



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

136 Main Street, Suite 401
New Britain, Connecticut 06051-4225
Phone: 827-7682

Petition No. 298 - Staff Report
Springwich Cellular Limited Partnership
Rooftop antenna structure and antennas
Manchester, Connecticut
February 11, 1993

On February 8, 1993, Daniel P. Lynch, Jr. of the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) and Fred Cunliffe of the Council staff met Peter Van Wilgen and Bob Marino of the Springwich Cellular Limited Partnership (Springwich) for a field review of this Petition. Springwich has submitted this petition to the Council, under the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies section 16-50j-38 through 40, for a declaratory ruling that the installation of a cellular telecommunications support structure and antennas on the roof of an existing two-story building located at 52 East Center Street, Manchester, Connecticut, would not have a substantial adverse environmental effect and therefore would not require a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need.

The existing building is owned by the Southern New England Telephone Company (SNET) to which an existing 90-foot monopole tower with a single whip antenna is located immediately to the rear of the building. In addition, a single microwave dish is mounted on a 10-foot support structure located on the roof of the building. Also, two other buildings, the Manchester Town Hall and Fire Station, located approximately two blocks south of the proposed site each have antenna support structures with various antennas.

Springwich proposes to construct a 30-foot antenna support structure near the center area of the roof and attach nine, two-foot by three and one-half-foot, directional antennas. Associated equipment would be installed in a second floor room directly below the antenna support structure. The building has been designed and constructed to hold telephone equipment and would be capable of supporting the addition of the proposed cellular equipment. The total height of the proposed structure with antennas would be 34 feet, 26 feet below the top of the antenna on the adjacent existing monopole. The proposed equipment would not cause any interference with existing telecommunications. A building permit and FAA notice to construct would be obtained following a favorable ruling by the Council. No other approvals would be necessary.

Springwich considered the use of the building facade but, its lower elevation to surrounding trees and buildings would prevent cellular coverage to the required areas. Also, the existing monopole is not designed to support the proposed antennas therefore this option was not available. Lastly, Springwich considered replacing the existing monopole but the new tower would take up limited space behind the building, would be more visible because of greater height and mass, and be more costly than the rooftop antenna support structure.

The nonionizing radio frequency power density levels from the proposed cellular equipment would be below allowable State levels, the proposed cellular equipment would not increase noise levels at the site boundary by six decibels or more, and would not increase the boundaries of the site. Springwich contends that the antennas will not add noticeably to the physical characteristics or visual appearance of the building or surroundings, and will have no effect on the ecology.

Fred Cunliffe
Siting Analyst
6774E