

ZONING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Linus Kafka, Zoning Examiner
John Beall, Planning & Development Services
Delma Sanchez, City Recording Clerk

=====

1 ZONING EXAMINER: Next case. Case No. SE-15-14
2 Verizon-Grant Road. And if I could get a little background on
3 that case.

4 MR. BEALL: This is a request by Adam Brixius of
5 Pinnacle Consulting on behalf of Verizon Wireless for approval of
6 a wireless communications facility. The special exception site
7 is located approximately 96 feet north of Grant Road and 67 feet
8 west of Columbus Boulevard.

9 The Preliminary Development Plan proposes a wireless
10 communications tower and 12 antenna panels concealed within an
11 artificial palm tree, a monopalm, 60 feet in height. The
12 communications - the facility will be placed within an
13 approximately 520-square foot lease area in the northwest portion
14 of the 0.23-acre site.

15 A communications use of this type in the C-1 zone is
16 subject to Sections 4.9.13.0 and 4.9.4.i.2.3 and .7 of the
17 Unified Development Code and requires approval through a Mayor
18 and Council special exception procedure.

19 Land use policy direction for this area is provided by
20 the Grant-Alvernon Area Plan and Plan Tucson. The rezoning - the
21 special exception site is located within a mixed use center as

1 identified on the Future Growth Scenario map of Plan Tucson.
2 Policy LT-28.1.2 requires that if possible wireless communication
3 facilities be located, installed and maintained to minimize
4 visual impacts and preserve views.

5 The special exception site is located within an office,
6 commercial, high density and residential area as identified in
7 the Grant-Alvernon Area Plan. The plan contains guidance on
8 wireless communication facilities which discourages wireless
9 communication antenna (inaudible) unless concealed, disguised or
10 co-located on existing buildings or structures.

11 The project is in general compliance with the intent of
12 these plans, which generally support cell tower proposals when
13 designed to minimize visual impacts on surrounding neighborhoods
14 and when buffering is provided.

15 The monopalm will include four antennas per sector with
16 three sectors for a total of 12 antennas. The Applicant has
17 submitted a photo simulation of the monopalm showing that the
18 antennas will be concealed by the artificial fronds of the
19 monopalm's crown.

20 The monopalm will be set back from Columbus Boulevard
21 approximately 67 feet and approximately 96 feet from Grant Road.
22 The nearest residential use, the nearest residence is north of
23 the site in R-2 zoning approximately 115 from the location of the
24 monopalm.

1 Ground equipment will be housed inside an equipment
2 cabinet located next to the tower. In addition, there'll be a
3 diesel generator. Staff recommends that the wireless
4 communications facility use an eight-foot masonry wall in place
5 of the chainlink fence to help mitigate noise from the generator
6 and help mitigate the equipment's visual impact on the
7 surrounding area.

8 The Applicant's proposal must meet the use specific
9 standards of UDC Sections 4.9.13.0 and 4.9.4.i.2 and .3 and .7.
10 The proposed cell tower is in compliance with the performance
11 criteria for a wireless communications facility. The special
12 exception request is consistent with policy direction in the
13 Grant-Alvernon Area Plan and Plan Tucson.

14 Subject to compliance with the attached preliminary
15 conditions, approval of the requested special exception is
16 appropriate. As of today, Planning & Development Services
17 Department has received one written approval, and one protest.

18 ZONING EXAMINER: Thank you. I'm in receipt of the
19 approval/protest forms. I'll note the protest form states
20 protest based on proximity to residential property with an
21 unknown effect the towers may cause to humans. And with that,
22 Mr. Brixius.

23 MR. BRIXIUS: Adam Brixius, Pinnacle Consulting. On
24 this property, I've heard no, no opposition. Obviously, there's

1 been one that's been reported. I had nobody show up, or attend
2 the neighborhood meeting. We did have a Ward 6 representative
3 there and we responded to any questions that they may have had
4 about locating there.

5 I also want to bring to your attention, we did try to
6 co-locate in this area on a TEP pole. There's a substation. I
7 believe it's about 700 feet east. The address is 4350 East Grant
8 Road, TEP substation on the south side of Grant Road. And we had
9 that approved through a Director decision.

10 1 And we just couldn't get enough space due to the Grant
11 Road widening project, and the TEP expansion of that substation.
12 It recently did just get built out, so we, we couldn't fit our
13 equipment in their compound. So we did try to co-locate in this
14 area.

15 Also to bring up the condition that Staff's requiring a
16 block wall. That's, that's not an issue. The reason it was
17 proposed as a chainlink fence was to minimize the space in that
18 rear of the parcel to maintain safe turning radiuses for cars.

19 So the block wall would inc- -- would incur a, a wider
20 footprint which could possibly encroach on traffic. So that's
21 the reason it was proposed chainlink and it does have existing
22 chainlink on the property lines.

23 Just a clarification on a, on another comment for the,
24 for the north wall of the compound. Was it just to see an

1 elevation of, of the proposed wall? Because there is like a
2 four-foot or three-foot CMU block wall existing on the north
3 property line.

4 ZONING EXAMINER: So your question's in reference to
5 the existing CMU wall on the north property line?

6 MR. BRIXIUS: Correct. Yeah. It says - it just says
7 just provide an elevation. I'm wondering if, if that's all it's
8 requiring, or if it's asking to extend that CMU block wall to
9 (inaudible)

10 ZONING EXAMINER: Are you, are you referring to a
11 condition?

12 MR. BRIXIUS: Correct. A condition that - they weren't
13 numbered, they were just bullet pointed.

14 ZONING EXAMINER: Oh, in the report.

15 MR. BRIXIUS: In the report.

16 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Oh. Ground equipment to be
17 screened by an existing masonry wall, provide elevation of street
18 views. And it's not a condition. But you have provided
19 elevations in your plan already.

20 MR. BRIXIUS: Right. So just asking that another one -
21 because that wall wasn't provided in the - probably was missed on
22 (inaudible)

23 ZONING EXAMINER: Which, which was Staff requesting
24 there?

1 MR. BEALL: No. This is just noting that there is an
2 existing wall there.

3 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

4 MR. BRIXIUS: And other than that, all, all other
5 conditions (inaudible)

6 ZONING EXAMINER: You're agreeable to all the
7 conditions. Let me just ask either Mr. Moyer or Mr. Beall.

8 Mr. Brixius brings up the issue of the CMU block wall
9 perhaps creating a safety hazard in terms of turning radius of
10 vehicles in that parking area. Was, was there any consideration
11 of that?

12 MR. BEALL: We, we were looking at the screening effect
13 and how it would mitigate views for the equipment, certainly on
14 the north side. There may be some flexibility on the south side,
15 but I think I'd, I'd want to have some - put some templates on
16 there for the type of vehicles that are gonna use the site
17 before, before saying that because of turning radiuses we need to
18 not have that wall there.

19 ZONING EXAMINER: Yeah. And I'm, I'm actually - I'm
20 pretty familiar with the site. I'm not sure how much traffic is
21 using the property all that much. But what I can do is revise
22 the condition to state that if, if you do come forward with some
23 evidence that there's a safety hazard from a block wall, then
24 Staff would consider revising the preliminary condition then.

1 MR. BRIXIUS: Okay.

2 ZONING EXAMINER: (Inaudible)

3 MR. BRIXIUS: And I'll give it to my engineer to make
4 sure if, if that is doable that we can get you an ele- -- or a
5 dimension for it.

6 ZONING EXAMINER: It's not - it used to be a highly
7 trafficked business. I think it was a drive-through. But now
8 it's an insurance office -

9 MR. BRIXIUS: Insurance office.

10 ZONING EXAMINER: - or something. Yeah.

11 MR. BEALL: It was my Dairy Queen.

12 ZONING EXAMINER: It was all of our Dairy Queens.

13 All right. Anybody else wishing to speak on, on this case?

14 Seeing no one, and with the provision to that particular

15 condition, let me call out the number. Condition 17. Case No.

16 SE-15-14 is hereby closed.

17 (Case No. SE-15-14 was closed.)

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the original tape recorded conversation in the case referenced on page 1 above.

Transcription Completed: 06/03/15

Kathleen R. Krassow
KATHLEEN R. KRASSOW - Owner
M&M Typing Service