

Greenwood Planning and Zoning Commission
Public Hearing
November 14, 2023 at 6:00pm
Council Chamber

The Public Hearing was called to order by Mayor Hansen. Roll call- Fortuna, Block, Ashbeck, Schmitz all present. Also present, Clerk/ Treasurer Kayla Schar, Attorney Bonnie Wachsmuth, Chad Morgan representing Ramaker, Attorney Mike Long Representing Ramaker.

Attorney Long and Morgan presented the design and proposal of the tower. Vertical Bridge is requesting permits to construct a 95' monopole tower on the west side of Hwy 73 on Stieglitz Dairy property in the south eastern corner of parcel 231.0563.000. The tower would be engineered to accommodate up to 3 wireless carriers. Verizon wireless is the only carrier proposed at this time. Attorney Long stated that they looked at other properties that would fit their network needs and they determined that the best location would be at that location.

Vertical Bridge is the company that owns the tower and the infrastructure. Verizon would lease the tower and own the radios, antenna, and provide the service. 100' x 100' area of land will be leased by Vertical Bridge from Stieglitz Dairy with around 50' x 50' of that being fenced in around the tower. An existing driveway would be used to get to the structure for construction and maintenance. It would not be lit.

Attorney Wachsmuth questioned when it comes to the output of the radioactive waves if it is Verizon or The Towers. Long stated that Verizon is the entity that is broadcasting at the site. Vertical Bridge has the ability to work with Verizon to make sure they are in line with the FCC. Wachsmuth questioned the level of FCC approval that they have would it accommodate only for Verizon or other carriers as well. Long shared the Licensee is currently Verizon. They each would have their own FCC approval.

Morgan explained they did a site audit within a 1-mile radius and did not find any existing structures that would meet their needs. Attorney Wachsmuth questioned what opportunities and locations were reviewed. Wachsmuth also questioned if the water tower was looked into. Morgan said that the water tower was on the edge of the 1- mile radius and that water towers have their own challenges. Wachsmuth argued that there was no information provided to us that showed these findings so the City could have it reviewed themselves. Attorney Long stated that the water tower is too close to the site that we have North East of town. Wachsmuth argued that it is within the search ring of 1-mile.

Nelson questioned why the City was not contacted. Mark Brey stated that he talked to 4 people on the east side of 73 and they weren't contacted. He also questioned what business in the City needs better cell service. Attorney Long could not answer the question but felt the goal for Verizon was to put out 5G services and make it as contiguous as possible. He felt the general demand for services was driving it.

Ken Smith questioned the foot print of the build. Morgan explained the 100' x 100' lease. If more land was needed, they would first have to obtain additional permits.

Going back to the collocation discussion, Attorney Long expressed that if during the search for a viable site, a property owner was present that was willing and able to sign a lease and the site met the needs of Verizon, that they may not have reached out to all property owners in the 1-mile radius. Discussion further regarding collocation.

Morgan expressed that they are not trying to upset people at all. He felt it was an anomaly with people not wanting the tower. Schmits further expressed that she understands what they are wanting to accomplish, however she feels that there isn't a good way to choose between them and tax payers and community members. The community members have showed up to express their concerns.

Don Pentz questioned what is in it for the City of Greenwood—tax based, lease fees, coverage for the unsightly structure. Attorney Long explained that they have the enhanced cell services and they could tax for the added value of the structure. Attorney Wachsmuth argued that in the lease it conveys that they will fight the additional assessment to the taxes due to it

being a utility, so the City wouldn't end up with any additional taxes. Attorney Long stated he had clients in the State of Wisconsin that paid taxes for their sites throughout the state. Clerk Schar requested a list of those clients.

Nelson questioned if this is the most pushback from a community would they think about moving the tower. Morgan responded that they would like to address the concerns. Attorney Long did not feel that it was an anomaly and each community is different. They need to weigh the pros and cons of proceeding. Nelson questioned if they have ever decided to not proceed. Attorney Long shared that typically they reach an agreement or work it out with community. Schar questioned the definition of working it out. Smith questioned by working it out would it make 5G safe. Attorney Long felt it was safe.

Rita Jackson shared there is not enough data to prove that it will not cause harm. Jackson expressed her concerns for the long-term health effects for the community and our children.

Ryan Ashbeck questioned the location being a lower part of the terrain. Morgan explained the tilts from other antennas would compensate for the lower terrain.

Attorney Long stated they would like to place the tower in the corner of the lot to allow for more development. The citizens and Mayor Hansen expressed that they felt it would hinder the future development for the lot.

Mayor Hansen shared he has not objections with the tower, he has a problem with the location.

Morgan shared development in Baraboo, Wisconsin that was built around a tower.

Rita Jackson questioned what happens if technology changes and the tower sits without being used. Attorney Long stated that they could post a bond to require the removal of the tower. Attorney Wachsmuth shared that collecting from a bonding company very hard. She didn't feel it would be a good solution. Attorney Long shared they could do a letter of credit.

Clerk Schar read a letter regarding the health risks from 5G from Dr. Kati Guess. Attorney Long followed it up that the City cannot take that into consideration when making a decision on the application. Attorney Wachsmuth stated we are discussing the structure of the tower, not the facilities of Verizon, Celcom or whatever is on the pole. Attorney stated that Verizon has the right to go on any tower. Attorney Wachsmuth argued that the conditional use permit application was for the pole, not the facilities.

Kole Hinker questioned if they can point the antennas' different locations could they not make the towers we have currently work. Morgan explained that the stronger the network the smaller the broadband of the frequency is. Smith felt that a stronger signal would be even more dangerous.

Smith questioned if the community has the ability to vote for or against the tower. Attorney Long did not feel they could vote on the matter. He feels that in the future the community is going to want/ demand 5G.

Nelson stated that our community does not want it here.

Mayor Hansen felt that they did not do their due diligence to find other locations. They did not reach out to the community at all.

Carteron questioned what the distance needed to reduce the exposure is.

Hinker questioned if the proposed driveway would be a shared driveway. Morgan explained that it would be a shared driveway from their field access driveway. Attorney Wachsmuth questioned if the driveway was state approved or if it was just something that Stieglitz did themselves without state approval. Pentz shared that State has denied driveway access off of the Highway several times prior.

Mayor Hansen closed the public hearing.

Attorney Wachsmuth reviewed the City ordinances in regards to the conditional use permit.

1. Schmitz motioned to deny the recommendation for the conditional use permit for the following reasons:

- Detrimental to the comfort of our citizens.
- It would be an impairment with the adjoining land.
- It would be an impediment of the future developments.
- Concerns that the site access road off of State Highway 73 is permitted.
- Insufficient information in the collocation affidavit.

Fortuna seconded the motion. All ayes. Motion carried.

2. Ashbeck motioned to deny the recommendation for the Structure Location Permit because of insufficient information in the collocation affidavit. Block seconded the motion. All ayes. Motion carried.
3. Ashbeck motioned to deny the recommendation for the Wireless Telecommunications Facility Permit, for the construction of a new facility because of insufficient information in the collocation affidavit. Fortuna seconded the motion. All ayes. Motion carried.
4. Ashbeck motioned to adjourn. Fortuna seconded the motion. All ayes. Motion carried.

Kayla Schar
Clerk/ Treasurer