



**PRESUBMITTAL MEETING  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
MARK TWAIN PARK MONOPOLE  
AT&T REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING ANTENNAS  
FOLLOW UP INFORMATION**

**Date:** August 31, 2011  
**Planner:** Jon Regala, Senior Planner  
**File No.:** PRE10-00063

**Proposal:** Replace existing antennas on existing tower with new antennas. Install equipment cabinet on grade within an existing compound.

**Property Address:** 10633 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE  
**Property Owner:** Timothy & Nancy Lamas  
14660 NW Arabian Way Seabeck, WA 98380

**Contact:** Todd Walton  
12704 Palantine Avenue N Seattle, WA 98133  
206-334-4116  
[Todd.Walton@TelcoPacific.com](mailto:Todd.Walton@TelcoPacific.com)

**Parcel No.:** 332605-9055  
**Panel No.:** H1  
**Zoning:** P  
**Lot Size:** 26,570 according to King County  
**Permit Plan:** Various. ZON03-00020 & ZON01-00004 are previous wireless zoning permits  
**Development Actions Map:** Various  
**Sensitive Areas Map:** N/A

## **I. CITY COMMENTS**

### **A. KZC 117.60 – Third Party Review**

In certain instances (particularly Process IIA and Process IIB permit applications) there may be a need for expert review by a third party of the technical data submitted by the applicant. The City may require such a technical review, to be paid for by the applicant. The selection of the third party expert shall be by mutual agreement between the applicant and the City, and such agreement not to be unreasonably withheld by either party. The third party expert shall have recognized training and qualifications in the field of radio frequency engineering.

The expert review is intended to be a site-specific review of technical aspects of the PWSF, and other matters described herein, and not a subjective review of the site selection. In particular, but without limitation, the expert shall be entitled to provide a recommendation on the height of the proposed facilities relative to the applicant's coverage objectives and system design parameters. Such a review should address the accuracy and completeness of the technical data, whether the analysis techniques and methodologies are legitimate, the validity of the

**NOTE:** *The information related by the City staff is a preliminary, qualified assessment which is based on the information provided by the applicant/contact person. More detailed technical review of a specific development permit application may disclose additional substantive or procedural requirements. Furthermore, in the case of a discretionary development permit, the role and authority of the City staff is advisory only. Final recommendation and decision on such permits can only be made, after public comment and/or public hearing, by the Planning Director (as to Short Plats and Zoning Code Process I Permits), the Hearing Examiner, or the Planning Commission and City Council, depending upon the type of permit.*

conclusions, and any specific technical issues outlined by the City or other interested parties.

Based on the results of the third party review, the City may require changes to the application to comply with the recommendations of the expert.

1. The City will be using Sparling out of Seattle: <http://www.sparling.com/firm/firm.aspx>
  2. Sparling provided a third party review for the subject property back in 2000. Please confirm in writing that the applicant is okay with using Sparling as the third party reviewer. You can submit this information with the zoning permit application. A contract will also be prepared by the City for review and approval by all parties.
- B. As part of the zoning permit application, please provide additional materials which provide supporting background information on the following items for review by Sparling and the City.
1. KZC 117.65.3.a - Antennas shall be integrated into the design of any tower to which they are attached. External projections from the tower shall be limited to the greatest extent technically feasible. Where antennas are completely enclosed within the tower, the need for the backdrop described in the preceding paragraph may be reduced or eliminated, depending on the tower design and context.
  2. KZC 117.65.3.d - Where feasible, cable and/or conduit shall be routed through the inside of any new tower, utility pole, or other support structure. Where this is not feasible, or where such routing would result in a structure of a substantially different design or substantially greater diameter than that of other similar structures in the vicinity or would otherwise appear out of context with its surroundings, the City may allow or require that the cable or conduit be placed on the outside of the structure. The outside cable or conduit shall be the color of the tower, utility pole, or other support structure, and the City may require that the cable be placed in conduit.
  3. KZC 117.65.5 - Tower and Antenna Height – The applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City that the tower and antenna are the minimum height required to function satisfactorily. Personal wireless service towers shall not exceed 40 feet in residential zones, as measured from the average building elevation at the tower base to the highest point of the tower, antenna, or other physical feature attached to or supported by the tower. Examples of information that can be used to demonstrate that the tower and antennas are the minimum height necessary include, but are not limited to, propagation maps showing the necessity of the height to provide the required coverage, and a letter from a radio frequency engineer stating and explaining the necessity of the proposed height.
  4. KZC 117.70.1 - Max height of any equipment structures in a residential zone is 5'.

**NOTE:**

*The information related by the City staff is a preliminary, qualified assessment which is based on the information provided by the applicant/contact person. More detailed technical review of a specific development permit application may disclose additional substantive or procedural requirements. Furthermore, in the case of a discretionary development permit, the role and authority of the City staff is advisory only. Final recommendation and decision on such permits can only be made, after public comment and/or public hearing, by the Planning Director (as to Short Plats and Zoning Code Process I Permits), the Hearing Examiner, or the Planning Commission and City Council, depending upon the type of permit.*

*<From what I recall, the reason for a Process IIB permit is that this regulation is not being met. Please provide background information as to alternatives and reasons for the preferred alternative.>*

## **II. PROCESS**

Process IIB Zoning Permit – Hearing Examiner public hearing. Hearing Examiner makes a recommendation to the City Council. City Council makes final decision. Approximately 4-6 month review timeframe.

- A. Finalize contract with Sparling
- B. Submit application, application materials, and fees (including third party review fee)
- C. Determination of Completeness (28 days)
- D. Public notice
- E. Forward information to Sparling for their review
- F. Public comment period (14 days)
- G. SEPA Review and determination
- H. SEPA appeal period (14 days)
- I. Staff Report
- J. Hearing Examiner - Public Hearing
- K. City Council action

## **III. FEES**

### **A. Zoning Review**

Process IIB Application fee = \$29,156.00

SEPA Review fee = \$552

Subtotal = \$29,708.00

1.3% Technology Surcharge = \$386.20

**TOTAL** = \$30,094.20

### **B. Third Party**

Third Party review fee will be approximately \$1,600 to \$2,000. Final cost to be determined and should be submitted with zoning permit application. In addition, there will be a charge of \$200/hr for the consultant to attend the public hearing. The applicant will be responsible for these fees.

## **NOTE:**

*The information related by the City staff is a preliminary, qualified assessment which is based on the information provided by the applicant/contact person. More detailed technical review of a specific development permit application may disclose additional substantive or procedural requirements. Furthermore, in the case of a discretionary development permit, the role and authority of the City staff is advisory only. Final recommendation and decision on such permits can only be made, after public comment and/or public hearing, by the Planning Director (as to Short Plats and Zoning Code Process I Permits), the Hearing Examiner, or the Planning Commission and City Council, depending upon the type of permit.*