

**AT A WORKSHOP AND MEETING OF THE PLANNING  
COMMISSION HELD IN AND FOR GADSDEN COUNTY, FL  
ON MARCH 11, 2021 AT 5:00 P.M., THE FOLLOWING  
PROCEEDING WAS HAD IN PERSON AND VIA ZOOM**

**Present:** Rev. Dr. Joe Parramore, Chair, District 5  
Lori Bouie, Vice-Chair, District 5- appeared remotely  
William Chukes, District 1  
John Youmans, District 2  
Tracey Stallworth, District 2- absent  
Frances Brown, District 3  
Wayne Williams, District 3  
Charles Hayes, District 4  
Anthony Powell, District 4  
Charles Roberts, At Large  
Steve Scott, School Board Representative- appeared remotely

**Staff Present:** Clayton Knowles, County Attorney  
Diane Quigley, Growth Management Director  
Jill Jeglie, Principal Planner  
Marcella Blocker, Deputy Clerk  
Hannah Pope, Clerk's Office

Due to the restrictions on gatherings as a result of the COVID-19 virus, this meeting and public hearings may be viewed by accessing the Gadsden County Board of County Commissioners Facebook Page, [www.facebook.com/GadsdenCountyBOCC](https://www.facebook.com/GadsdenCountyBOCC). Those wishing to provide public testimony for the meeting and public hearings will be able to do so by accessing the Zoom platform, with virtual meeting access details that will be posted to the Gadsden County website, [www.gadsdencountyfl.gov](http://www.gadsdencountyfl.gov). Anyone wishing to speak on agenda items should schedule or notify the County Public Information Officer at 850-875-8671 or emailing [media@gadsdencountyfl.gov](mailto:media@gadsdencountyfl.gov) at least 3 hours before attending the meeting and will be asked to follow the Gadsden County Public Meetings Citizens Access Guidelines. Public comment for the meeting and public hearings should be submitted via email to [CitizensToBeHeard@gadsdencountyfl.gov](mailto:CitizensToBeHeard@gadsdencountyfl.gov) until noon on the day of the meeting in order to allow sufficient time for provision to the Planning Commission prior to the meeting and public hearings. Any comments submitted after this time will be accepted and included as part of the official record of the meeting.

**1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Parramore welcomed everyone and read the above COVID-19 statement. He asked Commissioner Frances Brown to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance to the U. S. Flag.

Chair Parramore then called the meeting to order.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS – ROLL CALL**

The following commissioners in attendance were William Chukes, Wayne Williams, Frances Brown, Charles Roberts, Anthony Powell, Steve Scott (appeared remotely), Lori Bouie (appeared remotely), and Rev. Dr. Joe Parramore.

**3. DISCLOSURES AND DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS**

There were no disclosures or declarations of conflicts.

**WORKSHOP**

**4. TELECOMMUNICATION TOWER REGULATIONS WORKSHOP (LDR 2021-01) – Discussion of proposed amendments to Section 5800 Communications Towers; amendments to definitions located in Subsection 2102, Specifically; and, amendments to Subsections 7201 Type 1 and Subsection 7202 Type 11 Procedures in the Gadsden County Land Development Code**

Chair Parramore introduced the above item and asked Jill Jeglie, Senior Principal Planner, to give a recap of the February 11<sup>th</sup> workshop.

Ms. Jeglie stated that in the previous workshop it was proposed adding changes to Chapter 2, rewriting and making amendments to Section 5800 Communication Towers, and amending Subsection 7201 and 7202 which outline the type of procedures for towers. One change was allowing camouflage towers in rural residential areas only as a class two site plan that would require public notice, a sign, and ads in three local papers before coming in front of the Planning Commission for a noticed meeting. Camouflaged towers would have to meet the criteria for deviation in Section 5800. Other changes are to Subsection 5803 which are exemptions to site plan review regarding permitting of radio broadcast towers. Those towers require Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval and towers for government uses would be exempt. Lighting was discussed and no revisions have been proposed. The lights cannot be more restrictive than that of The Federal Communications Commission FCC guidelines for lights. In general, light shields are not permitted and there can be a request for red lighting.

*John Youmans entered the workshop at 5:11 p.m.*

Ms. Jeglie stated that in Subsection 7201 and 7202 about the review levels and staff made them more specific for site plans. In the staff report there is a table that shows the regulations that are in place and what the proposed changes are.

Chair Parramore asked why staff chose to remove the bonding issue. He stated that he did not think that it created undue burden or hardship on the part of the cell tower companies.

Ms. Jeglie stated that the County would have to hold the interest bond. She stated staff did not have specific direction on this and it wasn't all that common in the surrounding areas. She stated that it is a very complicated process so staff chose to not add it.

Chair Parramore asked what measures does the county employ to ensure that expired or unused towers are removed in a timely manner.

Ms. Jeglie stated that staff has a Code Enforcement Officer or received a phone call regarding an issue would be the only way staff would respond. The FCC monitors when towers are abandoned or inactive for their level of enforcement. At this time the staff are not notified yet staff could start checking the towers.

Diane Quigley read from Subsection 5814 which stated that the date of abandonment shall be made by the Planning Official who shall have the right to request documentation and/or

affidavits from the facility owner/operator of the facility regarding the active use of the facility regarding the issue of telecommunicate tower usage. The owner/operators responsible for removing now abandoned tower. She stated that staff can send out request to see if the tower is still active if there are issues and send out code enforcement. Staff can request that the owner/operator takes down the tower since they are responsible for it.

Chair Parramore asked if there was a change in ownership how was the County notified, so staff knew who to contact.

Ms. Quigley stated that staff does not track ownership at this time. The FCC has a website that tracks that information. She stated that it is something staff cannot do since there are so many towers, yet they when they need that information, they just check the FCC website. If staff feels that a tower has been abandoned, they check the tower on the FCC website staff and can ask for the tower to be taken down. She stated that upon the County's determination of such abandonment, the owner/operator of the communication site shall have an additional 180 Days to reactivate or dismantle the tower after abandonment. Upon determination of such abandonment, the County shall notify the owner of the property of record as recorded, the property owner is notified not just the tower operator. All approvals shall expire at the earlier of the 180 days of abandonment. The only way that staff is notified is if someone would tell, complain, or be notified by the FCC.

Chair Parramore asked if there were any other questions for Ms. Quigley.

Commissioner Bouie asked about how many towers are there in the County currently, what was the maturation date for the towers, and what was the exit plan for towers that are no longer in use.

Ms. Jeglie answered that the FCC keeps a count of active towers in the County and she did not count those. They also keep a count of the dismantled or inactive towers.

Commissioner Bouie asked if anyone on staff was monitoring that and how did they know if they needed to allow more towers in the area. Also, did the County have standards to say there is a limit on towers in the County.

Ms. Jeglie stated that the County did not have standards that say there is a limit and the FCC does not track the capacity for the County. When they come in for the tower, applicants have to provide a study of service with in a typically 3-mile radius.

Commissioner Bouie asked was there any evidence of service since there are people complaining about not having good service. She also asked how do citizens know that they are benefiting from allowing the towers to come into their community.

Chair Parramore stated there are multiple different types of towers including short wave, microwave towers, and cellphone towers for telecommunication purposes. He asked how many towers in each of those categories exist. If speaking specifically to cellphone towers in this workshop how will saturation play a role if there is a need for a cell phone tower and there is already a different type of tower that exist in the same proximity where a cell tower would go. He also asked how would those issues reconcile.

Ms. Jeglie stated that the proximity issue is reconciled through FCC when applicants apply through that agency. There are requirements through the FCC regarding spacing and interference. The County regulations are from a zoning stand point only. The reason that the Planning Commission is meeting is because of how the tower applications have been received over the past year and it was made loud and clear because of service issue.

Ms. Quigley added to Ms. Jeglie's response by stating that she understood the issue of saturation of towers, yet she did not know if the Planning Commission passed some sort of ordinance or governmental regulation limiting the number of towers in the County. The County cell towers have a number of antennas and different providers which are switched out regularly. The County cannot regulate the service provider, it can only set zoning and location requirements. For service issues going to the FCC would be the best bet since they can regulate that type of information. One approach would be to take FCC information and mapping it with GIS so the density could be shown for the different types of towers. Staff could identify what type of tower was on this map but not the services that were being provided off of those towers.

Commissioner Stallworth asked how did the County hold tower providers accountable to make sure that the towers were up to date. During hurricane Michael towers were damaged and not emitting correctly which caused issues with service.

Ms. Quigley stated County staff cannot regulate the services and types of services that are provided. The Commission can work with the Public Service Commission to see if there are any rural regulations on that issue. She stated that staff's hands are tied with the matter of types of service.

Commissioner Chukes asked if the quality of service was regulated by the state and federal level of government And Ms. Quigley responded yes.

Chair Parramore asked Commissioner Bouie if she had any follow up questions. Commissioner Bouie stated that even though they cannot regulate how the towers perform, it was beneficial to have that information. She stated that she was very interested about all the towers that are being taxed and did the County receive tax benefits.

Mr. Knowles stated that property taxes do go up once it is assessed by the Property Appraiser because the added value of the tower causes the land value to increase. He stated the increase is covered by the tower owner if they do not own the land.

Chair Parramore asked when the County receives the application for a cell tower placement, the FCC application is part of the County application.

Ms. Jeglie stated that before they start construction the owner of the tower must provide FCC approvals. She stated that part of the submittal requirement is a copy of a Non-ionizing Electromagnetic Radiation (NIER) report and a FAA determination of no hazards as required by the FCC. This shows that tower applicants have verification that they meet the Environmental Species Act and verification of tower antenna structure is compliant with national conservation.

Chair Parramore asked if all of those components were met before an approval request is submitted to this commission and Ms. Quigley stated yes.

Commissioner Brown stated that she has two towers within a half a mile from her house and only one is on the map. She stated that it would help if they knew what types of towers since she believes that one of the towers is a microwave tower. This could cause problems with competing towers service and over saturation of towers.

Ms. Quigley stated that the FCC 2014 maps do not have microwave towers on them. She stated that staff can get a map with the different types of towers.

Chair Parramore asked about the secure area where the tower is placed; is there a County ordinance or FCC regulation that stated the owners of what type of tower it was and who the provider/owner was.

Ms. Quigley stated that that was required by the FCC and it was located at the base of the tower.

Ms. Jeglie stated that it is the contact information of the owner of the tower and land. She stated that all service providers are not located at the base of the tower due to co-location.

Commissioner Youmans asked when an application is submitted to build a tower, did the County have any input on where it was placed.

Ms. Quigley stated that yes, they do because staff typically knows the property owner and they work with tower representative. The tower companies are the ones that look for the specific spots to place the towers. She stated that the tower company representatives make sure that they have the applications filled out and have an FCC license. They do studies for the service areas but it is very hard to regulate those services.

Commissioner Youmans asked about record keeping since he heard someone say that they cannot determine how many towers there are. He stated that if they apply for an application there should be somebody to keep that record of who is building it, where it's located, and who is the owner of the tower. Also, he stated that he feels like there should be a record somewhere that can at least say there are x-number of towers in Gadsden County just by using the applications.

Ms. Quigley stated there are factors that are out of staff's hands like the towers that were placed before they started regulations. She stated that there are multiple types of tower such as emergency services, microwave, collocated, and abandoned towers.

Ms. Jeglie stated that municipalities also have their own towers and their own regulations for towers that are put up in the County. Ms. Jeglie stated that staff could look at the FCC database and try to map the towers.

Ms. Quigley stated that the Department of Transportation (DOT) can place towers on their right of way and do not have to tell County staff. Staff will try to update the map and keep it up to date.

Commissioner Youmans stated that it was almost impossible to tell whether the County was over saturated with towers.

Ms. Quigley answered yes, that staff would reach out to the cities to see if they keep a list of their towers and work with DOT to see about the I-10 corridors. There was no way for the County to limit the saturation of them and the only thing that is in the County's proposed code is they have to at least be one mile apart. The only way for them to be closer, the tower company has to do a study showing the need for a deviation.

Commissioner Youmans asked was that something that the County staff would be interested in getting because that could cause a problem down the road. He stated when there are so many towers no one will be able to use their cellphones and that type thing so along the line it was something he felt the County should start looking at whether or not they wanted to get into it. Would this be something that would help the citizens in the County.

**Robert Volpe, Esquire**, appeared before the Board as a representative of the communication tower industry. In regards to tracking the towers each site is given an FCC permit number. The County application is the last step in the tower application process. FCC and FFA requirements are completed two to three years in advance before they even come to the County. The tower would be given an FCC number that is based off the latitude and longitude of the coordinates. They are mapped and there is a lot involved for a few years from the Federal Agency standpoint. Also, towers that are owned by government entities that are for other communication purposes such as emergency communication. Since there are so many types of towers, they are not all tracked and put on a single database. He stated that the County staff has done an incredible job and that the revised version of this Code is as good as it gets. The towers do have signs that have the owners' name, FCC number, and emergency numbers on them.

Ms. Quigley asked Mr. Volpe that it doesn't address the service provider on the tower signs.

Mr. Volpe answered that it is the owner of the property and the contact information for the emergency contact who ever that may be. That information is given to local emergency personnel during the application process. The process that the tower company's use go from the need determination then through the federal agencies which is all run by the carriers. When it gets to the determination of location that's when it comes to the County. At that point the first thing they look for is co-location because it's the least expensive way to provide the most service. There is a distinction between regulations and information. Applications have been 130-150 pages of supporting information that shows the work that has been done to get to the determination of locations. The information that is being looking for is being included in those applications. The carrier's goal is to find the best opportunity to provide the most service. The goal is to co-locate the towers, and every tower has the requirement for multiple antennas. There is a lack of locations in Gadsden County to meet the demand. When talking about saturation the demand for communication has skyrocketed and there is no way to provide service without constructing a new tower. Regarding the tax issue, yes this is an improvement on the property so when it is assessed by the Property Appraiser and typically the owner of the tower will pay those additional taxes.

Chair Parramore asked was there no negative impact to the homeowner via the added taxes.

Mr. Volpe answered that was correct.

Chair Parramore asked staff what was the frequency of applications.

Ms. Jeglie answered there are time gaps or cycles when they come in. It varies by the needs at that time.

Chair Parramore asked at the current rate of application, was there potential for over saturation or not.

Ms. Quigley stated that Mr. Knowles pulled up wireless2.fcc.gov and it listed the County towers. It lists 78 towers in Gadsden County that are licensed and some are have been dismantled.

Chair Parramore asked did the County have a threshold that determines over saturation or not.

Ms. Quigley stated that they do not. It would be up to County Officials to pass some sort of ordinance if they wanted to limit or put a max on the number of towers. However, since there are so many complaints regarding service, is that something the board is wanting to look in to?

Commissioner Roberts compared them to speakers, the higher the speaker, the further the sound goes unless something stops it. Is the situation at hand about the number of towers or of the strength of the signal in this area? There needs to be someone who comes and explains this to the board, because signal versus infrastructure are two different things.

Mr. Knowles informed the Commission that 29 of the 78.49 towers were not in use.

Commissioner Chukes stated that the towers that are DOT properties, they may not be able to find out anything on because he believed they were federal towers.

Commissioner Roberts stated that they would tell County staff what type of signal they are producing.

### **CITIZENS REQUESTING TO BE HEARD**

Marion Lasley made the following statements:

- Lighting: The current code states "Towers shall not be lit at night with white lights." This prohibition is not an FAA issue but one that states that if the FAA requires white lights, it will not be allowed and must be modified to conform to standards that only require red lighting at night. This language should stay in the proposed new wording. I can't imagine this is in any way a desirable option especially if one might allow towers every mile in the landscape!!
- Spacing: Allowing towers to be spaced 1 mile apart is horrifying thought. The previous two tower applications stated something like 2 ½ mile radius was what they were getting with these towers so why increase the density to allow one every mile? There are other options to wireless service such as a different carrier, a landline, internet service either by dish or cable.
- Type II: In the write up in Table 3, it states that towers will be Type I administrative review but a Type II procedure for all towers is stated in Subsection 5810 A. of the

proposed document. Will all towers have a Type II public hearing review process except exempt and camouflage tower?

- Setbacks: Even if all towers except exempt ones will have a public hearing, the Residential setbacks of a 375' setback to Ag 1 lands and 500' to Rural Residential lands still do not uphold the Purpose and Intent as stated. The visual blight that one will constantly see cannot be mitigated but only suffered in various ways. There is proposed setback in reality of only 25' from a property line for guy wires and equipment which includes a generator that will run intermittently and during power outages which we have regularly.
- Purpose and Intent: The Purpose and Intent is to avoid "proliferation of visually obtrusive facilities", minimize impacts on adjacent properties and respect the visual and physical environment by providing an aesthetically pleasing environment. Currently, the neighborhood is being allowed to have widespread notice of a cell tower's application. Citizens should have the opportunity to give input, for or against such an industrial development in their visual landscape. They should be allowed to discover what type of lighting will be affecting their nighttime skyline, how close the tower might fall to their property line, how close the generator equipment and guy wires will be to their house, how close the tower will be to their house, how this might impact the value of their investment by changing their aesthetically pleasing rural views cape into an industrial development and what this might do to their daily mental health, safety and welfare. The current code allows the public to be informed of a telecommunications tower application and to provide proper input to a change to their landscape. This is only right and as it should be. The developers should not be able to get a permit and construct a tower with no public notice or input. The County Commission allowed the creation of all of this disjunct Rural Residential land uses and now needs to protect each of those properties from industrial blight. The current code is not broken and does not need replacing just because the developers don't like it. Keep the existing language and setbacks and allow the neighborhoods to decide if they support the change in their surrounding and landscape and telecommunication service.

Chair Parramore asked if there were any other questions or comments for staff. Since there were none, Chair Parramore entertained a motion for adjournment of the workshop.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER YOUNG AND THE SECOND WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BROWN. A VOICE VOTE WAS CALLED. THE MOTION PASSED 7-0.**

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 5. TELECOMMUNICATION TOWER REGULATIONS PUBLIC HEARING (LDR 2021-01) – Consideration of Ordinance #2021-002 to approve amendments to Section 580 Communications Towers; amendments to definitions located in Subsection 2102, Specifically; and, amendments to Subsections 7201 Type 1 and Subsection 7202 Type 11 Procedures in the Gadsden County Land Development Code as follows:**

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF GADSDEN AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE BY AMENDING SUBSECTION 2102, SPECIFICALLY IN CHAPTER 2,**

**DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS; SECTION 5800, COMMUNICATION TOWERS IN CHAPTER 5, DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS; SUBSECTIONS 7101, TYPE 1 PROCEDURES AND SUBSECTION 7102, TYPE 11 PROCEDURES IN CHAPTER 7, DEVELOPMENT ORDERS, DEVELOPMENT PERMITS, AD DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS; AND PROVIDING FOR REPEAL, SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE GADSDEN COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, MODIFICATIONS THAT MAY ARISE FROM CONSIDERATION AT PUBLIC HEARING, AND CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Chair Parramore read the above statement.

Ms. Jeglie stated since the Gadsden County adopted telecommunication regulations in 1997, a committee was formed and tasked with drafting of what is now Section 5800 Communication Towers adopted in 2001 to address concerns pertaining to the location of towers. These regulations included restrictions on use by right and setbacks to mitigate the visual impacts on residences and roadway corridors. Telecommunication tower service providers have indicated that the County's telecommunication setbacks are excessive in comparison to other local governments. Citizens have complained about spotty coverage in areas. In 2014, a Planning Commission workshop was held to discuss revisions to the Telecommunication Tower regulations to remove barriers to the telecommunication tower siting. No amendments were moved forward. The onset of COVID 19 has further increased demand and highlighted the need for both capacity and coverage as people work from home and home school their children. The demand has increased need for additional data transmission capabilities. Many areas of the County do not have adequate coverage. As a result, the Telecommunication Tower regulations are being brought back for discussion for the purpose of removing barriers to providing coverage and capacity while striking a balance of protecting existing neighborhoods/residences, minimizing impacts on adjacent properties as well as preserving visual corridors and addressing technology. Amendments to the County's telecommunication regulations have been discussed by the Planning Commission at two workshops held on February 11, 2021 and March 11, 2021.

*Commissioner Bouie entered the meeting at 6:35 p.m.*

Chair Parramore asked if there were any questions from commissioners.

Commissioner Chukes stated that in the workshop he addressed the issue of how many miles it took for frequency to drop off. He believed that it would be congested with only one mile in between each tower.

Chair Parramore stated that would the five-mile spacing be an issue because his understanding is that you are not guaranteed a strong signal from the tower its self. That the signal strength is based on the generator and transmitter at the base of the tower, while it may have a five-mile compacity but the signal can drop. The only way people communicate now days is by cell phones. We have to provide everything that citizens need for emergency services.

Commissioner Roberts stated he wanted to see if there were other representatives or technical experts to come explain these issues to the commission. This is because Mr. Volpe is representative of company and he has an agenda regarding this issue.

Commissioner Brown stated that she has a problem with the towers having a minimum spacing of one mile apart. She stated that that was too close. Also, that she agreed with Commissioner Roberts on wanting more information on this issue.

Ms. Quigley stated that many counties did not have a separation standard. In staff's research that there is typically 1-3 miles apart. Staff suggested the minimum for the start but it can be expanded on. She stated that staff can get a tech expert but she did not think t they can give a definite answer.

Commissioner Brown asked if they did it at the two or three miles for the separation the only thing that will happen is that tower companies will have to request a deviation.

Ms. Quigley stated that that is correct, and that they will have them do a study for board approval of that deviation.

Commissioner Bouie recommended that the distance be further apart so they have to give the supporting information on each individual case. This is to have the applicant perform at a higher standard and not to lower the County's standards.

Chair Parramore called for a motion.

**COMMISSIONER ROBERTS MADE A MOTION FOR OPTION 3 AND SECOND WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BROWN.**

Ms. Quigley stated that specific changes had to be made and to state what changes they wanted.

**COMMISSIONER ROBERTS MADE A MOTION FOR OPTION 3 WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: 3-MILE RANGE INBETWEEN TOWERS; TO USE RED LIGHTS INSTEAD OF WHITE; AND HAVE SETBACKS OF 1500 FEET. SECOND WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER CHUKES. THE BOARD VOTED 11-0 TO APPROVE.**

<b>COMMISSIONER CHUKES</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER YOUMANS</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER BROWN</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER HAYES</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER ROBERS</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER STALLWORTH</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER WILLAMS</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER POWELL</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>COMMISSIONER SCOTT</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>VICE CHAIR BOUIE</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>CHAIR PARRAMORE</b>	<b>YES</b>

Chair Parramore read Don Stewart's comments and showed the picture that was provided to be placed into public record. His statement is as follows:

“Honorable Commissioners, I have chosen to provide written input for the Workshop, but have requested to speak via Zoom for the Public Hearing. In a poll on Nextdoor, 90 percent of my neighbors in Reston who voted, approved the allowance for camouflage towers in Rural Residential. Thus, I support the inclusion of the allowance for camouflage towers in Residential as a deviation request with a Type II, quasi-judicial review with notification. However, I do not support the change in setback from Residential from 1/2 mile (2, 640 feet) to 500 feet. I hope you are looking at the photo I included of a real example looking from a residential area on Sierra Road at the tower on US 27 (4465 Florida Georgia Hwy). Please ask yourself, if you would want a tower that close to your home. To me, it's too close and visually unappealing. I suggest a distance of at least 1500 feet (approximately .3 mile). If a provider proposes to build closer than that, they can always ask for a deviation and the residential neighbor/s can express support or opposition at a PC and BCC meeting. I suggest that the same setback apply to Historic Future Land Use. In the packet for the February 11, 2021 Workshop is this paragraph. "Separation - A one mile separation between towers is proposed. The capacity limitation is usually the factor that determines the spacing of cell towers. In suburban areas cell towers are commonly spaced 1-2 miles apart. Coverage can range from .5 of a mile to as far as 25 miles. A deviation can be requested for greater separation." I observe two things. One, there is no standard regarding separation of towers in the current ordinance. And there are existing towers closer than 1 mile apart. So, this is an improvement over the existing ordinance. Secondly, the last sentence, is probably meant to be "A deviation can be requested for **less** separation." In any event the propose ordinance states: "The separation between towers shall be no less than one mile. I observe that two (Havana West and 84 Triple H Lane) of the current towers in process are more than 3 miles apart. Providers build towers to satisfy coverage and capacity for customers. I would be very surprised is anyone proposes to put towers that close (1 mile) together anytime soon. Thank you for considering this input.”

Mr. Stewart appeared remotely and stated that he did not have anything else to add to his statement.

Mr. Volpe stated that staff has gone above and beyond and this draft is supported by all government entities. These draft addresses all the issues that have come before the Commission and he supported all the changes that have been made to it.

Marion Lasley came before the Commission and readdressed her comments from the workshop. Please see the workshop Citizens to be Heard section for her statement.

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **7. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION- New Business**

Chair Parramore asked if there was any new business. Hearing none he proceeded to the next item.

### **8. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

#### **a. Revisit Proposed Subsection 1306 Community Meetings**

Ms. Quigley stated that Commissioner Jeff Diekman has resigned from the Planning Commission. Staff has reached out to Commissioner Eric Hinson of the Board of County Commissioners for a replacement. Once the Board votes on the replacement, they will be part of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Quigley stated that the Citizen’s Bill of Rights that had community meetings in them. She asked for clarification from the board about still having them for some of the larger issues that would come before the commission.

Chair Parramore stated that with the current Code there is public hearing here and at the Board of County Commissioners’ meeting.

Ms. Quigley stated that was correct.

Chair Parramore stated that the community has ample opportunity to discuss their issues and concerns.

Ms. Quigley stated that the issues that staff will be bringing before the Commission in the following months will include agritourism. This issue is absent from the County’s Land Development Code and there is no direction from anywhere other than the State. There will be two public hearings. They will bring back the towers once they have addressed the issues that have been addressed in this meeting.

Commissioner Bouie stated that she was concerned about heir property Codes and she was under the impression that the Citizens Bill of Rights had a group of Codes with them. There were issues on the subdivision of land and the number of dwellings on property. She hoped they could address those types of Codes so they can grow with the County.

Chair Parramore asked Ms. Quigley about reviewing the Land Development Code.

Ms. Quigley stated that the Board of County Commissioners has asked to focus on the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map.

The next scheduled Planning Commission Meeting is April 15, 2021 at 6 pm.

**9. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**  
**UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BROWN AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BOUIE, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 7:16 P.M.**

**GADSDEN COUNTY, FL**

---

**REV. DR. JOE PARRAMORE, Chair**  
**Planning Commission**

**ATTEST:**

---

**NICHOLAS THOMAS, Clerk**