

Kazi Haque

From: Scott Quinn <scottquinn@quinnunited.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 9:51 AM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: RE: Stakeholders Meeting- Wireless/ Communication Industry

Hi Kazi,

I am unable to attend the Stakeholders meeting but I did review the draft text amendment 11-01 and have the following comments:

C, D, E are clear and understandable and I am glad to see that if an applicant can comply with the criteria then a Conditional Use Permit is not required as it is spelled out in Section F.

The only area of concern though is the reference that "Not exceed the applicable height of the zone district". Meaning that in many cases an applicant will be forced into a CUP. When looking at Table A it really does not provide much relief with respect to height. Fortunately the City of Maricopa has limited terrain variation and smaller building structures which should help.

What I foresee happening then is that new applicants will look more to County zoned parcels to achieve greater height relief. I would suggest that if a "stealth" type application then that should have greater relief with respect to process.

"Stealth" can be very subjective. I have seen monopines and monopalms where the antenna and appurtenances are not in scale with the attempted faux design creating a greater visual nuisance than had it been a standard monopole with uniform mounts throughout the tower. A good example of a quality tower are those on the forest service properties along I-17 where the antenna mounts are all consistently the same widths and the tower along with all appurtenances are painted the same color.

Anyway it is difficult to assess these situations without actually doing a mockup to apply the code in different scenarios.

My apologies for the last minute response.

Scott Quinn - Quinn United Enterprises, LLC
3655 W Anthem Wy, A109-250, Anthem, AZ 85086
Member of the American Planning Assoc & Ntl Assoc of Realtors
www.quinnunited.com, 602-909-8885, scottquinn@quinnunited.com

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Kazi Haque [<mailto:Kazi.Haque@maricopa-az.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 7:49 AM
To: JArmstrong@ctia.org; Reg Destree; rshaw@shaw-associates.com; Ryan Mott; lisa@azwa.org; susan@azcable.org; douglas.kearney@americantower.com; scottquinn@quinnunited.com; kkirkman@orbitelcommunications.com; ron.sprague@qwest.com; jmcmichael@maricopachamber.org; ron.fleming@gwresources.com; ryanrawson@cox.net; Brenda.Searle-Sung@crowncastle.com; Dana Burkhardt; Rodolfo Lopez; Brent Billingsley; Erin Garcia; Tina Vannucci; jlmendoz@bechtel.com; Paul Jepson; Danielle Casey
Subject: Stakeholders Meeting- Wireless/ Communication Industry

Kazi Haque

From: Lisa Durst <grammy.durst@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 6:05 AM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: Cell Phone Towers

It is a part of life anymore that we need the towers. Please just try to place them as far away from homes and businesses as possible. And could you please request that they look like saguaro's. I saw a few of those on our way to Laughlin a few weeks ago.

Thank you

--

Lisa Durst
Proud Army Mom
and Grammy!!!

Kazi Haque

From: Joe Anderson <JAnderson@nationalchurchresidences.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 6:06 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: Cell Towers
Attachments: Cell_Tower_In_Palm_Tree.jpg; 3629963086_a24241ac87_z.jpg

Good Morning,

I am in favor of allowing cell towers into the area. They provide a vital communications link for our businesses. Prohibiting them would/could impede the City's growth. But do they have to look like cell towers? I have seen wonderful disguises of cell towers in the Phoenix/Glendale area. I would love it if all our cell towers had such an appearance!



www.shutterstock.com - 978688

Joseph Anderson, CPM
Regional Director
National Church Residences
Cell 971.235.5762
Fax 614.273.2150

janderson@nationalchurchresidences.org
www.nationalchurchresidences.org

Kazi Haque

From: john and del <just-be@sonic.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 6:40 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: cell phone towers

I live in Maricopa 7 months out of the year and 5 months in Sonoma County, Ca. They disguise a lot of towers as trees or even old fashioned water towers. They also use scoreboards at high schools. I have seen the fake trees along the highway in Chandler, so somebody in Arizona is doing it.

Kazi Haque

From: Jeanie Burdi <squaredhead@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 9:38 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: Cellular Towers

We really need these. They can make them look nice and as for any health ramifications...The power emitted will be a lot less out of many towers rather than just having one or two trying to cover the whole city. Think of a sprinkler in your front yard, You can only supply so much power to cover your lawn..then you have to buy more sprinklers. It is simple physics.

I wouldn't mind having a tower in my backyard if your looking for a place. We live out in Sorrento (South Side) and are 7 miles from the nearest cell tower. We had to pay \$300 out of pocket to buy a cellular booster so that we can get a signal inside our house.

I really don't understand the problems people are having against this. It is better for the whole community.

Jeanie and Michael Burdi
Sorrento SubDivision
Maricopa, AZ

602-653-0548

Kazi Haque

From: pgolfh@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 9:22 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: Re: Stakeholder Meeting- Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance-TXT11-01

Hi Kazi,

What came out of the meeting on Sept. 10? I was in California and unable to attend. Please send me the comments or notes from that meeting. Thank you for keeping me informed.

Best Regards,

Rockh Myers (Victor E Myers Jr)

-----Original Message-----

From: Kazi Haque <Kazi.Haque@maricopa-az.gov>

To: amknorr <amknorr@msn.com>; ljoelbegay <ljoelbegay@gmail.com>; tskousen <tskousen@q.com>; story.craig <story.craig@az.sysco.com>; pgolfh <pgolfh@aol.com>

Cc: Leslie Carlyle-Burnett <LCarlyle-Burnett@ak-chin.nsn.us>; Dedrick Denton <Dedrick.Denton@pinalcountyz.gov>; PHilliard <PHilliard@aamaz.com>; BProkes <BProkes@rossmar.com>; LPimentle <LPimentle@rossmar.com>; Brent Billingsley <Brent.Billingsley@maricopa-az.gov>; Danielle Casey <Danielle.Casey@maricopa-az.gov>; Rodolfo Lopez <Rodolfo.Lopez@maricopa-az.gov>; Dana Burkhardt <Dana.Burkhardt@maricopa-az.gov>; Ryan Rawson <ryanrawson@cox.net>; Brenda Searle-Sung <Brenda.Searle-Sung@crowncastle.com>

Sent: Mon, Sep 10, 2012 10:40 am

Subject: FW: Stakeholder Meeting- Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance-TXT11-01

Hello,

As part of City's extensive outreach and public participation process, staff is contacting you to inform you regarding the attached text amendment to the Zoning Code.

Attached, please see the revised Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance text amendment, Case # TXT11-01.

The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing Monday, Sept. 10; and the City Council will also hold a public hearing on Oct. 2, and hear a presentation from staff. (See attached public hearing notification).

The final approval and adoption is tentatively scheduled for November 6, 2012.

Anyone wishing to appear at the public meetings and make comment is encouraged to attend.

Written comments are welcome and, if received prior to the meetings, will be included in the record.

Your feedback and input is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kazi Haque
Planning Manager

Kazi Haque

From: Lisa Pimentle [LPimentle@rossmar.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2012 9:56 AM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: RE: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment- Wireless Communication Facilities TXT11-01

No one had any comments to make.

Lisa Pimentle, CAAM
 District Manager – Central Division

Rossmar & Graham | 1801 S. Extension Road, Suite 124, Mesa, AZ 85210
 Office (480) 551-4300 | Fax (480) 551-6000 | www.rossmar.com



Follow Rossmar & Graham!



A FirstService Residential Management Company

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential. It may also be privileged or otherwise protected by work product immunity or other legal rules. If you have received it by mistake, please let us know by e-mail reply and delete it from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not copy this message or disclose its contents to anyone. Please note that if this e-mail message contains a forwarded message or is a reply to a prior message, some or all of the contents of this message or any attachments may not have been produced by the sender.



print only when necessary

From: Kazi Haque [mailto:Kazi.Haque@maricopa-az.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 11:10 AM
To: Lisa Pimentle
Cc: Brent Billingsley; Rodolfo Lopez
Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment- Wireless Communication Facilities TXT11-01

Dear Ms. Pimentle:

I appreciate your time to speak with me this morning. As I mentioned on the phone, staff as part of public outreach has been trying to contact City of Maricopa HOA Managers to garner comments regarding the proposed Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance (TXT11-01).

Per your request, I am sending you a draft copy for review and to share with your Board members.

Sincerely,

Kazi Haque
 Planning Manager

2/9/2012

Kazi Haque

From: Blanche Prokes [BProkes@rossmar.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2012 12:34 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Cc: Brent Billingsley; Rodolfo Lopez; Eric Schmidt; Christian Price <cprice@pantheoninvestments.com>; Aaron Pulford <apulford@onmbb.com>; Lauren Clark; Cindy Parsell
Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment- Wireless Communication Facilities TXT11-01
Attachments: City of Maricopa DRAFT WCF 112311 - 13 pages.pdf

Dear Kazi:

Have read thru the ordinance over the weekend. I have also copied the Maricopa Meadows HOA Board of Directors so that could send you their comments to this ordinance.

You have done a great job and pretty much covered any concerns homeowners would have on page one, points 1-9. I can tell you from my 16 year experience on Ahwatukee Foothills Village Planning Committee with wireless communication facilities that they always want to build these structure as cheap as possible and try to convince everyone that the towers will not have any negative impact on residential areas and property values. They are of course wrong! I know of several structures in Phoenix, Mesa, etc. where they hid the antennas inside a fake pine tree, or cactus or a palm tree. In another case, they hid the equipment in the building they constructed. One case in Ahwatukee resulted in a lease agreement with the Kyrene School District where they used the 65- foot tall light structures the high school had on the football field and placed the antennas on top. The school got \$65,000/year lease fee to cover the cost of computers and other things for their students. So it was a win-win situation but I can tell you we had to play a lot of hardball to get this done.

If the towers have to be anywhere near residential areas you absolutely should require hearing with the telecommunication company and the homeowners that live there; I think you have covered this on page 7a.

Well done.

Regards

Blanche

Blanche Prokes, CMCA

Community Association Manager

Rossmar & Graham | 1801 S Extension Rd. Ste. 124, Mesa, Arizona 85210

Office (480) 551-4300 | Fax (480) 551-6000 | www.rossmar.com



Follow Rossmar & Graham!



A FirstService Residential Management Company

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential. It may also be privileged or otherwise protected by work product immunity or other legal rules. If you have received it by mistake, please let us know by e-mail reply and delete it from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not copy this message or disclose its contents to anyone. Please note that if this e-mail message contains a forwarded

2/6/2012

Kazi Haque

From: Pamela Hilliard [PHilliard@aamaz.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 10:34 AM

To: Kazi Haque

Subject: RE: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment- Wireless Communication Facilities TXT11-01

As you already have in there that if the facility is to be in a homeowners association that it must meet the governing document restrictions, I see no issue with the draft.

Pamela Hilliard, CAAM®

Area Manager

AAM, LLC

(602) 906-4928 (direct line)

(480) 821-2334 (direct fax)

(602) 957-9191 (main line)

www.AAMAZ.com

"Setting the Standard of Excellence for 20 Years"



From: Kazi Haque [mailto:Kazi.Haque@maricopa-az.gov]

Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 10:14 AM

To: Pamela Hilliard

Subject: RE: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment- Wireless Communication Facilities TXT11-01

Here is the attachment

Sincerely,

Kazi Haque

Planning Manager

Development Services Department

City of Maricopa

45145 West Madison Avenue

P.O. Box 610

Maricopa, AZ 85139

p: 520/316-6985

f: 520/568-9120

c: 520/251-1884

kazi.haque@maricopa-az.gov

www.maricopa-az.gov

"The City of Maricopa will be open, responsive, and accountable while serving the public with integrity."

From: Pamela Hilliard [mailto:PHilliard@aamaz.com]

Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 10:13 AM

To: Kazi Haque

2/2/2012

Kazi Haque

From: Reg Destree [reg.destree@rfsusa.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2012 10:12 AM
To: Kazi Haque; Rodolfo Lopez
Cc: Zebrowski, Leanne

Subject: follow up on yesterday's meeting

Thanks for having the meeting yesterday. Here are the items that were requested for an email follow-up.

- ☞ Is there going to be a carve-out for City owned land?
- ☞ Please add Ball Field Light to the definition of Alternative tower structure.
- ☞ D5 (Building Codes; Safety Standards)—the following proviso should be added on line 7 after “If, upon inspection, the City of Maricopa concludes that a tower fails to comply with such codes and standards applicable at the time of building permit approval and constitutes a danger...”
- ☞ D15 (Site Security)—try this “Towers shall be enclosed with a minimum eight (8) foot high masonry wall unless it is determined that reduction in size or exclusion of the wall would reduce the overall visual impact of the site. All such walls shall be constructed of block or masonry unless an alternative would blend in better with the surrounding area. All Towers shall be equipped with an appropriate anti-climb device.”
- ☞ D17 (Noise)—add “Generators used for emergency purposes shall not be required to meet this provision.”
- ☞ F3i—at the end of the section add—“Towers shall be setback from neighboring property lines as shown on Table 6.18-1 (I’m assuming you mean Table B but I’m not sure) unless applicant provides a stamped letter from an Arizona licensed structural engineer stating that the tower will be contained within a smaller area in case of failure”
- ☞ F3b—this needs to be changed to allow the higher or 65’ or a 10’ extension on a replacement alternative structure. This covers ball field lights and utility poles and would likely offer a bit of wiggle room if a tower company needed to replace a stealth structure with a 10’ taller similar stealth structure to accommodate a collocation.
- ☞ Table B—Under permitted heights I would add in a call out for replacement Alternative Towers allowing 10’ over existing height. This would cover ball field lights and utility poles that might already be over the Permitted Height before being replaced and having antennas attached. It also allows some leeway for collocation on existing stealth structures. This requirement would already be a problem with the design at Pacana Park. I know you’re going to work on the setback numbers and I think the change in F3i covers an engineer’s letter for property lines in

Kazi Haque

From: Leslie Carlyle-Burnett [LCarlyle-Burnett@ak-chin.nsn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Jerry Owen
Subject: Wireless Telecommunication Facility Draft Ordinance
Attachments: Leslie Carlyle-Burnett.vcf

Good Afternoon Kazi,

I hope this email finds you in good spirits.

The Ak-Chin Planning and Development Office is in receipt of the City of Maricopa's Draft of Article 36 Wireless Telecommunication Facility. Today is the deadline to submit comments and suggestions. While the Ak-Chin Planning and Development Office has no comments at this time, your hard work in gathering information to create the Draft Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance is certainly appreciated. Its great that the City of Maricopa is meeting the demands for reliable wireless service. This is something I believe the Ak-Chin Indian Community is inevitably progressing toward. I hope to connect with you sometime in the future to gain some ideas and thought processes in creating such a document for the Ak-Chin Indian Community.

Have a safe, blessed and happy new year.

Leslie C. Burnett
Senior Planner
Ak-Chin Indian Community
42507 W. Peters and Nall Rd
Maricopa, AZ 85138
Phone 520-568-1062
LCarlyle-Burnett@ak-chin.nsn.us

This electronic mail transmission and any accompanying documents

1/3/2012

Kazi Haque

From: tskousen@q.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2011 1:29 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: Communication Tower Ordinance

Kazi Haque,

The draft copy of the zoning code for communication tower would make installing a tower very restrictive. It is much more restrictive than other cities in the area. Also most of the approved or installed towers would not have met the requirements of height or setback.

Using an arbitrary residential set back of 300' is a bad idea. It is much farther than more established cities like Phoenix and Chandler that have greater experience with spacing cell towers. Phoenix uses 50' to 150' and Chandler uses 200% of the height of the tower. A setback of 200% of the height of the tower from a residential lot would best suit varying circumstances. 3G and 4g networks require the towers to be closer to the homes to provide quality coverage. The land usage in Maricopa is predominately housing developments. I don't think we will be able to get the needed coverage with having such large setbacks from residential areas. Also using setbacks from subdivision areas instead of residential lots creates added difficulties. Restricting the use of green space parks or adjacent properties to these parks will severely limit viable locations to locate towers.

I also am not sure why you are trying to regulate the spacing between towers. If the first tower cannot support the added antennas and the second tower doesn't interfere with the bandwidth of the first tower, it makes more sense to group them together. Everything should be checked to make sure the other providers antennas can't be put on the first tower before allowing another. Two towers 300' apart are far more obtrusive than two next to each other.

New rules should not govern CUP renewals of property of existing towers. I also think if a parcel of land has an existing communication tower, the land owner should be allowed to continue with a similar usage being exempt from new or added regulations. Thank you for reviewing my ideas when implementing this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Troy Skousen

12/27/2011

Kazi Haque

From: LaMon Begay [ljoelbegay@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2011 2:36 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: Input regarding proposed ordinance

Hello,

The following are my concerns, as a proud resident of Maricopa:

1. That the towers be situated away from schools, parks, playgrounds and residential areas as much as is feasible.
2. That any towers to be built undergo public comments/suggestions whenever possible.
3. That towers be constructed with the environment and taste in mind.

Thank you,

LaMon Begay

Kazi Haque

From: Dedrick Denton [Dedrick.Denton@pinalcountyaz.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 1:42 PM
To: Kazi Haque
Subject: Maricopa wants your input on the proposed Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance-TXT11-01

Kazi,

We have had a chance to review the proposed Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance. Our only suggestion would be to incorporate standards for camouflaging the different types of stealth facilities that are common to your area. For example, a monopalm can have requirements pertaining to the location of antennas within the palm fronds, the number of fronds, bark type, and diameter of trunk. It has been our experience that there is a wide range in quality associated with stealth facilities.

Thanks,

Dedrick Denton, Planner II
Pinal County Planning & Development
(520) 866-6294