Theresa Walsh- You spoke of candidate C, which is owned by the City but there was another proposed site in which the property owner was not able to be reached can you speak to that site.

William Johnson- I do not have any information on that site since they could not make contact with the owner and did not create any propagation plots because of that.

Sam Giangreco- Any other concerns on health that you may have heard such as myths.

William Johnson- It would not be appropriate to talk about myths because those are things that are probably not true but decades of research have failed to prove the link of low levels of electromagnetic radiation exposure produced by these types of systems and health risks such as cancer and leukemia. A small section in the back of the report that provides some information but in this particular case the site is categorically excluded by the FCC regulations.

Crystal Cosentino- When thinking about future need and where new towers may be placed you mentioned the Northwest quadrant, is that out of the City?

Stephen Selvek- Yes, Aurelius. There will remain gaps in Aurelius.

Crystal Cosentino- So in thinking of future potential towers and where they are to be placed, they would not necessarily need to come before this Board because they would be outside the City.

Stephen Selvek- Based on the propagation maps that we have right now, they are looking at coverage on the northwest area of the city not necessarily into the city since there is adequate coverage. There may be other areas in the city that need coverage but not necessarily within this quadrant.

William Johnson- This site is off loading from other existing sites but as capacity needs continue to grow this site and existing sites may continue to grow again and may need to be subdivided for additional capacity. We don't know the capacity issues throughout the City.

Crystal Cosentino- What type of future are we moving towards?

William Johnson- In New York City the population is much denser so cell sites are every couple hundred feet or so and are mounted on the sides of buildings or light stations. This may not happen in Auburn but as more capacity demands occur, sites will subdivide. However they may become shorter. If Auburn has an increase in population you may see more towers.

Andy Tehan- How accurate do these towers need to be placed to be effective?

William Johnson- Because its wireless it does not need to go in a precise location and an example to that is the Perrine Street site which is actually located on Allen Street. Perrine was the center of the search ring and if there is a site within the search ring available, there is a very good probability of performing well. This location was chosen because it's in the search ring and someone signed a lease.

Anne McCarthy- It's location is placed so a signal can connect to other towers?

William Johnson- The user terminal or cell phone is communicating with the bay station. They currently have capacity and coverage issues with the Allen Street site and as a result users in the vicinity are able to communicate with that location. Right now they have to communicate with towers to the north and to the south which are too far away and capacity is being exceeded at those sites.

Andy Tehan- What if the site was moved three miles down the road?

William Johnson- If you move it three miles down the road the coverage area being proposed is outside the area. Three miles is a distance for current bay station technology. The bay station has to be nearby where the subscribers are.

Theresa Walsh- What is the visual impact to the residents?

William Johnson- Verizon will hire landscape architects for a visual analysis and tonight you will be seeing photo simulations showing the tower in the landscape and one of the things Boards look at is visual discontinuity so if you sweep your eyes across the photo you will look for the tower fitting in or not fitting in with the natural landscape. SEQRA is about mitigating the impact.

Karen Walters, from the audience, approaches the Board with pictures of the photo simulations that took place. The Chair asks the public to remain seated and not approach the bench.

Stephen Selvek- The application requests a centerline mounting height of 120 feet. In your experience is that the height the tower needs to be?

William Johnson- If it is a 120 foot antenna centerline the panel may be 120 feet and the antennas may protrude three or four feet higher than the tower. So if you lowered the tower three feet and decrease to 116 feet, for the antenna to be at 120 feet, it is a negligible difference with RF coverage.

Stacy DeForrest- Asks William Johnson to explain what a hinge point is, which is described in the report.

William Johnson- This is not always done but is done when there is not a comfortable set back from a property line. A hinge point is designed to specification of the tower and includes factors such as winds and icing but is then overbuilt. So if the whole tower was to fail because of some extreme winds the hinge point would go first and that would snap and hang. Usually there is cable that runs up the side of a monopole tower. In the Town of Rush, the tower did not meet the setback so it was built with a hinge.

Stacy DeForrest- It would make it safer?

William Johnson- It makes it safer in that regard. If everything was designed correctly that hinge point would allow it to fold over.

Stephen Selvek- Have you seen that type of installation employed where the setback is equal to the tower height?

William Johnson- The Town of Rush does not have a setback to the structure. So the hinge point was safety for the residents adjacent to the tower.

Chair asks for staff comments.

Stephen Selvek- The applicant has provided visual simulations and may present them to the Board.

Chair invites applicant to present the visual simulations.

Visual simulations are presented on the screen and applicant brought large poster size photos of the photo simulations.

Andy Leja, Barclay Damon – Before I get started I would like to address some of the points that were brought up earlier tonight.

- Alternative site: There was a mention of another site that the applicant was unable to contact the owner. That site was Kubis Auto Parts. Last meeting the accountant of Kubis Auto Parts was present and after the meeting mentioned that no further discussion would take place with the property owner. There are additional concerns with environmental factors because this is an auto yard.

- Height of the antenna: It was mentioned that the height of the centerline was 120 feet and because of the type of mounting being used for this (the dual collar), we request that the tower height be a minimum of 125 feet. However, we have requested 150 feet and standby that request for colocation opportunities to lessen the amount of future towers.

- Cumulative impact analysis under SEQRA: Your ordinance already has a cumulative impact analysis built into for telecommunication towers and that is a requirement that any carrier seeking to build a new tower in the City must also first analyze whether there are any prospects for colocation that could eliminate the need for a new tower. The requirement of an applicant exploring colocation as an alternative to new tower construction is recognition that cumulative

impacts are important and being considered. Typically carriers like Verizon will find a place to co-locate rather than spend the money to build a new tower but there are not any opportunities in that area. We would like to request a 150 tower and feel that it would not be a significant visual impact on the area. The extra 30 feet for colocation is worth the City to consider in terms of mitigating future impacts of other towers.

- Hinge point: A hinge point would typically be necessary when a tower height is in excess of the setback. This is not the case here. We have the necessary 150 foot setback. If the tower was to have a failure at the base, it would not fall down on private property or property outside the leased area.

- Segmentation under SEQRA is defined as the splitting up of a multi- phased project into individual phases and subjects each phase to its own review to circumvent a review of the entire project's impact. You do not need to worry about that here because this tower is an independent tower or structure. It is independent from other towers such as the McMaster site. Future towers are unknown and driven by population density in an area and coverage needs.

-Visual simulation: A balloon fly was done and a number of photos were taken around the City. A tower was superimposed where that balloon was. Maps indicating where photos were taken in correlation to the tower are shown to Board members. Posters of visual simulations passed around to Board members and photos were provided to Planning Staff earlier. In some cases it is difficult to see because of the topography and the height of the tower. For example, in the photo simulation from Casey Park the simulated tower is barely visible.

Stacy DeForrest- Questions the heights of surrounding towers.

Andy Leja- I can get that information for you. The WMBO Tower on the corner of York and North Division is in excess of 200 feet. That tower is lighted and those that are in excess of 200 feet are required to be lighted.

Stephen Selvek- I was able to pull information from the FCC licensing that indicated towers heights. The tower height on Cranebrook toward Home Depot is 180 feet, the one that was just mentioned on York and N. Division is 200 feet, the County 911 tower is 240 feet tall, there is a tower on Genesee Street towards Skaneateles which is 179 feet tall, the Wiley Street tower is 150 feet. So 150 feet is not uncharacteristic for a tower in this area.

Andy Leja- It is also worth noting that some of the towers are the old lattice style and the newest trend is monopole design, a more streamlined and compact tower.

Crystal Cosentino questions if any pictures were taken from Case Ave.

Andy Leja- Yes one of them was taken on Case Ave.

Crystal Cosentino questions if it was taken on the corner or middle of the street.

Andy Leja- In the middle of the street you will see the tower. From one end of the street to the other there is tree cover but in the middle of the street you will see it. Also, just as a note the viewpoints from Allen Street are from the industrial zone.



Stephen Selvek- The request for information that has not yet been fulfilled and part of it because of the calculations on stormwater runoff and related to SEQRA. There was a question as to why the use of propane instead of natural gas and I think that goes to the fact that there was a tank there. The need for clarification on the Environmental Assessment Form question E3h regarding the sound of the generator measured at the property line as well as clarification on the propagation map showing the City line. Those are the outstanding items that the Board needs before deciding on the application.

Chair asks for a motion to table the application for site plan review of 14 Allen Street so moved by Crystal Cosentino, second by Theresa Walsh. All in favor. None opposed. Motion carried.

**Agenda Item 4: 44 York Street: Site Plan Review and SEQRA Declaration for the construction of two 9,000 SF buildings and a 108-vehicle parking lot. Applicant: Weaver Tool.**

Chair invites applicant to present the project.

Michael O'Neil, applicant's engineer – Weaver Machine and Tool is requesting two 9,000 SF buildings and a parking area with 108 parking spaces. We concur with staff changes and comments.

Stephen Selvek- Provides an update to the Board stating that staff is working with the applicant on a complete site plan. This site is on the corner of Chase Street extension and is difficult to work in with regards to utilities because it was the old International Harvester site and the utilities are not in typical locations. On the screen is an updated plan, which received today via email that incorporates many of the questions the engineering office had in regards to stormwater management. We are waiting on the stormwater pollution plan because of the amount of disturbance of the project. The engineering office is reviewing the proposed plans. For example the fire hydrant tied to a specific water line but has moved to another location that has the adequate water line in place but it still needs to be reviewed by the fire department. Another point to this is that it is staff's understanding that the proposed project is to be addresses in phases. The intent is initially for the paved parking lot and following is the buildings. One thing on the plan is that we would like to make clear that we identified those particular phases but would like to make sure that the storm water management is being made part of phase one.

Michael O'Neil- Yes we agree. We put all the information on one application to avoid segmentation.

Stephen Selvek- Requests the application to be tabled for one additional month for additional information.

Chair asks for a motion to table the application for site plan review of 44 York Street so moved by Crystal Cosentino, second by Theresa Walsh. All vote in favor. None opposed. Motion carried.

**Agenda Item 5: 68 North Division Street: Site Plan Review for the construction of a 46 vehicle parking lot. Applicant: Glenn Fletcher.**

Chair invites applicant to introduce the project.

Sarah Casey, Napierala Consulting- Applicant is looking to add a 46 vehicle parking lot to the already existing 3,000 square foot building on North Division Street. The 46 spaces consisting of 10 compact spaces and 36 regular spaces which 2 are ADA accessible. A 24 foot curb cut is being proposed on Van Anden Street and all isles will be 24 foot wide. I believe you have seen the layout before and we are

looking to get your approval to move forward in submitting the storm water plan and landscape plan for the review.

Chair opens the public to be heard section of the meeting. There being none, Chair closes the public to be heard portion of the meeting.

Chair asks for Board comments or questions.

Crystal Cosentino asks a questions regarding handicap parking and if the shaded area was to be used if a wheelchair needed to be offloaded onto.

Sarah Casey responds that the paved stripping will be used for that purpose. The sidewalk will also be ADA accessible

Chair asks for staff comments.

Stephen Selvek- The DRC has reviewed the proposed plans in front of us. This layout satisfied DRC's review and meets the setback requirements for the right of way, the entrance is in a good location, and there is sufficient room for the isles for parking. At this point the applicant can move forward with the grading and drainage plans as well as the calculations that go with that and the landscaping plan requirements. Tonight it is requested to table the application for more details.

Chair asks for a motion to table the application for site plan review of 68 North Division Street so moved by Andy Tehan, second by Theresa Walsh. All vote in favor. None opposed. Motion carried

**Other Items:**

The date of the next Planning Board meeting is Tuesday, March 1, 2016 at 6:30 pm.

Motion to adjourn made by Crystal Cosentino and seconded by Theresa Walsh. All in Favor.

Respectively submitted by Renee Jensen