

**SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

**(CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 26, 2004 REGULAR MEETING)**

**SUBJECT:** REQUEST FOR (1) SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ESTABLISH A 150 FOOT TALL "ECCLESIASTICAL" CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER IN THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE DISTRICT); AND (2) VARIANCES FROM 450 FEET TO 320 FEET AND 450 FEET TO 300 FEET TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES REQUIRED BETWEEN A PROPOSED 150 FOOT TALL "ECCLESIASTICAL" CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER AND PROPERTIES WITH SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS; (BOB CHOPRA / WIRELESS FACILITIES / CINGULAR WIRELESS, LLC, APPLICANTS).

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning & Development **DIVISION:** Planning

**AUTHORIZED BY:** Earnest McDonald **CONTACT:** Earnest McDonald **EXT:** 7430

Agenda Date 08-23-04 Regular  Consent  Public Hearing

**MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:**

1. **APPROVE** THE REQUEST FOR (1) SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ESTABLISH A 150 FOOT TALL "ECCLESIASTICAL" CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER IN THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE DISTRICT); AND (2) VARIANCES FROM 450 FEET TO 320 FEET AND 450 FEET TO 300 FEET TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES REQUIRED BETWEEN A PROPOSED 150 FOOT TALL "ECCLESIASTICAL" CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER AND PROPERTIES WITH SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS; (BOB CHOPRA / WIRELESS FACILITIES / CINGULAR WIRELESS, LLC, APPLICANTS).
2. **DENY** THE REQUEST FOR (1) SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ESTABLISH A 150 FOOT TALL "ECCLESIASTICAL" CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER IN THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE DISTRICT); AND (2) VARIANCES FROM 450 FEET TO 320 FEET AND 450 FEET TO 300 FEET TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES REQUIRED BETWEEN A PROPOSED 150 FOOT TALL "ECCLESIASTICAL" CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER AND PROPERTIES WITH SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS; (BOB CHOPRA / WIRELESS FACILITIES / CINGULAR WIRELESS, LLC, APPLICANTS).
3. **CONTINUE** THE REQUEST TO A TIME AND DATE CERTAIN.

|                            |  |   |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| <b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b> | BOB CHOPRA / WIRELESS FACILITIES / CINGULAR WIRELESS, APPLICANTS<br>5210 MARKHAM WOODS ROAD<br>LAKE MARY, FL 32746 | A-1 District, LDC Section 124 (b)(23) Communication Towers; LDC Section 30.1364(b) Performance Standards (Minimum Separation from Off-Site Uses / Designated Areas) |
|----------------------------|--|---|

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p><b>BACKGROUND / REQUEST</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 26, 2004 REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD BY REQUEST OF THE APPLICANTS.</li><li>• THE APPLICANTS PROPOSE TO LEASE A PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IN ORDER TO CONSTRUCT A 150 FT TALL ECCLESIASTICAL MONOPOLE COMMUNICATION TOWER THAT WOULD BE DESIGNED TO COMPLIMENT AND CONFORM IN APPEARANCE WITH THE EXISTING CHURCH FACILITY.</li><li>• THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY OCCUPIED BY A CHURCH AND ATTENDANT ACCESSORY FACILITIES, WHICH COMPRISE PART OF A LARGER SITE OWNED BY MARKHAM WOODS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, INC.</li><li>• <b><u>REQUEST FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION</u></b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ THE EXISTING SITE IS LOCATED IN THE A-1 DISTRICT, WHERE CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWERS ARE PERMITTED SUBJECT TO PLANNING MANAGER APPROVAL AND THE CRITERIA BELOW.</li><li>○ THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE DEFINES A CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER AS:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ A STRUCTURE DESIGNED TO MERGE, BLEND INTO AND CONFORM IN APPEARANCE WITH EXISTING SURROUNDINGS; AND</li><li>▪ A STRUCTURE THAT DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE UNIQUE, UNUSUAL OR OUT OF PLACE; AND</li><li>▪ A STRUCTURE THAT A REASONABLE PERSON WITH NORMAL OBSERVATIONAL FACULTIES AND INTELLIGENCE WOULD NOT PERCEIVE AS A TOWER; AND</li><li>▪ A STRUCTURE WITH CAMOUFLAGE TECHNIQUES THAT DOES NOT HAVE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON THE GENERAL AREA IN WHICH IT WOULD BE LOCATED.</li><li>▪ BASED ON THIS DEFINITION, THE PLANNING MANAGER HAS DETERMINED THE PROPOSED "ECCLESIASTICAL" TOWER, WHILE CAMOUFLAGE IN DESIGN, WOULD NOT MEET THE ABOVE CRITERIA</li></ul></li><li>○ THE PLANNING MANAGER HAS DETERMINED THAT THE PROPOSED ECCLESIASTICAL MONOPOLE DOES NOT MEET THE ABOVE CRITERIA.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ THE PROPOSED TOWER, WHILE CAMOUFLAGE IN DESIGN, WOULD NOT MERGE, BLEND OR CONFORM IN APPEARANCE TO THE EXISTING CHURCH DUE TO ITS PROPOSED HEIGHT AND WOULD THEREBY APPEAR UNIQUE, UNUSUAL AND OUT OF PLACE WITH SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT. FOR THIS REASON, A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IS REQUESTED FOR THE PROPOSED</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul> |
|------------------------------------|---|

TOWER, AS ALLOWED BY THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR STRUCTURES THAT FAIL TO MEET THE DEFINITION OF A CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER.

• **REQUEST FOR VARIANCES**

- MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCE IS DEFINED AS 300 PERCENT OF PROPOSED TOWER HEIGHT (OR 150 FT X 3 = 450 FT), MEASURED FROM THE OUTER EXTREMITY OF THE BASE OF THE TOWER TO THE NEAREST PROPERTY LINE OF THE PARCELS WHERE RESIDENCES ARE LOCATED. FOR THE PROPOSED 150 FOOT TOWER, THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REQUIRES A MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCE OF 450 FT BETWEEN THE BASE OF THE TOWER AND EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY USES TO THE SOUTH.
- THE SUBJECT PROPERTY ABUTS TWO (2) PROPERTIES TO THE SOUTH WHERE THERE ARE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCES. THE FOLLOWING VARIANCES ARE REQUESTED TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS:

| SE DESIGNATED PARCELS  | PROPOSED DISTANCE SEPARATION | VARIANCE AMOUNT REQUESTED |
|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 02-20-29-506-0000-0020 | 300 FT (SOUTH)               | 150 FT                    |
| 02-20-29-300-027A-0000 | 320 FT (SOUTH)               | 130 FT                    |

- THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS OCCUPIED BY AN EXISTING CHURCH ON PROPERTY DESIGNATED SE (SUBURBAN ESTATES) FLU AND A-1 (AGRICULTURE DISTRICT), WHERE THE SEPARATION REQUIREMENT DOES NOT APPLY.
- THE ABUTTING TRACT TO THE WEST IS OCCUPIED BY A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING WHERE THE SEPARATION REQUIREMENT DOES APPLY. HOWEVER, SECTION 30.1364(B)(3) OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE ALLOWS THE PLANNING MANAGER TO REDUCE SEPARATION DISTANCES WITH WRITTEN CONSENT OF PROPERTY OWNERS WITHIN THE SEPARATION DISTANCE.
- THE ABUTTING TRACT TO THE WEST COMPRISES A PART OF THE MARKHAM WOODS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH SITE AND IS COMMONLY OWNED BY THE SAME ENTITY AUTHORIZING THE REQUEST. BY VIRTUE OF THIS AUTHORIZATION, THE OWNER HAS CONSENTED TO ALLOWING A REDUCTION IN

|  | SEPARATION DISTANCE BETWEEN THE BASE OF THE PROPOSED TOWER AND THE ABUTTING TRACT TO THE WEST; NO VARIANCE IS REQUIRED.   |              |   |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |
|--|---|--------------|---|--|-----------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----------|---------------|-------|-----|----|--------|-------|-----|----|---|------|-----|----|---------------|------|-----|----|---------------|
| <b>ZONING &amp; FLU</b>  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>DIRECTION</th> <th>EXISTING ZONING</th> <th>EXISTING FLU</th> <th>USE OF PROPERTY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>SITE</b></td> <td><b>A-1</b></td> <td><b>SE</b></td> <td><b>CHURCH</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NORTH</td> <td>A-1</td> <td>SE</td> <td>VACANT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SOUTH</td> <td>A-1</td> <td>SE</td> <td>THREE (3)<br/>SINGLE-FAMILY<br/>HOMES &amp;<br/>VACANT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EAST</td> <td>A-1</td> <td>SE</td> <td>SINGLE-FAMILY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WEST</td> <td>A-1</td> <td>SE</td> <td>SINGLE-FAMILY</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |              |   |  | DIRECTION | EXISTING ZONING | EXISTING FLU | USE OF PROPERTY | <b>SITE</b> | <b>A-1</b> | <b>SE</b> | <b>CHURCH</b> | NORTH | A-1 | SE | VACANT | SOUTH | A-1 | SE | THREE (3)<br>SINGLE-FAMILY<br>HOMES &<br>VACANT | EAST | A-1 | SE | SINGLE-FAMILY | WEST | A-1 | SE | SINGLE-FAMILY |
| DIRECTION  | EXISTING ZONING   | EXISTING FLU | USE OF PROPERTY                                 |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |
| <b>SITE</b>  | <b>A-1</b>  | <b>SE</b>    | <b>CHURCH</b>                                   |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |
| NORTH  | A-1   | SE           | VACANT  |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |
| SOUTH  | A-1   | SE           | THREE (3)<br>SINGLE-FAMILY<br>HOMES &<br>VACANT |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |
| EAST   | A-1   | SE           | SINGLE-FAMILY                                   |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |
| WEST   | A-1   | SE           | SINGLE-FAMILY                                   |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |
| <b>STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION; LDC SECTION 30.43(b)(2)</b> | <p>THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (BOA) SHALL HAVE THE POWER TO HEAR AND DECIDE SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS AND VARIANCES IT IS SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED TO PASS UNDER THE TERMS OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE UPON DETERMINATION THE USE REQUESTED:</p> <p><b><u>IS NOT DETRIMENTAL TO THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA OR NEIGHBORHOOD OR INCONSISTENT WITH TRENDS OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA:</u></b></p> <p>THE TREND OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA HAS INCLUDED OTHER COMMUNICATION TOWERS, INCLUDING TWO (2) FLAGPOLE TOWERS, 135 FT AND 90 FT IN HEIGHT, LOCATED TO THE NORTH OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY ON PROPERTY OWNED BY FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF MARKHAM WOODS, INC. HOWEVER, THE APPLICANT HAS SUBMITTED DOCUMENTATION TO SUGGEST A FLAG POLE DESIGN IS NOT COMPATIBLE WITH CINGULAR WIRELESS' COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE.</p> <p>THE PROPOSED TOWER IS DESIGNED TO RESEMBLE AN ECCLESIASTICAL APPURTENANCE AND COMPLIMENT THE APPEARANCE OF THE EXISTING CHURCH. HOWEVER, THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE DOES NOT DESCRIBE THE PROPOSED TOWER DESIGN AS AN ACCEPTABLE FORM OF CAMOUFLAGE TREATMENT, UNLIKE SIGNS, LIGHT POLES, UTILITY POLES AND ROOF FASCIAS.</p> <p>BECAUSE THE PROPOSED ECCLESIASTICAL TOWER, AT THE HEIGHT PROPOSED, WOULD NOT BLEND INTO EXISTING SURROUNDINGS SUCH THAT A REASONABLE PERSON WITH NORMAL OBSERVATIONAL FACULTIES AND INTELLIGENCE WOULD NOT PERCEIVE ITS PRESENCE AS A TOWER, STAFF BELIEVES AN ALTERNATIVE CAMOUFLAGE DESIGN WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. THE BOARD MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE DESIGN ELEMENTS, INCLUDING THOSE</p> |              |   |  |           |                 |              |                 |             |            |           |               |       |     |    |        |       |     |    |   |      |     |    |               |      |     |    |               |

IDENTIFIED IN THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (E.G., UTILITY POLE, FLAG POLE, ARCHITECTURALLY INTEGRATED FACILITY, OR STEEPLE DESIGN.)

**DOES NOT HAVE AN UNDULY ADVERSE EFFECT ON EXISTING TRAFFIC PATTERNS, MOVEMENTS AND VOLUMES:**

THE PROPOSED TOWER WOULD NOT HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES, SINCE THE FACILITY WOULD BE UNMANNED AND REQUIRE A MINIMUM NUMBER OF VEHICLE TRIPS FOR ROUTINE SERVICE AND MAINTENANCE.

**IS CONSISTENT WITH THE SEMINOLE COUNTY VISION 2020 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

THE SEMINOLE COUNTY VISION 2020 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESCRIBES THE SE (SUBURBAN ESTATES) FUTURE LAND USE (FLU) AS (1) MOST APPROPRIATE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LARGE-LOT SINGLE-FAMILY ESTATES AS A DESIRED FINAL LAND USE, (2) MOST APPROPRIATE AS A TRANSITIONAL USE BETWEEN URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND GENERAL RURAL USES, AND (3) MOST APPROPRIATE AS A LOCATION WHERE AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS CAN CONTINUE UNTIL DEVELOPMENT OCCURS FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FURTHER DESCRIBES SE FLU AS APPROPRIATE FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES LIKE UTILITY STRUCTURES. WITH THE IMPOSITION OF STAFF'S RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED COMMUNICATION TOWER WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THE SE FLU DESIGNATION.

**MEETS ANY ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN THE CODE SECTION AUTHORIZING THE USE IN A PARTICULAR ZONING DISTRICT OR CLASSIFICATION:**

BASED ON THE SUBMITTED SITE PLAN, THE PROPOSED COMMUNICATION TOWER WOULD NOT MEET THE 450 FT MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCE REQUIRED BETWEEN A 150 FT TOWER AND TWO (2) ABUTTING PARCELS WITH SINGLE-FAMILY USES TO THE SOUTH. FOR THIS REASON, VARIANCES FROM THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES REQUIRED BETWEEN THE BASE OF THE PROPOSED TOWER AND THE AFOREMENTIONED PROPERTIES TO THE SOUTH ARE REQUESTED AS A PART OF THIS APPLICATION.

**WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST:**

WITHIN THE A-1 DISTRICT, COMMUNICATION TOWERS ARE

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>ALLOWED AS CONDITIONAL USES. THE PRIOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SIMILAR TOWER STRUCTURES ON ADJACENT PROPERTY TO THE NORTH HAS DEFINED THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA AS APPROPRIATE FOR THIS TYPE OF FACILITY.</p>   |
|  | <p>THE PROPOSED INCORPORATION OF CAMOUFLAGE DESIGN ELEMENTS, INCLUDING THE ECCLESIASTICAL FEATURES, WOULD FURTHER REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED TOWER. HOWEVER, THE PROPOSED HEIGHT OF 150 FT WOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY TALLER THAN THE EXISTING CHURCH BUILDINGS THE TOWER WOULD BE DESIGNED TO COMPLIMENT. FOR THIS REASON, STAFF BELIEVES AN ALTERNATIVE DESIGN, AS SUGGESTED ELSEWHERE IN THE REPORT, WOULD PROVIDE A REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR ASSIMILATION AND THE REDUCTION OF VISUAL IMPACT TO SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</p>  |
| <p><b>STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IN THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE); LDC SECTION 30.124(a)</b></p> | <p>THE BOA MAY PERMIT ANY USE ALLOWED BY SPECIAL EXCEPTION IN THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE DISTRICT) UPON MAKING FINDINGS OF FACT, IN ADDITION TO THOSE REQUIRED BY SECTION 30.43(b)(2) OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, THAT THE USE:</p> <p><b><u>IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL ZONING PLAN OF THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE):</u></b></p> <p>AS PREVIOUSLY STATED, THE PROPOSED USE WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THE SE FLU AND UNDERLYING A-1 ZONING WITH THE IMPOSITION OF STAFF'S RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS. THE PROPOSED USE WOULD OTHERWISE COMPLY WITH THE DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS OF THE A-1 DISTRICT.</p> <p><b><u>IS NOT HIGHLY INTENSIVE IN NATURE:</u></b></p> <p>THE REQUEST WOULD NOT BE HIGHLY INTENSIVE IN NATURE, IF IMPROVEMENTS ARE LIMITED TO A CAMOUFLAGE TOWER SYSTEM THAT FURTHERS THE POLICY INTENT OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, AN EQUIPMENT CABINET, PRIVACY FENCE, AND REQUISITE LANDSCAPING AS DEPICTED ON THE SUBMITTED SITE PLAN.</p> <p>THE PROPOSED FACILITY WOULD BE SELF-OPERATING AND USED EXCLUSIVELY FOR TRANSMITTING AND RECEIVING. ROUTINE MAINTENANCE VISITS WOULD OCCUR APPROXIMATELY TWICE A MONTH. MORE FREQUENT VISITS WOULD BE REQUIRED IN THE EVENT OF MALFUNCTION OR EMERGENCY.</p> <p>PROPOSED INGRESS/EGRESS TO THE FACILITY WOULD BE</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>PROVIDED FROM MARKHAM WOODS ROAD THROUGH THE EXISTING CHURCH SITE.</p> <p><b><u>HAS ACCESS TO AN ADEQUATE LEVEL OF URBAN SERVICES SUCH AS SEWER, WATER, POLICE, SCHOOLS AND RELATED SERVICES:</u></b></p> <p>THE PROPOSED TOWER WOULD BE AN UNMANNED FACILITY, WHICH WOULD REQUIRE NO CONNECTION TO WATER OR SEWER, NOR IMPACT SCHOOL SERVICES. OTHER COUNTY SERVICES, INCLUDING POLICE, EMERGENCY, AND GARBAGE DISPOSAL ARE OTHERWISE AVAILABLE TO THE SITE. ELECTRICAL POWER AND TELEPHONE SERVICE WOULD BE RESPECTIVELY PROVIDED BY PROGRESS ENERGY AND BELL SOUTH.</p>   |
| <p><b>STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A VARIANCE; LDC SECTION 30.43 (b)(3)</b></p> | <p>SEPARATION DISTANCES MAY BE DECREASED OR INCREASED BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR VARIANCES.</p> <p>PRIOR TO GRANTING A VARIANCE, THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MUST REACH A FINDING THAT LITERAL ENFORCEMENT OF APPLICABLE REGULATIONS WOULD RESULT IN AN UNNECESSARY AND UNDUE HARDSHIP UPON THE APPLICANT AND DETERMINE COMPLIANCE WITH THE CRITERIA PRESENTED IN SECTION 30.43(B)(3) OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.</p> <p>THE STANDARDS RELATIVE TO VARIANCES AS OTHERWISE STATED BELOW MAY BE CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING WHETHER TO APPROVE A VARIANCE BUT <u>SHALL NOT BE DETERMINATIVE AS TO WHETHER THE VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED:</u></p> <p><b><u>THAT SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST WHICH ARE PECULIAR TO THE LAND, STRUCTURE, OR BUILDING INVOLVED AND WHICH ARE NOT APPLICABLE TO OTHER LANDS, STRUCTURES, OR BUILDINGS IN THE SAME ZONING CLASSIFICATION:</u></b></p> <p>SHOULD THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FIND THAT A COMMUNICATION TOWER IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE PROPOSED LOCATION AND THEREBY APPROVE THE REQUESTED SPECIAL EXCEPTION, REASONABLE USE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING A TOWER IN EXCESS OF 100 FEET WOULD BE DEPENDENT UPON VARIANCES FROM THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES REQUIRED BETWEEN THE PROPOSED TOWER AND THE TWO (2) PROPERTIES WITH EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES TO THE SOUTH.</p> |

BASED ON THE SUBMITTED PROPAGATION MAPS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION, THE APPLICANTS HAVE DEMONSTRATED A NEED TO EXPAND CINGULAR WIRELESS' SERVICE AREA BY ESTABLISHING A COMMUNICATION TOWER IN THE GENERAL VICINITY OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. THE APPLICANTS HAVE FURTHER INDICATED THAT ALL COLLOCATION OPPORTUNITIES, INCLUDING THE 100 FOOT COLLOCATION OPPORTUNITY TO THE NORTH, HAVE BEEN EXPLORED AND DETERMINED TO BE UNACCEPTABLE FOR MEETING CINGULAR WIRELESS' COVERAGE GOALS AND THE PROVISION OF HOMOGENEOUS SERVICE ACROSS ITS NETWORK.

STAFF HAS FURTHER DETERMINED THAT THE PROPOSED TOWER HEIGHT IS CONSISTENT WITH CINGULAR WIRELESS' DESIRE TO PROVIDE COVERAGE IN THE AREAS IDENTIFIED ON THE ATTACHED PROPAGATION MAPS. IN GENERAL, COMMUNICATION TOWERS REQUIRE A SPACING OF APPROXIMATELY 2 TO 3 MILES TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY OVERLAP AND SIGNALING REQUIREMENT TO OPTIMIZE PERFORMANCE AND COVERAGE TO A GEOGRAPHIC AREA. THE 150 FOOT HEIGHT IS REQUESTED TO COMPENSATE FOR THE TERRAIN OF THE WEKIVA RIVER BASIN, WHICH THE PROPOSED TOWER WOULD COVER. THIS FACTOR CONSTITUTES A HARDSHIP, WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD IF THE REQUESTED SPECIAL EXCEPTION IS APPROVED. FURTHER, THE APPLICANT HAS STATED THAT BY APPROVING A TOWER AT THE REQUESTED HEIGHT, THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL TOWERS IN THE AREA WOULD BE REDUCED AND/OR ELIMINATED.

**THAT THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES DO NOT RESULT FROM THE ACTIONS OF THE APPLICANTS:**

THE AFOREMENTIONED SPECIAL CONDITION RESULTED FROM THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE AREA TO BE SERVICED BY THE NEW TOWER FACILITY. THIS IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE THAT DID NOT RESULT FROM THE APPLICANTS' ACTIONS.

**THAT GRANTING THE VARIANCE REQUESTED WILL NOT CONFER ON THE APPLICANT ANY SPECIAL PRIVILEGE THAT IS DENIED BY CHAPTER 30 TO OTHER LANDS, BUILDINGS, OR STRUCTURES IN THE SAME ZONING CLASSIFICATION:**

SHOULD THE BOARD APPROVE THE REQUESTED SPECIAL EXCEPTION, THE GRANTING OF VARIANCES FROM THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCE WOULD NOT CONFER SPECIAL PRIVILEGES, SINCE REASONABLE USE OF THE PROPERTY FOR EXPANDING CINGULAR WIRELESS' SERVICE AREA WOULD BE COMPROMISED WITHOUT RELIEF FROM

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.</p> <p><b><u>THAT LITERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 30 WOULD DEPRIVE THE APPLICANT OF RIGHTS COMMONLY ENJOYED BY OTHER PROPERTIES IN THE SAME ZONING CLASSIFICATION AND WOULD WORK UNNECESSARY AND UNDUE HARDSHIP ON THE APPLICANT:</u></b></p>   |
|                              | <p>THE LITERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 30.1364 (PERFORMANCE STANDARDS) WOULD DEPRIVE THE APPLICANT OF RIGHTS COMMONLY ENJOYED BY OTHER PROPERTIES IN THE A-1 DISTRICT. WITHOUT VARIANCES FROM MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES, A TOWER NO TALLER THAN 100 FEET IN HEIGHT COULD BE CONSTRUCTED AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION, SHOULD A SPECIAL EXCEPTION BE GRANTED BY THE BOARD. FURTHERMORE, THE NEED FOR A TOWER NO TALLER THAN 100 FEET WOULD BE NEGATED BY THE 100 FOOT COLLOCATION OPPORTUNITY THAT EXISTS TO THE NORTH.</p> <p><b><u>THAT THE VARIANCE GRANTED IS THE MINIMUM VARIANCE THAT WILL MAKE POSSIBLE THE REASONABLE USE OF THE LAND, BUILDING, OR STRUCTURE:</u></b></p> <p>THE APPLICANTS HAVE INDICATED THE PROPOSED TOWER HEIGHT OF 150 FEET IS NECESSARY TO OVERCOME THE TERRAIN OF THE WEKIVA RIVER BASIN, WHICH THE PROPOSED TOWER SITE WOULD COVER. THEREFORE, STAFF BELIEVES THE PROPOSED HEIGHT AND THE CORRESPONDING REQUEST TO REDUCE MINIMUM DISTANCE SEPARATION DISTANCES TO BE REASONABLE.</p> <p><b><u>THAT THE GRANT OF THE VARIANCE WILL BE IN HARMONY WITH THE GENERAL INTENT AND PURPOSE OF CHAPTER 30, WILL NOT BE INJURIOUS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD, OR OTHERWISE DETRIMENTAL TO THE PUBLIC WELFARE:</u></b></p> <p>WITH THE DEMONSTRATION OF 150 FEET AS THE MINIMUM HEIGHT AT WHICH A COMMUNICATION TOWER COULD BE CONSTRUCTED TO ACHIEVE REASONABLE USE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, STAFF BELIEVES THE GRANT OF VARIANCES FROM SEPARATION DISTANCE (WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS) WOULD BE IN HARMONY WITH THE GENERAL INTENT AND PURPOSE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, SINCE SPECIAL CONDITIONS CONSTITUTING A HARDSHIP HAVE BEEN DEMONSTRATED BY THE APPLICANT.</p> |
| <p><b>STAFF FINDINGS</b></p> | <p>WHEN SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS AND ASSOCIATED VARIANCES ARE REQUESTED FROM MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCE REQUIRED BETWEEN A COMMUNICATION TOWER AND</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>PROPERTIES WITH EXISTING RESIDENCES, THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REQUIRES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <u>THE AESTHETIC IMPACT OF THE TOWER WOULD BE ENHANCED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● THE VISUAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED TOWER TO ABUTTING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES COULD BE MINIMIZED BY DESIGN FEATURES INTENDED TO CAMOUFLAGE ITS PRESENCE AND ASSIMILATE THE SAME INTO SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT. THE PROPOSED "ECCLESIASTICAL" METHOD FAILS TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE. STAFF BELIEVES A DESIGN MORE COMMONLY ASSOCIATED AS A CHURCH APPURTENANCE (e.g., FLAGPOLE) WOULD BE A MORE SUITABLE DESIGN AT THE REQUESTED HEIGHT OF 150 FEET.</li></ul></li><li>○ <u>COMPATIBILITY WITH ABUTTING PROPERTY OWNERS WOULD BE MAINTAINED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● THE PROPOSED TOWER IS AN ALLOWABLE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE UNDER THE EXISTING SE FLU AND CORRESPONDING A-1 ZONING; WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS, THE PROPOSED USE COULD BE MADE COMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING TREND OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA, WHICH INCLUDES OTHER COMMUNICATION TOWERS ON ADJACENT PROPERTY TO THE NORTH.</li></ul></li><li>○ <u>THE PROPOSED TOWER WOULD FURTHER THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF SECTION 30.1362 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● THE APPLICANTS HAVE SUBMITTED DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE (RADIO FREQUENCY PROPAGATION MAPS AND A SIGNED STATEMENT FROM A RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER) TO SUPPORT CINGULAR WIRELESS' NEED FOR A NEW TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY OF THE PROPOSED HEIGHT IN THE GENERAL AREA. FURTHERMORE, THE PROPOSED HEIGHT OF 150 FEET WOULD PROVIDE A GREATER COVERAGE AREA FOR CINGULAR WIRELESS</li></ul></li></ul> |
|--|---|

|                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
|                                    | <p>COMMUNICATION AND REDUCE THE POTENTIAL FOR ADDITIONAL TOWER SITES IN THIS AREA IN THE FUTURE.</p> <p>ON OCTOBER 27, 2003, THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT DENIED A SIMILAR REQUEST BY CINGULAR WIRELESS FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ESTABLISH A 150 FOOT TALL CAMOUFLAGE (MONOPINE) COMMUNICATION TOWER ON THE ABUTTING PROPERTY TO THE WEST AFTER FINDING THE REQUEST FAILED TO MEET MINIMUM SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE. ON FEBRUARY 24, 2004, THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS UPHELD THIS DECISION.</p> <p>IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT WHILE THE FINDINGS APPEAR TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR A COMMUNICATION TOWER ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR ENSURING COMPATIBILITY THROUGH THE ASSIMILATION OF THE PROPOSED TOWER WITH THE EXISTING CHURCH SITE HAS NOT BEEN SATISFIED BY THE APPLICANTS. THE BOARD'S DECISION TO DENY THE PRIOR APPLICATION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PROMOTION OF THIS POLICY.</p>   |
| <p><b>STAFF RECOMMENDATION</b></p> | <p>BASED ON THE STATED FINDINGS, STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT DENY THE REQUEST FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ESTABLISH A 150 FOOT TALL "ECCLESIASTICAL" CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER IN THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE DISTRICT). STAFF WOULD SUPPORT THE GRANTING OF A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ESTABLISH A 150 FOOT TALL CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER OF AN ALTERNATIVE DESIGN (e.g., FLAGPOLE) IN THE A-1 (AGRICULTURE DISTRICT) AND THE REQUEST FOR ASSOCIATED VARIANCES FROM 450 FEET TO 320 FEET AND 450 FEET TO 300 FEET TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES REQUIRED BETWEEN A PROPOSED 150 FOOT TALL COMMUNICATION TOWER AND PROPERTIES WITH SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS.</p> <p>STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION IS CONDITIONED UPON THE APPLICANTS' ABILITY TO PRESENT A TOWER DESIGN THAT WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EFFECTIVELY MERGE, BLEND INTO AND CONFORM IN APPEARANCE WITH EXISTING FACILITIES ON THE CHURCH PROPERTY. THE BOARD MAY WISH TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING DESIGN ALTERNATIVES, WHICH ARE PRESENTED AS ILLUSTRATED ATTACHMENTS IN THIS REPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ROOFTOP DESIGN</li> <li>○ ROOFTOP CHURCH CROSS</li> <li>○ FREESTANDING CHURCH CROSS</li> <li>○ CHURCH STEEPLE</li> </ul> |


|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o FLAGPOLE</li> <li>o UTILITY POLE</li> </ul> <p>SHOULD THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION BE GRANTED, STAFF RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:</p>  |
|  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. THE PROPOSED TOWER SHALL NOT EXCEED 150 FEET, AS VERIFIED BY A RF (RADIO FREQUENCY) ENGINEER TO BE THE MINIMUM HEIGHT NEEDED TO FURTHER CINGULAR WIRELESS' COMMUNICATION GOALS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.</li> <li>2. THE PROPOSED TOWER SHALL BE CAMOUFLAGE IN DESIGN AND PAINTED A MUTED COLOR TO BLEND IN WITH THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT.</li> <li>3. ANY IMPROVEMENTS AND/OR ADDITIONS TO THE PROPOSED TOWER SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL TO THE COUNTY.</li> <li>4. A LISTED SPECIES SURVEY SHALL BE PROVIDED PRIOR TO FINAL ENGINEERING APPROVAL.</li> <li>5. PRIOR TO FINAL ENGINEERING APPROVAL, A WATER QUALITY SWALE SHALL BE PROVIDED.</li> <li>6. PRIOR TO THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER / APPROVAL, AN APPLICATION FOR FULL CONCURRENCY MANAGEMENT SHALL BE PROVIDED.</li> </ol> <p>SHOULD THE ASSOCIATED VARIANCES FROM MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES BE GRANTED, STAFF RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ANY VARIANCE GRANTED SHALL APPLY ONLY TO THE PROPOSED COMMUNICATION TOWER DEPICTED ON THE ATTACHED SITE PLAN.</li> <li>2. ANY VARIANCE GRANTED SHALL BE THE MINIMUM THAT WOULD MAKE POSSIBLE THE REASONABLE USE OF THE PROPERTY FOR SITING A COMMUNICATION TOWER, BASED ON THE MINIMUM 150 FOOT HEIGHT DEEMED ACCEPTABLE BY AN RF ENGINEER FOR EXPANDING CINGULAR WIRELESS' SERVICE AREA.</li> <li>3. ANY VARIANCE GRANTED SHOULD BE CONDITIONED UPON CERTIFICATION BY A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER OF THE PROPOSED TOWER'S SAFE PERFORMANCE IN THE EVENT OF STRUCTURAL FAILURE OR COLLAPSE.</li> <li>4. ANY ADDITIONAL CONDITION(S) DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY THE BOARD, BASED ON INFORMATION PRESENTED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING.</li> </ol> |

- Attachments:**
- SEMINOLE COUNTY COMMUNICATION TOWER INVENTORY
  - STAFF CORRESPONDENCE
  - APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
  - APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION SUPPORTING MATERIAL

APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES & SUPPORTING MATERIAL  
AUTHORIZATION FORMS  
ENGINEERING & SAFETY INFORMATION  
PROPAGATION MAPS  
SITE MAP  
PROPERTY APPRAISER REPORT  
PROPOSED SITE PLAN  
PHOTOGRAPHIC SIMULATIONS  
CAMOUFLAGE COMMUNICATION TOWER DESIGN ILLUSTRATIONS

# LOCATION OF TOWERS Seminole County

*EXISTING  
TOWER  
SITES*



|   |                     |   |               |
|---|---------------------|---|---------------|
|  | MURKIN EXHAUST      |  | LINDWOOD      |
|  | OTHER TOWERS        |  | DIVERSO       |
|  | ALTAIR/ITE EFFLUENT |  | EXHAUST       |
|  | CASSELBERRY         |  | WATER STORAGE |
|  | LAKE NALTA          |   |               |

N

Includes a variety of Public and Private Wastewater and Gas Towers.  
Source Data: Seminole County GIS Tower Database - August 11, 2009



Greg Holcomb

01/13/2004 03:16 PM

To: Earnest McDonald/Seminole@Seminole  
cc: Don Fisher/Seminole@Seminole  
Subject: Agenda Item 58 - Cingular Wireless

I have reviewed item 58 regarding the Appeal of the Board of Adjustment's decision to deny a special exception to establish a 150 ft. tall camouflage communication tower in the A-1 (Agriculture District) and associated variances from 450 feet to 298.67 feet; 450 feet to 307.46 feet; and 450 feet to 353.5 feet for the minimum separation distance required between a proposed 150 foot tall camouflage communication tower and abutting properties with existing single-family residences; (Wireless Facilities, Cingular Wireless, LLC, & Kevin Karr). District – 5 McLain (Earnest McDonald).

The technical review finds that the proposed tower site is a necessity for Cingular Wireless to provide adequate coverage to the area identified by the request. In general, Cell towers require a spacing of approximately 2-3 miles to provide the necessary overlap and signaling requirement to optimize performance and coverage to a geographic area. The coverage maps are consistent with this requirement. The additional height in this area is designed due to the terrain of the Wekiva River basin that is being covered. This request conforms to the industry configuration for cellular coverage.

Please let me know if there is anything additional that you require. Thanks.

**Sec. 30.124 Special exceptions.**

- (a) The Board of Adjustment may permit any of the following uses upon making findings of fact that the
- (1) Is consistent with the general zoning category and plan of A-1 Agriculture;
  - (2) Is not detrimental to the character of the area or neighborhood or inconsistent with the trends of development in the area or neighborhood; and
  - (3) Is not highly intensive in nature;
  - (4) Is not incompatible with the concept of low-density, rural land use;
  - (5) Does not have an unduly adverse effect on existing traffic patterns, movements, and volumes ;
  - (6) Has access (where applicable) to urban services such as sewage, water, police, fire, schools, and related services; and
  - (7) Is consistent with the Seminole County Comprehensive
- (b) The Board of Adjustment, in granting any of the uses may place such restrictions and conditions thereon as said Board shall, in its sound discretion, deem necessary to protect the character of the area or neighborhood and the public health, safety, and welfare:
- (1) Cemeteries,
  - (2) Kennels including the commercial raising or breeding of
  - (3) Hospitals, sanitariums and convalescent homes, veterinary clinics and adult congregate living facilities and group homes when such facilities and homes are approved and licensed by the Florida State Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services.
  - (4) Public and private nursery schools, kindergartens, middle schools, high schools and
  - (5) Temporary asphalt plants for purpose of specific public road
  - (6)
  - (7) Public utility and service
  - (8) Fraternal clubs when chartered with the
  - (9) Country and golf clubs, fishing clubs, fishing camps, marinas, gun clubs, or similar enterprises or clubs making use of land with nominal impacts to natural resources, as determined by the Current Planning Manager.
  - (10) Privately owned and operated recreational facilities open to the paying public, such as, athletic fields, stadiums, racetracks, and speedways if, the use is located along a major roadway or has immediate accessibility thereto.
  - (11) Golf driving
  - (12) Riding stables, provided that no structure housing animals is located nearer than one hundred (100) feet from a property line.
  - (13) Airplane landing fields and helicopter ports with accessory facilities for private or public
  - (14) Commercial raising of swine (other than for family
  - (15) Sewage disposal plants, water plants, and sanitary landfill
  - (16) Off-street parking lots. When approved, said parking lots

- (A) Be provided with a durable, dust-free surface which is properly drained;
- (B) Be adequately buffered from adjacent properties and roadways by a landscape

(17) (A) Farmworker housing; either single family or multifamily dwellings, where land use is for bona fide agriculture uses; provided further, that such structures house only those persons, their immediate family or households, employed in carrying out such bona fide agricultural use. Mobile homes may be permitted in lieu of tenant dwellings, provided, however, that approval for mobile homes shall be limited to a time period not exceeding two (2) years after review and finding that the land is used for bona fide agricultural uses.

(B) "Bona fide agriculture purpose," as used herein, shall be determined by reference to the following criteria:

- (i) Is the parcel or its adjacent lands being actually utilized in agricultural pursuits by the same owner?
- (ii) Does the requested tenant dwelling or mobile home serve a purpose directly, and not indirectly, related to the agricultural laborers or employees and/or other direct purposes?

(18) A mobile home may be permitted as a Special Exception on a lot or parcel of record subject to the following requirements:

- (A) Only one (1) single-family mobile home may be
- (B) A mobile home placed on a lot or parcel shall bear the Florida Standards Seal or acceptable equivalent.
- (C) An approved mobile home shall be subject to all applicable regulations of the zoning classification, i.e., setbacks, land uses.
- (D) Where installation of a septic tank is proposed, an acceptable percolation and depth-of-water-table test shall be submitted at the time of application.
- (E) If the proposed site is known to be flood prone, an acceptable plan shall be submitted at time of application which details steps to prevent hazard to health and property.
- (F) An approved single-family mobile home shall be firmly anchored in accordance with all applicable codes and shall have skirting installed to screen the underside of the structure.

(19) Retail nurseries where products sold are grown on site of

(20) Slaughter of livestock and meat cutting and processing operations, with no retail

(21) Adult congregate living facilities and community residential homes (group homes and foster care facilities) housing more than six (6) permanent unrelated residents.

(22) Landscaping contractors as an accessory use to a wholesale nursery or wholesale tree

(23) Communication

(24) Disposal of tree cuttings or similar organic materials by burning which materials have been transported to the property.

(25) Bed and Breakfast establishments when not located within a platted

(c) A proposed master plan of development shall be submitted at time of application and approval shall be based upon and limited to the extent of said master plan.

(§ 3, Ord. No. 81-59, 9-1-81; § 1, Ord. No. 83-23, 7-26-83; § 11, Ord. No. 87-1, 2-10-87; § 5.104, LDC, through Supp 16; Part XIII, § 3, Ord. No. 92-5, 3-30-92; Part XX, § 1, Ord. No. 92-5, 3-30-92; Part XVIII, § 2, Ord. No. 93-1, 2-23-93; § 15, Ord. No. 94-15, 12-13-94; Ord. No. 96-5, § 3, 7-9-96; Ord. No. 97-18, §§ 14, 25, 5-13-97; Ord.

**Sec. 30.1364. Performance standards.**

(a) *Setbacks.*

- (1) **Communication tower** setbacks shall be measured from the outer extremity of the base of the **communication tower** to the property line of the parcel on which it is located.
- (2) **Communication towers** shall be located on parcels which comply with the minimum setback and lot size requirements of the zoning classification assigned to the property on which they are located.
- (3) For **towers** located on properties assigned the PUD or PCD zoning classification, the setback requirements for the parcel outlined in the PUD/PCD approval shall apply.
- (4) In cases where there are non-conforming residential uses on property which is not assigned a residential zoning classification, a reduction of fifty (50) percent of the side or rear yard setback distance opposite the non conforming residential use shall be permitted by the current planning manager unless the side or rear yard proposed for reduction is assigned a residential land use designation or zoning classification.

(b) *Minimum separation from off-site uses/designated areas.*

- (1) **Communication tower** separation shall be measured from the outer extremity of the base of the **tower** to the closest property line of the off-site use as specified in Table 1 below.
- (2) Separation requirements for **communication towers** shall comply with the minimum standards established in Table 1 below unless otherwise provided.
- (3) Reduced separation distances may be reduced by the current planning manager when written consent as set forth in a recordable instrument is obtained from all property owners within the applicable separation distance.
- (4) Separation distances may be decreased or increased by the board of adjustment in accordance with the procedural requirements for variances as set forth in this Code and the substantive determinations as set forth in Table 1 below, when considering whether to approve a special exception, if competent substantial evidence is presented demonstrating unique planning considerations and compatibility impacts.

TABLE 1

MINIMUM SEPARATION FROM OTHER USES

TABLE INSET:

| Off-site Use  | Separation Distance  |
|---|--|
| Property assigned a single-family (includes modular homes and mobile homes used for living purposes), duplex, or multi-family residential zoning classification or future land use designation or with an existing residential use. | 200 feet or 300% height of <b>tower</b> whichever is greater except when a variance is granted based upon findings that the aesthetic impacts of the <b>tower</b> is enhanced, that compatibility with abutting property owners is maintained, and the approval of the <b>tower</b> would be consistent with and further the provisions of Section 30.1362. The standard relative to variances as otherwise set forth in this Code may be considered in determining whether to approve a variance hereunder, but shall not be determinative as to whether the variance may be granted. |
| Property assigned a non-residential zoning classification or future land use designation or property with an existing non-residential use.  | None. Only district setbacks apply.  |

(c) *Separation distances between **communication towers**.*

- (1) Separation distances between **communication towers** shall be and measured between the **communication tower** proposed for approval and those **towers** that are permitted or existing.
- (2) The separation distances shall be measured by drawing or following a straight line between the GPS coordinate of the center of the existing or permitted **communication tower** and the proposed GPS

coordinate of the center of the proposed **communication tower** as depicted on a site plan of the proposed **tower**.

- (3) The separation distances, listed in linear feet, shall be as set forth in Table 2

TABLE 2

SEPARATION DISTANCES BETWEEN **COMMUNICATION TOWERS**

TABLE INSET:

| DESCRIPTION                         | EXISTING TOWERS |       |                                     |                                 |            |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
|                                     | LATTICE         | GUYED | MONOPOLE 75 FT IN HEIGHT OR GREATER | MONOPOLE LESS THAN 75 IN HEIGHT | CAMOUFLAGE |
| LATTICE                             | 5,000           | 5,000 | 1,500                               | 750                             | 0          |
| GUYED                               | 5,000           | 5,000 | 1,500                               | 750                             | 0          |
| MONOPOLE 75 FT IN HEIGHT OR GREATER | 1,500           | 1,500 | 1,500                               | 750                             | 0          |
| MONOPOLE LESS THAN 75 IN HEIGHT     | 750             | 750   | 750                                 | 750                             | 0          |
| CAMOUFLAGE                          | 0               | 0     | 0                                   | 0                               | 0          |

(4) A variance from the minimum separation distances between **communication towers** as set forth in Table 2 may be granted when two (2) or more **communication tower** owners or operators agree to co-locate their **communication** antennas on the same **communication tower** and upon findings being made that the aesthetic impacts of the **tower** is enhanced, that compatibility with abutting property owners is maintained, and the approval of the **tower** would be consistent with and further the provisions of section 30.1362. The standard relative to variances as otherwise set forth in this Code may be considered in determining whether to approve a variance hereunder, but shall not be determinative as to whether the variance may be granted.

(d) *Measurement of height.* Measurement of **communication tower** height shall include antenna, base pad and any and all other appurtenances and shall be measured from the finished grade of the parcel on which the **communication tower** is located.

(Ord. No. 96-5, § 29, 7-9-



**APPLICATION TO THE SEMINOLE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

Applications to the Seminole County Board of Adjustment shall include all applicable items listed in the Board of Adjustment Process Checklist. No application will be scheduled for Board of Adjustment consideration until a complete application (including all information requested below) has been received by the Planning & Development Department, Planning Division.

APPLICATION TYPE:

**COPY**

**VARIANCE**

**SPECIAL EXCEPTION** Seeking approval for 150' "ecclesiastical" type monopole. This is an unmanned telecommunications facility w/ supporting ground equipment.

**MOBILE HOME SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

EXISTING  PROPOSED  REPLACEMENT

MOBILE HOME IS FOR

YEAR OF MOBILE HOME \_\_\_\_\_ SIZE OF MOBILE HOME \_\_\_\_\_

ANTICIPATED TIME MOBILE HOME IS NEEDED \_\_\_\_\_

PLAN TO BUILD  YES  NO IF SO, WHEN \_\_\_\_\_

MEDICAL HARDSHIP  YES (LETTER FROM DOCTOR REQUIRED)  NO

**APPEAL FROM DECISION OF THE PLANNING MANAGER**

|               | PROPERTY OWNER                                 | AUTHORIZED AGENT  |
|---------------|--|---|
| NAME          | Markham Woods Presbyterian Church              | Bob Chopra, WFI, Agents for                             |
| ADDRESS       | 5210 Markham Woods Road<br>Lake Mary, FL 32746 | 1101 N. Lake Destiny Rd. Ste. 110<br>Maitland, FL 32751 |
| PHONE 1       | (407) 333-2030                                 | (267) 973-4228  |
| PHONE 2 (FAX) | (407) 333-3202                                 | (407) 660-4909 (FAX)                                    |
| E-MAIL        |  | Bob.Chopra@WRINET.COM                                   |

*Cingular wireless*

PROJECT NAME: West Heathrow (B)

SITE ADDRESS: 5210 Markham Woods Rd., Lake Mary, FL 32746

CURRENT USE OF PROPERTY: Church

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Leg Sec 02 Twp 205 R6E 29E E 1/2 of N 3/4 of S 1/2 of NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 (Less N 165 FT + E 50 FT for RD)

SIZE OF PROPERTY: 4.7 acre(s) PARCEL I.D. 02-20-29-300-030B-0000

UTILITIES:  WATER  WELL  SEWER  SEPTIC TANK  OTHER N/A

KNOWN CODE ENFORCEMENT VIOLATIONS None

IS PROPERTY ACCESSIBLE FOR INSPECTION  YES  NO

This request will be considered at the Board of Adjustment regular meeting on 7/26/04 (mo/day/yr), in the Board Chambers (Room 1028) at 6:00 p.m. on the first floor of the Seminole County Services Building, located at 1101 East First Street in downtown Sanford, FL.

I hereby affirm that all statements, proposals, and/or plans submitted with or contained within this application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Bob Chopra, WFI, Agents for Cingular wireless 6/3/04  
 SIGNATURE OF OWNER OR AGENT\* DATE

\* Proof of owner's authorization is required with submittal if signed by agent.  
 \\projects\boa\master forms & lists\boa applications\boa application.doc

ADDITIONAL VARIANCES

VARIANCE 2:

VARIANCE 3:

VARIANCE 4:

VARIANCE 5:

VARIANCE 6:

VARIANCE 7:

VARIANCE 8:

APPEAL FROM BOA DECISION TO BCC

|         | PROPERTY OWNER | AUTHORIZED AGENT |
|---------|----------------|------------------|
| NAME    |                |                  |
| ADDRESS |                |                  |
| PHONE 1 |                |                  |
| PHONE 2 |                |                  |
| E-MAIL  |                |                  |

NATURE OF THE APPEAL \_\_\_\_\_

BCC PUBLIC HEARING DATE \_\_\_\_\_

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

PROCESSING:

FEE: 4370 COMMISSION DISTRICT 5 FLU/ZONING SE/A1

LOCATION FURTHER DESCRIBED AS ON WEST SIDE OF MARKHAM WOODS RD. APPROX 0.3 MI SE OF CARTER RD

PLANNER VB DATE 6/3

SUFFICIENCY COMMENTS \_\_\_\_\_

**Cingular Wireless LLC**

**Seeks**

**Special Exception**

**In**

**A-1 Industrial (Zoning District)**

**For a Proposed  
150' "Ecclesiastical" Monopole Tower  
Communication Service Facility**

**Site Name: West Heathrow (B)  
5210 Markham Woods Rd., Lake Mary, FL 32746  
TAX PARCEL ID #02-20-29-300-030B-0000; 4.7 Acres**

---

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION**

**INTRODUCTION**

Cingular Wireless LLC, a subsidiary of Bellsouth Wireless, Inc., a Federal Communications Commission (FCC) licensed operator of commercial mobile radio services in the State of Florida, submits this application to the Seminole County Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception approval in the A-1 Agriculture zoning district in order to construct and operate an unmanned wireless communications service within Seminole County. In addition, a variance to the separation requirements is sought under a separate variance application request. This project description and justification narrative describes the scope of the proposed project by providing specific information regarding the project location, zoning, specifications, and required services.

**PROJECT GOAL**

Cingular's goal for this proposed site is to enhance the quality of wireless service coverage on Markham Woods Road and the surrounding area west of Heathrow, in addition to providing quality contiguous coverage into Sanford, Heathrow and the Lake Mary areas. This goal will be accomplished in an environmentally sensitive manner and consistent with the policies and ordinances of Seminole County, which the reason why Cingular has chosen to pursue approval for an "ecclesiastical" type monopole tower for this site location

## **GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The subject parcel is located at 5210 Markham Woods Rd., Lake Mary, FL 32746. The parent tract consists of approximately 4.7 acres and is zoned A-1 Agriculture with a future land use designation of Suburban Estates. The parent tract is currently occupied by the Markham Woods Presbyterian Church. Cingular Wireless proposes to construct a 150' "ecclesiastical" type monopole communications tower (*please see submitted photo simulations*) and place the supporting equipment cabinets on a 9'-6" x 13' concrete pad, within a fenced 60' x 60' lease compound.

### ***Facility Specifications***

Cingular's personal wireless service facility consists of three (3) equal "sectors" for three (3) panel antennas each, mounted to a support bracket at approximately 150' above ground level (AGL). The proposed 150' "ecclesiastical" monopole communications tower is designed with the structural capacity to accommodate two (2) future service providers at a lower height. The panel antennas will be approximately 8'-0" tall x 12.5" wide x 7" deep. Attached to each antenna will be coax cable that will run down the inside of the tower to the base and across a cable-bridge into the equipment cabinets located on the aforementioned concrete pad.

The proposed facility will be used strictly as a wireless transmitting and receiving facility. The facility is completely self operating, thus unmanned. Once the facility is operational, technicians from Cingular will visit the site approximately once or twice a month for routine site maintenance. In the event of a malfunction or emergency, more frequent visits will be necessary. Ingress/Egress to the facility is off Markham Woods Road, over an unrestricted access easement to the site. Electrical power and telephone will be supplied from existing utility service providers – Progress Energy and BellSouth respectively.

## **PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### ***Necessity and/or Desirability of the Proposed Project***

Cingular has quite strong customer demand for continuous quality mobile radio telephone services in Seminole County and particularly in the areas of Lake Mary, Heathrow and Sanford. The Cingular Wireless radio frequency engineer assigned to this area has identified a pressing need for a wireless communication facility in this proposed location of Seminole County to provide quality enhanced and continuous coverage into the areas of Sanford, Heathrow, Lake Mary, and the surrounding area west of Heathrow, as well as enhanced coverage along Markham Woods Road.

The proposed facility was selected after intense investigation of the topographic characteristics of the area, frequency analysis, adjacent cell interconnection capabilities (meaning "seamless radio frequency hand-offs" from cell to cell), existing co-location opportunities within and outside the RF search ring area, and most importantly land-use compatibility.

## *Siting Analysis*

In the site selection and acquisition process, the site leasing agent attempts to find any collocation opportunities with the search ring area or close enough that the site compliments the RF propagation studies and height requirements. This particular search ring affords no collocation opportunities and therefore a “green field” or “raw land” site is sought within the search area.

There are several criteria taken into consideration when attempting to site a tower location within the search ring area and it is always a compromise in blending all the factors together in order to come up with an “ideal” site location. Below are a list of general criteria a site leasing agent must address in locating an optimal site:

- A. Compliance with local land use ordinances (Is the use allowed in the zoning district?)
- B. Find a willing landlord with sufficient land to locate the site;
- C. Find a mutually agreed upon site location on the owner’s property;
- D. Find a mutually agreed upon ingress/egress to the proposed site;
- E. Locate the site where reasonable telephone and electrical runs are present;

Alternative Sites Investigated: The two potential collocation sites within the search ring area lie to the east of the First Baptist Church property located at 5400 Markham Woods Road. The two potential collocation opportunities were two stealth flag pole installations. The first is the 135’ T-Mobile flag pole. T-Mobile is at the top and Nextel is collocated at approximately the 120’-125’ level. The next available height down on this pole was rejected by Cingular RF as not an acceptable height. The second flag pole is approximately 90’ in height and owned by Sprint who are located at the top of the pole. This site was rejected by Cingular RF as being an unacceptable height.

Proposed Site Justification: Please see attached “Engineering & Safety Information”

### Additional Benefits:

- A. The proposed “ecclesiastical” type monopole tower mitigates the visual impact on the area to the greatest extent possible by locating at the rear northwest portion of the parent tract, taking advantage of the buffer provided by the trees located on the property lines.
- B. The proposed tower will afford the collocation opportunity for two more future communications providers (total of three), if technologically feasible for a future provider.

## **PUBLIC BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT – AN OVERVIEW**

The Congress of the United States has found that wireless radio services serve the national interest, and directly or indirectly benefit all of its citizens. Through licensing agreements

the FCC has established the desirability and need for wireless telephone service to facilitate telephone conversations between mobile units and the existing telephone system. The wireless system is intended to function as an extension of the present telephone network, and is intended to provide quality service for the entire nation at a reasonable price. Cingular Wireless LLC is mandated to provide mobile cellular radio service to those service areas of Florida granted under their FCC license. Seminole County is one of those areas granted under their FCC license.

The wireless telephone system divides the service area into a grid system call "cells". Each cell has its own radio receiver and low-power transmitter. The size and location of each cell is based on the anticipated volume of telephone traffic in each cell area. From each cell, calls are sent by radio to and from the mobile hand-held units, and then routed though the public telephone system to fixed (land-line) telephone or routed to other cells and on to other mobile units. A central "switch" routes all of the calls through the wireless system, facilitating the "seamless hand-offs" between cells as the hand-held mobile unit moves through the wireless service area.

Wireless telephone services play an important role in providing communications to individuals, the business community and to emergency service providers. In polls conducted over the past few years, it has been found that individuals purchase wireless services primarily for safety and security reasons. It makes individuals feel safer when traveling for business or pleasure. 911 wireless phone calls from individual customers are approaching 50,000 per day nationwide, and about 50 percent of wireless users have called authorities to report car trouble, medical emergencies, crimes, or drunk driving.

Business owners, managers, and employees have commented on the increase in productivity and better use of their time. Just as the standard (land-line) telephone facilitated the growth of American business in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, wireless communications have become an indispensable 21<sup>st</sup> Century tool of the modern business world.

Most importantly, wireless telephone services play an important role in providing vital communications to relief and emergency workers, i.e. 9-11 disaster in NYC, Hurricane Andrew. In addition, police patrol cars regularly use "mobile data terminals" giving them fast wireless access to key information for critical "on the spot" decision making.


## **REQUIRED FINDINGS**

Granting special exception approval for Cingular's personal wireless service facility will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons working or residing in the vicinity of the proposed cell site; nor will it be injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity. Once installed, the unmanned cell site becomes a *passive* use.

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposed site location satisfies Cingular's radio frequency requirements under its FCC license obligations to provide continued, quality "mobile radio telephone service" to the people of Seminole County. Under Seminole County's current ordinance, the "ecclesiastical" type monopole tower should be considered the most unobtrusive to the community, while providing a symbol of faith for the property on which tower will be sited.

---



EM

APPL. NO. BV2004-108

**APPLICATION TO THE SEMINOLE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

Applications to the Seminole County Board of Adjustment shall include all applicable items listed in the Board of Adjustment Process Checklist. No application will be scheduled for Board of Adjustment consideration until a complete application (including all information requested below) has been received by the Planning & Development Department, Planning Division.

**COPY**

**APPLICATION TYPE:**

- VARIANCE** *Variance necessary from minimum separation requirements from off-site uses for a communication tower that is within 450' of off-site residential future land-use designation*
- SPECIAL EXCEPTION**
- MOBILE HOME SPECIAL EXCEPTION**
- EXISTING**  **PROPOSED**  **REPLACEMENT**
- MOBILE HOME IS FOR \_\_\_\_\_
- YEAR OF MOBILE HOME \_\_\_\_\_ SIZE OF MOBILE HOME \_\_\_\_\_
- ANTICIPATED TIME MOBILE HOME IS NEEDED \_\_\_\_\_
- PLAN TO BUILD  YES  NO IF SO, WHEN \_\_\_\_\_
- MEDICAL HARDSHIP  YES (LETTER FROM DOCTOR REQUIRED)  NO
- APPEAL FROM DECISION OF THE PLANNING MANAGER**

|               | PROPERTY OWNER                                | AUTHORIZED AGENT*                                       |
|---------------|---|---|
| NAME          | Markham Woods Presbyterian Church             | Bob Chopra, W.F., Agents for Cellular Wireless          |
| ADDRESS       | 5210 Markham Woods Rd.<br>Lake Mary, FL 32746 | 1101 N. Lake Deering Rd. Ste. 110<br>Maitland, FL 32751 |
| PHONE 1       | (407) 333-2030                                | (267) 973-4228  |
| PHONE 2 (FAX) | (407) 333-3202                                | (407) 660-4909  |
| E-MAIL        |   | Bob.Chopra@WCFNET.com                                   |

PROJECT NAME: West Heathrow (B)

SITE ADDRESS: 5210 Markham Woods Rd; Lake Mary, FL 32746

CURRENT USE OF PROPERTY: Church

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Leg Sec 02 Twp 20S RGE 29E E 1/2 of N 3/4 of S 1/2 of NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 (Less N 165 FT & E 50 FT for RD)

SIZE OF PROPERTY: 4.7 acre(s) PARCEL I.D. 02-20-29-300-0300-0000

UTILITIES:  WATER  WELL  SEWER  SEPTIC TANK  OTHER N/A

KNOWN CODE ENFORCEMENT VIOLATIONS NONE

IS PROPERTY ACCESSIBLE FOR INSPECTION  YES  NO

This request will be considered at the Board of Adjustment regular meeting on 7/26/04 (mo/day/yr), in the Board Chambers (Room 1028) at 6:00 p.m. on the first floor of the Seminole County Services Building, located at 1101 East First Street in downtown Sanford, FL.

I hereby affirm that all statements, proposals, and/or plans submitted with or contained within this application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Bob Chopra, W.F., Agents for Cellular Wireless 6/3/04  
 SIGNATURE OF OWNER OR AGENT\* DATE

\* Proof of owner's authorization is required with submittal if signed by agent.

ADDITIONAL VARIANCES

VARIANCE 2:

VARIANCE 3:

VARIANCE 4:

VARIANCE 5:

VARIANCE 6:

VARIANCE 7:

VARIANCE 8:

APPEAL FROM BOA DECISION TO BCC

|         | PROPERTY OWNER | AUTHORIZED AGENT * |
|---------|----------------|--------------------|
| NAME    |                |                    |
| ADDRESS |                |                    |
| PHONE 1 |                |                    |
| PHONE 2 |                |                    |
| E-MAIL  |                |                    |

NATURE OF THE APPEAL \_\_\_\_\_

BCC PUBLIC HEARING DATE \_\_\_\_\_

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

PROCESSING:

FEE: \$150 COMMISSION DISTRICT 5 FLU/ZONING SE/A1

LOCATION FURTHER DESCRIBED AS  
 ON WEST SIDE OF MARKHAM WOODS RD. APPROX.  
 0.3 MI SE OF CARTER RD.

PLANNER VB DATE 6/3

SUFFICIENCY COMMENTS \_\_\_\_\_

**APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE FROM MINIMUM SEPARATION  
REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNICATION TOWER FACILITIES**

**I. Is a Variance Required?**

Per section 30.1364(b) of the Seminole County Zoning Code, minimum separation requirements from off-site uses for communication towers that are to be sited within 200 feet or 300% of the height of the tower (whichever is greater) from property that (a) has a residential zoning classification; (b) has a residential future land use designation; or (c) contains an existing residential use. The proposed "ecclesiastical" monopole tower at issue will be 150' in height. Thus, the applicant must seek a variance if the tower is located within 450' of the off-site uses listed above.

- A. Is there property within 450 feet of the tower that has a residential zoning classification?** No. The property has an A-1 (Agriculture) zoning classification. Thus, no variance is needed from the minimum separation requirements.
- B. Is there property within 450 feet of the tower that contains an existing residential use?** Yes. The owner of the property (Markham Woods Presbyterian Church, Inc.) leases a single-family home that is located on-site. However, Section 30.1364(b) (3) provides that a "reduced separation distance may be approved by the current planning manager when written consent is obtained by all property owners within the applicable separation distance." By the fact that the property owner (Markham Woods Presbyterian Church) is in fact the one seeking the variance, the County has "written consent" that the "property owner within the applicable separation distance" (Markham Woods Presbyterian Church) consents to the reduced separation distance. Additionally, there is a parcel just south of the subject property that contains another single family residence.
- C. Is there property within 450 feet of the tower that has a residential future land use designation?** Yes. The tower is located within 450 feet of another parcel that has a Suburban Estates land use classification. However, the applicant respectfully submits that it meets the requisite criteria (as set forth in "Table 1" of Section 30.1364) for granting a variance from this minimum separation requirement.

**II. Does the applicant meet the requirements for a variance?**

A variance from the minimum separation requirements for communication towers may be granted based upon findings that: (1) the aesthetic impacts of the tower are enhanced; (2) compatibility with abutting property owners is maintained; and (3) approval of the tower would be consistent with and further the provisions of Section 30.1362.

- A. **Have the “aesthetic impacts” of the tower been enhanced?** Yes. The proposal is for an “ecclesiastical” type monopole tower, designed to blend in with the religious nature of the property and as a symbol of faith.
- B. **Is compatibility with abutting property owners maintained?** Yes. The property to the north of the subject parcel has an agricultural zoning classification (A-1) currently occupied by another church. This property has two “flagpole” communication towers on its property. The property to the south of the subject parcel contains single family dwellings, however with the proposed “ecclesiastical” monopole tower, it will act as a symbol of faith for the church and the community as opposed to acting as visual obtrusiveness.
- C. **Would the approval of the tower be consistent with and further the provisions of Section 30.1362?** Yes. The primary purposes of Section 30.1362 are to (1) accommodate the growing need for communication tower facilities; (2) encourage and direct the location of communication towers to the most appropriate locations, to provide the needs of the communication industry, and to provide for the needs of public and to provide for the protection of private property rights; (3) protect residential areas and land uses from potential adverse impacts of communication towers when placed at inappropriate locations or permitted without adequate controls and regulation; (4) minimize the adverse visual impacts resulting from communication towers through design, siting, screening, and innovative camouflaging techniques; and (5) avoid potential damage to adjacent properties through sound engineering and planning. The proposal for an “ecclesiastical” type monopole tower at this proposed location advances the aforementioned objectives.

**Cingular Wireless LLC**

**Seeks**

**Special Exception**

**In**

**A-1 Industrial (Zoning District)**

**For a Proposed  
150' "Ecclesiastical" Monopole Tower  
Communication Service Facility**

**Site Name: West Heathrow (B)  
5210 Markham Woods Rd., Lake Mary, FL 32746  
TAX PARCEL ID #02-20-29-300-030B-0000; 4.7 Acres**

---

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION**

**INTRODUCTION**

Cingular Wireless LLC, a subsidiary of Bellsouth Wireless, Inc., a Federal Communications Commission (FCC) licensed operator of commercial mobile radio services in the State of Florida, submits this application to the Seminole County Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception approval in the A-1 Agriculture zoning district in order to construct and operate an unmanned wireless communications service within Seminole County. In addition, a variance to the separation requirements is sought under a separate variance application request. This project description and justification narrative describes the scope of the proposed project by providing specific information regarding the project location, zoning, specifications, and required services.

**PROJECT GOAL**

Cingular's goal for this proposed site is to enhance the quality of wireless service coverage on Markham Woods Road and the surrounding area west of Heathrow, in addition to providing quality contiguous coverage into Sanford, Heathrow and the Lake Mary areas. This goal will be accomplished in an environmentally sensitive manner and consistent with the policies and ordinances of Seminole County, which the reason why Cingular has chosen to pursue approval for an "ecclesiastical" type monopole tower for this site location

## **GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The subject parcel is located at 5210 Markham Woods Rd., Lake Mary, FL 32746. The parent tract consists of approximately 4.7 acres and is zoned A-1 Agriculture with a future land use designation of Suburban Estates. The parent tract is currently occupied by the Markham Woods Presbyterian Church. Cingular Wireless proposes to construct a 150' "ecclesiastical" type monopole communications tower (*please see submitted photo simulations*) and place the supporting equipment cabinets on a 9'-6" x 13' concrete pad, within a fenced 60' x 60' lease compound.

### ***Facility Specifications***

Cingular's personal wireless service facility consists of three (3) equal "sectors" for three (3) panel antennas each, mounted to a support bracket at approximately 150' above ground level (AGL). The proposed 150' "ecclesiastical" monopole communications tower is designed with the structural capacity to accommodate two (2) future service providers at a lower height. The panel antennas will be approximately 8'-0" tall x 12.5" wide x 7" deep. Attached to each antenna will be coax cable that will run down the inside of the tower to the base and across a cable-bridge into the equipment cabinets located on the aforementioned concrete pad.

The proposed facility will be used strictly as a wireless transmitting and receiving facility. The facility is completely self operating, thus unmanned. Once the facility is operational, technicians from Cingular will visit the site approximately once or twice a month for routine site maintenance. In the event of a malfunction or emergency, more frequent visits will be necessary. Ingress/Egress to the facility is off Markham Woods Road, over an unrestricted access easement to the site. Electrical power and telephone will be supplied from existing utility service providers – Progress Energy and BellSouth respectively.

## **PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### ***Necessity and/or Desirability of the Proposed Project***

Cingular has quite strong customer demand for continuous quality mobile radio telephone services in Seminole County and particularly in the areas of Lake Mary, Heathrow and Sanford. The Cingular Wireless radio frequency engineer assigned to this area has identified a pressing need for a wireless communication facility in this proposed location of Seminole County to provide quality enhanced and continuous coverage into the areas of Sanford, Heathrow, Lake Mary, and the surrounding area west of Heathrow, as well as enhanced coverage along Markham Woods Road.

The proposed facility was selected after intense investigation of the topographic characteristics of the area, frequency analysis, adjacent cell interconnection capabilities (meaning "seamless radio frequency hand-offs" from cell to cell), existing co-location opportunities within and outside the RF search ring area, and most importantly land-use compatibility.

### *Siting Analysis*

In the site selection and acquisition process, the site leasing agent attempts to find any collocation opportunities with the search ring area or close enough that the site compliments the RF propagation studies and height requirements. This particular search ring affords no collocation opportunities and therefore a “green field” or “raw land” site is sought within the search area.

There are several criteria taken into consideration when attempting to site a tower location within the search ring area and it is always a compromise in blending all the factors together in order to come up with an “ideal” site location. Below are a list of general criteria a site leasing agent must address in locating an optimal site:

- A. Compliance with local land use ordinances (Is the use allowed in the zoning district?)
- B. Find a willing landlord with sufficient land to locate the site;
- C. Find a mutually agreed upon site location on the owner’s property;
- D. Find a mutually agreed upon ingress/egress to the proposed site;
- E. Locate the site where reasonable telephone and electrical runs are present;

Alternative Sites Investigated: The two potential collocation sites within the search ring area lie to the east of the First Baptist Church property located at 5400 Markham Woods Road. The two potential collocation opportunities were two stealth flag pole installations. The first is the 135’ T-Mobile flag pole. T-Mobile is at the top and Nextel is collocated at approximately the 120’-125’ level. The next available height down on this pole was rejected by Cingular RF as not an acceptable height. The second flag pole is approximately 90’ in height and owned by Sprint who are located at the top of the pole. This site was rejected by Cingular RF as being an unacceptable height.

Proposed Site Justification: Please see attached “Engineering & Safety Information”

#### Additional Benefits:

- A. The proposed “ecclesiastical” type monopole tower mitigates the visual impact on the area to the greatest extent possible by locating at the rear northwest portion of the parent tract, taking advantage of the buffer provided by the trees located on the property lines.
- B. The proposed tower will afford the collocation opportunity for two more future communications providers (total of three), if technologically feasible for a future provider.

### **PUBLIC BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT – AN OVERVIEW**

The Congress of the United States has found that wireless radio services serve the national interest, and directly or indirectly benefit all of its citizens. Through licensing agreements

the FCC has established the desirability and need for wireless telephone service to facilitate telephone conversations between mobile units and the existing telephone system. The wireless system is intended to function as an extension of the present telephone network, and is intended to provide quality service for the entire nation at a reasonable price. Cingular Wireless LLC is mandated to provide mobile cellular radio service to those service areas of Florida granted under their FCC license. Seminole County is one of those areas granted under their FCC license.

The wireless telephone system divides the service area into a grid system call "cells". Each cell has its own radio receiver and low-power transmitter. The size and location of each cell is based on the anticipated volume of telephone traffic in each cell area. From each cell, calls are sent by radio to and from the mobile hand-held units, and then routed though the public telephone system to fixed (land-line) telephone or routed to other cells and on to other mobile units. A central "switch" routes all of the calls through the wireless system, facilitating the "seamless hand-offs" between cells as the hand-held mobile unit moves through the wireless service area.

Wireless telephone services play an important role in providing communications to individuals, the business community and to emergency service providers. In polls conducted over the past few years, it has been found that individuals purchase wireless services primarily for safety and security reasons. It makes individuals feel safer when traveling for business or pleasure. 911 wireless phone calls from individual customers are approaching 50,000 per day nationwide, and about 50 percent of wireless users have called authorities to report car trouble, medical emergencies, crimes, or drunk driving.

Business owners, managers, and employees have commented on the increase in productivity and better use of their time. Just as the standard (land-line) telephone facilitated the growth of American business in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, wireless communications have become an indispensable 21<sup>st</sup> Century tool of the modern business world.

Most importantly, wireless telephone services play an important role in providing vital communications to relief and emergency workers, i.e. 9-11 disaster in NYC, Hurricane Andrew. In addition, police patrol cars regularly use "mobile data terminals" giving them fast wireless access to key information for critical "on the spot" decision making.

## **REQUIRED FINDINGS**

Granting special exception approval for Cingular's personal wireless service facility will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons working or residing in the vicinity of the proposed cell site; nor will it be injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity. Once installed, the unmanned cell site becomes a *passive* use.

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposed site location satisfies Cingular's radio frequency requirements under its FCC license obligations to provide continued, quality "mobile radio telephone service" to the people of Seminole County. Under Seminole County's current ordinance, the "ecclesiastical" type monopole tower should be considered the most unobtrusive to the community, while providing a symbol of faith for the property on which tower will be sited.

---

AGENT AUTHORIZATION

Please accept this signed and notarized document authorizing Cingular Wireless and its agent, Wireless Facilities, Inc., to act as agents for the property owner in the submission of any applications and supporting documentation, and to attend and represent the property owner at all meetings and public hearings pertaining to the installation of a Cingular Wireless unmanned telecommunications facility located at 5214 Markham Woods Rd

Lake Mary, FL 32746

Markham Woods Presbyterian Church, Inc

Signature: By James A. Barker

Owner James A. Barker

Print Name President

Title

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF Seminole

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 28 day of May, 2008 by James A. Barker. He is personally known to me or has produced as identification.

(NOTARY SEAL)

Malinda H. McAdow  
Signature of Notary

(Printed or typed name of Notary)

 Malinda H. McAdow  
My Commission DD307753  
Expires June 19, 2008

To: Bob Chopra

AGENT AUTHORIZATION

Please accept this signed and notarized document authorizing Cingular Wireless and its agent, Wireless Facilities, Inc., to act as agents for the property owner in the submission of any applications and supporting documentation, and to attend and represent the property owner at all meetings and public hearings pertaining to the installation of a Cingular Wireless unmanned telecommunications facility located at 5214 Markham Woods Rd  
Lake Mary, FL. 32746

Markham Woods Presbyterian Church, Inc

Signature: By James A. Barks  
Owner

James A. Barks

Print Name  
President

Title

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF Seminole

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 28 day of May, 2000 by James A. Barks. He is personally known to me or has produced as identification.

(NOTARY SEAL)

Malinda H. McAdow  
Signature of Notary



Malinda H. McAdow  
My Commission DE307233  
Expires June 19, 2008

(Printed or typed name of Notary Public)



---

# **SITE**

## **West Heathrow**

---

Engineering and Safety  
Information

---



---

# Site Name

## Overview and Site Objective

The proposed new cell West Heathrow is required to improve the RF signal strength and coverage for the existing cellular system in the area north of Lake Mary Boulevard, West of I-4, along Markham Woods Road. The new West Heathrow cell is also required to provide the necessary capacity relief to decrease overflow and blocking on the alpha face of the Lake Mary Cell.

## Tower Height Requirements

Several factors have to be considered when determining the height for the new West Heathrow cell. In this particular case, neighboring trees, surrounding towers and terrain of the area dictate that the minimum tower height for this cell site to meet the objectives of coverage and traffic relief in the area effectively should be 150 feet.

The two potential collocation sites within the search ring area lie to the north at the First Baptist Church property located at 5400 Markham Woods Rd. The two potential collocation opportunities were two stealth flag pole installations. The first is the 135' Voice Stream (now known as T-Mobile) flag pole. T-Mobile is at the top and Nextel is collocated at approximately the 120'-125' level. The next available height down on this pole would be 100'. This height has been rejected by Cingular as an unacceptable height to meet coverage goals, as well as Nextel being a potential interferer to Cingular. The second flag pole is approximately 90' in height and owned by Sprint who is at the top of the pole. The 70' available on this site was also rejected by Cingular as being too low in height. All of Cingular's engineering and testing for this proposed cell has been optimized around a 150' height, which is only attainable at the Presbyterian Church location.

## Neighboring Sites

| Site Name    | Address           | County   | Tower Ht. | Gnd. Elev. |
|--------------|-------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| Lake Mary    | 40 Skyline Dr.    | Seminole | 200' AGL  | 62' MSL    |
| Payola       | 935 Wallace Ct.   | Seminole | 120' AGL  | 57' MSL    |
| Towne Center | 1050 Rinehart Rd. | Seminole | 120' AGL  | 65' MSL    |
| Sanford Mall | 5405 Orange Blvd. | Seminole | 180' AGL  | 39' MSL    |

• MSL - Mean Sea Level AGL - Above Ground Level

The ground elevation for the West Heathrow site is approximately 56' MSL. With the ground elevation at this level, the required antenna centerline to meet the objective will be 150'.

---

---

## FAA Status

It is the policy of Cingular Wireless to notify the FAA of construction and modifications of all cell sites and to comply with any and all regulations.

## Safety

The proposed West Heathrow cell site will be 150 feet above ground level. The Decibel Products antenna model 854DG90VTEX is four feet in length and would be mounted for a centerline of 148 feet, putting the tip height at 150 feet and the lower tip at 146 feet. The maximum proposed power per sector is 400 Watts (based on 100 Watts per channel for 4 channels per sector).

The FCC's OET Bulletin 65 (Edition 97-01), "Evaluating Compliance with FCC Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radio frequency Electromagnetic Fields," provides guidelines for predicting radio frequency (RF) field levels which can be used in evaluating FCC RF safety compliance. Using the predictive methods described in OET Bulletin 65 and the FCC-adopted standards for general public Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) defined in Appendix A to OET Bulletin 65, the following evaluation for the West Heathrow cell site was performed:

| Base<br>(feet) | (mW/cm <sup>2</sup> )* |          |         |
|----------------|------------------------|----------|---------|
| 10             | 0.000022               | 0.003794 | 1/ 263  |
| 20             | 0.000031               | 0.005411 | 1/ 184  |
| 50             | 0.000010               | 0.001795 | 1/ 556  |
| 100            | 0.000073               | 0.012525 | 1/ 79   |
| 150            | 0.000074               | 0.012712 | 1/ 78   |
| 200            | 0.000002               | 0.000275 | 1/ 3631 |
| 250            | 0.000030               | 0.005191 | 1/ 192  |
| 300            | 0.000030               | 0.005162 | 1/ 193  |
| 350            | 0.000005               | 0.000875 | 1/ 1142 |
| 400            | 0.000008               | 0.001451 | 1/ 688  |
| 450            | 0.000037               | 0.006465 | 1/ 154  |
| 500            | 0.000096               | 0.016490 | 1/ 60   |
| 550            | 0.000130               | 0.022415 | 1/ 44   |
| 600            | 0.000225               | 0.038876 | 1/ 25   |

\* milliwatts/square centimeter

\*\* FCC's Maximum Permissible Exposure at 880 MHz is 0.58 mW/cm<sup>2</sup>

The data presented in the table above confirm that the West Heathrow cell site will pose no RF safety hazard to the general public.

---

## Attachments



The following plots are from drive data collected during a crane test of the proposed site:

1. The existing present coverage in the area.
2. The proposed coverage of just the new cell at 150 feet.
3. The proposed coverage of just the proposed cell at 100 feet.
4. The proposed coverage at 150 feet and existing coverage combined.
5. The proposed coverage at 100 feet and existing coverage combined.

The following plots are from software generated propagation:

1. The propagation of the existing coverage..
  2. The proposed propagation of 150 feet at the Presbyterian Church.
  3. The proposed propagation of the Presbyterian church by itself.
  4. The proposed propagation of 100 feet at the Baptist Church.
  5. The proposed propagation of 115 feet at the Baptist Church.
-

Personal Property

| PARCEL DETAIL  | REAL ESTATE   | PERSONAL PROP. | TAX ROLL   | SALES SEARCH  | ◀ Back ▶   |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
|--|---|----------------|--|---------------|------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|---|---------------|---------------|------|---------|---------|------------------------|-----------|------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------------------|---------|-------|---------------------------|----------|--------|---|---------------|------|----|-------|---|------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|
|  <p><b>Seminole County</b><br/>Property Appraiser Services<br/>1101 E. First St.<br/>Sanford FL 32771<br/>407-685-7506</p>  |  |                |    |               |            |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
|  |   |                |  |               |            |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>GENERAL</b></p> <p>Parcel Id: 02-20-29-300-030B-0000      Tax District: 01-TX DIST 1 - COUNTY</p> <p>Owner: CHURCH MARKHAM WOODS      Exemptions: 36-CHURCH/RELIGIOUS</p> <p>Own/Addr: PRESBYTERIAN INC</p> <p>Address: 5210 MARKHAM WOODS RD</p> <p>City,State,ZipCode: LAKE MARY FL 32746</p> <p>Property Address: 5210 MARKHAM WOODS RD LAKE MARY 32746</p> <p>Facility Name:</p> <p>Dor: 71-CHURCHES</p>  |   |                | <p align="center"><b>2004 WORKING VALUE SUMMARY</b></p> <p>Value Method: Market</p> <p>Number of Buildings: 3</p> <p>Depreciated Bldg Value: \$1,068,668</p> <p>Depreciated EXFT Value: \$58,220</p> <p>Land Value (Market): \$164,500</p> <p>Land Value Ag: \$0</p> <p>Just/Market Value: \$1,291,388</p> <p>Assessed Value (SOH): \$1,291,388</p> <p>Exempt Value: \$1,291,388</p> <p>Taxable Value: \$0</p> |               |            |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>SALES</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Deed</th> <th>Date</th> <th>Book</th> <th>Page</th> <th>Amount</th> <th>Vac/Imp</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>WARRANTY DEED</td> <td>03/1993</td> <td>02575</td> <td>0160</td> <td>\$681,400</td> <td>Improved</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WARRANTY DEED</td> <td>11/1986</td> <td>01791</td> <td>1240</td> <td>\$4,600</td> <td>Vacant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WARRANTY DEED</td> <td>01/1983</td> <td>01517</td> <td>1196</td> <td>\$180,000</td> <td>Improved</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WARRANTY DEED</td> <td>01/1977</td> <td>01114</td> <td>0839</td> <td>\$15,000</td> <td>Vacant</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p align="center">Find Comparable Sales within this DOR Code</p>   |   |                | Deed   | Date          | Book       | Page                      | Amount           | Vac/Imp       | WARRANTY DEED | 03/1993       | 02575                | 0160      | \$681,400 | Improved      | WARRANTY DEED   | 11/1986       | 01791         | 1240 | \$4,600 | Vacant  | WARRANTY DEED          | 01/1983   | 01517            | 1196     | \$180,000 | Improved | WARRANTY DEED     | 01/1977 | 01114 | 0839                      | \$15,000 | Vacant | <p align="center"><b>2003 VALUE SUMMARY</b></p> <p>2003 Tax Bill Amount: \$0</p> <p>2003 Taxable Value: \$0</p> <p align="center">DOES NOT INCLUDE NON-AD VALOREM ASSESSMENTS</p> |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| Deed   | Date  | Book           | Page   | Amount        | Vac/Imp    |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| WARRANTY DEED  | 03/1993   | 02575          | 0160   | \$681,400     | Improved   |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| WARRANTY DEED  | 11/1986   | 01791          | 1240   | \$4,600       | Vacant     |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| WARRANTY DEED  | 01/1983   | 01517          | 1196   | \$180,000     | Improved   |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| WARRANTY DEED  | 01/1977   | 01114          | 0839   | \$15,000      | Vacant     |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>LAND</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Land Assess Method</th> <th>Frontage</th> <th>Depth</th> <th>Land Units</th> <th>Unit Price</th> <th>Land Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ACREAGE</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>4.700</td> <td>35,000.00</td> <td>\$164,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |   |                | Land Assess Method   | Frontage      | Depth      | Land Units                | Unit Price       | Land Value    | ACREAGE       | 0             | 0                    | 4.700     | 35,000.00 | \$164,500     | <p align="center"><b>LEGAL DESCRIPTION</b></p> <p>LEG SEC 02 TWP 20S RGE 29E E 1/2 OF N 3/4 OF S 1/2 OF NW 1/4 OF SE 1/4 (LESS N 165 FT &amp; E 50 FT FOR RD)</p> |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| Land Assess Method   | Frontage  | Depth          | Land Units   | Unit Price    | Land Value |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| ACREAGE  | 0   | 0              | 4.700  | 35,000.00     | \$164,500  |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>BUILDING INFORMATION</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bld Num</th> <th>Bld Class</th> <th>Year Blt</th> <th>Fixtures</th> <th>Gross SF</th> <th>Stories</th> <th>Ext Wall</th> <th>Bld Value</th> <th>Est. Cost New</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>MASONRY PILAS</td> <td>1989</td> <td>12</td> <td>9,550</td> <td>1</td> <td>BRICK COMMON - MASONRY</td> <td>\$486,672</td> <td>\$597,143</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"></td> <td colspan="3">Subsection / Sqft</td> <td colspan="3">OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>MASONRY PILAS</td> <td>1993</td> <td>20</td> <td>9,263</td> <td>1</td> <td>BRICK COMMON - MASONRY</td> <td>\$499,178</td> <td>\$578,757</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"></td> <td colspan="3">Subsection / Sqft</td> <td colspan="3">OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 400</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"></td> <td colspan="3">Subsection / Sqft</td> <td colspan="3">OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 616</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   |                |  |               |            | Bld Num                   | Bld Class        | Year Blt      | Fixtures      | Gross SF      | Stories              | Ext Wall  | Bld Value | Est. Cost New | 2   | MASONRY PILAS | 1989          | 12   | 9,550   | 1       | BRICK COMMON - MASONRY | \$486,672 | \$597,143        |          |           |          | Subsection / Sqft |         |       | OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 120 |          |        | 3   | MASONRY PILAS | 1993 | 20 | 9,263 | 1 | BRICK COMMON - MASONRY | \$499,178 | \$578,757 |  |  |  | Subsection / Sqft |  |  | OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 400 |  |  |  |  |  | Subsection / Sqft |  |  | OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 616 |  |  |
| Bld Num  | Bld Class   | Year Blt       | Fixtures   | Gross SF      | Stories    | Ext Wall                  | Bld Value        | Est. Cost New |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| 2  | MASONRY PILAS   | 1989           | 12   | 9,550         | 1          | BRICK COMMON - MASONRY    | \$486,672        | \$597,143     |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
|  |   |                | Subsection / Sqft  |               |            | OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 120 |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| 3  | MASONRY PILAS   | 1993           | 20   | 9,263         | 1          | BRICK COMMON - MASONRY    | \$499,178        | \$578,757     |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
|  |   |                | Subsection / Sqft  |               |            | OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 400 |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
|  |   |                | Subsection / Sqft  |               |            | OPEN PORCH FINISHED / 616 |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>BUILDING INFORMATION</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bld Num</th> <th>Bld Type</th> <th>Year Blt</th> <th>Fixtures</th> <th>Base SF</th> <th>Gross SF</th> <th>Heated SF</th> <th>Ext Wall</th> <th>Bld Value</th> <th>Est. Cost New</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>SINGLE FAMILY</td> <td>1978</td> <td>6</td> <td>1,473</td> <td>1,473</td> <td>1,473</td> <td>CB/STUCCO FINISH</td> <td>\$82,818</td> <td>\$92,534</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |   |                |  |               |            | Bld Num                   | Bld Type         | Year Blt      | Fixtures      | Base SF       | Gross SF             | Heated SF | Ext Wall  | Bld Value     | Est. Cost New   | 1             | SINGLE FAMILY | 1978 | 6       | 1,473   | 1,473                  | 1,473     | CB/STUCCO FINISH | \$82,818 | \$92,534  |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| Bld Num  | Bld Type  | Year Blt       | Fixtures   | Base SF       | Gross SF   | Heated SF                 | Ext Wall         | Bld Value     | Est. Cost New |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| 1  | SINGLE FAMILY   | 1978           | 6  | 1,473         | 1,473      | 1,473                     | CB/STUCCO FINISH | \$82,818      | \$92,534      |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>EXTRA FEATURE</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Year Blt</th> <th>Units</th> <th>EXFT Value</th> <th>Est. Cost New</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALUM PORCH W/CONC FL</td> <td>1987</td> <td>448</td> <td>\$1,264</td> <td>\$2,912</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WOOD DECK</td> <td>1987</td> <td>350</td> <td>\$700</td> <td>\$1,750</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  |   |                |  |               |            | Description               | Year Blt         | Units         | EXFT Value    | Est. Cost New | ALUM PORCH W/CONC FL | 1987      | 448       | \$1,264       | \$2,912   | WOOD DECK     | 1987          | 350  | \$700   | \$1,750 |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| Description  | Year Blt  | Units          | EXFT Value   | Est. Cost New |            |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| ALUM PORCH W/CONC FL   | 1987  | 448            | \$1,264  | \$2,912       |            |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |
| WOOD DECK  | 1987  | 350            | \$700  | \$1,750       |            |                           |                  |               |               |               |                      |           |           |               |   |               |               |      |         |         |                        |           |                  |          |           |          |                   |         |       |                           |          |        |   |               |      |    |       |   |                        |           |           |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |                   |  |  |                           |  |  |

|                             |      |        |          |          |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|----------|----------|
| MOBILE HOME COMM            | 1984 | 2,520  | \$40,320 | \$50,400 |
| MH A/C PKG                  | 1984 | 2,520  | \$2,520  | \$3,150  |
| COMMERCIAL CONCRETE DR 4 IN | 1989 | 3,000  | \$3,750  | \$6,000  |
| COMMERCIAL ASPHALT DR 2 IN  | 1989 | 17,500 | \$9,078  | \$14,525 |
| POLE LIGHT STEEL            | 1989 | 2      | \$308    | \$308    |
| POLE LIGHT STEEL            | 1989 | 2      | \$280    | \$280    |

**NOTE:** Assessed values shown are NOT certified values and therefore are subject to change before being finalized for ad valorem tax purposes.

\*\*\* If you recently purchased a homesteaded property your next year's property tax will be based on Just/Market value.

[BACK](#)     
 [PROPERTY APPRAISER HOME PAGE](#)     
 [CONTACT](#)





**PROJECT INFORMATION**

SCOPE OF WORK: PROPOSED UNMANNED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY  
 SITE ADDRESS: 5210 MARKHAM WOODS ROAD, LAKE MARY, FLORIDA 32746  
 COUNTY: SEMINOLE  
 LATITUDE: N28° 46' 33.1"  
 LONGITUDE: W81° 22' 57.3"  
 JURISDICTION: SEMINOLE COUNTY  
 PARCEL ID #: 02-20-29-300-030B-0000  
 ZONING: A1-AGRICULTURE  
 CURRENT USE: CHURCH  
 PROPOSED USE: PROPOSED 150' 3 CARRIER ECCLESIASTICAL MONOPOLE  
 PROPERTY OWNER: MARKHAM WOODS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, 5210 MARKHAM WOODS ROAD, LAKE MARY, FLORIDA 32746  
 PROPERTY CONTACT PERSON: FRANK BELL (407) 333-2030  
 TOWER COLOR: GALVANIZED  
 PARENT TRACT: 4.7 ± ACRES

| A/E DOCUMENT REVIEW STATUS  |  |
|---|--|
| Status Code   |  |
| 1   | Accepted - With minor or no comments, construction may proceed |
| 2   | Not accepted - Please resolve comments and resubmit            |
| Acceptance does not constitute approval of design details, calculations, analysis, test methods or materials developed or selected by the subcontractor and does not relieve subcontractor from full compliance with contractual obligations. |  |
| Reviewed  | ENG CONST  |
| By: <i>J. Bedrows</i>   | Date: 5/27/04  |



**SITE NAME:  
NFB-WEST HEATHROW**

**RF REVISION**

**VICINITY MAP**

**APPLICABLE BUILDING CODES AND STANDARDS**

RF REVISION # 1.0  
 RF REVISION DATE 01/26/04

DIRECTIONS:  
 FROM I-4 IN ORLANDO, FL. TRAVEL NORTHEAST TO EXIT #50. TURN LEFT ON LAKE MARY BLVD AND HEAD WEST APPROXIMATELY 1 MILE TO MARKHAM WOODS ROAD. TURN RIGHT HEADING NORTH AND TRAVEL APPROXIMATELY 1 MILE. SITE IS ON THE LEFT HAND SIDE OF THE ROAD.

SUBCONTRACTOR'S WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL APPLICABLE NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CODES AS ADOPTED BY THE LOCAL AUTHORITY HAVING JURISDICTION (AHJ) FOR THE LOCATION. THE EDITION OF THE AHJ ADOPTED CODES AND STANDARDS IN EFFECT ON THE DATE OF CONTRACT AWARD SHALL GOVERN THE DESIGN.

**DRAWING INDEX**

**REV**

|                         |  |   |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| NFB-REYNOLDS AIRPARK-01 | TITLE SHEET                                  | 0 |
| NFB-REYNOLDS AIRPARK-02 | SITE PLAN                                    | 0 |
| NFB-REYNOLDS AIRPARK-03 | COMPOUND PLAN                                | 0 |
| NFB-REYNOLDS AIRPARK-04 | LANDSCAPE PLAN                               | 0 |
| NFB-REYNOLDS AIRPARK-05 | TOWER ELEVATION AND ANTENNA ORIENTATION PLAN | 0 |
| NFB-REYNOLDS AIRPARK-06 | COAX COLOR CODING AND IDENTIFICATION DETAIL  | 0 |
| NFB-REYNOLDS AIRPARK-07 | FOUNDATION LAYOUT                            | 0 |



BUILDING CODE: FLORIDA BUILDING CODE (FBC), LATEST EDITION  
 WIND SPEED: BASIC WIND SPEED PER FBC - WINDSPEED 110 MPH (3 SEC. GUST) 190 MPH FASTEST MILE; EIA/TIA-222-F; 95 MPH BASIC WIND SPEED  
 ELECTRICAL CODE: NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION (NFPA) 70, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE, LATEST ADOPTED EDITION.  
 LIGHTNING PROTECTION CODE: NEPA - 2000, LIGHTNING PROTECTION CODE  
 SUBCONTRACTOR'S WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS:  
 AMERICAN CONCRETE INSTITUTE (ACI) 318, BUILDING CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR REINFORCED CONCRETE  
 AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF STEEL CONSTRUCTION (AISC), MANUAL OF STEEL CONSTRUCTION, ASD, NINTH EDITION  
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION/ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (TIA/EIA) 222-F, STRUCTURAL STANDARDS FOR STEEL ANTENNA TOWER AND ANTENNA SUPPORTING STRUCTURES; INSTITUTE FOR ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICS ENGINEERS (IEEE) 81, GUIDE FOR MEASURING EARTH RESISTIVITY, GROUND IMPEDANCE, AND EARTH SURFACE POTENTIALS OF A GROUND SYSTEM, IEEE 1100 (LATEST EDITION); RECOMMENDED PRACTICE FOR POWERING AND GROUNDING OF ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT, IEEE C62.41, RECOMMENDED PRACTICES ON SURGE VOLTAGES IN LOW VOLTAGE AC POWER CIRCUITS (FOR LOCATION CATEGORY "C3" AND HIGH SYSTEM EXPOSURE); TIA 607, COMMERCIAL BUILDING GROUNDING AND BONDING REQUIREMENTS FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS, TELCORDIA, GR-1603 COAXIAL CABLE CONNECTION. FOR ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN SECTIONS OF LISTED CODES AND STANDARDS REGARDING MATERIAL, METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION, OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS, THE MOST RESTRICTIVE REQUIREMENT SHALL GOVERN, WHERE THERE IS CONFLICT BETWEEN A GENERAL REQUIREMENT AND A SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT, THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT SHALL GOVERN.

**NOTES**

**SCOPE OF WORK**

(INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO)

- SEE THE FOLLOWING NOTES, SYMBOLS AND DETAILS, BECHTEL DOCUMENT NUMBER 24782-000-A3-EF-00001 FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS SITE DESIGN PACKAGE:  
 CONCRETE AND REINFORCING STEEL NOTES (DETAIL 102)  
 RF NOTES (DETAIL 116)  
 SITE WORK GENERAL NOTES (DETAIL 619)  
 STRUCTURAL STEEL NOTES (DETAIL 620)  
 GROUNDING NOTES (DETAIL 621)  
 ELECTRICAL INSTALLATION NOTES (DETAIL 622)  
 GENERAL NOTES (DETAIL 623)  
 GREENFIELD TVSS NOTES (DETAIL 624)
- ALL BECHTEL SAFETY PROCEDURES MUST BE ADHERED TO AS PER EXHIBIT B1.
- SUB-CONTRACTOR SHALL INCLUDE ANTENNA SYSTEM SWEEP TESTING PER BECHTEL DOCUMENT 24782-801-3PS-EFYD-00001 REV A.
- POWER TO BE PROVIDED BY PROGRESS ENERGY: 1-866-372-4663  
 TELCO TO BE PROVIDED BY BELLSOUTH: 727-535-8157.

- INSTALL NEW 150' ECCLESIASTICAL TOWER (DESIGN BY OTHERS)
- INSTALL NEW CONCRETE SLAB FOR NEW OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT.
- INSTALL NEW CABLE SUPPORT BRIDGES.
- FURNISH AND INSTALL NEW ELEC. SERVICES WITH METER AND DISCONNECT.
- FURNISH AND INSTALL ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES.
- INSTALL NEW MOUNTS AND ANTENNAS AND CABLES.
- INSTALLATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

THE EXISTING CONDITIONS REPRESENTED HEREIN ARE BASED ON VISUAL OBSERVATIONS, AND INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHERS. KCI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. CORPORATION CANNOT GUARANTEE THE CORRECTNESS NOR COMPLETENESS OF THE EXISTING CONDITIONS SHOWN AND ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY THEREOF. CONTRACTOR AND HIS SUB-CONTRACTORS SHALL VISIT THE SITE AND VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AS REQUIRED FOR PROPER EXECUTION OF PROJECT. REPORT ANY CONFLICTS OR DISCREPANCIES TO THE CONSULTANT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

- THIS IS AN UNMANNED AND RESTRICTED ACCESS EQUIPMENT ROOM AND WILL BE USED FOR THE TRANSMISSION OF RADIO SIGNALS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING PUBLIC CELLULAR SERVICE.
- CINGULAR WIRELESS CERTIFIES THAT THIS TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT FACILITY WILL BE SERVICED ONLY BY CINGULAR WIRELESS EMPLOYEES AND THE WORK ASSOCIATED WITH ANY EQUIPMENT CANNOT BE PERFORMED BY HANDICAPPED PERSONS. THIS FACILITY WILL BE FREQUENTED ONLY BY SERVICE PERSONNEL FOR REPAIR PURPOSES. PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 553 PART 54 OF THE FLORIDA STATUTES, THIS FACILITY IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF THAT STATUTE, PURSUANT TO THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA), APPENDIX B, SECTION 4.11.15(b). THIS FACILITY IS EXEMPT FROM THAT ACT.
- THIS FACILITY WILL CONSUME NO UNRECOVERABLE ENERGY AND IS EXEMPT FROM THE FLORIDA ENERGY REVIEW CODE.
- NO POTABLE WATER SUPPLY IS TO BE PROVIDED AT THIS LOCATION.
- NO WASTE WATER WILL BE GENERATED AT THIS LOCATION.
- NO SOLID WASTE WILL BE GENERATED AT THIS LOCATION.
- SEE ATTACHED SURVEY FOR LEGAL DESCRIPTION, EXISTING GRADE INFORMATION, LOCATION PLAN AND OTHER SITE INFORMATION.
- CINGULAR WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS MAINTENANCE CREW (TYPICALLY ONE PERSON) WILL MAKE AN AVERAGE OF ONE TRIP PER MONTH, ONE HOUR PER VISIT.

**KCI Technologies, Inc.**  
 10500 HIGHLAND MANOR DRIVE, SUITE 100  
 TAMPA, FL 33610  
 (813) 740-2000

ENGINEERS  
 PLANNERS

FLORIDA LICENSE NO. ENR0000000  
 LICENSED UNDER J. PROCTOR, P.E.  
 LICENSE NO. 043, 0000

**NFB-WEST HEATHROW**  
 5210 MARKHAM WOODS ROAD  
 LAKE MARY, FLORIDA 32746




| CINGULAR WIRELESS |           |                         |                      |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| TITLE SHEET       |           |                         |                      |
| 0                 | 5/26/04   | ISSUED FOR ZONING       | MB DC DK             |
| A                 | 5/25/04   | ISSUED FOR REVIEW       | MB DK DK             |
| NO.               | DATE      | REVISIONS               | BY CHK APP'D         |
| SCALE:            | AS SHOWN  | DESIGNED: DARRYL KROEZE | DRAWN: W. DURMS      |
| BECHTEL JOB NO.   | 24782-350 | DRAWING NUMBER          | NFB-WEST HEATHROW-01 |
| REV               |           |                         |                      |


*J. Bedrows*  
 5/27/04

KCI: J00M11001201310

C:\NFB\B-20\09 5/26/2004 4:04:52 PM





VICINITY MAP  
SCALE: NOT TO SCALE



LOCATOR MAP  
SCALE: NOT TO SCALE

- LEGEND:**
- A = AND
  - IP1 = PLAT DATA
  - IC1 = CALCULATED DATA
  - IF1 = FIELD DATA
  - ID1 = DEED DATA
  - OTS = BASE STATION TRANSEIVER SUBSYSTEM
  - B = BENCHMARK
  - CON = CENTER LINE
  - CON = CONTOUR ELEVATION DATA
  - ELEV. = ELEVATION
  - FAA = FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
  - F.D.O.T. = FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
  - FL = FLORIDA
  - GPS = GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM
  - G = GROUND MARK
  - W = WIRE
  - IB = IDENTIFICATION
  - INC = INCORPORATED
  - MES = MITERED END SECTION
  - M.O.L. = MORE OR LESS
  - NAD = NORTH AMERICAN DATUM
  - NAD83 = NORTH AMERICAN DATUM 1983
  - NCS = NO CORNER FOUND
  - ND = NUMBER
  - DHW = OVERHEAD WIRES
  - PKWT = PARKWAY
  - CON = CONCRETE
  - TOP = TOP OF BANK
  - TOS = TOP OF SLOPE
  - TSP = TYPICAL
  - UT = UTILITY POLE WITH
  - FIR = FOUND IRON ROD
  - FIP = FOUND IRON PIPE
  - FCW = FOUND CONCRETE MONUMENT
  - SIRAC = SET IRON ROD & CAP 5/8"
  - SE = SET
  - FP/KAD = FOUND PARKER-KALON NAIL AND DISK
  - SP/KAD = SET PARKER-KALON NAIL AND DISK
  - REF. PT. = REFERENCE POINT
  - LP = LIQUID PROPANE


**FLOOD NOTE:**  
THE PROPOSED CINGULAR WIRELESS LEASE AREA APPEARS TO FALL WITHIN ZONE C AS SCALED FROM FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP, COMMUNITY 120289 PANEL NUMBER 0000 C, EFFECTIVE DATE 01/16/1981.



**PARENT TRACT DESCRIPTION:**  
THE EAST 1/2 OF THE NORTH 1/4 OF THE SOUTH 1/2 OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 28 EAST, SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA, LESS THE EAST 1/2 OF THE NORTH 1/4 OF THE SOUTH 1/2 OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SAID SECTION 2, AND LESS THE RIGHT-OF-WAY OF MARKHAM WOODS ROAD.  
CONTAINING 4.671 ACRES, MORE OR LESS

**KCI Technologies, Inc.**  
1050 HIGHLAND MANOR DRIVE, SUITE 100  
TAMPA, FL 33600  
(813) 740-2300  
ALFLORIDA LICENSE NO. 60000000  
ENGINEER DANIEL J. KROEZE, P.E.  
PLANNER AND PLANNERS

**NFB-WEST HEATHROW**  
5210 MARKHAM WOODS ROAD  
LAKE MARY, FLORIDA 32746




|                           |         |                   |    |     |       |
|---------------------------|---------|-------------------|----|-----|-------|
| NO.                       | DATE    | REVISIONS         | BY | CHK | APP'D |
| 0                         | 5/26/04 | ISSUED FOR ZONING | MB | DK  | DK    |
| 1                         | 5/25/04 | ISSUED FOR REVIEW | MB | DK  | DK    |
| SCALE: AS SHOWN           |         |                   |    |     |       |
| DESIGNED BY DARRYL KROEZE |         |                   |    |     |       |
| DRAWN BY M. BURNS         |         |                   |    |     |       |

|                          |                      |      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|------|
| <b>CINGULAR WIRELESS</b> |                      |      |
| SITE PLAN                |                      |      |
| BECKETT JOB NO.          | DRAWING NUMBER       | REV. |
| 24782-350                | NFB-WEST HEATHROW-02 | 0    |

*Handwritten signature and initials*



KCI 5/26/04 4:03:25 PM



**GENERAL PLANTING NOTES**


ALL PLANTS SHALL BE HEALTHY, VIGOROUS MATERIAL FREE OF PESTS AND DISEASE. ALL PLANTS SHALL BE CONTAINER-GROWN OR BALLED AND BURLAPPED. ALL TREES SHALL BE STRAIGHT TRUNKED, FULL HEADED AND MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED ON TREE STAKING DETAIL. ALL PLANTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE OWNERS REPRESENTATIVE BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER INSTALLATION. ALL TREES SHALL BE GUED OR STAKED AS SHOWN. ALL PLANTS AND PLANTING AREAS SHALL BE COMPLETELY WATCHED AS SPECIFIED ON TREE STAKING DETAIL. PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCATING ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AND SHALL AVOID DAMAGE TO ALL UTILITIES DURING COURSE OF THE WORK. STRUCTURES, SITE IMPROVEMENTS, ETC. WHICH OCCURS AS A RESULT OF THE LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING ALL QUANTITIES SHOWN ON THESE PLANS BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FULLY MAINTAINING ALL PLANTING (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: WATERING, SPRAYING, MULCHING, FERTILIZATION, ETC.) OF PLANTING AREAS AND LAWNS UNTIL THE WORK IS ACCEPTED IN TOTAL BY THE ENGINEERS REPRESENTATIVE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLETELY GUARANTEE ALL PLANT MATERIAL FOR A PERIOD OF ONE (1) YEAR BEGINNING AT THE DATE OF TOTAL ACCEPTANCE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAKE ALL REPLACEMENTS BEFORE OR AT THE END OF THE GUARANTEE PERIOD. THE OWNERS REPRESENTATIVE WILL APPROVE THE STAKED LOCATION OF ALL PLANT MATERIAL PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. AFTER BEING BUD AT THE NURSERY SOURCE, ALL TREES IN LEAF SHALL BE ACCLIMATED FOR TWO (2) WEEKS UNDER A MIST SYSTEM PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. ANY PLANT MATERIAL THAT DIES, TURNS BROWN OR DEFLATES PRIOR TO TOTAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE WORK SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE SITE AND REPLACED WITH MATERIAL OF THE SAME SPECIES, QUANTITY, SIZE AND MEETING ALL SPECIFICATIONS. STANDARDS SET FORTH IN "AMERICAN STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK", LATEST EDITION, REPRESENT GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS ONLY AND SHALL CONSTITUTE MINIMUM QUANTITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANT MATERIAL. ALL TREE PROTECTION MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO GRADING. THERE ARE NO TREE SAVE AREAS. ALL BUFFERS AND TREE SAVE AREAS ARE TO BE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED WITH FLAGGING AND/OR FENCING PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY LAND DISTURBANCE. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE MAINTAINED AT ALL TIMES IF FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE APPROVED PLAN DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE EROSION CONTROL. ADDITIONAL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED TO CONTROL OR TREAT THE SEDIMENT SOURCE. ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL DEVICES TO BE USED AS REQUIRED BY THE COUNTY. DISTURBED AREAS LEFT BLE FOR TWO TO FOUR WEEKS AND NOT TO FINAL GRADE WILL BE ESTABLISHED TO TEMPORARY VEGETATION (DA). DISTURBED AREAS LEFT BLE FOR FOUR WEEKS OR MORE WILL BE ESTABLISHED TO PERMANENT VEGETATION (DA). ALL AREAS TO FINAL GRADE WILL BE ESTABLISHED TO PERMANENT VEGETATION WITHIN TWO WEEKS. WHEN HAND PLANTING, MULCH (HAY OR STRAW) SHOULD BE UNIFORMLY SPREAD OVER THE SEEDED AREA WITHIN 24 HOURS OF SEEDING. DURING UNSUITABLE GROWING SEASONS, MULCH WILL BE USED AS A TEMPORARY COVER (DA). ON SLOPES THAT ARE 4:1 OR STEEPER, MULCH WILL BE ANCHORED. THE COUNTY LAND DISTURBANCE PERMIT MUST BE DISPLAYED ON SITE AT ALL TIMES DURING CONSTRUCTION AND IN PLAN VIEW FROM A COUNTY ROAD OR STREET. EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL DEVICES MUST BE INSTALLED AND INSPECTED PRIOR TO ANY GRADING ON SITE. SEDIMENT / EROSION CONTROL DEVICES MUST BE CHECKED BY THE DEVELOPER AFTER EACH STORM EVENT. EACH DEVICE IS TO BE MAINTAINED OR REPLACED IF SEDIMENT ACCUMULATION HAS REACHED ONE HALF THE CAPACITY OF THE DEVICE.

FOR 24"x36" DRAWINGS  
GRAPHIC SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"  
FOR 11"x17" DRAWINGS  
GRAPHIC SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

**LANDSCAPE PLAN**  
SCALE: AS NOTED

**VEGETATIVE PLAN**


| SPACING  | COMMON NAME | SIZE/REMARKS  |
|----------|-------------|---|
| 20' O.C. | LIVE OAK    | TREES SHALL BE MIN. 10' HEIGHT AT TIME OF PLANTING. |
| 3' O.C.  | WAX MYRTLE  | SHRUBS SHALL BE MIN. 3' HEIGHT AT TIME OF PLANTING. |



**SHRUB / GROUND COVER PLANTING DETAIL** (KCI-1) 04

- LAYOUT BED. NOT TO SCALE
- ROTOTILL BED TO 12" DEPTH. INSTALL PLANTS AND MULCH. WATER THOROUGHLY.
- IF UNABLE TO ROTOTILL DUE TO TREE ROOTS, DIG HOLE FOR EACH PLANT 12" WIDER AND 6" DEEPER THAN CONTAINER.

NOTE:  
SET TREE PLUMB PRIOR TO STAKING. TREES SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 6' IN HEIGHT AT TIME OF PLANTING.  
RUBBER HOSE (2 PLY GREEN) GUY WIRE (DOUBLE STRAND 2" PLY WIRE)  
2" SETTLED PINESTRAW MULCH  
4" REBAR STAKE 36" LENGTH DRIVE BELOW GRADE  
SCAFFRY BASE OF PLANT PIT



**TREE STAKING AND GUYING DETAIL** (KCI-2) 04

**KCI Technologies, Inc.**  
10150 HIGHWAY 408 NORTH, SUITE 100  
TAMPA, FL 33610  
(813) 740-2100  
ALPHABET LICENSE NO. 00000000  
ENGINEER (DATE) 3/19/02  
FLORIDA REG. NO. 22002

**NFB-WEST HEATHROW**  
5210 MARKHAM WOODS ROAD  
LAKE MARY, FLORIDA 32746



| NO. | DATE    | REVISIONS         | BY | CHK | APP'D |
|-----|---------|-------------------|----|-----|-------|
| D   | 5/26/04 | ISSUED FOR ZONING | MB | DK  | DK    |
| A   | 5/25/04 | ISSUED FOR REVIEW | MB | DK  | DK    |

SCALE: AS SHOWN  
DESIGNED: DANYL KROEZE  
DRAWN: H. BURNS

*[Signature]*  
5/27/04

**CINGULAR WIRELESS**

LANDSCAPE PLAN

| REVISION | DATE    | DESCRIPTION       |
|----------|---------|-------------------|
| 1        | 5/27/04 | ISSUED FOR REVIEW |

PROJECT JOB NO.: 24782-350  
DRAWING NUMBER: NFB-WEST HEATHROW-04  
REV: 0

KCI 24782-350-04-01



**CABLE MARKING TAGS:**

- SECTOR ORIENTATION/AZIMUTH WILL VARY FROM REGION TO REGION AND IS SITE SPECIFIC. REFER TO RF REPORT FOR EACH SITE TO DETERMINE THE ANTENNA LOCATION AND FUNCTION OF EACH TOWER SECTOR FACE.
- THE STANDARD IS BASED ON EIGHT COLORED TAPES-RED, BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, ORANGE, BROWN, WHITE, AND SLATE(GREY). THESE TAPES SHOULD BE READILY AVAILABLE TO THE ELECTRICIAN OR CONTRACTOR ON SITE.
- USING COLOR BANDS ON THE CABLES, MARK ALL RF CABLE BY SECTOR AND CABLE NUMBER AS SHOWN ON "CABLE MARKING COLOR CONVENTION TABLE".
- ALL COLOR CODE TAPE SHALL BE 3M-35 AND SHALL BE INSTALLED USING A MINIMUM OF (3) WRAPS OF TAPE AND SHALL BE NEATLY TRIMMED AND SMOOTHED OUT SO AS TO AVOID UNRAVELING.
- ALL COLOR BANDS INSTALLED AT THE TOWER TOP SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 3" WIDE AND SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM OF 3/4" OF SPACING BETWEEN EACH COLOR.
- ALL COLOR BANDS INSTALLED AT OR NEAR THE GROUND SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 3/4" WIDE.
- ALL COLOR CODES SHALL BE INSTALLED SO AS TO ALIGN NEATLY WITH ONE ANOTHER FROM SIDE-TO-SIDE.

**RF SYSTEM DESIGN PLAN:**


| ITEM NO. | ITEM DESCRIPTION               | SECTOR A AZIMUTH 0°   | SECTOR B AZIMUTH 120°         | SECTOR C AZIMUTH 240°     | TOTAL        | SUPPLIED BY |
|----------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1.       | ANTENNAS                       | 8540G690VTE5X-1(2)  | 8540G690VTE5X-1(2)            | 8540G690VTE5X-1(2)        | 6            | BECHTEL     |
| 2.       | ANTENNA MOUNT KIT              | *   | *                             | *                         | 6            | BECHTEL     |
| 3.       | MECHANICAL TILT                | 0   | 0                             | 0                         |              | BECHTEL     |
| 4.       | RADIATION HEIGHT FROM GROUND   | 150   | 150                           | 150                       |              |             |
| 5.       | TRX TYPE                       | EDGE  | EDGE                          | EDGE                      |              |             |
| 6.       | ANTENNA JUMPER ANDREW (LENGTH) | LDF4-50A (2) TBD IN FIELD                                   | LDF4-50A (2) TBD IN FIELD     | LDF4-50A (2) TBD IN FIELD | 6            | BECHTEL     |
| 7.       | DIN CONNECTOR (ANDREW)         | L4PDM-RC (2)  | L4PDM-RC (2)                  | L4PDM-RC (2)              | 6            | BECHTEL     |
| 8.       | DIN CONNECTOR (ANDREW)         | F4PDMV2-C (2)   | F4PDMV2-C (2)                 | F4PDMV2-C (2)             | 6            | BECHTEL     |
| 9.       | BOTTOM JUMPER LENGTH           | TBD IN FIELD (2)  | TBD IN FIELD (2)              | TBD IN FIELD (2)          | 6            |             |
| 10.      | DIN CONNECTOR (ANDREW)         | L7PDF-RPC   | L7PDF-RPC                     | L7PDF-RPC                 | ---          | BECHTEL     |
| 11.      | POLYPHASER (SURGE ARRESTOR)    | APTDC-DFDM-WB (2)   | APTDC-DFDM-WB (2)             | APTDC-DFDM-WB (2)         | 6            | BECHTEL     |
| 12.      | BIAS-T                         | ----  | ----                          | ----                      | ---          | CINGULAR    |
| 13.      | DUPLEXER                       | ----  | ----                          | ----                      | ---          | BECHTEL     |
| 14.      | TMA                            | LGP17401  | LGP17401                      | LGP17401                  | 6            | CINGULAR    |
| 15.      | FEEDER DIAMETER                | 1 5/8" LDF7-50A   | 1 5/8" LDF7-50A               | 1 5/8" LDF7-50A           | ---          | BECHTEL     |
| 16.      | FEEDER LENGTH                  | 150 FT. (4)   | 150 FT. (4)                   | 150 FT. (4)               | 2040 FT +10% | BECHTEL     |
| 17.      | COAX CABLE GROUND KIT          | SGL7-15B4 (8)   | SGL7-15B4 (8)                 | SGL7-15B4 (8)             | ---          | BECHTEL     |
| 18.      | CABLE TRAY MOUNTING KIT        | MT-CB71B  | MT-CB71B                      | MT-CB71B                  |              | GC          |
| 19.      | WEATHER PROOF KIT              |   | 221213 (ANDREWS)              |                           | (6)          | GC          |
| 20.      | PIN OUT CONNECTOR (RJ-45)      |   | ATX85C-2224 (SUPERIOR ES5X)   |                           | (13)         | BECHTEL     |
| 21.      | LOSP CAT-5e1                   |   | 24-04PE54-50P (SUPERIOR ES5X) |                           |              | BECHTEL     |
| 22.      | SHIELD GROUND CONNECTOR KIT    |   | 53490-1 (AMP, INC.)           |                           |              | BECHTEL     |
| 23.      | COLOR CODE                     | SEE LATEST CINGULAR CABLE MARKING GUIDELINES DETAIL 150M/05 |                               |                           |              |             |

PER RFOS REV. 1.0 DATED 01-26-04

SPECIAL NOTE: TABLE PROVIDED AS A COURTESY FOR INFORMATION ONLY CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE-OFF ITEM INDIVIDUALLY TO VERIFY QUANTITIES

SUBCONTRACTOR TO VERIFY W/ CONTRACTOR LATEST REVISION TO RF DESIGN DATA

COORDINATE WITH TOWER MANUFACTURER




**CABLE MARKING LOCATIONS DIAGRAM**

DETAIL 150M/06 REV. 2 NOT TO SCALE

| NO. | TAPE TAG | LOCATIONS  |
|-----|----------|--|
| 1.  | X        | EACH TOP-JUMPER SHALL BE COLOR CODED WITH (1) SET OF 3" WIDE BANDS.  |
| 2.  | X        | EACH MAIN COAX SHALL BE COLOR CODED WITH (1) SET OF 3" WIDE BANDS NEAR THE TOP-JUMPER CONNECTION AND WITH (1) SET OF 3" WIDE COLOR BANDS JUST PRIOR TO ENTERING THE BTS OR TRANSMITTER BUILDING. |
| 3.  | X        | CABLE ENTRY PORT ON THE INTERIOR OF THE SHELTER.   |
| 4.  | X        | ALL BOTTOM JUMPERS SHALL BE COLOR CODED WITH (1) SET OF 3" WIDE BANDS ON EACH END OF THE BOTTOM JUMPER.  |
| 5.  | *        | ALL BOTTOM JUMPERS SHALL BE COLOR CODED WITH (1) SET OF 3" WIDE BANDS ON EACH END OF THE BOTTOM JUMPER.  |


(\* - DENOTES TAG OR TAPE.) ALL RF CABLE SHALL BE MARKED AS PER CABLE MARKING LOCATIONS TABLE ABOVE.




**CABLE JUMPER COLOR CODE TABLE**

| SECTOR | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4   | 5  | 6   | 7  | 8   |
|--------|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|
| ALPHA  | R1 | R1W | R2 | R2W | R3 | R3W | R4 | R4W |
| BETA   | B1 | B1W | B2 | B2W | B3 | B3W | B4 | B4W |
| GAMMA  | G1 | G1W | G2 | G2W | G3 | G3W | G4 | G4W |

NOTES: THE FIRST LETTER STANDS FOR THE COLOR OF THE TAPE. R=RED, B=BLUE, G=GREEN. THE NUMBER STANDS FOR THE NUMBER OF STRIPS TO PLACE ON THE COAX. THE W STANDS FOR A WHITE STRIP TO BE PLACED ON THE COAX RUNNING TO THE SECOND ELEMENT OF EACH JUMPER.



**ANTENNA SECTOR AND CABLE DEFINITION**



**WAVEGUIDE BRIDGE LAYOUT**



**GSM LINE TAG**

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL IDENTIFICATION RF CABLES SHALL BE IDENTIFIED WITH A METAL TAG MADE OF STAINLESS STEEL OR BRASS AND STAMPED WITH THE SECTOR, ANTENNA POSITION, AND CABLE NUMBER. THE ID MARKING LOCATIONS SHOULD BE AS PER "CABLE MARKING LOCATIONS TABLE". THE TAG SHOULD BE ATTACHED WITH CORROSION PROOF WIRE AROUND THE CABLE. THE TAG SHOULD BE LABELED AS SHOWN ON THE "GSM LINE TAG" DETAIL.

**CABLE MARKING TAGS**

**CABLE PORT DIAGRAM**

CAUTION: HARMFUL RF ENERGY EXISTS ON THESE LINES.



**TOWER PLAN VIEW**

- NOTES:
- CONTRACTOR SHALL FILL OUT THE CABLE PORT DIAGRAM UPON COAX INSTALLATION. CABLE PORT DIAGRAM WILL BE AFFIXED TO THE INTERIOR SHELTER WALL NEAR THE CABLE ENTRY PORT TO AID IN CABLE IDENTIFICATION. THE CHART IS INTENDED TO BE USED TO RECORD THE LINE AND CORRESPONDING ANTENNA POSITION ON THE TOWER AT THE TIME OF INSTALLATION.
  - ONE COMPLETED COPY PLUS TWO BLANK COPIES OF THE CHART SHOULD BE POSTED IN THE SHELTER IN A PROTECTIVE PLASTIC SLEEVE.

**KCI Technologies, Inc.**  
1050 HIGHLAND MANOR DRIVE, SUITE 120  
TAMPA, FL 33606  
(813) 742-2700  
FLORIDA LICENSE NO. 00000000  
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER & SURVEYOR  
ALFONSO REYES, P.E., E.S.

**NFB-WEST HEATHROW**  
5210 MARKHAM WOODS ROAD  
LAKE MARY, FLORIDA 32746

**cingular WIRELESS**

| NO. | DATE    | REVISIONS         | BY | CHK | APP'D |
|-----|---------|-------------------|----|-----|-------|
| 0   | 3/26/04 | ISSUED FOR ZONING | MD | DK  | DK    |
| 1   | 5/25/04 | ISSUED FOR REVIEW | MD | DK  | DK    |

SCALE: AS SHOWN DESIGNED: DARRYL RHOZE DRAWN: W. BURNS

**CINGULAR WIRELESS**

COAX COLOR CODING & IDENTIFICATION DETAIL

BECHTEL JOB NO. 24782-350 DRAWING NUMBER NFB-WEST HEATHROW-06


DATE: 05/27/04

|                 |                          |                 |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| SCALE: AS SHOWN | DESIGNED: DANIEL KROEGER | DRAWN: M. BURNS |
| NO. DATE        | REVISIONS                | BY CHK APP'D    |
| 0 3/26/04       | ISSUED FOR ZONING        | MB DR DR        |
| 1 5/25/04       | ISSUED FOR REVIEW        | MB DR DR        |
| 2 7/22/04       | ISSUED FOR ZONING        | MB DR DR        |


FOUNDATION LAYOUT  
 CINGULAR WIRELESS

24782-350  
 NFB-WEST HEATHROW-07


**E811-GPS ANTENNA PIPE MOUNT**  
 NOT TO SCALE




**METER AND DISCONNECT MOUNTING RACK**  
 NOT TO SCALE




**PLAN VIEW**



**CONCRETE EQUIPMENT PAD SLAB ON GRADE**  
 NOT TO SCALE




**GPS CABLE DETAIL**  
 NOT TO SCALE




**BILL OF MATERIALS**

| ITEM NUMBER | STOCK CODE | DESCRIPTION | QUANTITY |
|-------------|------------|-------------|----------|
| 1           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 2           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 3           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 4           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 5           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 6           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 7           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 8           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 9           | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 10          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 11          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 12          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 13          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 14          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 15          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 16          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 17          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 18          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 19          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 20          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 21          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 22          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 23          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 24          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 25          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 26          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 27          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 28          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 29          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 30          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 31          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 32          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 33          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 34          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 35          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 36          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 37          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 38          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 39          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 40          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 41          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 42          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 43          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 44          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 45          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 46          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 47          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 48          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 49          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |
| 50          | 1/2" COAX  | 150 IN      | 1        |


**CABINET ATTACHMENT**  
 NOT TO SCALE



**EQUIPMENT LAYOUT**  
 NOT TO SCALE




**Bob Chopra / Wireless Facilities  
Cingular Wireless, LLC  
5210 Markham Woods Road**



Parcel: 02-20-29-300-030B-0000 / District: 5

**BV2004-108 and BS2004-019  
August, 2004**





wp.fowler@att.net  
07/12/2004 09:45 AM

To emcdonald@co.seminole.fl.us,  
ssherman@seminolecountyfl.gov  
cc dmerkt@seminolecountyfl.gov  
bcc  
Subject 150ft celltower on Markham Woods Road

I would like to add a few comments for your consideration regarding the pre-application meeting I attended a couple of weeks ago regarding the 150 ft. Cingular celltower at the Presbyterian church on Markham Woods Road. I'll list them :

- during the meeting several reasons were cited for the prior failed attempts by Cingular and the church before the BOA and the county commissioners. One that was not mentioned was the breaking of variances. A couple of BOA members and even more county commissioners pointed at this in their questioning and obviously felt uncomfortable with the close proximity of this tower to residences. I hope those concerns will come into play regarding your recommendation because this has been proven to be a huge point of concern.

- Cingular is suppose to exhaust their search for nearby locations that do not break variances. The church about 0.2 miles to the north has not heard from Cingular. They have 20+ acres of land, taller trees on the north side of the property, is willing to talk to Cingular regarding a tower, and the vast majority of their site will NOT break any variances if a tower is placed there.

- During the commissioner meeting a couple of residents brought up the fact that Cingular has bought AT&T Wireless and there is a big AT&T cell currently on the west side of International Parkway. Cingular never answered what they are going to do with those new celltowers. I would think reuse of towers would be a very high priority.

- Part of their presentation before the commissioners was a slide showing their current celltowers in the Heathrow/Lake Mary/Sanford area. I did not see this as part of their submitted documentation, maybe I missed it. Anyway, this slide looked more convincing for their NOT to be a need because of the proximity of their towers. I hope you'll get this slide and look at the proximity of the current towers. It looks very sufficient to me.

- Please keep in mind that the Cingular proposal is for two collocation locations on this celltower. Since this will be the largest tower in the area by far I'm sure they'll have no problem leasing that space to other companies. Remember that roaming revenues can be huge for collocation leasing. Rather than improving their own network I'm sure this opportunity for roaming revenue is a big part of their reasoning for the tower at this location.

- the King residential development is proposed against the north property line of the Prebyterian church. I understand it is not part of your consideration at this time but if the celltower goes in as well as this King residential community you'll have about a 330ft wide parcel of property with a 150ft cellsite stuck between residences on the north and south side of the property. Do you think

this is wise to allow? Also keep in mind that the new proposed location of the celltower is much closer to Markham Woods Road. That will look even worse.

- if they come back with a proposal for a flagpole that would go against what they have already stated in the earlier meetings. They said they'd need an external antenna structure, unlike other cell companies. If they come back with a shorter monopine why not collocate at a tower to the north?

---

Any of these concerns is grounds to not recommend this proposal but I would think that the multitude of reasons stated by citizens in close proximity to this proposal is sufficient reason to not give this your endorsement.

There are many people quite upset over this so please let me know when county staff has made a decision so I can let everyone know.

I thank you for your time and God Bless.

paul fowler & family  
3524 acre ct



**Diane Merkt/Seminole**  
07/16/2004 11:50 AM

To Earnest McDonald/Seminole@Seminole  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Fw: Seminole County Communication Tower Plan

Diane Merkt, Executive Assistant  
Commissioner Daryl G. McLain  
Chairman and District 5  
Seminole County Board of Commissioners  
407-665-7209 ph  
407-665-7958 fax

----- Forwarded by Diane Merkt/Seminole on 07/16/2004 11:55 AM -----



**"Quentin R. Beitel"**  
<qbobbe4@att.net>  
07/16/2004 10:18 AM

To <kgrace@co.seminole.fl.us>,  
<dmclain@seminolecountyfl.gov>, "Dick Van Der Weide"  
<lstabler@co.seminole.fl.us>, "Brenda Carey"  
<bkcarey@cfl.rr.com>, <win2004@bellsouth.net>  
cc  
Subject Seminole County Communication Tower Plan

Seminole County needs a plan to deal with Communications Towers. In individual face to face discussions we have the Markham Woods Association has identified this need. Those of use on Markham Woods Road are again faced with the request by Cingular to erect a Cell Tower. We do not want nor is there a need for this cell tower. Enclosed for your review are some concerns from the Cingular Pre-Application Hearing. This information was emailed to E. McDonald, Planning Department.

Quentin (Bob) Beitel  
President  
Markham Woods Association  
407-333-1436

-----Original Message-----

We would like to add a few comments for your consideration regarding the pre-application meeting we attended a couple of weeks ago regarding the 150 ft. Cingular celltower at the Presbyterian church on Markham Woods Road. They are:

- during the meeting several reasons were cited for the prior failed attempts by Cingular and the church before the BOA and the county commissioners. One that was not mentioned was the breaking of variances. A couple of BOA members and even more county commissioners pointed at this in their questioning and obviously felt uncomfortable with the close proximity of this tower to residences. We hope those concerns will come into play regarding your recommendation because this has been proven to be a huge point of concern.

- Cingular is suppose to exhaust their search for nearby locations that do not break variances. The church about 0.2 miles to the north has not heard from Cingular. They have 20+ acres of land, taller trees on the north side of the property, is willing to talk to Cingular regarding a tower, and the vast majority of their site will NOT break any variances if a tower is placed there.

- During the commissioner meeting a couple of residents brought up the fact that Cingular has bought AT&T Wireless and there is a big AT&T cell currently on the west side of International Parkway. Cingular never answered what they are going to do with those new celltowers. We would think reuse of towers would be a very high priority.

- Part of their presentation before the commissioners was a slide showing their current celltowers in the Heathrow/Lake Mary/Sanford area. We did not see this as part of their submitted documentation, maybe wemissed it. Anyway, this slide looked more convincing for their NOT to be a need because of the proximity of their towers. We hope you'll get this slide and look at the proximity of the current towers. It looks very sufficient to me.

- Please keep in mind that the Cingular proposal is for two collocation locations on this celltower. Since this will be the largest tower in the area by far I'm sure they'll have no problem leasing that space to other companies. Remember that roaming revenues can be huge for collocation leasing. Rather than improving their own network we're sure this opportunity for roaming revenue is a big part of their reasoning for the tower at this location.

- the King residential development is proposed against the north property line of the Prebyterian church. We understand it is not part of your consideration at this time but if the celltower goes in as well as this King residential community you'll have about a 330ft wide parcel of property with a 150ft cellsite stuck between residences on the north and south side of the property. Do you think this is wise to allow? Also keep in mind that the new proposed location of the celltower is much closer to Markham Woods Road. That will look even worse.

- if they come back with a proposal for a flagpole that would go against what they have already stated in the earlier meetings. They said they'd need an external antenna structure, unlike other cell companies. If they come back with a shorter monopine why not collocate at a tower to the north?

Any of these concerns is grounds to not recommend this proposal but we would think that the multitude of reasons stated by citizens in close proximity to this proposal is sufficient reason to not give this your endorsement.

There are many people quite upset over this so please let me know when county staff has made a decision so we can let everyone know.



DebbieYero@aol.com  
07/26/2004 05:50 PM

To plandesk@seminolecountyfl.gov  
cc  
bcc  
Subject 5210 Markham Woods Road

**COPY**

I would like to express my opposition to the installment of the cellular tower behind the Presbyterian church on Markham Woods Rd. I feel that to build such an obtrusive and commercial structure in the middle of a completely residential area is unnecessary and should be avoided at all costs. Living very close by, such a structure would directly affect me, and I am sure that the many others living in the surrounding area feel the same way. I hope that you will take into consideration the feelings of those who live here now and will most likely still be living here years from now. Thankyou.

Debbie Yero  
3431 Dawn Court  
Lake Mary, FL 32746



"Steven Smith "  
<ssmith412@cfl.rr.com>  
07/26/2004 02:14 PM

To <plandesk@seminolecountyfl.gov>

cc <paul.fowler@convergys.com>

bcc

Subject against proposed cell phone tower @ 5210 markham woods rd.

**COPY**

To whom it may concern:

I spoke at the last meeting on this cell phone tower issue and am unable to attend tonight because of a sick child ;however, my husband and I live at 3700 Wimbledon Drive in Shannon Downs subdivision and we would be directly affected by this tower. We specifically chose to buy our house in this area because it was solely residential. This tower is too tall and an eyesore even as a cross or tree and will drop our property values. It will be seen from our backyard and my daughter will be forced to play underneath high frequency radiation 24 hours a day!

Cell phone towers belong in commercial areas where no one is living underneath it's exposure 24 hours a day. I know the board is not allowed to consider health affects of high frequency radiation but as I mentioned at the last meeting we don't always know the health risks of certain items in our environment early on. For instance my grandparents showed me ads from the 1920's were cigarette smoking was actually billed as good for you and we all know what happened with that.

As at the last Seminole county meeting on 2/24/04 the proposed cell phone tower should be defeated again. They do not belong so close to our hard earned and worked for houses.

Thank you,

Dr. and Mrs.. Steven J. and Chris A. Smith

**COPY**



Fayeglovermk@aol .com  
07/26/2004 01:22 PM

To plandesk@seminolecountyfl.gov.

cc

bcc

Subject Cellular Site Proposal

I am not in favor of this cellular site proposal on 5210 Markhamwoods Rd. Based on the company using the cross that my Jesus shade his blood for our sins as a cover up. ABSOLUTELY NOT!!!!!!

---

Sincerely Yours,  
Faye Glover  
5348 Carter Rd  
Lake Mary, FL 32746