

1181.01 PURPOSE AND INTENT (B) (8): Worried this statement may be argued and interpreted differently than why it's written. I.e; a wireless company could argue FOR a tower being placed in any of the 'restricted' areas and ask for a variance because, as we saw last year, they feel that all customers within the service area of the proposed tower don't have reliable coverage. Could this be reworded, expanded for clarification, or simply eliminated?

1181.05 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS: This section appears to have some general formatting issues.

1181.05 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (D) (3) Wireless communications facility support structures (f) Maximum height: If no new towers are allowed in Residential, why does section 1 list maximum height details for Residential? Also, under (f) there are multiple #2 section headings.

1181.05 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (D) (4) Site requirements (a) 2: We feel strongly that the residential setback noted in (4) should be greater than 300 ft., and that there should be a greater minimum distance, such as 1,500 ft. established and written into (4), but denoted that all applications which include a proposal to erect a new tower which meet or exceed the aforementioned setback will be reviewed according to the minimum distance requirement . Essentially, the 1,500 ft setback is simply the stipulation to allow one to apply, but does not guarantee that it will be granted. It should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. This greater setback distance is already being used in other surrounding communities. I.e; Hilliard enforces a 1,000 ft residential setback. Gahanna residents feel a greater setback distance is even more important in a community like ours where such a large number of different zoning classifications touch.

1181.05 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (D) (5) Equipment shelters and cabinets (a) 4: In regards to "Existing mature tree growth and natural land forms on the site shall be preserved to the maximum extent possible" - who is responsible for defining or upholding the "maximum extent possible" definition? Would hate to see that abused by an applicant. Also, what penalty is assessed if applicant doesn't abide by the agreed upon definition?

1181.06 ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW (A) General provisions (3): The notes off to the right mention something about eliminating giving notice to those within the vicinity of any new tower/construction. In efforts toward transparency, we believe citizens should always be informed to the maximum ability and letters should always go out to contiguous properties. Furthermore, what timeline is currently enforced for letters to go out to contiguous properties? Please clarify.

1181.07 CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (C) Conditional use review considerations (8) (a): As a part of "applicant must further submit evidence that it has made all reasonable efforts to procure antenna space on existing facilities but was denied" - we recommend "evidence" be further defined. I.e: requiring letters/proof of denials in writing from all other existing facilities, along with any other "evidence" requests as defined by Planning Commission or Council. That will ensure accurate and truthful process and should be implemented in all areas of code dealing with the request for a new tower or structure (Administrative Review/any other time an applicant seeks a variance).

received 6/15/16