



[If you have concerns about the proliferation of cell phone towers—including 5G monopoles—across the city, you should pay attention and read on...]

1) On May 26, the SLC Planning Commission will decide whether to allow "stealth" cell towers up to 60-feet tall as permitted uses in all zoning across Salt Lake City except residential zones, where they would be conditional uses (needing approval by the Planning Commission on a case-by-case basis). Find the meeting agenda here:

<https://www.slc.gov/planning/public-meetings/planning-commission-agendas-minutes/>

2) FYI: Stealth cell towers are disguised as trees, flagpoles, chimneys or lampposts with the goal of "concealing the intended use and appearance of the facility." They also need to: "conform with the dimension of the object it is being disguised as," and "be in concert with its surroundings."

3) Currently, SLC code limits wireless towers to only certain zoning districts and restricts their height to the same limit as other structures in the zoning district. In most residential zones, that height limit is 30 to 35 feet.

4) This Verizon proposal is not directly related to the 5G monopoles (which are not stealth towers) that have been appearing across SLC... except that it would further reduce existing limits on wireless carriers on the height and placement of their wireless towers. It seems that Verizon made this proposal after their recent request for an 80-foot stealth tower in Poplar Grove was trimmed down to 60 feet by city planners. Verizon is making this proposal to remove the city review process for stealth towers in non-residential zones.

Read more here: <https://www.slc.gov/planning/2020/08/24/stealth-cellular-towers-text-amendments/>

5) Currently, the Verizon proposal does not include additional buffer zones for 60-foot stealth towers adjacent to residential areas. That means 60-foot towers could be placed next to residential zones as permitted use (i.e. no review), including zones like CB in 9th and 9th, and CN in 15th and 15th.

6) Whether you support this proposal.... or if (like ELPCO) you have serious concerns about reducing the height and location limits for wireless carriers at a time when SLC faces an unregulated and unknown proliferation of 5G towers across the city, you can register comments with Aaron Barlow, the principal planner at SLC managing this proposal.

Email Aaron Barlow at aaron.barlow@slcgov.com Note: If you respond before this Thursday (5/20), your comments might be included in the staff report that Mr. Barlow prepares for the SLC Planning Commissioners ahead of next Wednesday's meeting.

And while you're at it, please copy your email to planning.comments@slcgov.com, along with mayor@slcgov.com and council.comments@slcgov.com to get more bang for your comments.

All those emails are: aaron.barlow@slcgov.com, planning.comments@slcgov.com, mayor@slcgov.com, council.comments@slcgov.com

And if you're looking for reasons to oppose this proposal, consider borrowing some of the ideas listed below that ELPCO jotted down.

Key Arguments against Stealth Towers Text Amendment (PLNPCM2020-00284)

1-At a time when wireless carriers are freely exercising their immunity in Salt Lake City from zoning limits, notification requirements, and local control, now is not the time to give them more authority to add taller towers in more places.

2-Salt Lake City should be guiding its land use and zoning process, not commercial interests who value market share and profits over the needs of city residents.



3-A 60-foot man-made structure would be an unprecedented height in most low-density commercial zones like CN-Neighborhood Commercial and CB-Community Business. This proposal makes it a permitted use with no review. It would also be taller than most buildings outside downtown business district and downtown Sugar House, and the University of Utah.

4-Salt Lake City needs to understand the long-term scope and impact of 5G monopole placements before allowing this significant expansion of taller cell towers in more areas of the city.

5-Instead of giving wireless carriers a blanket rule to add 60-foot stealth towers in all areas of the city (either permitted or conditional use), Salt Lake City should retain its existing land use policy of conditional use for all towers higher than the maximum height for the area zoning.

6-While 60-foot stealth towers will be conditional uses in residential areas, this proposal opens the door to an approval process that is rarely denied.

7-This proposal would allow 60-foot towers to build as a permitted use in iconic non-residential zoning districts that are closely surrounded by residential areas, such as 9th and 9th (CB-Community Business), 1300 S and 1100 East and 15th and 15th (CN-Neighborhood Commercial).

8-Height limits are one of the most important design elements of local zoning. Giving wireless carriers the authority to ignore height limits without review in large areas of the city damages the integrity of the zoning code.