## CELL SERVICE STATEMENT OF DIRECTION

The Paradise Valley Mayor & Town Council hereby provides the Planning Commission with the following Statement of Direction (SOD) concerning cellular service.

Phase I SOD

- Amend Chapter 12, Personal Wireless Service Facilities (PWSF), of the Town Zoning Code to come into compliance with a new state statute captured in House Bill 2365.
  - Recognize that the State law focuses upon the placement of small cell PWSF's in the ROW. As such, complete the amendment regarding small cell facilities in the ROW first (Phase I) and submit to Council prior to work on amendments to PWSF's on private property and macro cells (Phase II).
  - Said amendment should develop "Objective design standards and reasonable stealth and concealment requirements" that include the following:
    - For new small cell PWSF's in the ROW:
      - Codify a standard that captures the twenty-four (24) foot faux cactus [are we willing to go to 30'?] and associated undergrounding of related equipment used in the O-DAS system currently permitted in Town ROW.
        - The location area preferred by the applicant shall be reviewed for a location, with the substantially the same coverage capabilities, that best blends with the existing natural and built environment and avoids conflicts with existing view-sheds. The PWSF should not be located within intersection and driveway view triangles. The final location shall be established by the Commission after input from property near the location recommended by the staff at a public CUP hearing.
        - The design standard shall not allow a new faux cactus to be placed in existing cement nor shall cement be placed around the base of the facility;
        - The design standard shall require a certain amount of landscaping within a defined perimeter of the facility.
        - Any utility meter associated with the facility shall be faced away from the street or center of the ROW or camouflaged in some manner.
        - Design details should be similar to the finite standards used in the approval of the NewPath nodes.
      - Develop a process for an applicant who chooses not to comply with the aforementioned reasonable design standards to apply for an alternative design that meets the core principals of the faux cactus solution including:
        - o height,
        - o stealth and concealment of antenna and equipment; and,
        - undergrounding;
        - In said process, provide a provision such that subsequent to Planning Commission approval of any alternative design, the application shall be forwarded to Council for approval or denial

[Consider the pros and cons of a CUP process for faux cactus applications and an SUP process for alternative applications]

- Determine if the timeline for processing an alternate design application is greater than the time limits imposed by the state statute.
- For placement of a small cell PWSF on an existing traffic signal or light pole as of August 8, 2017:
  - Codify a standard that captures the PWSF located on the southwest corner of 56<sup>th</sup> and Lincoln Drive. Such design standard shall:
    - Limit the height of the PWSF to 10' above the top of the pole (not including the mast arm), not to exceed a total height of 40'
    - Require all pole mounted equipment to be contained in a cylinder the same size as the supporting pole [not to exceed 20 inches];
    - Require all wiring associated with the PWSF to be contained within the existing (or replacement) pole;
    - Replacement poles shall not be more than twenty (20) inches in diameter at the point immediately below the PWSF;
    - Require all ground mounted equipment to be buried with the exception of the associated utility meter;
    - Adopt standard details similar to the spec sheet for the existing DAS site at 56<sup>th</sup> & Lincoln Drive
  - Develop a process for an applicant who chooses not to comply with the aforementioned reasonable design standards to apply for an alternative design that meets the core principals of the 56<sup>th</sup> Street reasonable design standard solution including:
    - o height,
    - stealth and concealment of antenna and equipment; and,
    - undergrounding;
    - In said process, provide a provision such that subsequent to Planning Commission approval of any alternative design, the application shall be forwarded to Council for approval or denial [Consider the pros and cons of a CUP process for faux cactus applications and an SUP process for alternative applications]
    - Determine if the timeline for processing an alternate design application is greater than the time limits imposed by the state statute.
- Codify a process that meets the state statute timeline requirements. Said code provision shall include:
  - A 20 day provision for determining if a small cell PWSF application is complete and a process for notifying and/or denying an application that is not complete;
  - A 75 day provision for completing a Planning Commission review of a PWSF small cell application;
  - Identify a timeline provision for resubmittals to cure problems or denials.
  - Identify a timeline provision, if required, for applications that choose an alternative design which would include review by the Planning Commission and the Town Council.
  - Determine if the appropriate process is a CUP or SUP

- Codify, or make reference to, a fee schedule that reflects the maximum allowed fees under the state statute.
- Complete and remit a draft to the Town Council by August 1, 2017

Phase II – SOD for private land and Macro Cells [some initial concepts]

- For new macro cell PWSF's in the ROW:
  - Codify an objective design standard with reasonable stealth and concealment requirements. Said standards shall include:
    - A specific maximum height allowed on any PWSF under 50'.
    - A specific design guideline for stealth and concealment that blends with the adjacent property.
- For placement of a macro cell PWSF on an existing traffic signal or light pole, replicate the same standard as a small cell.
- A 30 day provision for determining if a macro cell PWSF application is complete and a process for notifying and/or denying an application that is not complete;
- A 150 day provision for completing a Planning Commission review of a PWSF macro cell application;