

Planning Commission Comments from October 14, 2014

Unipole Freestanding Wireless Communication Facility TC1400004

The Planning Commission recommended approval, 7-2, of the text amendment on October 14, 2014. The Planning Commission determined that the ordinance request is consistent with the adopted *Comprehensive Plan*, and that the request is reasonable and in the public interest based on comments received at the public hearing and the information in the staff report.

In addition, the following individual comments from the Commissioners are as follows:

- Buzby** This is a fine proposal but I voted against approval due to the lack of public hearings.
 - Davis** Move approval.
 - Gibbs** Approved addition of Unipole to other options for F.S. Communication towers options and to UDO Text Amendment. Recommend CC Approval.
*Should be an option in all zoning districts.
 - Harris** Voted No.
- JCCPC (Joint City-County Planning Committee)
- August 6, 2014 meeting
- Our task for this UDO Text Amendment, Unipole (a.k.a “Slick-stick”) Freestanding Wireless Communication Facility (TC1400004) request was to;
1. Receive this report from the staff
 2. Review the report
 3. Provide comments
 4. Provide policy directions to the Planning Director
- Such as:
- a. Recommend proceeding with the adoption process of the amendment as proposed by the applicant, and in conjunction with TC1200013 Wireless Communication Facilities,
 - b. Recommend changes prior to proceeding with the adoption process, or
 - c. Do not recommend including Unipoles as a concealed WCF
- After a lengthy discussion the JCCPC were supportive but very concern; because currently a Special Use Permit is required for the implementation of a Unipole in a non-residential zone, this would remove this requirement.
- DURHAM PLANNING COMMISSION RULES OF PROCEDURE
Section 1.3 Functions of the Planning Commission
The Planning Commission shall have the following duties:
- a. Propose and review policies and procedures for **encouraging broad public** input on all comprehensive, area, sub-area, neighborhood and functional plans.
- By removing the Special Use Permit process we are removing a public input event which is opposing our Rules of Procedures.

It is for this reason I am recommending voting no for this request. A few years ago a decision by the Planning Director divided the entire community and we have not recovered from that decision after years of discussions.

With more public input in the beginning processes, maybe lots of the confusion would have been avoided. This was the 751 project.

Unipole installations will be revisited with the adoption of the WCF updates within in the next 6 to 18 months anyway.

To grant a text amendment for a single customer is not the proper process for smart growth.

Padgett

Approve.