Petitioner: Milestone Tower Limited Partnership IV

Request: To rezone approximately 9.55 acres from R-1, Low Density Residential District to AR, Agricultural/Residential District, and to obtain a special use permit for a broadcasting tower (cell tower) approximately 137 feet in height

Location: Stonebridge Park, 420 Swan Drive

Magisterial District: Vinton

Proffered Conditions: None

Suggested Conditions: 1. The site shall be developed in substantial conformance with the conceptual site plan prepared by Entrex Communication Services, Inc. and dated September 8, 2020, subject to any changes required during the site plan review process.

2. Only one broadcast tower shall be constructed on site. The maximum height of the broadcasting tower shall not exceed 137 feet in height. The broadcast tower shall be galvanized or gray in color.

3. A row of large evergreen trees shall be planted along the outside of the fenced compound to screen it from public view. If any trees are cut down or removed during construction of the broadcast tower the applicant shall replant the same number of trees in the park at locations approved by County staff. The planting of new trees shall be warranted for 12 months.

4. The broadcast tower shall not impact nor create any barriers to recreational amenities (trails, parking, playgrounds, athletic fields, etc.). Construction of the broadcast tower shall not alter the flow of stormwater in the park to impede any recreational amenity.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Milestone Tower Limited Partnership IV is requesting two actions: 1) to rezone the 9.55 acre Stonebridge Park (owned by Roanoke County) from R-1, Low Density Residential District to AR, Agricultural/Residential District, and 2) to obtain a Special Use Permit for the construction of a 137’ monopole broadcasting tower (cell tower) in Stonebridge Park.

The subject parcel is designated Neighborhood Conservation on the future land use map of the Roanoke County Comprehensive Plan. The parcel’s existing use is a public park with passive and active recreational spaces and infrastructure. Neighborhood Conservation is a future land use area where established single-family neighborhoods are delineated and the conservation of the existing development pattern is encouraged. Appropriate land use types in Neighborhood Conservation include single-family residential, neighborhood institutional centers (including recreational and park facilities) and neighborhood commercial.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS
The Roanoke County Zoning Ordinance defines a broadcasting tower as “any structure that is designed and constructed primarily for the purpose of supporting one (1) or more antennas. The term includes but need not be limited to radio and television transmission towers, microwave towers, common-carrier towers, and cellular telephone and wireless communication towers. Broadcasting tower types include, but are not limited to monopoles, lattice towers, wooden poles, and guyed towers. Excluded from this definition are amateur radio towers, which are described separately.”

A broadcasting tower is not a permitted use in the R-1 zoning district; however, it is allowed in the AR zoning district with a Special Use Permit. Section 30-87-2 (attached) of the Roanoke County Zoning Ordinance provides use and design standards for broadcasting towers. If approved, development of the site would require comprehensive site plan review and building permit review.

ANALYSIS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

Topography/Vegetation/Public Amenities – The proposed project sits within Stonebridge Park, a Roanoke County park along the Wolf Creek Greenway. Stonebridge is a neighborhood park of 9.55 acres with rolling topography. The park includes tennis courts, parking lot, basketball court, baseball field, picnic shelter, playground, wooded and open space areas and a greenway connection. Wolf Creek and the Wolf Creek Greenway run through the park. The application proposes to demolish the existing restroom building and construct the tower in its location.

Surrounding Neighborhood – The park is surrounded by single-family neighborhoods to the east, west and south, Wolf Creek Greenway to the west, and the campuses of William Byrd Middle and High Schools to the west and south. The Wolf Creek Greenway and Wolf Creek traverse the northwest section of the park property. The proposed tower location is 0.4 mile from the Blue Ridge Parkway. The surrounding properties are all zoned R-1, Low Density Residential.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Site Layout/Architecture – The submitted application proposes demolishing the existing park restrooms (which currently are not in use), and shows the construction of a 135’ gray steel monopole broadcasting tower with a 2’ lightening rod, totaling 137” in height surrounded by a fenced compound. The compound plan shows that the base of the pole would be surrounded by an 8-foot tall galvanized chain link fence and various equipment. The proposed compound area would be approximately 4 times the size of the existing restrooms. The compound area is approximately 1,935 square feet. The foundation of the existing restroom is approximately 480 square feet. The proposed tower compound is approximately 100 feet from the picnic shelter, 140 feet from the tennis courts, 200 feet from the playground, and 160 feet from home plate at the baseball field.

Access/Traffic Circulation – One vehicular access is shown on the proposed conditions plan extending from the existing entrance road to Stonebridge Park to the tower compound.

Atlantic Technology Consultants, Inc. – Technical Review – George Condyles, Roanoke County’s wireless communications consultant with Atlantic Technology Consultants, Inc., has reviewed the submitted request and has submitted a technical report, which is attached. Mr. Condyles recommends approval of this application.

Agency Comments – The following comments were provided by the various agencies on this request:

National Park Service - Blue Ridge Parkway:
Due to the tower’s proximity to the parkway boundary which varies between 0.4 and over a mile a balloon test is suggested with the potential outcome to be a stealth tower or a tower that is lower and less visible.
The tower as proposed has the potential to be an adverse effect to the viewshed of the Blue Ridge Parkway (comments and map attached).

**Parks, Recreation and Tourism:**
1. Parks, Recreation and Tourism requests that the finish of the broadcast tower be galvanized or gray in color. The proposal appears to show the tower painted white.
2. The proposed plan shows fencing around the base of the tower. Parks, Recreation and Tourism requests landscaping around the fence to screen the fencing from the public. The landscaping needs to be maintained by the tower owner.
3. Parks, Recreation and Tourism requests that the proposed tower have no impact and create no barriers to recreational amenities in Stonebridge Park such as trails, parking, playground, athletic fields, etc.
4. Parks, Recreation and Tourism requests that if any trees are cut and or removed for the construction of the tower that Milestone replant the same number of new trees in the park and warranty the trees for 12 months. The location of the new trees will be approved by Roanoke County.
5. The proposed site plan for the broadcast tower should not alter the flow of stormwater in the park to impede any recreational amenity.
6. Another alternative location for consideration in Stonebridge Park is in the northeast corner of the park. This would screen the tower within the park from users and adjacent land owners. The tree buffer would also aid in screening the tower from the general public.

**Communications & Information Technology (CommIT):** No issues for CommIT and or public safety are foreseen, however, we ask that Roanoke County be allocated a spot above tree line to locate an antenna or equipment if needed in the agreement, if approved.

**Building Safety:** The Office of Building Safety stated that all construction would need to meet the requirements of the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code adopted at time of construction.

**Fire & Rescue:** The proposed project will not increase the services provided by Fire and Rescue.

**Economic Development:** Economic Development offers no objection.

**Stormwater Operations:** No impacts to the Floodplain or additional requirements for development.

**Solid Waste:** No impact on solid waste.

**Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT):** The use of this property for a communications tower site will not adversely impact the VDOT right of way. Any future expansions or redevelopment of the parcel or alteration to the existing drive may require VDOT review, approval, and permitting.

**Bedford County Community Development:** No concerns regarding this request.

**Town of Vinton:** The Town of Vinton has one of its wells (Stonebridge Well) on a contiguous lot at the back of the William Byrd track/football field. There are various Vinton utility lines running through Stonebridge Park. The Town would be part of the development review process should the project be approved and moved to construction.

**CONFORMANCE WITH ROANOKE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**
Roanoke County’s Comprehensive Plan indicates that the Future Land Use Designation of the subject parcel is Neighborhood Conservation. Neighborhood Conservation is a future land use area where established single-family neighborhoods are delineated and the conservation of the existing development pattern is encouraged. Land use types in this designation include single-family residential, neighborhood institutional centers (including recreational and park facilities) and neighborhood commercial. The current R-1 (Low Density Residential) zoning is consistent with the current future land use designation of Neighborhood Conservation. While a rezoning to AR (Agricultural/Residential) would generally be considered inconsistent with the Neighborhood Conservation future land use designation, the development of the property will remain a park with the addition of the broadcasting tower. As mentioned above, recreational and park facilities are use types appropriate for Neighborhood Conservation.

The Roanoke County Comprehensive Plan also provides the following guidance for broadcast towers:

- Discourage the placement of broadcast towers along scenic roads or in scenic viewsheds.
- Implement regional cellular tower policies to protect the region’s viewsheds and mountaintops.
- Prohibit the use of ridgelines as locations for communications and transmission towers.
- Encourage the siting of communication antennae and dishes on existing or new structures rather than on stand-alone towers.

COMMUNITY MEETING

Due to the state of emergency during the COVID-19 pandemic, Roanoke County did not host a neighborhood meeting on this application. The County mailed out 280 property owner notification letters regarding the application and the public hearing dates. However, Milestone Communications hosted a virtual (on the internet only) "Stonebridge Park Town Hall Meeting" using Zoom technology on October 21, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. Staff attended the meeting and took notes (attached). A slide presentation was provided by the applicant. The meeting did allow for questions and comments. Questions and comments included: how the tower use will devalue their real property; why is the entire park is being rezoned and suspect that the broadcast tower use will grow and eventually remove the park uses altogether; the zoning ordinance is supposed to protect citizens and property owners, and asked for a guarantee that the property will never be rezoned again; negative impacts to the Wolf Creek Greenway and to Wolf Creek, both during and after construction; the proposed tower provides no benefit to them; they are against the rezoning and special use permit; why did the School Board refuse to allow the tower on school property, and confusion about why Stonebridge Park is a better location; how busy and beloved the park is, and concerns that this use will destroy the park; potential health issues caused by the technology on the tower; monetary benefits to the County; and concerns about the height and appearance of the tower.

STAFF CONCLUSIONS

Milestone Tower Limited Partnership IV is requesting to rezone 9.55 acres from R-1, Low Density Residential District to AR, Agricultural/Residential District, and to obtain a Special Use Permit for a 137’ monopole tower in a public park. The submitted concept plan shows the demolition of an existing 480 square foot public restroom building within the park, and the construction of a monopole communications tower and 1,935 square foot fenced compound in the same location. The County’s wireless telecommunications consultant, Atlantic Technology Consultants, has recommended approval of this request. If the Planning Commission recommends approval, staff suggests four conditions associated with this request.
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Check type of application filed (check all that apply)
- ☐ Rezoning ☐ Special Use ☐ Variance ☐ Waiver ☐ Administrative Appeal ☐ Comp Plan (15.2-2232) Review

Applicants name/address w/zip

Milestone Tower Ltd Ptsa IV

Owner’s name/address w/zip

Roanoke Co Board of Super

Property Location

420 Swan Drive, Vinton

Magisterial District: Vinton

Community Planning area:

Tax Map No.: 061-02-01-51.00-0000

Existing Zoning: R-1

Size of parcel(s): Acres: 9.55 AC

Existing Land Use: Park

REZONING, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, WAIVER AND COMP PLAN (15.2-2232) REVIEW APPLICANTS (R/S/W/CP)

Proposed Zoning: AR
Proposed Land Use: Broadcast Tower

Does the parcel meet the minimum lot area, width, and frontage requirements of the requested district?
Yes ☐ No ☐ IF NO, A VARIANCE IS REQUIRED FIRST (Rezoning).

Does the parcel meet the minimum criteria for the requested Use Type in Article IV (Special Use Permit)? Yes ☐ No ☐ IF NO, A VARIANCE IS REQUIRED FIRST

If rezoning request, are conditions being proffered with this request? Yes ☐ No ☐

VARIANCE, WAIVER AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL APPLICANTS (V/W/AA)

Variance/Waiver of Section(s) ________________ of the Roanoke County Zoning Ordinance in order to:

Appeal of Zoning Administrator’s decision to ____________________________.

Appeal of Interpretation of Section(s): ____________________________ of the Roanoke County Zoning Ordinance

Appeal of Interpretation of Zoning Map to ____________________.

Is the application complete? Please check if enclosed. APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED IF ANY OF THESE ITEMS ARE MISSING OR INCOMPLETE.

R/S/W/CP V/AA

☐ Consultation
☐ Application
☐ Application

8 1/2" x 11" concept plan
Meteors and bounds description
Water and sewer application

Application fee
Proffer, if applicable
Adjoining property owners

I hereby certify that I am either the owner of the property or the owner’s agent or contract purchaser and am acting with the knowledge and consent of the owner.

Phil Steller

Owner’s Signature
Applicant: Milestone Communications

The Planning Commission will study rezoning, special use permit waiver or community plan (15.2-2232) review requests to determine the need and justification for the change in terms of public health, safety, and general welfare. Please answer the following questions as thoroughly as possible. Use additional space if necessary.

Please explain how the request furthers the purposes of the Roanoke County Ordinance as well as the purpose found at the beginning of the applicable zoning district classification in the Zoning Ordinance.

See separate page

Please explain how the project conforms to the general guidelines and policies contained in the Roanoke County Community Plan.

See separate page

Please describe the impact(s) of the request on the property itself, the adjoining properties, and the surrounding area, as well as the impacts on public services and facilities, including water/sewer, roads, schools, parks/recreation and fire and rescue.

see separate page
JUSTIFICATION FOR VARIANCE REQUEST

Applicant ________________________________

The of Zoning Appeals is required by Section 15.2-2309 of the Code of Virginia to consider the following factors before a variance can be granted. Please read the factors listed below carefully and in your own words, describe how the request meets each factor. If additional space is needed, use additional sheets of paper.

1. The variance shall not be contrary to the public interest and shall be in harmony with the intended spirit and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.

2. The variance will not be of a substantial detriment to the adjacent properties or the character of the district.

3. Evidence supporting claim:
JUSTIFICATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL REQUEST

Applicant ____________________________

Please respond to the following as thoroughly as possible. If additional space is needed, use additional sheets of paper.

1. Reasons for appeal:

2. Evidence supporting claim:
A concept plan of the proposed project must be submitted with the application. The concept plan shall graphically depict the land use change, development or variance that is to be considered. Further, the plan shall address any potential land use or design issues arising from the request. In such cases involving rezonings, the applicant may proffer conditions to limit the future use and development of the property and by so doing, correct any deficiencies that may not be manageable by County permitting regulations.

The concept plan should not be confused with the site plan or plot plan that is required prior to the issuance of a building permit. Site plan and building permit procedures ensure compliance with State and County development regulations and may require changes to the initial concept plan. Unless limiting conditions are proffered and accepted in a rezoning or imposed on a special use permit or variance, the concept plan may be altered to the extent permitted by the zoning district and other regulations.

A concept plan is required with all rezoning, special use permit, waiver, community plan (15.2-2232) review and variance applications. The plan should be prepared by a professional site planner. The level of detail may vary, depending on the nature of the request. The County Planning Division staff may exempt some of the items or suggest the addition of extra items, but the following are considered minimum:

**ALL APPLICANTS**

- **a.** Applicant name and name of development
- **b.** Date, scale and north arrow
- **c.** Lot size in acres or square feet and dimensions
- **d.** Location, names of owners and Roanoke County tax map numbers of adjoining properties
- **e.** Physical features such as ground cover, natural watercourses, floodplain, etc.
- **f.** The zoning and land use of all adjacent properties
- **g.** All property lines and easements
- **h.** All buildings, existing and proposed, and dimensions, floor area and heights
- **i.** Location, widths and names of all existing or platted streets or other public ways within or adjacent to the development
- **j.** Dimensions and locations of all driveways, parking spaces and loading spaces

*Additional information required for REZONING and SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICANTS*

- **k.** Existing utilities (water, sewer, storm drains) and connections at the site
- **l.** Any driveways, entrances/exits, curb openings and crossovers
- **m.** Topography map in a suitable scale and contour intervals
- **n.** Approximate street grades and site distances at intersections
- **o.** Locations of all adjacent fire hydrants
- **p.** Any proffered conditions at the site and how they are addressed
- **q.** If project is to be phased, please show phase schedule

I certify that all items required in the checklist above are complete.

**Phil Stetler**

**9/8/20**
POTENTIAL OF NEED FOR TRAFFIC ANALYSIS AND/OR TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

The following is a list of potentially high traffic-generating land uses and road network situations that could elicit a more detailed analysis of the existing and proposed traffic pertinent to your rezoning, subdivision waiver, public street waiver, or special use permit request. If your request involves one of the items on the ensuing list, we recommend that you meet with a County planner, the County traffic engineer, and/or Virginia Department of Transportation staff to discuss the potential additional traffic related information that may need to be submitted with the application in order to expedite your application process. *(Note this list is not inclusive and the County staff and VDOT reserve the right to request a traffic study at any time, as deemed necessary.)*

High Traffic-Generating Land Uses:
- Single-family residential subdivisions, Multi-family residential units, or Apartments with more than 75 dwelling units
- Restaurant (with or without drive-through windows)
- Gas station/Convenience store/Car wash
- Retail shop/Shopping center
- Offices (including: financial institutions, general, medical, etc.)
- Regional public facilities
- Educational/Recreational facilities
- Religious assemblies
- Hotel/Motel
- Golf course
- Hospital/Nursing home/Clinic
- Industrial site/Factory
- Day care center
- Bank
- Non-specific use requests

Road Network Situations:
- Development adjacent to/with access onto/within 500-ft of intersection of a roadway classified as an arterial road (e.g., Rte 11, 24, 115, 117, 460, 11/460, 220, 221, 419, etc)
- For new phases or changes to a development where a previously submitted traffic study is more than two (2) years old and/or roadway conditions have changed significantly
- When required to evaluate access issues
- Development with ingress/egress on roads planned or scheduled for expansion, widening, improvements, etc. (i.e. on Long Range Transportation Plan, Six-Yr Road Plan, etc.)
- Development in an area where there is a known existing traffic and/or safety problem
- Development would potentially negatively impact existing/planned traffic signal(s)
- Substantial departure from the Community Plan
- Any site that is expected to generate over one hundred (100) trips during the peak hour of the traffic generator or the peak hour on the adjacent streets, or over seven hundred fifty (750) trips in an average day

*Effective date: April 19, 2005*
NOTICE TO APPLICANTS FOR REZONING, SUBDIVISION WAIVER, PUBLIC STREET WAIVER, OR SPECIAL USE PERMIT PETITION

PLANNING COMMISSION APPLICATION ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE

The Roanoke County Planning Commission reserves the right to continue a Rezoning, Subdivision Waiver, Public Street Waiver or Special Use Permit petition if new or additional information is presented at the public hearing. If it is the opinion of the majority of the Planning Commissioners present at the scheduled public hearing that sufficient time was not available for planning staff and/or an outside referral agency to adequately evaluate and provide written comments and suggestions on the new or additional information prior to the scheduled public hearing then the Planning Commission may vote to continue the petition. This continuance shall allow sufficient time for all necessary reviewing parties to evaluate the new or additional information and provide written comments and suggestions to be included in a written memorandum by planning staff to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission shall consult with planning staff to determine if a continuance may be warranted.

POTENTIAL OF NEED FOR TRAFFIC ANALYSES AND/OR TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

The Roanoke County Planning Commission reserves the right to continue a Rezoning, Subdivision Waiver, Public Street Waiver, or Special Use Permit petition if the County Traffic Engineer or staff from the Virginia Department of Transportation requests further traffic analyses and/or a traffic impact study that would be beneficial in making a land use decision (Note: a list of potential land uses and situations that would necessitate further study is provided as part of this application package). This continuance shall allow sufficient time for all necessary reviewing parties to evaluate the required traffic analyses and/or traffic impact study and to provide written comments and/or suggestions to the planning staff and the Planning Commission. If a continuance is warranted, the applicant will be notified of the continuance and the newly scheduled public hearing date.

Effective date: April 19, 2005

Milestone Stonebridge Park

Name of Petition
Phil Stetler

Digitally signed by Phil Stetler
Date: 2020.05.08 14:52:08 -04'00'

Petitioner's Signature
9/8/20

Date
Statement of Justification for Rezoning and Special Use Permit Requests for Proposed 135’
Monopole
at 420 Swan Drive, Vinton, VA 24179

Milestone Tower Limited Partnership IV, the Petitioner (Milestone), seeks to install a
135’ tall monopole on the property of the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, located at 420
Swan Drive, Vinton, VA 24179 (the Property). The Property parcel contains approximately 9.55
acres and is located in the R-1 Low Density Residential District. Milestone seeks (1) approval of
a rezoning request to rezone the Property to AR Agricultural / Residential District, and (2) a
Special Use Permit approval for Broadcasting Tower, which is a use permitted by special use
permit in the AR District pursuant to Section 30-34-2(B)(5) of the Roanoke County Zoning
Ordinance (the “Ordinance”).

As outlined below, the proposed monopole complies with the Ordinance, specifically
Sections 30-19-1 (Special Use Permit Standards) and 30-87-2 (Broadcasting Towers).

I. Exhibits Included
   Exhibit A: Rezoning/Special Use Permit Application
   Exhibit B: Broadcast Tower Checklist
   Exhibit C: Zoning Drawings including Site Plan
   Exhibit D: Viewshed Analysis
   Exhibit E: List of Alternative Sites Considered
   Exhibit F: Propagation Maps
   Exhibit G: Photo Simulations
   Exhibit H: List of adjoining property owners (found on sheet Z-2 of Zoning Drawings)

II. Summary

A. Background: The Need for the Monopole

Milestone provides the ability for wireless service providers to enhance and upgrade
service in addition to meeting coverage and propagation objectives. In this case, the Vinton area
was noted as having a deficiency of both coverage and capacity by Shenandoah Personal
Communications, LLC (Shentel).

B. Milestone’s Request for a Special Use Permit

The subject property is zoned R-1 (Low Density Residential). Broadcasting Towers are
not permitted in the R-1 District. The Applicant requests an approval to rezone to AR
Agricultural/Residential District. Pursuant to Section 30-34-(B)(5) of the Zoning Ordinance,
Broadcasting Towers are permitted by special use permit subject to the additional standards set
out in Section 30-87-2. Below, please find a detailed statement of justification and code
compliance, all of which is supported by documents attached as exhibits (and listed above) and
will be confirmed at an upcoming public hearing. Milestone’s compliance narratives and responses are in **bold** and *italics*.

III. **General Standards for Special Use Approval**

Sec. 30-19-1. - General Standards.

(A) The administrator shall not accept a special use permit application for a lot or parcel that does not comply with the minimum requirements contained in article IV, use and design standards, for that use. In such situations, the applicant shall first seek a variance from the board of zoning appeals. If a variance is granted, the administrator shall thereafter accept the special use permit application for the consideration of the commission and board. *Milestone submits that the subject parcel complies with the minimum requirements.*

(B) No special use permit shall be issued except upon a finding of the board that in addition to conformity with any standards set forth in article IV, use and design standards, the proposed special use conforms with the following general standards. These standards shall be met either by the proposal made in the original special use permit application, or by the proposal as modified or amended as part of the review of the application by the commission and the board:

1. The proposal as submitted or modified shall conform to the comprehensive plan of the county, or to specific elements of the plan, and to official county policies adopted in relation thereto, including the purposes of the zoning ordinance. *Milestone submits that the proposed substantially conforms to the County Comprehensive Plan. Please see discussion below.*

2. The proposal as submitted or modified shall have a minimum adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood or community. Adverse impact shall be evaluated with consideration to items such as, but not limited to, traffic congestion, noise, lights, dust, drainage, water quality, air quality, odor, fumes and vibrations. In considering impacts, due regard shall be given to the timing of the operation, site design, access, screening, or other matters which might be regulated to mitigate adverse impact. *Milestone submits that the proposed monopole will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding community and will in fact serve to enhance community services. Following installation, traffic to the site would be limited to a technician visit approximately once per month. No traffic congestion, noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, or vibrations will be produced by the project. The applicant will comply with all County ordinance requirements regarding ground disturbance, access, and screening.*

IV. **General Standards for Broadcasting Tower Special Use Approval**

Section 30-87-2. Broadcasting Tower.

(D) General standards:
1. The maximum height of any proposed broadcasting tower and associated antenna shall be made as a condition of the special use permit, but in no case shall any broadcasting tower and antenna exceed one hundred ninety-nine (199) feet in height. Applicants shall request the lowest broadcasting tower and antenna height necessary to accomplish their specific communication objectives. *Milestone is in compliance with this standard and indeed falls far short of the maximum allowable height. Milestone proposes a monopole of 135’ with 2’ lightning rod, for total height of 137’, which is the lowest tower height necessary in order to meet propagation objectives.*

2. The setback for any proposed broadcasting tower shall, at a minimum, conform to the requirements for principal structures for the proposed zoning district. However, in no case shall the minimum setback from the base of the broadcasting tower to any residential structure on an adjoining lot be less than forty (40) percent of the height of the tower, measured from the closest structural member of the broadcasting tower (excluding guy lines). Guy lines shall be exempt from the minimum setback requirements in side and rear yards for the respective zoning district, but shall comply with the setback requirements for the front yard. *Milestone submits that the proposed monopole meets all setback requirements. As shown on Sheet Z-1A of the Zoning Drawings, the closest dwelling to the location of the proposed monopole is 430’ to the southeast.*

3. The minimum setback from any property line abutting a road right-of-way for any other building or structure associated with a broadcasting tower shall be fifty (50) feet. Such buildings or structures shall be located a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet from any other property line. *Milestone submits that the proposed monopole meets all setback requirements. As shown on Sheet Z-1 of the Zoning Drawings, the fenced compound is 170.6’ from the western boundary line of the subject property and further distances to the boundary line in other directions (378.6’ to the northwest, 410.9’ to the northeast, and 306.1’ to the southeast).*

4. More than one (1) broadcasting tower shall be permitted on a lot provided all applicable requirements have been met including setback requirements. *Milestone is only proposing (1) broadcast tower at this location.*

5. Broadcasting towers shall not be illuminated with any type of lighting apparatus, unless such lighting is a requirement of the FAA or FCC. When lighting is proposed to conform to federal requirement, the county shall contact the federal agency to verify the necessity of lighting, and to determine the minimal amount and type of lighting necessary to comply with federal guidelines. Security lighting, or a "down lighting" design may be installed on buildings and structures associated with a broadcasting tower. In no case shall any lighting violate section 30-94 of this ordinance. *Milestone will not illuminate the monopole with any type of lighting apparatus.*

6. Any proposed broadcasting tower within two (2) miles from any general or commercial airport or located at a ground elevation at or above two thousand (2,000) feet, average mean sea level, shall be referred to the appropriate regional office of the FAA for review and comment prior to filing an application for a special use permit. *The proposed monopole is not within two (2) miles of any general or commercial airport and is situated below 2000’ MSL.*
7. All broadcasting towers shall comply with any additional requirements established in the airport overlay district in section 30-72 of this ordinance, and the emergency communications overlay district in section 30-73. Not applicable.

8. Any broadcasting tower approved shall be structurally designed to carry sufficient loading, and the site approved shall be sized to accommodate the additional equipment necessary for at least three (3) other vendors/providers of communications services in order to minimize the proliferation of new broadcasting towers in the vicinity of the requested site. In addition, by applying and being granted the special use permit, the applicant and the owner of the land agree to make the broadcasting tower and tower site available for additional leases within the structural capacity of the broadcasting tower and at reasonable costs adequate to recover the capital, operating and maintenance costs of the broadcasting tower location required for the additional capacity. Milestone submits that the proposed monopole is designed to be structurally sufficient to support a total of four (4) carriers/co-locators.

9. A monopole broadcasting tower design is recommended. The board may approve an alternative broadcasting tower design if it finds that an alternative type of structure has less of a visual impact on the surrounding community and Roanoke County, and/or based upon accepted technical and engineering data a monopole design is not technically feasible. Cost shall not be a criteria for determining broadcasting tower design. Milestone proposes a monopole broadcasting tower design.

10. No broadcasting towers shall be permitted within the critical viewsheds of the Blue Ridge Parkway or Appalachian Trail as shown on any official map designating these viewsheds and pre-approved by the board of supervisors. In addition, no towers shall be proposed within any other designated area of local scenic, historical, ecological and cultural importance as designated and approved by the board of supervisors prior to the filing of a tower application. Milestone submits that the proposed monopole does not fall within the critical viewshed of the Appalachian Trail. At its closest point, the Blue Ridge Parkway is located approximately 2,000 feet east of the proposed monopole. The proposed monopole was visible from a number of photos taken along the Blue Ridge Parkway; however, based on the photographic survey, the monopole will have limited visibility from the Blue Ridge Parkway. The proposed site is not within any other designated scenic, historic, or ecologically/culturally significant areas.

11. By applying and being granted the special use permit, the applicant and the owner of the land agree to dismantle and remove the broadcasting tower and associated facilities from the site within ninety days of the broadcasting tower no longer being use for wireless communications. Dismantling and removal from the site shall only be required after notice by the County. If antennas on any approved tower are relocated to a lower elevation, the tower shall be shortened to the height of the highest antenna. A bond or similar performance guarantee may be required as part of the special use permit approval. Said guarantee will be in an amount sufficient to ensure removal of the tower and all associated facilities and the reclamation of the property and road, access and utility corridors to a condition that existed prior to tower construction. Milestone will comply with this requirement.
12. All broadcasting tower structures and associated hardware, antennas, and facilities shall be a flat matted finish so as to reduce visibility and light reflection unless otherwise required by the FCC or FAA. *Milestone submits that the monopole will comply with this requirement.*

13. No business signs shall be allowed on the property identifying the name of, or services offered by, any business associated with the broadcasting tower. *Milestone submits that no business signs shall be permitted at the facility.*

V. **Compliance with Roanoke County Community Plan**

Milestone’s proposed monopole is in conformance with the 2005 Roanoke County Community Plan. Chapter 2 of the Community Plan outlines various vision statements to guide the County into the future. “Technology and Communications” is called out as a vital component of a holistic approach to maintaining and improving the quality of life in the Roanoke Valley. Specifically, the Plan states “*In 2010, Roanoke County provides its citizens opportunities to interface with each other, the capability to access local and global community services through the latest communications technologies and encourages - through both public and private means - the use of the latest technologies to enhance the quality of life in the Roanoke Valley. In 2010, Roanoke County encourages technological improvements/innovations in manufacturing, power transmission, communications, commerce and transportation to preserve and enhance the natural resources of the Roanoke Valley. Roanoke County facilitates a managed technological environment that balances education, productivity, social skills, health and the ecosystem.*” Milestone submits that this proposal falls directly in line with the County’s stated vision for continued successful implementation and enhancement of the latest communications technologies. Further, a robust wireless communications network is necessary to achieve the County’s vision with respect to all aspects of life in the county, including providing citizens with information about their government and resource protection programs, operating public transit, developing business and tourism, and supporting education at school and at home. Wireless communications networks are critical for ensuring citizens have access to emergency services.

VI. **Items from the Broadcast Tower Checklist**

1. Information on how the proposed site relates to the applicant’s existing communication system including number of other sites within the Roanoke Valley, and the location of the antenna at each site.

*Shentel will be the initial wireless provider at the top position on the monopole. The applicant anticipates that other wireless providers will co-locate on the facility over time. Please see the attached maps identifying the locations of all the existing communications facilities in proximity to the proposed facility. The proposed facility will serve to enhance the existing Shentel network by providing increases in both coverage and capacity and will help to offload traffic from the neighboring sites.*
2. A map designating the specific coverage area(s) desired with any overflow area denoted separately.

*Included with this application package are propagation maps, provided by Shentel, indicating current coverage levels (without the new site) and new coverage levels upon the addition of the proposed site to the network.*

3. A list, with a map, of all the alternative sites considered or evaluated to serve the area of this proposed tower, including other existing tower sites in the vicinity. This should include any co-locations considered and the specific technical, legal or other reasons the site(s) were rejected.

*Included with this application package is a list of alternative sites considered to serve the area of this proposed tower. The reasons why the alternatives will not work are also included.*

### VII. Conclusion

Milestone looks forward to the opportunity to add and enhance wireless service in and around this primarily residential area of Vinton. Milestone appreciates your attention to and consideration of this proposal. The evidence outlined above and supported in the attached exhibits highlights that Milestone’s proposal meets and exceeds every relevant code requirement. At the upcoming public hearing, Milestone will elaborate on and present additional expert and other supporting evidence to demonstrate why, as a matter of fact and law, this application for a Special Use Permit should be granted. Thank you.
BROADCAST TOWER
PREAPPLICATION CONSULTATION CHECKLIST

Applicant Name: Milestone Communications
Consultant Staff Member: Philip Thompson

BROADCASTING TOWERS AND ASSOCIATED ANTENNA PERMITTED BY RIGHT:

- New and replacement broadcasting towers and associated antenna not exceeding thirty (30) feet in height and located within any commercial or industrial zoning district provided:
  - the proposed tower is a monopole type design;
  - the general area of the proposed tower is currently served by above ground utilities including electric power and telephone poles; and
  - all other use and design standards for the construction of the broadcasting tower and associated facilities are met.
- Antennas may be installed on any existing structure within the County provided said antenna does not meet the definition of a broadcasting tower, does not increase the height of the existing structure more than ten (10) feet, and does not result in the structure and antenna exceeding the maximum structure height for that zoning district.
- Temporary towers erected for a period not to exceed twenty-one days.

The following information shall be required as part of the Special Use Permit for a Broadcast Tower in addition to standard application requirements.

### Proposed Site Qualities

Utilities that are currently present on site: Electric
Utilities required that are not currently present on site: N/A
Expected route of linkage: N/A
Estimated noise level in decibels: N/A

### Broadcast Tower

Structure Type: ☑ Monopole ☐ Lattice Tower ☐ Guyed Tower ☐ Stealth Design (description)
Other (description):
Proposed height of tower excluding antenna: 135’
Existing height of surrounding tree canopy and/or buildings: n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction material and finish of tower:</th>
<th>Specific tower location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material: steel</td>
<td>Longitude: 79° 51 ‘34 “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish: gray</td>
<td>Latitude: 37° 17 ‘16 “</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ground Elevation in mean sea level of the proposed tower site: 1147.72’

Tower has structural ability to accommodate: ☑ One ☐ Two ☑ Three ☐ other providers.

### Types(s) of Antenna or Other Devices Attached to Tower

- Omni-Directional Antenna
- Directional Panel
- Parabolic Antenna
- Whip Antenna
- Other

Material and finish of the proposed antenna(s):
- Material: polymer/steel
- Finish: white

Dimensions of Antenna(s)-height/width/depth: / /
The following information must be submitted separately in either a written or mapped format.

- Information on how the proposed site relates to the applicant’s existing communication system including number of other sites within the Roanoke Valley, and the location of the antenna at each site.
- A map designating the specific coverage area(s) desired with any overflow areas denoted separately.
- A list, with a map, of all the alternative sites considered or evaluated to serve the area of this proposed tower, including other existing tower sites in the vicinity. This should include any co-locations considered and the specific technical, legal or other reasons the other site(s) were rejected.
- Provide conceptual site plan drawn to scale, depicting the location of support structures, equipment enclosures, landscaped areas, fences, lighting, access, limits of disturbed land, average slope of the site, ownership and use of adjoining properties, etc.
- Provide accurate, to scale, photographic simulations showing the relationship of the proposed broadcast tower and associated antenna to the surroundings. Photographic simulations should include the relationships of any new or modified road or utility corridors necessary to serve the proposed broadcast tower site.
- Provide computerized terrain analysis showing the visibility of the proposed broadcast tower and antenna at the requested height and location. If new or modified road, access or utility corridors are proposed, the terrain analysis shall also show the visibility of these new or modified features.
- Provide detailed sheet for broadcast tower structure.
- Provide an accurate description and photograph of the proposed tower structure, including antenna.
- Provide detail sheet of any antenna or devices attached to tower including electrical and mechanical specifications for antenna systems.

Notes:

I hereby certify that:

- All required submittals to the FAA, as required by Zoning Ordinance Section 30-87-2D.6, have been submitted.
- A required on-site balloon or comparable test will be performed on the dates of 10/20 for the Planning Commission public hearing scheduled for 11/22, and on the dates of 9/20 for the Board of Supervisors public hearing scheduled for 11/17.
- I, the applicant, shall be responsible for all fees associated with the filing of the application, including the reasonable cost of any independent analysis deemed necessary by the County to verify the need for the new broadcast tower.

Signature: Phil Steller  
Date: 9/20
Alternative Site Rule-out

There are no existing collocation structures within the coverage gap. The closest collocation opportunity is a US Cellular tower 1.64 miles to the southwest and Shentel is active on that tower.

- **Proposed Location**
- **Coverage Gap**
- **1-mile radius**
- **1 ½ mile radius**
- **Existing Shentel Sites**
- **US Cellular Tower**
AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROANOKE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE ROANOKE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2020

RESOLUTION 081120-1 AUTHORIZING MILESTONE COMMUNICATION, INC. TO FILE A REZONING/ SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION TO ERECT A WIRELESS BROADCAST TOWER ON PROPERTY OWNED BY THE ROANOKE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, LOCATED AT 420 SWAN DRIVE (TAX MAP NO. 061.02-01-51.00-0000), VINTON MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT

WHEREAS, by letter of February 11, 2020, Milestone Communication, Inc. ("Milestone") has proposed to erect a wireless broadcast tower on property owned by the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, located at 420 Swan Drive (Tax Map No. 061.02-01-51-00.0000) in Stonebridge Park in the Vinton Magisterial District; and

WHEREAS, in order for the Board to properly consider Milestone’s proposal, Milestone must first submit an application for a rezoning and a special use permit, and the application must be reviewed by County staff, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to the process set forth in the Roanoke County Zoning Ordinance (Appendix A to the Roanoke County Code); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 30-19-2 of the County Code, because Milestone is not the owner of the property located at Stonebridge Park, Milestone must first obtain written consent from the Board of Supervisors in order to file the application; and

WHEREAS, a rezoning and special use permit application is necessary because the property at Stonebridge Park is presently zoned R-1 (low density residential); pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, a wireless broadcast tower may only be erected on property that is zoned for agricultural, commercial or industrial use, and further requires a special use permit; and
WHEREAS, no County representatives have given Milestone assurance, of any kind, that such an application will ultimately be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of Roanoke County, Virginia, that Milestone Communications, Inc. is hereby authorized to file a rezoning and special use permit application regarding its proposal to erect a wireless broadcast tower on property located at 420 Swan Drive (Tax Map No. 081.02-01-51-00.0000) in Stonebridge Park in the Vinton Magisterial District.

On motion of Supervisor Peters to adopt the resolution, seconded by Supervisor Hooker and carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Supervisors Mahoney, Hooker, North, Peters, Radford

NAYS: None

A COPY TESTE:

[Signature]
Deborah C. Jacks
Chief Deputy Clerk to the Board of Supervisors

cc: Peter S. Lubeck, County Attorney
Philip Thompson, Director of Planning
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TECHNICAL REVIEW
SPECIAL USE PERMIT
7-11/2020

PROPOSED
135-ft WIRELESS
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

MILESTONE COMMUNICATIONS

Site Name: Stonebridge Park

420 Swan Drive
Vinton, VA 24179

Submitted by:

ATLANTIC TECHNOLOGY CONSULTANTS, INC.
A Member of The Atlantic Group of Companies, Inc.

ATC PROJECT #: 1100-18

October 15, 2020
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Milestone Tower Limited Partnership IV (Wireless Communications Facility Provider) as agent for ShenTel Communications (Wireless Communications Service Provider) has made application to the County for the issuance of a Special Use Permit to allow construction of a new 135-ft monopole telecommunications tower at 420 Swan Drive, Vinton, VA 24179.

ShenTel is an FCC Licensed provider of wireless communications services in the Roanoke County area and beyond.

The property is owned by the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. The property is located at the terminus of 420 Swan Drive, Vinton, VA 24179 at parcel #061-02-01-51.00-0000. The property is Zoned R-1 (Residential District) and is used as a Park. The parcel is 9.55 acres.

RECOMMENDATION

This consultant recommends approval of construction of this a 139-ft (135-ft tower + 4-ft lightning rod) monopole tower as proposed.

The Applicant has thoroughly researched the availability of property on the school compound (William Byrd Middle and High School) that is approximately 600'+ from the proposed free-standing monopole tower. The Applicant indicated that the schools did not want to have this on school property.

Stonebridge Park is the alternate location.

This report outlines the specific areas of evaluation with respect to this proposal, and details this consultant’s analysis regarding the site plans and proposal as presented. Supporting and clarifying evidence regarding the suitability of the proposed design is included.

______________________________
George N. Condyles, IV
President and COO
Atlantic Technology Consultants, Inc.
1.0 TECHNICAL

1.1 Siting

The proposed tower site is a 2,500 s.f. lease area of Stonebridge Park property situated within a 9.55 Acre parent parcel owned by Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. The property is located at the terminus of 420 Swan Road, Vinton VA 24179 at parcel #061-02-01-51.00-0000. The property is Zoned R-1 (Residential District). The Applicant has requested that the property be rezoned to an AR Zoning (Agriculture-Residential)

Site Plan: Access Road and location of leased area on parcel
Swan Drive Entrance

The proposed project Site Plans were prepared by the firm of Entrex Communications Services, Inc. of Rockville, MD. The Site Plans submitted by Entrex are professional and accurate and will be used in this report.

The proposed tower is a 135-ft monopole tower placed within a 50’x 50’ fenced compound upon the destruction of the existing bathroom building.
Compound Plan

The center of the proposed tower is located at coordinates 37° 17’ 16” N and 79° 51’ 34” W (NAD 83).

1.2 Topography

The topography of this site is relatively uneven. The ground elevation for the proposed tower is 1147’ above sea level. The tower is proposed at 135’ + a 4’ Lightning Rod for an overall height of 139’. Combining the Ground elevation of 1147’ + 139’ would give an Average Mean above Sea Level of 1,286’ AMSL.

The Consultant has reviewed the information supplied by the Applicant of the tower as conditions relative to the topography. Site placement is adjacent to many residential structures and will be surrounded by 40’ to 60’ trees on 3 sides. The site has a natural tree buffer around 3 sides and will cause very little land disturbance. The site (as for the topography) is well suited and will serve many residences with advanced wireless broadband services.
Viewsheds

Roanoke County Communications Tower Ordinance

“10. No broadcasting towers shall be permitted within the critical view sheds of the Blue Ridge Parkway or Appalachian Trail as shown on any official map designating these view sheds and pre-approved by the board of supervisors. In addition, no towers shall be proposed within any other designated area of local scenic, historical, ecological and cultural importance as designated and approved by the board of supervisors prior to the filing of a tower application.”

Visibility Locations

Blue Ridge Parkway

Locations: 23, 24, and 26
## Environmental/NEPA Opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRIS# / DPR Form # / Status Code</th>
<th>Historic Property Name</th>
<th>Effect Determination</th>
<th>Explanation of Effect Determination</th>
<th>EBI Photo No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>080-059</td>
<td>Boxmont House</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Within APE-VE. The Subject Property is located 0.45 miles to the west. Due to the distance there will be little, if any, change to the viewshed from Boxmont House. The abundant mature foliage will obstruct views of the new pole from historic property. There will be no effect to the eligible historic property.</td>
<td>17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080-5161</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Parkway Historic District</td>
<td>No Adverse effect</td>
<td>Within APE-VE, the Subject Property is located to 0.4 miles to the north and west. Due to the density of the vegetation and the distance from the subject property the visibility of the monopole from the Blue Ridge Historic District would be low. If visible from sections of the parkway the transmission and telecommunication tower will not adversely affect the characteristics that make this historic district potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Radius from Proposed Site of 250’, 500’, 1000’ and ½ mile
These homes of the neighborhood will receive a clear and unobstructed view of the tower.
Visibility from Park to Athletic Field at William Byrd Middle/High Schools
Visibility from William Byrd Athletic Field back to Proposed Tower
Technology Background:

**Enhanced Wireless Services will be provided from this site**

Generically, the wireless broadband is the two-way reception and transmission from an antenna support facility (tower, power line transmission tower, or elevated structure/rooftop) signaled through a home antenna with a series of router equipment to home computers, laptops and tablets.

*(See generic diagram below)*

![Diagram of fixed-point high speed wireless internet](image)

**Wireless In Home Broadband**

A service that provides high-speed in-home Internet access leveraging the power and speed of one of the nation’s largest 4G/5G LTE network will be available throughout this site.

Wireless Broadband offers customers a reliable alternative for residential broadband, especially in areas with limited broadband choices. It provides connectivity for a wide range of devices, including computers and gaming consoles, using the 4G/5G LTE network, which is now available in 230 markets covering more than two-thirds of the population in the United States.
1.3 Setbacks

The proposed site is approximately 125' from the nearest primary road, Swan Drive. All property line setbacks required for this area have been observed in the drawing (Page Z-1A) of the enclosed site plans, including those with respect to adjacent property lines.

The tower is located 170' from the existing property line which meets setback requirements. In addition, the closest residential structure is over 430' feet from the base of the tower thus meeting this requirement.

The proposed tower meets the Setback requirements for structural failure.
1.4 Co-Location

The Application does meet the County Ordinance.

Roanoke County Broadcast Tower Ordinance

Sec. 30-87-2 - Broadcasting Tower

(A) Intent:
The intent of these provisions is to regulate the placement of new and replacement broadcasting towers within Roanoke County. These provisions provide broadcasting tower applicants, property owners, and all other Roanoke County citizens clear guidance on the official policies and standards of the County. These policies and standards shall be used by applicants as a guide when selecting alternative broadcasting tower sites and broadcasting tower designs within the county. In addition, the county staff, planning commission and board of supervisors shall use these policies and standards, the Roanoke County community plan and the general special use permit criteria found in section 30-19 as a guide for evaluating any future requests for broadcasting towers.

In the interest of preserving and enhancing the scenic and natural beauty of Roanoke County it is the goal of the county to achieve a long term reduction in the number of broadcasting towers within the county, and where possible, to achieve a reduction in the height of existing broadcasting towers throughout the county, with special emphasis on towers located along or near the ridgetops of major mountains and land forms. In addition, it is the goal of the county, where possible, to achieve the relocation of existing broadcasting towers and associated utility and access corridors which have a high visual impact on scenic resources. To this end, the county will work cooperatively with broadcasting tower owners and applicants and land owners to achieve these goals. It is the official policy of the county to encourage and promote the collocation of antennas on existing public and private structures within the county. To achieve this end, the county encourages all wireless communication providers to locate new antennas on existing structures. Permits for new broadcasting towers should only be requested when no other reasonable alternative exists for locating needed antennas.

When new broadcasting towers are proposed as a last alternative, the requested broadcasting tower location, height and design should be chosen to protect and enhance the scenic and natural beauty of Roanoke County. Broadcasting tower locations at elevations lower than surrounding ridge lines are preferred. The use of stealth designs should be considered for any new broadcasting tower.

It is the intent of the county to fully comply with all of the applicable provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 and other applicable federal and state laws as said laws address and preserve Roanoke County's zoning authority and provide to the communication industry the right and responsibility to provide communication services within their service areas.
Consultant’s Response:

There are no other existing structures within the search ring that are tall enough to meet the coverage objective.

Alternative Co-location Site

Alternative Site Rule-out

There are no existing collocation structures within the coverage gap. The closest collocation opportunity is a US Cellular tower 1.64 miles to the southwest and ShenTel is active on that tower.

A US Cellular Tower is 1.64 miles away and is not in position to provide broadband coverage to this area for ShenTel.
1.5 Structural

The proposed 135' monopole tower design is of high strength steel, and represents a highly stable structural design not known by this consultant to have failed at any installation in this region. This structure, as proposed, is well within compliance of EIA/TIA-222-G guidelines for structures mandated ability to withstand the structural loading of all appurtenances, plus additional wind and ice loading.

This tower structure, as proposed, would allow room for future co-location of at least three (3) additional wireless Land Mobile Radio carriers at the same site, minimizing the number of towers needed for all wireless telecommunications carriers to eventually optimize service in this area.

Furthermore, in conformance with the County, work at this site will remain in compliance with ALL federal, state, and local building codes and regulations if work proceeds as outlined in the application. The applicant’s proposal includes site plans representing a soundly engineered design conforming to industry standards.
1.6 RF Exposure

FCC bulletin OET-65 provides guidance for a licensee proposing to construct a telecommunications support structure in calculation of RF exposure limitations, including analysis of the cumulative effect of all transmitters on the structure. Appropriate steps, including warning signage at the site, will be taken to protect both the general public and site workers from unsafe RF exposure in accordance with federal guidelines.

Milestone has agreed in writing to be in compliance with all FCC requirements.

The consultant sees no evidence of unsafe RF exposure levels being generated at this site if it were to proceed as proposed. RF site exposure warning signage placement is appropriately planned for this site.

1.7 Grounding

Grounding of all structures and equipment at an RF site is critically important to the safety of both personnel and equipment at the site. Even a single component not meeting this standard places all other site components at risk for substantial damage. All structures and equipment at the site should maintain a ground potential difference of less than 5 ohms. If construction proceeds as proposed, all structures and equipment shall be appropriately grounded and any obvious grounding deficiencies rectified for safety purposes and minimizing the potential for a situation to occur requiring mitigation.

These concerns will be addressed in the building Permit Phase.

1.8 General Safety

This site compound (50’ x 50’) will be surrounded by suitable 6-ft high chain link fence with three strand barbed wire to prevent unauthorized access to the tower site, as clearly indicated in the proposed site plans. Additional safety measures to be placed at this site should include:

- RF exposure warning signage
- Site identification information
- Routine and Emergency contact information
- No Trespassing signs

Furthermore, OSHA-approved style of fall prevention cable and an anti-climbing device shall be installed.
1.9 **Interference**

The consultant sees no evidence of interference by or with this site after a general evaluation of the surrounding transmitter sites.

Should any interference issues be posed with respect to this site, mitigation would nevertheless remain the responsibility of the FCC License Owner and affected carrier(s), and would be regulated by the Federal Communication Commission and/or the Federal Aviation Administration, having no effect or burden on the County.

2.0 **PROCEDURAL**

2.1 **FAA Study**

A full FAA Study to determine potential Air Hazard requirements for this tower was submitted with this Application by Milestone.

---

### TOWAIR Determination Results

*** NOTICE ***

TOWAIR’s findings are not definitive or binding, and we cannot guarantee that the data in TOWAIR are fully current and accurate. In some instances, TOWAIR may yield results that differ from application of the criteria set out in 47 C.F.R. Section 17.7 and 14 C.F.R. Section 77.13. A positive finding by TOWAIR recommending notification should be given considerable weight. On the other hand, a finding by TOWAIR recommending either for or against notification is not conclusive. It is the responsibility of each ASR participant to exercise due diligence to determine if it must coordinate its structure with the FAA. TOWAIR is only one tool designed to assist ASR participants in exercising this due diligence, and further investigation may be necessary to determine if FAA coordination is appropriate.

#### DETERMINATION Results

Structure does not require registration. There are no airports within 8 kilometers (5 miles) of the coordinates you provided.

**Your Specifications**

**NAD83 Coordinates**

- **Latitude**: 37-17-16.0 north
- **Longitude**: 079-51-34.0 west

**Measurements (Meters)**

- **Overall Structure Height (AGL)**: 42.4
- **Support Structure Height (AGL)**: 41.1
- **Site Elevation (AMSL)**: 349.6

**Structure Type**

- MTOWER - Monopole

**Tower Construction Notifications**

Notify Tribes and Historic Preservation Officers of your plans to build a tower.
2.2 **FCC Antenna Site Registration**

This tower is not required to be registered.

2.3 **Environmental Impacts**

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), delineated in Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1, Subpart I, sections 1.1301-1.1319, requires federal agencies to incorporate environmental considerations into their decision-making process when evaluating new construction proposals. As a licensing agency, the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) requires all licensees to consider the potential environmental effects from their construction of antenna support structures, and to disclose those effects in an Environmental Assessment (EA) that must be filed with the FCC for review.

**This Application does not have any “Adverse Effects” on the placement.**

![Phase I Archaeological Survey Report](image-url)
2.4 Historic Impacts

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) requires that State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and the President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation be given a reasonable opportunity to comment on all undertakings with the potential to affect historic properties. Prior to construction, the licensee is required to submit to the SHPO a detailed description of the project, a listing of local historic resources, and a discussion of any measures being undertaken to mitigate impacts (if any) on historic resources. Upon receipt, the SHPO has thirty (30) days to review and respond.
Determination of Effect

14) Direct Effects (Select One):
   ( X ) No Historic Properties in Area of Potential Effects (APE)
   ( ) No Effect on Historic Properties in APE
   ( ) No Adverse Effect on Historic Properties in APE
   ( ) Adverse Effect on one or more Historic Properties in APE

15) Visual Effects (Select One):
   ( ) No Historic Properties in Area of Potential Effects (APE)
   ( ) No Effect on Historic Properties in APE
   ( X ) No Adverse Effect on Historic Properties in APE
   ( ) Adverse Effect on one or more Historic Properties in APE

Conclusion and Recommendations

In light of the available information, it is my professional opinion that the APE-DE for the present project is not sensitive for the presence of significant precontact and/or historical archaeological resources due to unfavorable environmental setting and negative results of the archaeological fieldwork conducted at the Project Area. In this context, it is unlikely that the proposed installation would adversely affect intact below-grade cultural resources. No Historic Properties were identified by this survey and no further archaeological work is recommended for this project.

In the event that a concentration of artifacts or culturally modified soil deposits (including trash pits older than 50 years) should be encountered at any time during ground disturbing activities, all work must stop until a qualified archaeologist views the finds and makes a preliminary evaluation. If warranted, further archaeological work in the discovery area should be performed. Although unlikely, if human remains are encountered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovery until the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist evaluate the remains.
This Application will have “No Adverse Effects” on the placement.
2.5 Radio Frequency Coverage Analysis

Applicant's Data

ShenTel is proposing to co-locate on the Applicant’s 139-ft monopole tower. This tower will address the lack of 4-G coverage in the Vinton/Washington Street corridor.

This site will be known as “RI67SH462” from ShenTel networking naming of their transceiver sites.

The ShenTel network is surrounded by several “handoff” sites.

- North: RI68SH763
- Northwest: RI685H882
- West: RI68SH935
- Southwest: RI68SH811
- South: RI68SH768
- East: RI68SH871

The Observer can see how significant the “hole” is and how this area of the county is underserved. (See page 24 below.)

This site fills in the underserved areas of marginal to weak service for data and in-building penetration.
The Consultant concurs with the Applicant’s data and plans as presented concerning filling in this underserved area for data service.
3.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

This request for approval to construct a 135-ft monopole tower with 4’ lightning rod as proposed represents an appreciable intent on the part of the Applicant to conform to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

The Consultant recommends that the County approve the Application/Request for issuance of a Special Use Permit to allow construction of this site.

In closing, this consultant remains available to address any comments or questions which may arise following review of this report. Any interested party with such comments or questions may feel free to contact this firm, which remains committed to delivering independent, objective, unbiased, and thorough consulting services.

Respectfully submitted,

George N. Condyles, IV, CPM
President & COO
SEC. 30-41. R-1 LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

Sec. 30-41-1. Purpose.

(A) The R-1, low density residential district is established for areas of the county within the urban service area with existing low-middle density residential development, with an average density of from one (1) to three (3) units per acre, and land which appears appropriate for such development. These areas are generally consistent with the neighborhood conservation land use category as recommended in the comprehensive plan. In addition, where surrounding development and the level of public services warrant, these areas coincide with the development category recommended in the plan. This district is intended to provide the highest degree of protection from potentially incompatible uses and residential development of a significantly different density, size, or scale, in order to maintain the health, safety, appearance and overall quality of life of existing and future neighborhoods. In addition to single-family residences, only uses of a community nature which are generally deemed compatible are permitted in this district. This would include parks and playgrounds, schools and other similar neighborhood activities.

(Ord. No. 042799-11, § 1f., 4-27-99; Ord. No. 042208-16, § 1, 4-22-08)

Sec. 30-41-2. Permitted uses.

(A) The following uses are permitted by right subject to all other applicable requirements contained in this ordinance. An asterisk (*) indicates additional, modified or more stringent standards as listed in article IV, use and design standards, for those specific uses.

1. Agricultural and Forestry Uses
   Stable, Private *

2. Residential Uses
   Accessory Apartment *
   Home Beauty/Barber Salon *
   Home Occupation, Type I *
   Manufactured Home *
   Manufactured Home, Emergency *
   Multiple Dog Permit *
Residential Human Care Facility
Single Family Dwelling, Attached *
Single Family Dwelling, Attached (Cluster Subdivision Option) *
Single Family Dwelling, Detached
Single Family Dwelling, Detached (Cluster Subdivision Option) *
Single Family Dwelling, Detached (Zero Lot Line Option) *

3. **Civic Uses**
   Community Recreation *
   Family Day Care Home *
   Park and Ride Facility *
   Public Parks and Recreational Areas *
   Utility Services, Minor

4. **Commercial Uses**
   Bed and Breakfast *

5. **Miscellaneous Uses**
   Amateur Radio Tower *
   Wind Energy System, Small *

(B) The following uses are allowed only by special use permit pursuant to section 30-19. An asterisk (*) indicates additional, modified or more stringent standards as listed in article IV, use and design standards, for those specific uses.

1. **Residential Uses**
   Alternative Discharging Sewage System *

2. **Civic Uses**
   Cemetery *
Crisis Center

Day Care Center *

Educational Facilities, Primary/Secondary *

Religious Assembly *

Utility Services, Major *

3. Commercial Uses

Golf Course *

4. Miscellaneous Uses

Outdoor Gatherings *

(Ord. No. 42793-20, § II, 4-27-93; Ord. No. 62293-12, §§ 3, 8, 6-22-93; Ord. No. 82493-8, § 2, 8-24-93; Ord. No. 62795-10, 6-27-95; Ord. No. 042799-11, § 2, 4-27-99; Ord. No. 042500-9, § II, 4-25-00; Ord. No. 072605-7, § 1, 7-26-05; Ord. No. 042208-16, § 1, 4-22-08; Ord. No. 052609-22, § 1, 5-26-09; Ord. No. 030811-1, § 1, 3-8-11; Ord. No. 052411-9, § 1, 5-24-11, Ord. No. 111213-15, § 1, 11-12-13)

Sec. 30-41-3. Site Development Regulations.

General Standards. For additional, modified, or more stringent standards for specific uses, see Article IV, Use and Design Standards.

(A) Minimum lot requirements.

1. All lots served by private well and sewage disposal systems:
   a. Area: 0.75 acre (32,670 square feet).
   b. Frontage: 90 feet on a publicly owned and maintained street.

2. Lots served by either public sewer or water:
   a. Area: 20,000 square feet.
   b. Frontage: 75 feet on a publicly owned and maintained street.

3. All lots served by both public sewer and water:
   a. Area: 7,200 square feet.
b. Frontage: 60 feet on a publicly owned and maintained street.

(B) Minimum setback requirements.

1. Front yard:
   a. Principal structures: 30 feet.
   b. Accessory structures: Behind the front building line.

2. Side yard:
   a. Principal structures: 10 feet.
   b. Accessory structures: 10 feet behind front building line or 3 feet behind rear building line.

3. Rear yard:
   a. Principal structures: 25 feet.
   b. Accessory structures: 3 feet.

4. Where a lot fronts on more than one street, front yard setbacks shall apply to all streets.

(C) Maximum height of structures.

1. Height limitations:
   a. Principal structures: 45 feet.
   b. Accessory structures: 15 feet, or 25 feet provided they comply with the setback requirements for principal structures.

(D) Maximum coverage.

1. Building coverage: 35 percent of the total lot area for all buildings and 7 percent for accessory buildings.

2. Lot coverage: 50 percent of the total lot area.

(Ord. No. 62293-12, § 10, 6-22-93; Ord. No. 42694-12, § 8, 4-26-94; Ord. No. 042208-16, § 1, 4-22-08, Ord. No. 111213-15, § 1, 11-12-13)
**SEC. 30-34. AR AGRICULTURAL/RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.**

**Sec. 30-34-1. Purpose.**

(A) These areas are generally characterized by very low density residential and institutional uses mixed with smaller parcels that have historically contained agricultural uses, forest land and open space outside the urban service area. These areas provide an opportunity for rural living in convenient proximity to urban services and employment. Agricultural uses should be encouraged to be maintained. Over time, however, these areas are expected to become increasingly residential in character, with residential development becoming the dominant use over agricultural and more rural type uses. The purpose of this district, consistent with the Rural Village land use category in the comprehensive plan, is to maintain these areas essentially in their rural state, consistent with the level of services anticipated by the county. These areas are generally suitable for low density residential development and other compatible land uses.

(Ord. No. 62795-10, 6-27-95; Ord. No. 042799-11, § 1f., 4-27-99; Ord. No. 042208-16, § 1, 4-22-08)

**Sec. 30-34-2. Permitted Uses.**

(A) The following uses are permitted by right subject to all other applicable requirements contained in this ordinance. An asterisk (*) indicates additional, modified or more stringent standards as listed in article IV, use and design standards, for those specific uses.

1. *Agricultural and Forestry Uses*
   - Agriculture *
   - Agritourism *
   - Farm Brewery *
   - Farm Distillery *
   - Farm Winery *
   - Forestry Operations *
   - Stable, Commercial *
   - Stable, Private *
   - Wayside Stand *
2. **Residential Uses**
   Accessory Apartment *
   Home Beauty/Barber Salon *
   Home Occupation, Type II *
   Manufactured Home *
   Manufactured Home, Emergency *
   Multiple Dog Permit *
   Residential Human Care Facility
   Single Family Dwelling, Detached
   Single Family Dwelling, Detached (Zero Lot Line Option) *

3. **Civic Uses**
   Community Recreation *
   Family Day Care Home *
   Park and Ride Facility *
   Public Parks and Recreational Areas *
   Religious Assembly *
   Utility Services, Minor

4. **Commercial Uses**
   Bed and Breakfast *
   Veterinary Hospital/Clinic

5. **Miscellaneous Uses**
   Amateur Radio Tower *
   Wind Energy System, Small *
(B) The following uses are allowed only by special use permit pursuant to section 30-19. An asterisk (*) indicates additional, modified or more stringent standards as listed in article IV, use and design standards, for those specific uses.

1. **Residential Uses**
   
   Alternative Discharging Sewage Systems *

2. **Civic Uses**
   
   Camps *
   
   Cemetery *
   
   Crisis Center
   
   Day Care Center *
   
   Educational Facilities, Primary/Secondary *
   
   Safety Services *
   
   Utility Services, Major *

3. **Commercial Uses**
   
   Antique Shops *
   
   Golf Course *
   
   Kennel, Commercial *
   
   Studio, Fine Arts

4. **Industrial Uses**
   
   Custom Manufacturing *
   
   Resource Extraction *

5. **Miscellaneous Uses**
   
   Broadcasting Tower *
   
   Outdoor Gatherings *
Sec. 30-34-3. Site Development Regulations.

General Standards. For additional, modified, or more stringent standards for specific uses, see Article IV, Use and Design Standards.

(A) Minimum lot requirements

1. Lots served by private well and sewage disposal system:
   a. Area: 1 acre (43,560 square feet)
   b. Frontage: 110 feet on a publicly owned and maintained street.

2. Lots served by either public sewer or water:
   a. Area: 30,000 square feet
   b. Frontage: 100 feet on a publicly owned and maintained street.

3. Lots served by both public sewer and water:
   a. Area: 25,000 square feet
   b. Frontage: 90 feet on a publicly owned and maintained street.

(B) Minimum setback requirements.

1. Front yard:
   a. Principal structures: 30 feet.
   b. Accessory structures: Behind the front building line.

2. Side yard:
   a. Principal structures: 15 feet
   b. Accessory structures: 15 feet behind front building line or 10 feet behind rear building line.
3. Rear yard:
   a. Principal structures: 25 feet
   b. Accessory structures: 10 feet

4. Where a lot fronts on more than one street, front yard setbacks shall apply to all streets.

5. Where the principal structure is more than 150 feet from the street, accessory buildings may be located 150 feet from the street and 20 feet from any side property line.

(C) Maximum height of structures.
   1. All structures: 45 feet

(D) Maximum coverage.
   1. Building coverage: 25 percent of the total lot area.
   2. Lot coverage: 50 percent of the total lot area.

(Ord. No. 62293-12, § 10, 6-22-93, Ord. No. 111213-15, § 1, 11-12-13)
Sec. 30-87-2. Broadcasting Tower.

(A) Intent:

The intent of these provisions is to regulate the placement of new and replacement broadcasting towers within Roanoke County. These provisions provide broadcasting tower applicants, property owners, and all other Roanoke County citizens clear guidance on the official policies and standards of the County. These policies and standards shall be used by applicants as a guide when selecting alternative broadcasting tower sites and broadcasting tower designs within the county. In addition, the county staff, planning commission and board of supervisors shall use these policies and standards, the Roanoke County community plan and the general special use permit criteria found in section 30-19 as a guide for evaluating any future requests for broadcasting towers.

In the interest of preserving and enhancing the scenic and natural beauty of Roanoke County it is the goal of the county to achieve a long term reduction in the number of broadcasting towers within the county, and where possible, to achieve a reduction in the height of existing broadcasting towers throughout the county, with special emphasis on towers located along or near the ridgetops of major mountains and land forms. In addition, it is the goal of the county, where possible, to achieve the relocation of existing broadcasting towers and associated utility and access corridors which have a high visual impact on scenic resources. To this end, the county will work cooperatively with broadcasting tower owners and applicants and land owners to achieve these goals.

It is the official policy of the county to encourage and promote the collocation of antennas on existing public and private structures within the county. To achieve this end, the county encourages all wireless communication providers to locate new antennas on existing structures. Permits for new broadcasting towers should only be requested when no other reasonable alternative exists for locating needed antennas.

When new broadcasting towers are proposed as a last alternative, the requested broadcasting tower location, height and design should be chosen to protect and enhance the scenic and natural beauty of Roanoke County. Broadcasting tower locations at elevations lower than surrounding ridge lines are preferred. The use of stealth designs should be considered for any new broadcasting tower.

It is the intent of the county to fully comply with all of the applicable provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 and other applicable federal and state laws as said laws address and preserve Roanoke County’s zoning authority and provide to the communication industry the right and responsibility to provide communication services within their service areas.

(B) Applicability:

1. These standards shall apply to all new and replacement broadcasting towers within Roanoke County with the exception that new and replacement
broadcasting towers and associated antenna not exceeding thirty (30) feet in height and located within any commercial or industrial zoning district shall be permitted by right provided:

a. The proposed tower is a monopole type design;

b. The general area of the proposed tower is currently served by above ground utilities including electric power and telephone poles; and

c. All other use and design standards for the construction of the broadcasting tower and associated facilities are met.

2. No modification to increase the height, size, type or location of any existing broadcasting tower or associated facilities, excluding antennas, shall be made unless such modification results in the full compliance of the broadcasting tower and facilities with all of the requirements of this ordinance.

3. Antennas may be installed on any existing structure within the county, without the necessity of obtaining a special use permit, provided said antenna does not meet the definition of a broadcasting tower, does not increase the height of the existing structure more than ten (10) feet, and does not result in the structure and antenna exceeding the maximum structure height for that zoning district.

4. These provisions shall not apply to any temporary broadcasting tower erected for the purpose of system design or testing provided the temporary broadcasting tower is erected for a period not to exceed twenty-one (21) days. In addition, in declared local emergency situations, the county administrator shall be authorized to allow the temporary installation of a broadcasting tower for the duration of the local emergency. A zoning permit pursuant to section 30-9 of this ordinance shall be applied for and approved prior to erecting any temporary or emergency tower.

(C) Application requirements:

1. All potential applicants for broadcasting towers shall consult with county planning staff at least thirty (30) days prior to submitting an application for a proposed broadcasting tower. During this consultation the applicant shall present information to the staff on system objectives, proposed coverage areas, and alternative sites considered and rejected. The staff shall provide the potential applicant information on Roanoke County policies and standards for broadcasting towers, and shall discuss with the applicant possible alternatives to broadcasting tower construction.

2. In addition to the application requirements contained in section 30-19-2 of this ordinance, all applicants for broadcasting towers shall provide the following at the time of application:
a. The location of all other proposed broadcasting tower sites considered and rejected, and the specific technical, legal or other reasons for the rejection.

b. The location of all other possible collocation sites considered and rejected, and the specific technical, legal or other reasons for the rejection.

c. Accurate, to scale, photographic simulations showing the relationship of the proposed broadcasting tower and associated antenna to the surroundings. Photographic simulations shall also be prepared showing the relationship of any new or modified road, access or utility corridors constructed or modified to serve the proposed broadcasting tower site. The number of simulations and the perspectives from which they are prepared, shall be established with the staff at the consultation required in section C.1. above.

d. A computerized terrain analysis showing the visibility of the proposed broadcasting tower and antenna at the requested height and location. If new or modified road, access or utility corridors are proposed, the terrain analysis shall also show the visibility of these new or modified features.

e. Information on how the proposed site relates to the applicants existing communication system, including number of other sites within the Roanoke Valley, and the location of the antenna at each site.

f. All broadcasting tower applicants shall be required, at their expense to conduct an on-site "balloon" or comparable test prior to the planning commission and board of supervisors hearings on the special use permit. The purpose of this test shall be to demonstrate the potential visual impact of the proposed tower. The dates and periods of these tests shall be established with the applicant at the pre-application consultation.

g. Written verification that all required submittals to the FAA as required by section 30-87-2(D)6 of this ordinance have been submitted.

3. The applicant shall be responsible for all fees associated with the filing of the application including the reasonable cost of any independent analysis deemed necessary by the county to verify the need for the new broadcasting tower. The board of supervisors shall establish these fees, which shall be discussed with the applicant at the pre-application conference.

(D) General standards:

1. The maximum height of any proposed broadcasting tower and associated antenna shall be made as a condition of the special use permit, but in no case shall any broadcasting tower and antenna exceed one hundred ninety-nine (199) feet in
height. Applicants shall request the lowest broadcasting tower and antenna height necessary to accomplish their specific communication objectives.

2. The setback for any proposed broadcasting tower shall, at a minimum, conform to the requirements for principal structures for the proposed zoning district. However, in no case shall the minimum setback from the base of the broadcasting tower to any residential structure on an adjoining lot be less than forty (40) percent of the height of the tower, measured from the closest structural member of the broadcasting tower (excluding guy lines). Guy lines shall be exempt from the minimum setback requirements in side and rear yards for the respective zoning district, but shall comply with the setback requirements for the front yard.

3. The minimum setback from any property line abutting a road right-of-way for any other building or structure associated with a broadcasting tower shall be fifty (50) feet. Such buildings or structures shall be located a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet from any other property line.

4. More than one (1) broadcasting tower shall be permitted on a lot provided all applicable requirements have been met including setback requirements.

5. Broadcasting towers shall not be illuminated with any type of lighting apparatus, unless such lighting is a requirement of the FAA or FCC. When lighting is proposed to conform to federal requirement, the county shall contact the federal agency to verify the necessity of lighting, and to determine the minimal amount and type of lighting necessary to comply with federal guidelines. Security lighting, or a "down lighting" design may be installed on buildings and structures associated with a broadcasting tower. In no case shall any lighting violate section 30-94 of this ordinance.

6. Any proposed broadcasting tower within two (2) miles from any general or commercial airport or located at a ground elevation at or above two thousand (2,000) feet, average mean sea level, shall be referred to the appropriate regional office of the FAA for review and comment prior to filing an application for a special use permit.

7. All broadcasting towers shall comply with any additional requirements established in the airport overlay district in section 30-72 of this ordinance, and the emergency communications overlay district in section 30-73.

8. Any broadcasting tower approved shall be structurally designed to carry sufficient loading, and the site approved shall be sized to accommodate the additional equipment necessary for at least three (3) other vendors/providers of communications services in order to minimize the proliferation of new broadcasting towers in the vicinity of the requested site. In addition, by applying and being granted the special use permit, the applicant and the owner of the land agree to make the broadcasting tower and tower site available for additional leases.
within the structural capacity of the broadcasting tower and at reasonable costs adequate to recover the capital, operating and maintenance costs of the broadcasting tower location required for the additional capacity.

9. A monopole broadcasting tower design is recommended. The board may approve an alternative broadcasting tower design if it finds that an alternative type of structure has less of a visual impact on the surrounding community and Roanoke County, and/or based upon accepted technical and engineering data a monopole design is not technically feasible. Cost shall not be a criteria for determining broadcasting tower design.

10. No broadcasting towers shall be permitted within the critical viewsheds of the Blue Ridge Parkway or Appalachian Trail as shown on any official map designating these viewsheds and pre-approved by the board of supervisors. In addition, no towers shall be proposed within any other designated area of local scenic, historical, ecological and cultural importance as designated and approved by the board of supervisors prior to the filing of a tower application.

11. By applying and being granted the special use permit, the applicant and the owner of the land agree to dismantle and remove the broadcasting tower and associated facilities from the site within ninety days of the broadcasting tower no longer being use for wireless communications. Dismantling and removal from the site shall only be required after notice by the County. If antennas on any approved tower are relocated to a lower elevation, the tower shall be shortened to the height of the highest antenna. A bond or similar performance guarantee may be required as part of the special use permit approval. Said guarantee will be in an amount sufficient to ensure removal of the tower and all associated facilities and the reclamation of the property and road, access and utility corridors to a condition that existed prior to tower construction.

12. All broadcasting tower structures and associated hardware, antennas, and facilities shall be a flat matted finish so as to reduce visibility and light reflection unless otherwise required by the FCC or FAA.

13. No business signs shall be allowed on the property identifying the name of, or services offered by, any business associated with the broadcasting tower.

(E) General review policies:

All special use permit requests for new broadcasting towers, including the replacement or modification of existing broadcasting towers shall be reviewed by the staff, planning commission and board of supervisors on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which the broadcasting tower proposal conforms to the general special use permit criteria in section 30-19 of this ordinance, and the intent, application requirements, and general standards for broadcasting towers found in
these provisions.

2. The demonstrated willingness of the applicant to evaluate collocation opportunities within the proposed communication service area, and the demonstrated history of the applicant choosing collocation sites within the Roanoke Valley.

3. The base and top elevation of the proposed broadcasting tower relative to surrounding natural land forms. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, broadcasting tower locations below surrounding ridge lines are preferred.

4. Broadcasting tower locations already served by existing roads and utilities are preferred due to the potential detrimental environmental and visual impacts resulting from the construction of new road and utility corridors.

5. Within the needed service area, the availability of other existing structures that are, based upon independent analysis, of suitable height, design, and location for the needed antenna.

6. The visibility of the broadcasting tower from the surrounding community and neighborhood compatibility of the tower as determined by the submitted computer simulations, terrain analysis and balloon or comparable test.

7. The degree to which the proposed tower location, site design and facilities including fencing, buildings and other ground mounted equipment and new or modified road, access or utility corridors are located, designed and constructed to be compatible with the neighborhood.

(Ord. No. 82493-8, § 4, 8-24-93; Ord. No. 102798-12, § 1, 10-27-98)
**Neighborhood Conservation:** A future land use area where established single-family neighborhoods are delineated and the conservation of the existing development pattern is encouraged.

**Land Use Types:**  
**Single-Family Residential** - Attached and detached housing at a reasonable density that is not significantly higher than the existing neighborhood. Infill lots or community re-development should be designed to be sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood but can be at reasonably higher density. New single-family residential developments should incorporate greenways and bike and pedestrian trails. Cluster developments are encouraged.

**Neighborhood Institutional Centers** - Uses that serve the neighborhood residents including parks, schools, religious assembly facilities, recreational and park facilities, community meeting areas and clubs. These facilities should be linked to the residential areas by greenways, bike trails and pedestrian paths.

**Neighborhood Commercial** - Low impact services to serve the local neighborhood that are consistent with the Community Plan design guidelines.

**Land Use Determinants:**  
**EXISTING LAND USE PATTERN** - Locations where limited density residential subdivisions have been platted and developed.

**EXISTING ZONING** - Locations where limited density residential zoning has been established.

**EXPANSION AREAS** - Locations where the expansion of the existing development pattern is logical.

**INFILL DEVELOPMENT** - Locations where infill areas complement the surrounding development pattern.

**ACCESS** - Locations served by a local street system.

**URBAN SECTOR** - Locations served by urban services.
Notes: Virtual "Stonebridge Park Town Hall Meeting" hosted by Milestone Communications via Zoom.

Oct. 21, 2020
6:30 p.m.

There were 4 speakers introduced by voice only. There were slides being presented, but no video of the people hosting the meeting or the attendees. There was no way to tell how many people were in attendance, or who they were. Someone presented slides of the photo simulations of the balloon test, then opened it up for Q&A. The audience could ask questions by clicking on the “raise your hand” icon. Chris Herald (Milestone) controlled the Q&A. When someone rose their hand Chris would unmute them and we could hear them ask a question and discuss Chris’s answer. Chris deferred some of the questions to other presenters.

Chris referred to the website that Milestone has for the Stonebridge Park tower proposal. He said the link was in the email we received to sign up for the meeting. However, I tried to access it the next day and it did not work.

The coverage map that included in the application only shows Shentel’s coverage. Therefore, the areas that appear to be big gaps in cell coverage are only Shentel’s gaps, they do not show whether other carriers cover those areas.

The first simulated photo that was shown on the slides – looking at the tower from Swan Drive – does not show the compound and fencing around the tower.

Q&A: Q by resident, A by Milestone representatives

Q. Matt – The request is to rezone the entire park, why? Are you going to remove the whole park?
A. There are proffered conditions that ensure that only two uses can occur in the park: the tower use and parks and recreation uses.

Q. Shentel does not offer services in Roanoke County or Vinton. We can’t use it here, why put a tower here if they don’t offer services here?
A. Sprint and T-mobile operate through Shentel equipment.

Q. Hope – If we use other carriers, we are only getting an eyesore and no benefit.
A. That’s right. But there will be space for more tenants on the tower.

Q. How much will this disrupt the greenway, and how much disruption will be caused by the construction?
A. The application is being reviewed by Roanoke County’s Environmental Department and the County Arborist. It will take 4 weeks to construct, and then the disruption will be over.
Q. Gretchen – 3224 Robindale Rd. This tower is literally in my back yard. This will devalue our property and be an eyesore and you can’t tell me it won’t. Even the schools turned you down because they didn’t want it.

A. This site was chosen because the school board refused to put it on school property, and the County was interested in putting it on this property.

Q. I want to meet face to face, I don’t like that I can’t see anyone. Will there be an opportunity to meet face to face?

A. Yes, there are 2 public hearings. I encourage you to come to the public hearings.

Q. I’ll be there. I have lived in Stonebridge since 1988, and in this house for 15 years. I don’t want you here. Gretchen explained how many people use the park, how busy it is, that people of all ages use it, and it’s busy all the time. You’ll destroy the whole area once you’re in.

A. We won’t affect the use of the park.

Q. Do you want this in your back yard?

A. Actually, I know I’m biased, but I like living where I know I have reliable coverage.

Q. Danielle – Have you done any research on health implications of towers and 5G technology?

A. At this time the structure will be 4G. CTIA studies refute studies about health problems caused by communications towers. There is a lot of misinformation about health issues.

Q. What will the affect be on the creek and the natural environment?

A. The application will be reviewed by (he listed) organizations.

Q. Megan – What is the benefit?

A. Public Safety and wireless service and monetary gains to Roanoke County.

Q. James – I’ve done research myself and these towers are shown to cause neural health problems.

A. Many of the studies out there have been debunked by the FDA.

Q. Barbara – question about the height of the tower in the photos that were shown.

A. Those photos are simulations.

Q. Hope – Does the tower have to be this tall? Why don’t you disguise it? In some places they build them to look like trees.

A. The tower needs to be this tall to get the signal over the trees. The tower is too tall to actually look like a tree, it would look awkward and fake sticking up that high. We could explore painting it brown.
Q. What is the impact on property values?
A. Repeated that he is biased and doesn’t think it would reduce property values.

Q. (missed name) - Is this all there is? What else will happen in the park once it is rezoned and this is allowed?
A. The rezoning would limit the property to tower and parks and recreational uses only. There won’t be a proliferation of towers because the County encourages colocation.

Q. Howard – What is the incentive to Roanoke County?
A. We have a contract that is public information, so I can tell you. We will pay Roanoke County 40% of the revenue from Shentel, we will pay the County $29,000 for site access, and we will pay more for any additional carriers on the tower. Roanoke County can also put public safety equipment on the tower.

Q. It’s an eyesore, there is no benefit and I don’t want it.

Q. David – how was the site chosen? The zoning ordinance is there to protect us, why would they change the zoning? Why not put it somewhere else where it’s already allowed?
A. Shentel shows a need for coverage in this area, if we put it somewhere else it’ll be too far away. The tower covers a one mile radius. We don’t want to put it farther from the school and people who will use it. Also, Shentel always improves existing sites and looks for colocation before looking for new sites.

Q. I object and want the (current) zoning preserved. You’re telling me it’s the county’s decision and they want it here, so I thank you for your information and I’ll take my fight to the County.

Q. Morgan – Why isn’t this 5G? If you’re putting in a new tower why not put in new technology?
A. 5G is coming, but it’s not here yet. It takes a long time to transition from 4G to 5G, so 4G is not going away soon.

Q. Please clarify the proffer.
A. There is a condition to allow broadcast towers and parks and recreation uses only.

Q. Will this information be public before the public hearing?
A. Yes, everything will be in the staff report.

Q. This will reduce property values and Shentel doesn’t have coverage here now.
A. I think it improves value, but I admit I’m biased and don’t have any proof.
Q. James – The American Cancer Society has stated that more research is needed to see if there are health implications from this technology.

A. The American Cancer Society has said that there is no proof that the technology causes health problems or cancer.

Q. Heather – Will 5G cause cancer?

A. The American Cancer Society states that the use of cell phones and towers have not raised concerns (he read from a document).

Q. Barbara – What are the public safety improvements you spoke about?

A. 80% of the 911 calls in this area are made from wireless devices. The tower will increase coverage for those devices. Also, there is space on the tower for Roanoke County to use for public safety if they want to.

Q. Megan – Can you guarantee that there won’t be any future rezonings on this property?

A. Actually, I can all but guarantee it. The Special Use Permit conditions will limit the use to broadcast towers and parks & rec uses. It’s very unlikely it would be rezoned, and the zoning ordinance wouldn’t allow it.

Q. Heather – find another location, we don’t want it here

A. We worked with the county parks, recreation and tourism department and other County officials and this is the site they want.

Q. Will this meeting be recorded and accessible after tonight?

A. Yes, it will be available on our website.

Q. Amber – Why did the school turn it down?

A. The school board didn’t want it on the school property.
Absolutely! This is a public case about a public park, comments are welcome from anyone, regardless of where they live.

Cecile

>>> Maria Robertson <maja.robertson@gmail.com> 10/20/20 10:43 AM >>>
Thank you. I meant I haven't heard of the Milestone and the towers being planned on school properties last year. Can I submit a comment even though I have not received a written notice but live within a mile of the proposed tower location depicted on the map by the company?

Again, thank you very much,

Maria

On Mon, Oct 19, 2020, 13:55 Cecile Newcomb <cnewcomb@roanokecountyva.gov> wrote:
You're welcome. The public notice just went out Oct. 12, so you are finding out along with everyone else.

Cecile

>>> Maria Robertson <maja.robertson@gmail.com> 10/19/20 1:43 PM >>>
Thank you for your response and information provided. We moved in at the end of the last year, that's why we probably haven't heard of it.

I appreciate it.

Kind regards,
Maria Robertson

On Mon, Oct 19, 2020, 09:39 Cecile Newcomb <cnewcomb@roanokecountyva.gov> wrote:
Good morning,
Thank you for your interest in this case. I am not an expert on broadcast towers, so I don't know how to answer the frequency question. However, the company plans to start with Shentel as a user of the tower, but they would have enough space on the tower to rent to multiple companies and I imagine the technology of the equipment on the tower will change over time.

The same request was made of the School Board in 2019 because Milestone wanted to place the tower on school property. The school board denied it. This information should all be public. I just did a quick search and found this article: https://roanoke.com/news/education/roanoke-county-school-board-terminates-cell-tower-agreement/article_cff769a0-d0c5-5fbf-9c29-93ebe15bc6ff.html

Here is the link to the school board meeting archives:
https://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/roecnty/Board.nsf/Public

The case did not come before the Planning Commission in 2019 because the school board ended the contract.
On the Friday before the planning commission public hearing (Oct. 30) the entire information packet will be available, which will include the staff report. Check back on our website where you found the application and you will see any added materials. [https://www.roanokecountyva.gov/278/Planning-Commission](https://www.roanokecountyva.gov/278/Planning-Commission)

I hope this answers your questions. I encourage you to do your own research and to either attend the public hearing to make comments, call in comments during the public hearing, or submit comments to the planning commission prior to Oct. 30 so they can be included in the packet.

Thank you,
Cecile Newcomb

---

Cecile Newcomb  
Planner II, AICP, MURP  
Roanoke County Department of Planning  
(540) 283-8184  
CNEWCOMB@roanokecountyva.gov

>>> Maria Robertson <maja.robertson@gmail.com> 10/18/20 9:39 PM >>>  
Dear Ms. Newcomb,

I am a resident of Vinton and live within a mile of the Stonebridge park that is being considered to be rezoned.

I was able to find the application of the company that wants a special permit to build a FCC tower there online. Maybe I missed it, but I could not find any information about the frequency that would be used by the mentioned wireless carrier. The application also mentions other locations being considered but them not being ideal. However, I did not see that information attached to it.

Is the information about frequency and other considered sites available to the public? And if so, could you please forward it to me?

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,  
Maria Robertson
FYI

>>> Board of Supervisors 10/19/2020 7:07 AM >>>

Deborah C. Jacks
Clerk to the Board of Supervisors
County of Roanoke
P. O. Box 29800
Roanoke, VA  24018-0798
(540) 772-2003
(540) 772-2005
(540) 772-2193 fax
djacks@roanokecountyva.gov

>>> Kevin Owens Show <jackpotking7@gmail.com> 10/18/2020 6:28 PM >>>
Hello. My name is Nick. I heard that Stonebridge Park may be demolished. I wanted to know if Stonebridge Park would be gone completely or if you would build it back after the cell towers? Thanks in advance.

WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system.

DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source.
Hi Steve,

The rezoning is not in compliance with the future land use in the comprehensive plan. My staff report will be distributed with the packet by Oct. 30. It will be posted at the bottom of the page under "upcoming land use applications" here: https://www.roanokecountyva.gov/278/Planning-Commission

I do not know the answer to your other questions. The applicant is holding their own town-hall online meeting tomorrow night at 6:30. Perhaps they can answer your questions there. Here is the link to sign up: http://www.stonebridgeparkwireless.com/town-hall/

Cecile

Thanks Cecile! It makes more sense.

Is this rezoning in compliance with comprehensive plan?

Can they make stealth? Slim design? Tree in the woods?

When does your staff report become available? Thanks.

Steve
To: Sandy, Steve <Steve.Sandy@franklincountyva.gov>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] - Milestone petition to rezone and SUP for communications tower

Hi Steve,

Good to hear from you.

I'll answer your questions below in bold.

Let me know if I can be of further help,

Cecile

Cecile Newcomb
Planner II, AICP, MURP
Roanoke County Department of Planning
(540) 283-8184
CNEWCOMB@roanokecountyva.gov

>>> "Sandy, Steve" <Steve.Sandy@franklincountyva.gov> 10/19/20 10:22 AM >>>

Cecile,

Hey, hope you are doing well! I have had several people inquiring about the proposed tower at Stonebridge Park in Vinton.

Is this site being leased by the Board or sold?

Leased.

Will all the park amenities remain?

Everything except the restroom building. They propose to demolish the restroom building and place the tower in that spot. However, the tower compound would be about 8 times the size of the exiting restroom.

Will the entire park zoning change or just a small area for the tower?

The entire park zoning would change to AR from R-1. The special use permit would also be for the whole property, but we would place a condition on the SUP that limits it to the submitted plan.

Is this part of the County's comprehensive plan or broadband plan?

No, to my knowledge it was prompted by the tower company. In 2019 Milestone wanted to place towers on school properties, William Byrd HS being one of them. The school board denied it and canceled their contract. After that they started looking at Stonebridge Park.

Thanks for any info you can share. I apologize if these items are addressed in the application. I did look at application materials quickly but wasn’t sure about a few things.

Steve

--- WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source. ---
FYI - I responded to Amy's email.

Hi Philip,

Anything you can share to help out Debbie?

Amy Whittaker
Public Information Officer
County of Roanoke
(540) 772-2010

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

Amy,

I have received some messages and emails from residents who live in Stonebridge Park and are concerned about the cell tower which may be erected nearby.

Rumors among neighbors have it that the park itself will be destroyed to build the tower. I have looked at the photos and maps, and I can't really tell for sure where the park itself is in relation to the cell tower, and I don't see the park itself mentioned in the planning documents.

Although it is small, that is a popular park, just off the greenway, and near the petting farm along the greenway. My own grandson goes there frequently. I just attended a Girl Scout ceremony at the picnic shelter there last month. Tennis courts are located nearby as well.

Not only is word going around that the park will be destroyed, residents are fearful of the radiation effects of the cell tower--which I believe is one reason the School Board turned down the cell tower at their ball field nearby.

Could you refer me along to whoever knows about this issue, please?
Thanks,
Debbie Adams
Vinton Messenger

WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source.
From: Sharon Ranney <littlebitspr@gmail.com>
To: <planning@roanokecountyva.gov>
Date: 10/20/2020 7:08 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Cell tower at STONEBRIDGE PARK

Sent from my iPhone we do not want a 5G tower in our backyard. The tower is damaging to our children’s and our health. The cell tower will lower the price of our homes by 20 o/o. Put it on the parkway and NOT in our subdivisions. WE DO NOT WANT IT HERE! Sharon Ranney

**********************************************************************
* WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source.
*
Evon,

Thank you for your message and concerns. This tower was originally proposed at the William Byrd Complex and was met with similar resistance. I will keep this in mind as we consider this application.

Rick James
Mr. Thompson,

I am reaching out to you as Director of Planning of the Roanoke County Department of Planning to express my sincere concern for the proposed rezoning and potential construction of a cell phone tower in Stonebridge Park. My family and I have lived in the Stonebridge area for several years, and like many of my neighbors, one of the specific reasons why we chose to live in the area is the close proximity of Stonebridge Park. As a community, we feel that our beloved park is being threatened by the potential rezoning and by potential construction of the proposed tower. The construction of the proposed tower has the potential to carry devastating implications for our neighborhood as well as the park itself.

I also have concerns regarding the physical application that was submitted by Milestone Communications. I have reviewed the public document several times, and have found spelling and grammatical errors. Also, there is a statement within the application that reads: "No traffic congestion, noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, or vibrations will be produced by the project." Considering that the restroom facility will be demolished in addition to physical construction for the pole, I find this statement fundamentally impossible and untrue. There is a lot of ambiguity within the proposed plans and images, and this leaves me feeling very unsettled. Also, I believe that many of the pictures of proposed viewpoints were selectively taken from high elevations in surrounding areas in an attempt to minimize the perceived viewing impact of the proposed tower.

The rezoning and construction of a cell phone tower in a park heavily used by families and children also carries many safety and health concerns. I am a board-certified critical care registered nurse and future nurse practitioner, and it is my ethical obligation to advocate for the health and wellness of my community. I am fearful for the potential health and wellness implications that could be generated by the project as well as the tower.

The physical appearance of the tower, as well as the fenced compound surrounding the tower would absolutely blight the appearance of the park, as well as demean the integrity and overall appearance of the surrounding area. I cannot think of many families that would want to take their children to play in an area that resembles a prison or correctional facility.

I do not believe that the rezoning and construction projects that have been proposed are within the best interests of the community, or Stonebridge Park. I am disappointed that the Roanoke County Department of Planning would even consider such a request. I am also profoundly disappointed that the Roanoke County Department of Planning would be willing to risk so many potential negative implications to its citizens and public use areas.
I would like to sincerely thank you for your time in reading my email, and understanding my concerns as both a resident of the Stonebridge area, and a citizen of Roanoke County.

Respectfully,

Stephen M. Holman
Susan McCoy - [EXTERNAL] - cell tower

From: <vmc10@cox.net>
To: <planning@roanokecountyva.gov>
Date: 10/20/2020 10:15 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - cell tower

I am very much against changing the zone level to allow a company to place what they want here. This is a residential area and this no place for cell towers at a park. Children play there and cell towers do give off electromagnetic radiation. We are not aware as to what this radiation can do to harm children that are around these towers. They have Not truly been proven they are SAFE. STOP this greed for profit and start caring for the residents in the area. I live on Swan dr. and instead of seeing an enhancement to my area all I will see looking up the street is an EYESORE. PLEASE do not approve this and make us proud of where we live.

WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source.
thanks for this!

Scott G. Dreyer, M.A.; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
Bestselling Author & Educator
www.DreyerCoaching.com
www.facebook.com/DreyerCoaching
http://www.linkedin.com/pub/scott-dreyer/1a/529/459
Skype: scottdreyer

From: Cecile Newcomb <cnewcomb@roanokecountyva.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 10:25 AM
To: sgdreyer@hotmail.com <sgdreyer@hotmail.com>
Subject: letter about tower

Hi Scott,
Attached is the letter that was sent to adjacent property owners of Stonebridge Park.
The ways to contact your representatives are included in the letter.
Thank you,

Cecile Newcomb
Planner II, AICP, MURP
Roanoke County Department of Planning
(540) 283-8184
CNEWCOMB@roanokecountyva.gov

WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source.
From: Rick James
To: Philip Thompson; Susan McCoy
Date: 10/28/2020 7:21 AM
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] - Stonebridge Park Rezoning Proposal

Fyi.

>>> Stephen Holman <smholman1@gmail.com> 10/20/20 3:38 PM >>>

Mr. James,

I am reaching out to you as Chairman of the Roanoke County Planning Commission, as well as the representative of the Vinton district, to express my deep concern for the proposed rezoning and potential construction of a cell phone tower in Stonebridge Park. My family and I have lived in the Stonebridge area for several years, and like many of my neighbors, one of the specific reasons why we chose to live in the area is the close proximity of Stonebridge Park. As a community, we feel that our beloved park is being threatened by the potential rezoning and by potential construction of the proposed tower. The construction of the proposed tower has the potential to carry devastating implications for our neighborhood as well as the park itself.

I also have concerns regarding the physical application that was submitted by Milesone Communications. I have reviewed the public document several times, and have found spelling and grammatical errors. Also, there is a statement within the application that reads: "No traffic congestion, noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, or vibrations will be produced by the project." Considering that the restroom facility will be demolished in addition to physical construction for the pole, I find this statement fundamentally impossible and untrue. There is a lot of ambiguity within the proposed plans and images, and this leaves me feeling very unsettled. Also, I believe that many of the pictures of proposed viewpoints were selectively taken from high elevations in surrounding areas in an attempt to minimize the perceived viewing impact of the proposed tower.

The rezoning and construction of a cell phone tower in a park heavily used by families and children also carries many safety and health concerns. I am a board-certified critical care registered nurse and future nurse practitioner, and it is my ethical obligation to advocate for the health and wellness of my community. I am fearful for the potential health and wellness implications that could be generated by the project as well as the tower.

The physical appearance of the tower, as well as the fenced compound surrounding the tower would absolutely blight the appearance of the park, as well as demean the integrity and overall appearance of the surrounding area. I cannot think of many families that would want to take their children to play in an area that resembles a prison or correctional facility.

I do not believe that the rezoning and construction projects that have been proposed are within the best interests of the community, or Stonebridge Park. I am disappointed that the Roanoke County Department of Planning would even consider such a request. I am also profoundly disappointed that the Roanoke County Department of Planning would be willing to risk so many potential negative implications to its citizens and public use areas.

Due to my very demanding work schedule while working as a critical care registered nurse in the midst of a global pandemic, I am unsure that I will be able to directly participate in the scheduled town hall meetings and public hearings. As a result, I believe that it is of high importance to share my feelings directly with you. I hope that you can take my comments and feelings into consideration and advocate for the preservation of Stonebridge Park. Rather than rezone and construct a cell phone tower, there are many other enhancements that could be made to the park that would contribute to the increased health and wellness of our residents and community.
I would like to sincerely thank you for your time in reading my email, and understanding my concerns as both a resident of the Stonebridge area, and a citizen of Roanoke County.

Respectfully,

Stephen M. Holman

WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source.
To the Planning Commission of Roanoke County:

We live at 530 Cambridge Court Road in Vinton. Our subdivision adjoins Stonebridge Park and we strongly oppose the rezoning and building of a cell tower at the edge of our neighborhood! We have adequate cell service and have great concerns about the safety and esthetics of a giant tower near our home. We enjoy Stonebridge Park and want it left as is!

Charlie and Kay Lutz

WARNING: This message was sent from outside the Roanoke County email system. DO NOT CLICK any links or downloaded attachments unless you know the content is from a trusted source.
Concerns and questions received by phone

Patricia Steahly – lives in the neighborhood. Wanted clarification on exactly what property is being considered for rezoning. Wanted clarification about the future land use, what it means, whether it is meant to protect the current neighborhood development pattern. Wanted clarification about whether the park will remain or not.

Many calls about whether the park is being removed. Confusion about why the entire park is being rezoned.