

Citizen Participation Report

FOR

Verizon Wireless AZ5 Glennwilde Groves CUP12-02—Pacana Park Cell Tower

18800 N. Porter Road
Maricopa, AZ 85138
APN: 510-24-001Q
Jurisdiction: Maricopa
Zoning: CR-3



Submitted by:

Reg Destree

Reliant Land Services, Inc.
3200 N. Hayden Road, Ste. 205
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
602-349-6930 (mobile)
602-453-0002 (fax)
Reg.destree@rlsusa.com

June 28, 2012

Verizon Wireless has taken a multi-pronged approach to engage the neighbors to pursue early and effective communication regarding its proposal to place a cell site on a replacement ball field light at Pacana Park. Four separate actions have occurred in an attempt to include neighbors in the development process for this site.

Sign Posting

Verizon Wireless engaged Dynamite Signs to place a 24" x 32" sign at each of the entrances to the South portion of Pacana Park. These signs were designed in accordance with the guidelines of the City of Maricopa Citizen Participation Plan and Notification Guide packet. The sign was presented to and approved by Staff prior to placement. The signs were placed at the east entrance on Porter Road and south entrance on Adams Lane on June 7th. The signs included a project description, dates for the neighborhood meeting, P&Z hearing, City Council hearing and also had contact information for staff in case anyone had comments or questions. Dynamite Signs provided an Affidavit of Posting.

As of 6/25 staff had not received any feedback from neighbors or users of the park or neighboring church based on this sign posting.

Newspaper Public Notice

Verizon Wireless placed a legal notice in the Maricopa Monitor on June 8th. This notice was designed in accordance with the guidelines of the City of Maricopa Citizen Participation Plan and Notification Guide packet. The notice was presented to and approved by Staff prior to publishing. The notice ran in the June 8th edition of the Maricopa Monitor. The notice included a project description, dates for the neighborhood meeting, P&Z hearing, City Council hearing and also had contact information for staff in case anyone had comments or questions. The Maricopa Monitor provided an Affidavit of Posting.

As of 6/25 staff had not received any feedback from neighbors or users of the park or neighboring church based on this sign posting.

Neighborhood Notification Letter

A neighborhood notification letter was prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the City of Maricopa Citizen Participation Plan and Notification Guide packet. The letter included an aerial showing the location in the park, dates for the neighborhood meeting, P&Z hearing, City Council hearing, a lengthy description of the proposal including a history of the project and also had contact information for staff and me in case anyone had comments or questions. The letter also included a site plan and elevations showing the proposed ball field light replacement. The letter was approved by staff prior to distribution.

The letter was sent to landowners of record within 300' of the subject property. Due to the size of the southern park parcel there were a total of 54 properties within the 300' radius from the property. A majority of these properties are undeveloped and still owned by developers. After eliminating duplicate owners there were only 15 separate land owners within the 300' radius. I provided stamped, addressed letters staff who mailed them.

As of 6/25 staff and the applicant's representative had not received any feedback from neighbors or users of the park or neighboring church based on this sign posting. Both attendees at the neighborhood meeting indicated they had received the notice letter and had the letter with them.

Neighborhood Meeting

On June 25th a Neighborhood Meeting was held at Community of Hope Church. This church is directly adjacent to Pacana Park and was chosen due to proximity to the site and neighborhood. There were two neighbors in attendance at the meeting. They both walked from their homes to the meeting and indicated they had been informed by the Letter of the Neighborhood Meeting and the upcoming Public Hearings.

The attendees were Christy Livesey and Craig Story and they were both there at the same time just after 5:00PM.

The back of Mr. Story's home on Falcon Lane looks directly out on to the park in the general location of our proposed site. He indicated that he feels having a cell site next to his home will further decrease his already diminished property value. He was also concerned about the unknown nature of long-term health effects of sites such as this. The main question he raised was why this park was chosen and more specifically why this particular location was chosen within the park. I explained to him that Verizon Wireless needed improve coverage and needs to improve capacity in this area. I showed him the coverage maps to demonstrate why this general area was being targeted. The park was chosen as it is a non-residential use in this residential area and it also offers multiple vertical structures meaning a new vertical structure would not need to be built by Verizon Wireless. As for the exact location within the park I explained we had worked with City Staff for many years on the location and it was placed adjacent to the maintenance facility so that the ground equipment could best be concealed and integrated into the current park design. I also indicated that staff had requested photo-simulations earlier that day and I had in fact taken one of the pictures from his back fence. I offered to provide him a copy if he wanted to give me his email address. He declined. Mr. Story also indicated he felt his Verizon Wireless coverage was sufficient.

Ms. Livesey lives a few houses further away on Centennial Dr. She was mainly concerned about the general location and also wondered why this specific location in the park was chosen. She did indicate she concurred when Mr. Story raised his concerns regarding possible value and health concerns. I was able to address their concerns at the same time. I spent about 10 minutes discussing the location with both attendees. Ms. Livesey indicated that she does have some trouble with her VZW service and seemed to understand the need for improved coverage and capacity.

The neighbors indicated that there were additional neighbors who were unable to make it to the meeting and would be attending the P&Z. They also let me know there was a new resident in one of the homes who had not received the notice as she just moved in but they let her know about the proposal.

The neighbors seemed somewhat resigned to the fact the site would ultimately be approved. I let them know that was not the case and if they had issues they could be heard and that was the point of the meeting and the public hearings. I also suggested if they or others had questions or felt their concerns weren't being addressed they should contact me, staff, the P&Z commissioner or the City Council member serving their area.

On-going contact

If I receive further contact I will inform staff of any contacts that occur and any questions or concerns that are raised.