



Loudoun County, Virginia

www.loudoun.gov

County Administration

1 Harrison Street, S.E., 5th Floor, P.O. Box 7000, Leesburg, VA 20177-7000

Telephone (703) 777-0200 • Fax (703) 777-0325

At a public hearing of the Board of Supervisors of Loudoun County, Virginia, held in the County Government Center, Board of Supervisors' Meeting Room, 1 Harrison St., S.E., Leesburg, Virginia, on Wednesday, October 5, 2005 at 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Bruce E. Tulloch, Vice Chairman
James G. Burton
James E. Clem
Eugene A. Delgaudio
Sally Kurtz
Stephen J. Snow
Mick Staton Jr.
Lori L. Waters

ABSENT: Scott K. York, Chairman

IN RE: CMPT 2005-0001 AND SPEX 2005-0009 / NEXTEL AT GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Mrs. Waters moved that the Board of Supervisors suspend the rules.

Seconded by Mrs. Kurtz.

Voting on the Motion: Supervisors Burton, Clem, Delgaudio, Kurtz, Snow, Staton, Tulloch, and Waters –Yes; None – No; Chairman York absent for the vote.

Mrs. Waters moved that the Board of Supervisors ratify the Planning Commission approval of 2005-0001, Nextel at George Washington University, subject to the Commission Permit plat dated April 29, 2005, and the findings in the September 13, 2005 staff report.

Mrs. Waters moved that the Board of Supervisors approve SPEX 2005-0009, Nextel at George Washington University, subject to the conditions of approval dated June 21, 2005, and the findings contained in the September 13, 2005 staff report.

Seconded by Mr. Clem.

Voting on the Motion: Supervisors Burton, Clem, Delgaudio, Kurtz, Snow, Staton, Tulloch, and Waters –Yes; None – No; Chairman York absent for the vote.

COPY TESTE:

DEPUTY CLERK FOR THE LOUDOUN
COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

b-cmpt2005-0001 and spex 2005-0009 nextel at george washington university

II. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Referral Agency	Issues Examined and Status
Comprehensive Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed site and rooftop location is an appropriate and preferred location as identified in the Plan – no outstanding issues. • The overall design and visual impact of the replacement antennas and equipment cabinet is in conformance with Plan policies – no outstanding issues.
Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Commission Permit and Special Exception are required for the proposal. The special exception application proceeds directly to the Board without Planning Commission review – no outstanding issues. • Initial questions have been addressed by the applicant – no outstanding issues.
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will generate less than 10 trips per month - no outstanding issues.
<p>Proffers – There are no proffers associated with the approval of a Commission Permit or Special Exception. The approved proffers and Concept Development Plan remain in effect for the entire University Center development. The approved concept plan depicts the University at this location.</p>	

III. PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW

The Planning Commission reviewed the Commission Permit application at the June 20, 2005, public hearing. No one from the public spoke regarding the application. The Planning Commission did not have any questions regarding the application. The Commission voted 7-0-2 (Syska and Tolle absent) to approve the Commission Permit application and to forward it to the Board of Supervisors for ratification.

FINDINGS for COMMISSION PERMIT & SPECIAL EXCEPTION

1. The proposal is consistent with the policies of the Revised General Plan, including the Strategic Land Use Plan for Telecommunications Facilities.
2. The location of the proposed antennas and equipment cabinet is a preferred location (on an existing building) according to Plan policies.
3. The proposal conforms to the requirements of the 1972 Zoning Ordinance.

IV. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The subject property shall be developed in substantial conformance with the special exception plat dated April 29, 2005, prepared by SCE Inc. Approval of this application does not relieve the applicant of any Zoning Ordinance, Codified Ordinance, or any other regulatory requirement.

V. PROJECT REVIEW

A. Context

A commission permit and special exception is required when a public utility or public service facility is constructed. The Zoning Ordinance is silent concerning wireless telecommunications facilities; however, the Zoning Administrator has made a determination that these facilities shall be processed as a public utility. The special exception application has proceeded directly to the Board of Supervisors, without Planning Commission review, in accordance with the 1972 Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Nextel is licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to provide telecommunications service to its users. This requires a network of antennas and associated equipment to broadcast and receive radio signals within a limited frequency to wireless users in the vicinity. Each site is capable of covering a limited area based on the height of the antennas, the surrounding topography, and any obstructions (such as trees or buildings).

There are existing antennas and communications dishes and associated equipment located on the GWU roof. The applicant is proposing to install up to ten additional panel antennas on the roof. The taller building is a five story brick structure (86 feet in height) with a parapet wall that runs the length of the building. A smaller, four story building (75 feet in height) is attached to the larger structure and has a cupola on the roof.

Nextel proposes to install up to eight panel antennas on the taller building. The antennas will be pole-mounted and will extend four feet above the existing parapet wall. The remaining two antennas will be flush mounted on the cupola and will not extend above it. The equipment cabinet will be installed inside the cupola. The antennas and associated equipment will not generate any noise, fumes, lights, glare, or vibrations. The proposed facilities will be unmanned and will require routine maintenance once or twice a month.

B. Summary of Outstanding Issues

All of the questions identified in the initial referral comments have been addressed on the revised plat or in the response letter dated May 11, 2005. There are no outstanding issues with these applications.