

1 been through a lot today already. The proposal does appear to conform to the
2 goals and criteria of the Central Mountains Community Plan. Again the proposal
3 conforms to all but one of the Telecommunications Land Use Plan criteria and
4 this is the one regarding alternative sites. And the applicant's responsibility to
5 demonstrate that there are no existing facilities that can accommodate the
6 proposed equipment. Again the proposal was evaluated against the criteria in
7 the zoning resolution and with the exception of again the regulation in the zoning
8 resolution that says that an applicant must demonstrate there's no existing
9 facility that can accommodate their equipment. Staff does find that they have
10 met the requirements, the other regulations listed in the zoning resolution. Also
11 the proposal is compatible with the existing telecommunications facilities present
12 on Lookout Mountain and the issues relative to compatibility with the residential
13 uses can either be mitigated or they're already in compliance. And there are
14 provisions in the written restrictions to address that. Going on to findings and
15 recommendations. Staff does recommend that the Board of County
16 Commissioners find that the proposal is in substantial conformance with the
17 Central Mountains Community Plan because it meets the plan recommendations
18 regarding visual resources, mountain site design criteria, open space, wildlife,
19 air odor and noise, hazards, public services and facilities, water, sanitation and
20 commercial and office, that the proposal is in substantial conformance with the
21 policies of the Telecommunications Land Use Plan because it meets the
22 recommendations regarding engineering and economic concerns, visual and
23 noise impacts, residential interference and health issues. The proposal does not

1 conform to the policy of the Telecommunications Land Use Plan regarding tower
2 siting because the applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that there are no
3 existing facilities that can accommodate the proposed equipment. And that the
4 proposal meets the review criteria for planned developments for
5 telecommunication towers as described in the zoning resolution with the
6 exception that the applicant has not demonstrated that there are no existing
7 sites that can accommodate their equipment and that the proposed land use is
8 compatible with existing and allowed land uses in the surrounding area in all
9 directions because it is consistent with a similar use, telecommunications uses
10 in the area and the application includes requirements to measure and monitor
11 NIER as well as mitigate visual, noise and interference impacts and that the
12 Board of County Commissioners deny Case Number 02-111694RZ.

13 HOLLOWAY: You said we would have this packet by the end of the
14 day or even before?

15 WOOD: I can get it to you. It will probably be after the dinner
16 break this evening but I can pull it together at that point in time and I will get it to
17 you.

18 HOLLOWAY: Okay. Thank you.

19 TUTHILL: Susan, I have a technical question concerning the
20 setback issues. The applicant indicated that they were going to make sure that
21 the setback for the tower was at least 680 feet from the adjoining property and
22 I'm reading the written restrictions and it suggests that for the west side it would