

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION  
MARCH 13, 2001 MINUTES  
7:05 P.M. 10:50 P.M.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Chairman John Elmer. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

In attendance, representing the Planning Commission, were John Elmer (Chairman), Dr. Paul Dibble, Terri Binder, William Putnam, and James Nall. Nick Prinster and Mike Denner were absent.

In attendance, representing the Community Development Department, were Kristen Ashbeck (Senior Planner) and Tricia Parish (Associate Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney) and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 34 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Available for consideration were the minutes from the February 13 and February 20 public hearings.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Putnam) “Mr. Chairman, I move for approval of the minutes (of February 13) as presented.”**

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Commissioner Dibble noted an error on the motion for item ANX-2001-011 (pages 3-4) where he was referenced as both making and seconding the motion. This should have been correctly recorded as Commissioner Binder making the motion and Commissioner Dibble seconding.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) “I move we approve the minutes (of February 20) as corrected.”**

Commissioner Binder seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-0, with Commissioner Putnam abstaining.

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS**

Pulled from the evening’s agenda was item ANX-2001-011 (Preliminary Plan - Westland Subdivision).

A brief discussion ensued over the hearing’s advertisement in the newspaper. The public hearing had been incorrectly advertised in the display ad as being held at Two Rivers Convention Center. Because the error was not also contained in the legal ad and since a sign had been placed at Two Rivers Convention Center directing people to City Hall’s auditorium, Chairman Elmer, with the concurrence of Mr. Shaver, said that the legal notification requirement had been met and the meeting could continue.

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

Proposed for placement on the Consent Agenda were items VE-2000-061 (Appeal of Administrative Denial of Mesa Village Marketplace), VR-2001-037 (Melody Park Right-of-Way Vacation), MS-1999-179 (Minor Subdivision - Horizon Park Meadows time extension), PP-2001-029 (Preliminary Plan - 12<sup>th</sup> Street Plaza Subdivision), and VE-2001-035 (Olson Easement Vacation). No objection or commentary was received from any citizen, staff or planning commissioner. Item VE-2000-061 was continued to the first regular meeting in May 2001.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the Consent Agenda as you just said.”**

Commissioner Putnam seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

#### **IV. FULL PUBLIC HEARING**

##### **CUP-2001-031 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—WHEELING TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER**

**A request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 100-foot monopole telecommunications tower to allow for digital wireless phone service.**

**Petitioner: Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel Corp., Tom Lunch**  
**Location: 2749 S. Highway 50**  
**Representative: NTCH Colorado, Inc., Craig Hoff**

##### **PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Craig Hoff, site development coordinator for NTCH Colorado, Inc., also know as Cleartalk, said that this was the first of three proposed tower sites. He said that Cleartalk’s goal was to provide better quality service for lower prices. Doing that meant closing some of the currently existing coverage gaps. An overhead map was presented and alternate sites, which had been investigated as possible tower sites, were noted. Photos of poles from other sites were also presented. Mr. Hoff recounted the problems associated with the alternate sites. He said that because digital signalization didn’t extend as far as analog, a network of towers was required to cover a broader service area. Mr. Hoff explained that the tower would be located far enough from the road as to be virtually unseen from Highway 50. He stressed that Cleartalk currently had 6 other towers located in the Grand Junction area with 16 total carriers using them. The fact that the company’s towers were co-locatable meant that a greater number of users could share fewer towers. Approximately 4-5 users could co-locate on each tower. Access to the proposed site would be derived from B ¼ Road.

##### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Binder questioned why digital would be preferred over analog if it meant more towers. Mr. Hoff replied that digital signalization meant that more calls could be handled on a single frequency. It could also handle data transmission more effectively than analog. The use of digital, he said, would give enhanced 911 capability. Mr. Hoff added that Cleartalk’s tower network made co-location on them by other users very desirable. This resulted, he said, in fewer providers coming before the City with proposals for single-user towers.

Commissioner Binder asked for elaboration on stealth-designed towers. Mr. Hoff said that while more compact and camouflaged, they were more expensive, less efficient, and not as easily co-locatable. When asked about Cleartalk’s build-out projections, Mr. Hoff responded that in addition to the three proposed sites, there could be one other tower constructed at the Colorado State University Research

Center on 32 Road and another constructed in the Appleton area. An overhead map depicting “before” and “after” tower construction coverage areas was presented and explained.

Commissioner Putnam wondered if digital signalization would eventually originate from satellites, making tower construction obsolete. Mr. Hoff did not expect such a scenario to occur.

Commissioner Nall asked if the stealth or other tower designs had been considered. Mr. Hoff said that alternate designs were always given due consideration; however, near an urban area, the monopole made the best sense. Stealth towers were typically as wide at the bottom as at the top. They were sometimes camouflaged as trees and contained an antenna array on top, which looked like a large can. Mr. Hoff explained that the typical monopole was painted with a dull grey, non-reflective coating, which the industry had proven was the least obtrusive. Since there were so many drawbacks to the stealth design, he said, it had not been given serious consideration.

Commissioner Binder remarked that the tower located off Compass Drive really stood out. Mr. Hoff said that Cleartalk had tried to pick out the fewest number of sites promising the greatest coverage benefit.

Commissioner Dibble wondered how construction of Cleartalk’s towers would impact other service providers who might want to construct their own towers. He wondered "how close to a 'saturation point' were the towers?" Mr. Hoff replied that in addition to Cleartalk, 8 additional providers could co-locate on the towers. Commissioner Dibble conjectured that not all service providers would be able, or want, to locate on Cleartalk’s towers; thus, the City could still be faced with future tower proposals from other providers. Commissioner Binder concurred with this conclusion. Mr. Hoff explained that only so many digital licenses were dispensed in a given area, and only 4 were available for the Grand Junction area. He also said that given the expense and time involved in getting a site approved and a tower built, having a co-locatable tower already available was attractive to other providers. An aerial photo of the proposed site location was presented.

**STAFF’S PRESENTATION**

Tricia Parish said that, in addition to Cleartalk, four other providers had contacted her about co-locating on towers and buildings; she noted the surrounding zoning and uses. Access to the site would be via a 25-foot utility easement, with tower and landscaping maintenance required. A 6-foot chain link fence, surrounded by trees and shrubs, would surround the project site. Staff felt that CUP criteria had been met and recommended approval of the request subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall submit evidence of additional users (maximum of three other entities as speculated by the applicant) co-locating on the tower and annually report the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of every inquiry for co-location, as well as the status of such inquiry, as part of an agreement retained by the City.
2. Construction of the tower shall consist of a non-glare finish.
3. The petitioner shall submit evidence of satisfactory structural and engineering standards for the 100-foot tower, prepared and stamped by a registered State of Colorado professional engineer.
4. No lights shall be allowed on the tower except those required by the FAA in the Air Hazard Determination.
5. The petitioner shall adhere to all provisions of the Telecommunication Towers/Facilities Use Specific Standards from section 4.3.R of the Zoning and Development Code, the Conditional

Use Permit Criteria from section 2.13 of the Zoning and Development Code, the comments submitted to the petitioner by the Community Development Department, and the response to comments and general project report submitted by the petitioner.

**QUESTIONS**

Chairman Elmer asked staff to recount the federal legislation regarding cell phone service providers. Ms. Parish answered that the federal government viewed cell phone service as a utility; thus, while local governments could place restrictions on site locations or tower construction, they could not deny service or tower construction altogether. Detailed elaboration of the law was provided by John Shaver.

Commissioner Binder asked if the City received any revenue from tower construction. Ms. Parish said that revenues were received in the form of sales and property taxes; additional revenues would have been received had the tower been located within a City-owned easement or on City-owned property.

Commissioner Binder asked for clarification on various sections of the Code pertaining to telecommunications towers, which was provided.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**FOR:**

Gary Curry (1600 Ute Avenue, Grand Junction), operations manager for Cleartalk, said that while the towers were designed for four carriers, more could be added depending on the antenna configuration. Since individual service needs varied, not all providers required co-location on every Cleartalk tower. He said that stealth towers had a propensity for catching the wind. Cleartalk representatives had approached local business owners to try and co-locate atop their buildings, but in all instances they had been turned down.

Dave Sikut (1600 Ute Avenue, Grand Junction), network manager for Cleartalk, said that they were receiving a lot of customer complaints regarding dropped calls.

Mac Newman (no address given), American Tower Corporation, commended Cleartalk for its job in finding suitable sites and for its marketing to other carriers.

Jean Bierwirth (2754 Compass Drive, Suite 360, Grand Junction) said that Cleartalk provided good service, fair prices, and provided the community with many benefits including jobs and tax revenues.

Chris Stryker (608 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Montrose) emphasized co-location benefits and agreed with previous comments regarding Cleartalk's marketing of other service providers for co-location.

**AGAINST:**

There were no comments against the request.

**PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Hoff said that Cleartalk had considered utilizing existing poles at the fairgrounds; however, none of them were structurally sound enough to support the weight of Cleartalk's antenna array. He expounded briefly on Cleartalk's contributions to the community, citing its support of telecommunications programs at UTEC.

**DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Nall said that while there was perhaps some way of making the proposed monopole more “friendly,” the monopole didn’t seem all that intrusive to him. Since the pole was located far enough from Highway 50 that it wouldn’t be seen, therefore he expressed support for the proposal.

Commissioner Putnam agreed, adding that Cleartalk representatives had shown due diligence in complying with local and federal requirements.

Commissioner Dibble stated that the limiting of digital signal licenses should limit the number of towers proposed. He noted that federal legislative authority didn’t really give local government that much latitude in preventing a tower’s construction. He also expressed support for the request.

Chairman Elmer said that while not completely happy with the visual impacts to the site’s western neighbors, he’d noticed other poles existing within the same commercial area.

Commissioner Binder said that after having seen the tower located off of Compass Drive, she felt that the antenna array made the poles visually intrusive. She agreed, however, that federal legislation prevented local government from denying tower construction altogether. While she felt that the petitioner should give further consideration to camouflaging its tower, she expressed general support for the request.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Nall) “Mr. Chairman, on item CUP-2001-031, I move that we approve the Conditional Use Permit for a co-locatable 100-foot telecommunications tower subject to staff recommendation and conditions, due to compliance to section 2.13 and section 4.3.R of the Zoning and Development Code.”**

Commissioner Putnam seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

A brief recess was called at 8:52 P.M. The public hearing reconvened at 8:57 P.M.

**CUP-2001-032 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT—MEIER TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

**A request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 140-foot monopole telecommunications tower to allow for digital wireless phone service.**

**Petitioner: Gary Meier**  
**Location: 688 – 29 ½ Road**  
**Representative: NTCH Colorado, Inc., Craig Hoff**

**PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION**

Craig Hoff, representing the petitioner, said that 9 other sites had been considered. The new Code, he said, imposed new restrictions on where towers could be located. An overhead of an area map denoting the current site and other investigated sites was presented. Existing trees and foliage would be used to help screen the tower from view, with additional landscaping installed to meet Code requirements. The request had been submitted to an FAA consultant, who said that lighting would be required; however, based on local airport input, the tower would not have to be lit.

**QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dibble asked for clarification on the discrepancy between airport officials. Mr. Hoff said that while lighting had been recommended by the FAA consultant, the consultant had said that if local airport officials didn’t express concerns over a non-lit tower, no lighting would be necessary. The tower,

he said, was located only 40 feet above the base of the runway, which itself was approximately 8,000 feet away. The tower would not pose an aviation risk.

Commissioner Dibble asked if the tower's radio waves would interfere with airport communications, to which Mr. Hoff responded negatively. While interference wasn't considered an issue, he acknowledged that tower owners are often required to sign aviation easements.

Commissioner Binder wondered about the safety of helicopters flying at night (*e.g.*, St. Mary's helicopter). Mr. Hoff said that those considerations were taken into account prior to the FAA making a recommendation. When asked again if lighting the tower was required, Mr. Hoff expressed uncertainty. He noted that concerns had been raised by several residents, who wanted the tower lit for safety purposes. Mr. Shaver stated that the FAA was generally very explicit in its requirements, with safety decisions not being discretionary with local airport officials. In response to questioning by Mr. Shaver, Mr. Hoff said that he possessed a document from the FAA which required lighting on the tower. The document went on to say that if local airport officials deemed it unnecessary, the matter could be brought back before FAA officials for re-review.

Chairman Elmer asked for a brief description of the type lighting to be used. Mr. Curry explained that white lighting would be used during the day, with red lights used at night. There would be no rotating beacon placed atop the tower.

Commissioner Nall wondered why the tower's height had to be 140 feet. Mr. Hoff said that the added height would extend cell service to an area further south. He briefly recounted the other alternatives explored.

Commissioner Binder asked if the applicants had considered locating the tower along or to the north of I-70. Referencing an aerial photo of the area, Mr. Hoff noted where conflicts would arise if the site were relocated. In one instance, topography was a problem; in another, the tower would conflict with the airport's area of influence. Most of the area south of I-70 was residential, he said. There just weren't any commercial/industrial zones existing north of F Road. The stealth design had been considered but later rejected because it failed to meet co-location needs.

Commissioner Binder asked if other than cell service providers could co-locate on Cleartalk's towers. Mr. Hoff said that that was always a possibility.

### **STAFF'S PRESENTATION**

Tricia Parish submitted a packet of letters received from residents, one having been recently published in the Daily Sentinel's Letters to the Editor (copy of the editorial submitted as well). Ms. Parish said that the applicants had complied with Code criteria including hosting a neighborhood meeting. The site, she said, is approximately 11 acres in size, with access via a 25-foot utility easement. A 6-foot chain link fence, surrounded by trees and shrubs would surround the project site. Tower and landscaping maintenance would be required. She said that a number of opposing comments had been received from surrounding neighbors. Concerns included safety, visual impacts, and impacts to property values and quality of life. Having determined, however, that the applicants met Code criteria for a CUP, approval was recommended subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall submit evidence of additional users (maximum of three other entities as speculated by the applicant) co-locating on the tower and annually report the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of every inquiry for co-location, as well as the status of such inquiry, as part of an agreement retained by the City.

2. The tower shall be constructed of non-glare materials and be finished with non-glare gray or blue paint.
3. The petitioner shall submit evidence of satisfactory structural and engineering standards for the 140-foot tower, prepared and stamped by a registered State of Colorado professional engineer.
4. No lights shall be allowed on the tower except those required by the FAA in the Air Hazard Determination.
5. The petitioner shall adhere to all provisions of the Telecommunication Towers/Facilities Use Specific Standards from section 4.3.R of the Zoning and Development Code, the Conditional Use Permit Criteria from section 2.13 of the Zoning and Development Code, the comments submitted to the petitioner by the Community Development Department, and the response to comments and general project report submitted by the petitioner.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Nall asked if the Code required some sort of documentation proving a good faith effort by the applicants that alternative sites were sufficiently investigated. Ms. Parish said that staff asked applicants for that information.

Commissioner Dibble observed that any additional tower height would violate setback requirements; however, he wondered if the tower posed a safety hazard to airport operations. Ms. Parish said that while the tower would be located within the flight path of runway 29, airport officials had not expressed concern or objection.

When asked by Commissioner Binder if the Code limited tower height, Ms. Parish said that tower height was measured against available setback; a proper ratio was required. Commissioner Binder asked if a taller tower located further away was possible. Ms. Parish said that while a possibility, the current request did not reflect that option.

A brief discussion ensued over the location of the airport's critical zone and tower setback requirements.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

#### **FOR:**

Gary Curry (1600 Ute Avenue, Grand Junction) said that the City's Code limited Cleartalk to just a very few tower sites. It was difficult, he said, to find property with enough area to construct a tower of this height. A taller tower required a bigger "fall zone," although the chance of any tower falling was a near impossibility since they were designed to buckle in on themselves. He reiterated the need to close coverage gaps for better customer service; he highlighted the positive co-location opportunities. He reiterated that more than 4 carriers could be located on a tower, depending on antenna configuration. With regard to lighting, he confirmed that the FAA had required it and citizen safety concerns seemed to warrant it; however, there were also those who objected to lighting the tower. He understood that the decision would be left up to local airport authorities. If lighting were required, use of a 'Fresno lens' would direct light up into the air and away from the ground.

Dale Hunt (631 Pioneer Road, Grand Junction), marketing manager for Cleartalk, said that he understood citizen concerns but said that there was no evidence to support devaluation of properties located near a communications tower. A tower's impact, he said, could be compared to that of a large cottonwood tree. He emphasized Cleartalk's desire to provide the community with good service and its willingness to co-

locate other users on its towers. The proposed site, he said, was a good one, and all Code criteria had been met.

Joe Reynolds (1244 Main Street, Grand Junction), sales manager for Cleartalk, reiterated the need for the proposed tower to address an existing coverage area gap. He said that their customers continued to complain about dropped calls.

**AGAINST:**

Evelyn McCabe (2946 Erika Road, Grand Junction) read from her letter, which had been published in the Daily Sentinel. In it she cited airport safety concerns, visual impacts, and potential impacts to property values. She'd suggested co-locating on existing water tanks north of I-70.

Kathy Deppe-Spomer (676 – 29 ½ Road, Grand Junction) said that the tower's placement would be "basically in her back yard." She wondered how residents protected their property rights if the City wouldn't regulate providers. She reiterated concerns about airport safety, citing the large volume of aircraft using runway 29. As a realtor, she said that the highest and best use for the subject property was residential, not commercial/industrial. She was very concerned that her property would be devalued if a 140-foot monopole were constructed next door. She said that the applicants had described in their narrative the need for additional pads and shelters at the base of the pole. She wondered what else would be located there? She submitted photos of the site and the proposed tower superimposed to show how the tower would appear from her property. She pointed out the scale of surrounding trees and vegetation and said that existing and proposed landscaping would do little, if anything, to screen the tower and reduce visual impacts. She submitted 48 letters of opposition from surrounding residents.

Bob Smagala (2942 Shavano Street, Grand Junction) noted the strict covenants placed on him and other homeowners in his subdivision. Covenants prevented homeowners from erecting structures higher than 25 feet or installing even so much as a flagpole on their properties. If they were forced to abide by such restrictions, why didn't those same restrictions apply to Cleartalk? He noted that a pair of eagles frequented the area and wondered if they would use the pole as a nesting site. He felt it more acceptable to erect a group of smaller towers than one 140-foot tower. He also felt that the tower would be better located within a utility corridor and suggested moving the site further to the west along I-70.

James Mackley (687 – 30 Road, Grand Junction) said that he would have the same view from his property as Ms. Deppe-Spomer would have from hers. The location was not suitable, he said, for this type of structure. Citing the Code section regarding visual impacts of such a structure, he felt that the applicants had not and could not satisfy this requirement. He suggested alternative sites such as Matchett Park. It seemed to him that other options were available and hadn't been fully explored.

Paul Crabtree (678 Shavano Court, Grand Junction) expressed his opposition for the reasons cited by Ms. Deppe-Spomer. Placing the tower within a nearby copse of trees, he said, might reduce visual impacts.

Mary Anne Pacini (624 Pioneer Road, Grand Junction) agreed that the tower's placement within a residential area was inappropriate. She wondered if additional towers would be constructed in the area if the number of carriers exceeded co-location spots on Cleartalk's tower. She felt that issues over the tower's placement within the airport's area of influence should be better addressed. Planes in this area, she said, typically fly very low. Even if local pilots grew used to seeing the tower within the runway's flight path, what about planes diverted to this area from other locations? What about new pilots in training? The tower would be very noticeable to residents in the area. She would have appreciated the applicants submitting a landscape design plan with the proposal for review. Ms. Pacini felt that approval



of the current application would set a precedent for the placement of additional towers in other residential locations.

Ken Richards (2973 Bookcliff Avenue, Grand Junction), who worked for Cleartalk, said that the pole's placement was not actually located within the runway's flight path. Referencing an aerial photo of the area, he said that he was also a pilot and that the tower's location would not pose a safety risk to himself or other pilots using the runway.

### **PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL**

Mr. Hoff said that he and others had considered and later discounted Matchett Park as a siting alternative. And while it would have been convenient to use a utility corridor, such access was unavailable. He reminded planning commissioners that the tower would be located within an 11-acre field. He again noted the restrictions placed on tower placement by the City's Code. Placement within a residential area was permitted via a CUP. Trees and other onsite vegetation would be used to help screen the tower, but the added height was a necessity. Co-location on the water tanks, as mentioned by Ms. McCabe, was impossible since the towers were too far away. Location of the tower within the copse of trees, as referenced by Mr. Crabtree, was also impossible since the trees would block the signal coming from the antenna array. The basic need, he said, was to satisfy a coverage objective. He presented a photo of a tower from another location and noted the cleanliness of the site. Carrier base transceiving systems (BTS's) do require shelters, which will be constructed on the various pad sites at the tower's base.

### **QUESTIONS**

Commissioner Dibble noted the existence of donkeys on the site and wondered if they would remain, to which Mr. Hoff responded affirmatively. When asked if they would be allowed to graze on existing and installed landscaping, Mr. Hoff said that the property's owners, Mr. and Mrs. Meier, had the donkeys behind electric fencing, so he didn't foresee grazing as a problem. Commissioner Dibble asked if there would be a health risk posed to the donkeys by the radio waves, to which Mr. Hoff replied negatively.

Commissioner Dibble asked if pad sites and shelters would also be screened. Mr. Hoff said that this had been addressed in the applicants' landscaping plan. Five additional trees and multiple shrubs had been proposed, with irrigation provided via a pressurized system. He recounted the problems experienced when trying to secure a water tap from Ute Water for irrigation purposes. When asked if Cleartalk retained any water rights, Mr. Hoff said that water would be provided by the Meiers.

### **DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Binder empathized with surrounding residents but said that planning commissioners had to base their decision on the federal legislation in place, the City's Code and other regulations. She said that while there may be no evidence to support diminished property values by virtue of the tower's placement in a residential area, there was also no evidence to prove that it wouldn't. Citing herself as an example, she said that if she were in the market to buy a home in that area, the presence of the pole would certainly factor into her purchasing decision. Co-location of multiple carriers was a good idea, but doing so within a residential area was very different. She agreed that the highest and best use of the subject property was residential. She also concurred that if covenants governing residential neighborhoods limited structure heights, how could a 140-foot tower be given an exception? In a community where people were prevented from erecting flagpoles or fences higher than 6 feet, what kind of message would approval of a 140-foot tower send to the community? She said she could not support such a request within a residential area.

Chairman Elmer reiterated that federal legislation took precedence over local regulation. He noted that the Code's setback requirements did limit the location of such towers. The shape and design of the

monopole would not impact resident views. Having watched the take-offs and landings of planes at runway 29, he didn't feel that the pole's height and location would impact air traffic at all. Because the request met CUP criteria, he expressed his support.

Commissioner Dibble concurred with Chairman Elmer's comments. He also agreed with the petitioner's arguments that the tower must be constructed in that general area to satisfy service needs. He didn't believe that the visual impacts of a tower were all that intrusive and eventually residents would acclimate themselves to its presence. He was unsure whether or not it would affect the area's property values. If the site was the best alternative available, and given that it met setbacks and other Code criteria, he felt the request should be supported.

Commissioner Nall agreed, noting that this request put the City "between a rock and a hard place." He acknowledged that there could be some devaluation of surrounding properties from a common sense perspective. It appeared from the staff report that all available options had been explored; thus, it didn't seem that another siting option was available.

Commissioner Putnam remarked that he disliked approving this for a residential neighborhood but he, too, acknowledged that no other alternative seemed available.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Dibble) "Mr. Chairman, on item CUP-2001-032, I move that we approve the Conditional Use Permit for a co-locatable 140-foot telecommunications tower subject to staff recommendations and conditions, due to compliance to section 2.13 and section 4.3.R of the Zoning and Development Code."**

Commissioner Nall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner Binder opposing.

Due to the lateness of the hour, Chairman Elmer asked the applicants if the remaining item #ANX-2001-033 (Annexation/Conditional Use Permit - Berthod Telecommunications Tower) could be tabled until next week's public hearing. No objection was given.

**MOTION: (Commissioner Binder) "Mr. Chairman, I move that we move until next Tuesday #ANX-2001-033, and I also move that we hear this one first."**

Commissioner Nall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:50 P.M.