

Telecommunications Facility Policies/Protocols: Summary of Consultation with other Land Use Authorities

Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy		City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
Issues	Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy	City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
Tower Height	<p>Winnipeg: “prefers that freestanding communication facilities be a maximum of 30 m (100 feet) in height, except in industrial areas.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -consider height bonuses over 30 m, up to 76 m (200 feet, “where communication facilities are co-located”). -bonus requirements include accommodation of one additional user’s equipment for every 7.6 m (25 feet) of height above 30 m (100 feet). <p>City of Richmond - recommends a maximum height for stand-alone towers be set at 15 m (48 ft.) or the maximum accessory structure height in the applicable zone, whichever is greater.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -recognizes Industry Canada’s authority under the <i>Radiocommunication Act</i>, that “local zoning is not applied so as to impair the performance of the telecommunications network (A, p. 1 of 8). -“development variance permits” would allow height to be varied 	No specific guidelines on new tower height
Tower Type Preferences	<p>Winnipeg – Monopole in residential areas.</p> <p>Mississauga – Monopole</p> <p>Toronto – Monopole within 120 m of residential neighbourhood</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -no preferred type stated, -rationale: individual siting situations and monopoles tend to need to be higher to accommodate co-location as compared with lattice or tri-poles. <p>Under Section 5 “Design and Visual Impact” 5.02(f) states,</p>

Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy		City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
Issues		under “Tower type” that “designs with the least visual impact should be used.”
Setback Guidelines	<p>Calgary: Setback guidelines to residential areas is from between 2 to 3 times proposed tower height</p> <p>Toronto: Setback guideline to residential areas: “equivalent to height of the telecommunication tower...whenever possible” [(D(d), p. 5)].</p>	<p>Edmonton: Setbacks should be maximized to residential areas and be at least same as the setbacks in the applicable Zone (4.04)(b).</p>
Notification:	<p>Toronto, Calgary, Winnipeg require notification to <u>both</u> landowners and tenants</p> <p>Richmond, Mississauga, Vancouver require notification to property owners</p> <p>Vancouver notifies property owners consistent with its Development Permit process (City discretion as to whether or not consultation is required)</p>	<p>-notification to both landowners and tenants. -tenant notification in former policy advised where a high proportion of rental accommodation exists</p>
Notification Distance to Residential Areas (where required)	<p>Calgary: 300 metres to residential development or residential district</p> <p>Toronto: 3 times tower height or 120 m, whichever is greater</p> <p>Winnipeg: 3 times tower height</p> <p>Vancouver: Director of Development recommendation (not specific)</p>	<p>Edmonton: six (6) times proposed tower height (beyond Industry Canada guideline)</p>

Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy		City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
Issues		
Notification Distance to Residential Areas (where required)	<p>City of Richmond: six (6) times proposed tower height (beyond Industry Canada guideline; same as Edmonton).</p> <p>Toronto: Study required showing all similar facilities within 500 m of proposed facility. -statement as to why co-location not viable is required.</p> <p>Calgary: Statement as to why co-location is not possible for technical or other reasons is required.</p> <p>Mississauga: Site Selection/Justification Report – by Engineer or land use planner. -required to state why co-location on existing facility is not viable -includes details of coverage and capacity of existing facilities.</p> <p>Richmond: may require appropriate information from Proponent’s consultants to confirm whether or not co-location is possible.</p>	<p>Edmonton: “Co-location Feasibility Review” required (8.02). -required to include details of coverage and capacity of existing telecommunications infrastructure. -City may require verification of the results of this study through a third-party analysis.</p>
Co-Location Site Investigation report required?		
Co-Location – new towers must or should provide for future co-location?	<p>Calgary (2011) new towers “shall be designed with co-location capacity”</p> <p>Toronto: new towers must accommodate up to two other carriers, but only applies in non-residential areas</p> <p>Winnipeg: like Toronto, encourages co-location capability on new towers, but only where tower not in proximity to a residential area.</p>	<p>Edmonton: Location (4.02)(b) Antennae co-location on existing Telecommunications Facilities is preferred.</p> <p>8. Site Investigation: 8.02(a)(iii) “Proponents should consider the</p>
	<i>Continued</i>	

Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy		City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
<p>Issues</p>	<p>Co-Location – new towers must or should provide for future co-location?</p>	<p>possibility of future requests for co-location on proposed facilities and sites, in the design of Telecommunications Facilities”.</p>
<p>Co-Location – new towers must or should provide for future co-location?</p>	<p>City Richmond: “All new Installations should be designed and engineered to accommodate additional antennas and related supporting infrastructure... particularly to the extent that it does not significantly increase the visible bulk of antennas...” [4(A)(b), p.6].</p> <p>Mississauga: new towers should “allow for future co-location of facilities” [3.4(C), p. 4].</p> <p>Vancouver: emphasis on co-locating on existing buildings, relatively few tower locations</p>	<p>Edmonton: proposed protocol requires consultation for situations indicated in section 11.01(a) and (c), and may be required for 11.01(b) and (d). Some of the instances where consultation may be required otherwise fall under Industry Canada’s exclusion list.</p> <p>In most cases, consultation will not be required for situations described in 11.01(b) and (d), but the City reserves the right to require consultation if the individual circumstance warrants. It</p>
<p>Consultation Requested - beyond Industry Canada Client Procedures Circular (CPC-2-0-03)?</p> <p>CPC-2-0-03 allows municipalities to request consultation despite exclusions:</p> <p><i>Continued</i></p>	<p>Most other municipalities list Industry Canada’s exceptions to public consultation, or, they may include design guidelines for some structure types, but do not typically require public consultation in situations that include Industry Canada-exempted applications.</p> <p>e.g. Winnipeg, Toronto, Mississauga, Richmond, lists exemptions consistent with Industry Canada’s requirements in Sections 44 and 45 (p.p. 9-10).</p> <p>Calgary also lists some situations where consultation may be required, notwithstanding Industry Canada’s exemption list, at the discretion of the City of Calgary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -e.g. building-mounted facilities, where the roof top is not higher than surrounding residential development – same as City of Edmonton 11.01(e) (column to right). -e.g. towers of any height within 100 metres of a residential district require public consultation (as a Type “A” application), 	<p>Edmonton: proposed protocol requires consultation for situations indicated in section 11.01(a) and (c), and may be required for 11.01(b) and (d). Some of the instances where consultation may be required otherwise fall under Industry Canada’s exclusion list.</p> <p>In most cases, consultation will not be required for situations described in 11.01(b) and (d), but the City reserves the right to require consultation if the individual circumstance warrants. It</p>

Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy		City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
Issues		
Consultation Requested - beyond Industry Canada Client Procedures Circular (CPC-2-0-03)?	<p>unless they are on street light pole, on a parking light pole, or on existing utility structure (and are under 15 m in height)</p> <p>Toronto: Administration report Sept. 10, 2012, being considered Oct. 31, 2012, recommends Council to request Industry Canada to amend the Client Procedures Circular (CPC-2-0-03) to allow municipalities to request public consultation where proposed telecommunications towers are under 15 m (currently exempted by Industry Canada)</p>	<p>should be noted that Industry Canada has the right to overrule the City and not require consultation where the telecommunication facility is listed as an exclusion.</p> <p>From CPC-2-0-03, section 6: <i>“...exclusion criteria ...should be applied in consideration of local circumstances. Consequently, it may be prudent for the Proponents to consult with LUA and the public even though the proposal meets an exclusion noted above.”</i></p>
Public Meeting Type – specified?	<p>Winnipeg, Calgary, Richmond, Toronto, Vancouver either do not specify a particular type of meeting to be held by the proponent, or simply suggest an “Open House” (Richmond, Mississauga)</p> <p>Richmond, Winnipeg: Public Meeting requirement may be waived, if City determines that anticipated level of public reaction is minimal or if no outstanding issues after first notification</p> <p>Vancouver: freestanding tower applications in or near residential and commercial areas will require full Development</p>	<p>Edmonton: format is not specified, and up to the Proponent. The chosen format is typically is an open house, and that is consistent with what other municipalities require.</p>
<i>Continued</i>		

Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy		City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
Issues		
Public Meeting Type – specified?	<p>permit Application (and notification of property owners), but distance where notification applies is determined by City. -public meeting not necessarily required.</p>	
<p>Towers < 15 m - trends</p> <p>-is consultation requested for short towers/modest additions despite exemption from Public Consultation from Industry Canada?</p> <p><i>Continued</i></p>	<p>Toronto: Administration monitoring trend toward antennae on light poles on arterial/collector roadways in view of potential residential intensification (i.e., to avoid antennae being horizontally in-line with mid-rise apartments – intent to avoid 15 m towers unless they are above future residential development.</p> <p>Calgary: Rogers has replaced some 56 light poles and added antennae, at their cost. Pays City Lease Fee</p> <p>-little to none negative public reaction</p> <p>-these normally exempt from public consultation (Type “B” application)</p> <p>-towers of any height, including under 15 m and within 100 metres of a residential development or residential district require consultation (Type “A” application), unless they are on street light pole, on a parking light pole, or on existing utility structure (and are under 15 m in height)</p> <p>Red Deer: Telus has pilot project, adding Picco Booster cells to existing light poles in Downtown.</p>	<p>Edmonton: requires consultation where the additional height would cause tower to be > 15 m in height <i>and</i> it would then be within 6 times tower height of residential area (despite Industry Canada exemption for additions of 25% or less on towers that are otherwise < 15 m in height).</p>
<p>Towers < 15 m - trends</p> <p>-i.e. if addition is 25% or less of the original tower height for towers less than 15 m in height.</p>		
<p>Visual Design</p> <p><i>Continued</i></p>	<p>Calgary, Richmond, Mississauga, Winnipeg, Toronto all state that where appropriate, camouflage, disguised, or “stealth” design techniques be used to design a telecommunications antenna or tower into an existing feature in the area, such as a flagpole, clock tower, or landscape</p>	<p>Edmonton, similarly, encourages stealth design under Section 5 Design and Visual Impact, under 5.02(e) Structure.</p>

Issues	Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy	City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
<p>Visual Design</p> <p><i>Continued</i></p>	<p>feature.</p> <p>Calgary: encourages, integrated design (7.1). Type of antenna selected “should be selected based on the goal of making best efforts to blend with the nearby surroundings and minimize the visual aesthetic impacts...” (p. 16).</p> <p>Vancouver; due to predominance of antennae on top of high-rise towers, has requested industry to create design template to prevent “skylining”, clustering of antennae visible from street-level - industry hired designer to address issue and result has been positive.</p> <p>Toronto: Design and Landscaping – architectural style ...which is most compatible with surrounding neighbourhood (D(b), p. 5). -“...mitigation measures should include consideration of: design features, structure type, design, colour, materials, landscaping, screening and decorative fencing.” [4(D)(f), p. 6].</p> <p>Richmond: - integrate with existing buildings/structures and landscape in a manner...minimize the visual impact...” [4(B)(b), p. 6].</p> <p>Winnipeg: under Section 32, the design “should be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood”.</p> <p>Mississauga: design should “minimize visual impact in high profile and sensitive areas and...ensure land use compatibility with the surrounding area” (p. 3).</p>	<p>Section 5 “Design and Visual Impact” was expanded.</p> <p>Similar to most other municipalities, Edmonton’s proposed protocol, under 5.02(b) “Design, colour and massing” states that it should be “sensitive and complimentary to the style of architecture, the materials and colours used, the overall design and the massing of existing buildings in the vicinity”.</p>

Municipal Approaches in Protocol/Policy		City of Edmonton proposed Policy C471B (Aug. 23, 2012)
Issues		
Visual Design	-special design treatments where facilities are to be located within parks and open space areas or on heritage buildings/sites.	
Screening Requirements	<p>Calgary: landscaping, fences, architectural features – assist structures to blend into surrounding environment.</p> <p>Toronto: screening and decorative fencing “to ameliorate the scale and visual impact...” [D(f), p. 6].</p> <p>Richmond: screening buffers, including a solid decorative fence or planted landscape buffer to screen stand-alone structures from residential areas, adjacent buildings and public roads.</p> <p>- minimum height of 2.0 m, and sufficient thickness of vegetation to obscure the view of the installation [D(b), p. 8].</p> <p>Winnipeg: facilities recommended to be attractively designed or screened and concealed from ground level or other public views to mitigate visual impact [39(a), p. 8].</p> <p>Mississauga: screening using landscape treatment, decorative fencing, etc. applies to equipment shelters.</p>	<p>Edmonton – 5.02 (a).p. 7</p> <p>Screening: using existing or new vegetation, landscaping, fencing or other means in order to blend the proposed Telecommunications Facility with the surrounding built and natural environment.”</p>

Sources:

City of Calgary “Telecommunication Antenna Structures Siting Protocols” (May, 2011; revised May 9, 2012).
City of Edmonton “Policy for Siting Telecommunications Facilities” Proposed Policy C471C, August 23, 2012
City of Mississauga “Telecommunication Tower/Antenna Facilities Protocol (Interim)” March 5, 2012.
City of Richmond “Telecommunication Antenna Consultation and Siting Protocol” February 7, 2012.
City of Toronto: “Review of City Protocol for Telecommunications Towers Under 15 Metres in Height” Report to Planning and
Growth Management Committee, September 10, 2012, File No. 12 161103 SPS 00 TM).
City of Toronto “Telecommunication Tower and Antenna Protocol” (March 3, 4 and 5, 2008,
Amended January 27 and 28, 2009)
City of Winnipeg “Communication Facility Protocol” (April 28, 2010)
City of Vancouver “Antennas (Non-Residential Installations) Review Process and Design Issues
Planning By-law Administration Bulletin, June 9, 2010

C:\Program Files\Posse Suite\Production\Tempfiles\Posse\posse-20121121-0955559-
140\POSSEou9wkh\document_1.doc