



City of Greenville
Design Review Board – Urban Design Panel
Minutes of the **July 2nd, 2020** Regular Meeting
Webex Virtual Meeting

Meeting Notice Posted on Wednesday, June 17th, 2020
Minutes prepared by Matt Lonnerstater

Members Present: Carmella Cioffi, William Crawford, John Edwards, Danielle Fontaine, Mitch Lehde
Members Absent: None
Staff Present: Jay Graham, Planning and Development Manager, Logan Wells, Assistant City Attorney; Courtney Powell, Senior Development Planner; Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner; Brennan Williams, Community Development Division; Kris Kurjiaka, Development Planner; Benjamin Abdo, Development Planner; Jordan Harris, Development Intern.

Call to Order:

Chairwoman Carmella Cioffi called the virtual meeting to order at 4:12 PM. She welcomed those in attendance and explained the procedures for the meeting. The minutes of the June 4th, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously. The agenda for the July 2nd, 2020 meeting was approved unanimously. All affidavits were received. No conflicts of interests were cited. Planner Lonnerstater called out to the public to gather names for public comment.

Old Business:

A. None

New Business:

A. CA 19-674

Application by Kimley Horn on behalf of Verizon Wireless for a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for new wireless infrastructure.

Planner Lonnerstater presented the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new small-cell wireless facility polls within city rights-of-way. The applicant is seeking design approval for two types of poles, a wood pole and a metal pole. Per the City's Small-Cell Wireless Facilities Design Catalogue, applicants may submit details for inclusion in the catalogue. Lonnerstater clarified that the applicant has not, to-date, formally submitted a list of node locations; rather, the applicant is seeking approval for design only. Lonnerstater outlined staff's support of a wood pole with a concealed shroud at the top and support of a slim metal pole design with a pole-top omni antenna. Staff is not supportive of the decorative lamp attachments. Lonnerstater outlined staff's recommended conditions of approval:

1. The wood pole design shall feature a concealed antenna shroud of the same diameter as the wood pole for pole-top omni technology antennae and a similarly suitable shroud proposal for future technology currently unspecified. Applicant shall submit to staff a revised wood pole design depicting the applicable shroud solution at the top of the pole rather than exposed antennas/radios; and
2. The wood pole design shall only be permitted for use in rights-of-way where there are existing wood utility pole along the same block face; and

3. Equipment cabinets should be about the width of the pole (so that from the opposite side they are only partially visible); and
4. Metal poles shall be of a slim design and feature the omni-top antenna design; and
5. The decorative lamps are not approved for the metal poles; and
6. Colorations should match the pole for the wood pole, and the stealth facilities should be colored the same as street lights along the same corridor; and
7. No elements are permitted that are not shown on the design (e.g., lighting, noise-generating equipment); and
8. This is a design approval only. All specific locations must be authorized by an individual node site license issued upon a showing of compliance with the LMO, the right-of-way management ordinance, and the terms of the Verizon Franchise Agreement dated November 25, 2019.

David Franklin, 6410 Yellow Birch St., Cumming, GA – applicant - presented updated graphics that incorporate 5G technology. Mr. Franklin clarified that the wood poles would likely only be permitted where there are existing wood poles.

Ian Thomas, 209 Perry Ave., stated that he would prefer to see metal pole design #3 (slim design, omni-top antenna). If the wood pole is to be approved, Mr. Thomas would like to see a case-by-case review.

Danielle Fontaine expressed her preference for the metal pole over the wood pole design.

Chairwoman Cioffi stated that if a light pole or lamp is preferred, a condition should be that the lamp would need to match those existing in the surrounding area. Chairwoman Cioffi expressed her preference for the wood pole with the shroud.

John Edwards commented that the shrouded method is preferred, but that technology may shrink in the future

William Crawford made a motion to approve application CA 19-674 for the shrouded wood pole and metal pole option number 3 (omni-top antenna and slim design), with the following conditions:

- 1. The wood pole design shall feature a concealed antenna shroud of the same diameter as the wood pole for pole-top omni technology antennae and a similarly suitable shroud proposal for future technology currently unspecified. Applicant shall submit to staff a revised wood pole design depicting the applicable shroud solution at the top of the pole rather than exposed antennas/radios; and**
- 2. The wood pole design shall only be permitted for use in rights-of-way where there are existing wood utility pole along the same block face; and**
- 3. Equipment cabinets should be about the width of the pole (so that from the opposite side they are only partially visible); and**
- 4. Metal poles shall be of a slim design and feature the omni-top antenna design; and**
- 5. The metal pole shall include a decorative base if there is a pattern of decorative bases in the area.**
- 6. The decorative lamps are not approved for the metal poles; and**

7. Colorations should match the pole for the wood pole, and the stealth facilities should be colored the same as street lights along the same corridor; and
8. No elements are permitted that are not shown on the design (e.g., lighting, noise-generating equipment); and
9. This is a design approval only. All specific locations must be authorized by an individual node site license issued upon a showing of compliance with the LMO, the right-of-way management ordinance, and the terms of the Verizon Franchise Agreement dated November 25, 2019.

Motion seconded by John Edwards and approved 5-0.

Other Business (Not a Public Hearing):

- A. None

Advice and Comment (Not a Public Hearing)

- A. None

Informal Review (Not a Public Hearing):

- A. None

Adjourn:

Having no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.