

**Attachment A**

For the purposes of this section, single-family zoning districts shall include the following:

- RSF-1: 3.5 units/acre single-family residential district.
- RSF-2: 4.6 units/acre single-family residential district.
- RSF-3: 5.8 units/acre single-family residential district.
- RSF-4: 8 units/acre single-family residential district.
- RC: 12 units/acre residential conservation district.
- MH: 12 units/acre mobile home residential district.

Multiple-family districts shall include the following:

- RMF-5: 12 units/acre single-family/multiple-family residential district.
- RMF-6: 8--15 units/acre multiple-family residential district.
- RMF-7: 8--21 units/acre multiple-family residential district.
- RMF-8: 8--30 units/acre multiple-family residential district.
- RMU: Up to 75 units/acre residential mixed use district.
- RH-1: 8--43 units/acre residential high density district.
- RH-2: 8--100 units/acre residential high density district.

Office districts shall include the following:

- OR: 20 units/acre office residential district.
- OF: General office district.
- MD: Medical services district.

Mixed-use districts shall include the following:

- MU-1: 10--30 units/acre mixed use low intensity.
- MU-2: 14--30 units/acre mixed use medium intensity.
- CCD: Up to 150 units/acre central city district.

2. **Petition 170TCH-03 PB** City Plan Board. Amend the City of Gainesville Land Development Code regarding communication towers and antennas.

Mr. Jason Simmons was recognized. Mr. Simmons noted that the petition had been continued from the January Plan Board meeting, and had been revised to reflect Plan Board comments. He noted that the petition also reflected comments from Mr. Arthur K. Peters, a professional engineer and telecommunications expert. Mr. Simmons discussed changes in the public hearing process for camouflaged towers, an increase in co-location requirements based upon the height of a tower, a 2-mile radius for location of towers, increased requirements for a Special Use Permit, and limitations on the height of tower identification sign. He noted that the changes included revised definitions and requirements for the applicant to retain a professional consultant. He offered to answer any questions from the board.

Chair Pearce referred to Attachment A, and asked why 2 residential low-density districts were included in the single-family zoning districts, and the third excluded.

Mr. Simmons explained that staff believed that the RC and MH Zoning categories were more in character than the RSF 1 through 4 Districts, and as such shouldn't be subject to the same commercial intrusion as the other commercial districts.

Chair Pearce asked why the RMF-5 District was not included with the single-family district, since it had the same building heights. He suggested that someone could include the change in a motion.

Mr. Polshek asked about the wi-fi issue that was discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Arthur Peters was recognized. Mr. Peters indicated that the City had retained him as a consultant tower matter. He explained that the ordinance before the board was, fundamentally, a tower ordinance and did not go into the regulation of antennas.

Mr. Polshek requested clarification of the language on Page 6, ...or any other spectrum based transmissions/receptions. He suggested that the word "spectrum" could be better defined.

Mr. Peters agreed with Mr. Polshek's comments. He suggested that the words "spectrum based" be removed so the language would address transmissions/receptions.

Mr. Polshek referred to the language on new technology as stated on Page 18, and suggested that the ordinance be revised so that antiquated and obsolete antenna technology would no longer be permitted when new, less intrusive, technology became available. He pointed out that, in the future when new technology came forward, it was possible the older more intrusive type antennas might still be constructed for financial or other reasons.

Mr. Simmons indicated that he was not sure there should be a blanket regulation that future providers must use new technology in all circumstances and conditions.

Chair Pearce noted that all aspects of the Code were often under revision. He suggested that, if new, less intrusive technology, became available, new regulation would be brought before the board. He asked if Mr. Polshek would like to make a recommendation.

Mr. Polshek indicated that he would like to be certain that the ordinance was revised to address new technology.

Mr. Andrews indicated that the board was speaking to an administrative amendment to an ordinance. He suggested that the action was not valid.

Mr. Polshek suggested that the section on new technology be stricken.

Chair Pearce asked if staff objected to the language being removed.

Mr. Mimms asked if Mr. Peters was familiar with regulations in other areas.

Mr. Peters explained that an ordinance was written to prohibit or limit, and that ordinance would limit the maximum obtrusiveness of a tower. He noted that, in the future, things would probably be smaller. He agreed that striking the language might be best, since there was no way to predict new technology.

There was no public comment on the petition.

Mr. Polshek discussed the problem of towers and migratory birds. He asked if staff had reviewed the US Fish and Wildlife guidelines regarding mitigation of damage to migratory birds.

Mr. Simmons indicated that he had not specifically reviewed the matter.

Mr. Polshek requested that staff review the guidelines for future inclusion in the ordinance. He noted that Brevard County had incorporated the guidelines into their ordinance.

Mr. Peters noted that the County had an ornithologist on their planning staff, and there had been problems with taller towers. He suggested that the ornithologist be consulted on the matter.

<u>Motion By:</u> Mr. Andrews	<u>Seconded By:</u> Mr. Gold
<p><u>Moved to:</u> Approve Petition 170TCH-03 PB, with the following amendments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Remove paragraph (t), Staff report, Page 18, regarding new technology.</li> <li>2) Add the residential low-density zoning district to (d), staff report, Page 6.</li> <li>3) Move RMF-5 to single-family section in Attachment A, Page 19.</li> <li>4) Remove the language "spectrum based" staff report, Page 6, under "Wireless communication facility."</li> </ol>	<p><u>Upon Vote:</u> Motion Carried 5 – 0  Ayes: Andrews, Gold, Pearce, Polshek, Rwebyogo</p>