to this application, including the proposed location's ability to enhance telecommunication service, minimize adverse impacts on the community, and encourage the location of towers in non-residential areas. The Planning Commission also recommended approval.
Kim Watkins Lindsey, 4364 Rocky Ford Road, spoke against this request. Ms. Lindsey suggested alternative locations, including the Wild Adventures property or the Camp Rock location. She also mentioned the possibility of using fiber installation as an alternative solution to improve connectivity in the area. Michael Potochnak, 4364 Rocky Ford Road, spoke against this request and mentioned he is the spouse of Kim Watkins Lindsey. Mr. Potochnak expressed concern about negative impacts on property values and urged the commission to reject the proposed location and to consider alternative sites in non-residential areas. Mr. Potochnak further requested that the County uphold the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC) guidelines for responsible tower placement in Lowndes County. Emily Esler, 5413 Worthington Street, Lake Park, spoke in opposition to this request. Ms. Esler noted that her partner's parents live on Rocky Ford Road and expressed concern about the tower's close proximity to residential areas. Ms. Esler cited potential health, ethical, and community-related concerns, emphasizing that such an installation could negatively affect the well-being and integrity of the neighborhood. Nathan Brantley, 701 North Patterson Street, spoke in favor of this request on behalf of the applicant, RBW Service Group, LLC, which is a site acquisition consultant for the lessee for the tower location, and property owners Jay and Sandra Watkins. Mr. Brantley stated multiple documents have been submitted to the county addressing concerns raised by the opposition. Mr. Brantley emphasized that tower locations are subject to strict criteria, including coverage needs, land availability, environmental and wetland requirements, and that this location meets those standards. He stated that the tower location and coverage area maps that were presented demonstrate that the subject area currently experiences poor coverage. Further, Mr. Brantley stated that the proposed tower is intended for colocation use and is in compliance with the ULDC. Jay Watkins, 4391 Rocky Ford Road, spoke in favor of this request. Mr. Watkins stated that he operates Camp Rock and that the farm has been in his family for many years. He noted that during a large event held the previous weekend, he was unable to use his cell phone due to the poor coverage. He also mentioned that following the recent hurricane, while helping to feed the community, he had to travel to specific locations in order to make phone calls. Mr. Watkins emphasized the need for improved service and expressed support for the proposed tower. James McMullen, III, 4416 Rocky Ford Road, spoke in favor of this request. Mr. McMullen stated that he is the director at Camp Rock and that there are many times when staff and participants are out in the fields or woods. In the event of an emergency, he noted, a landline would not help them communicate or get back to camp. Dale McDonald, 5869 Cothron Lane, spoke in favor of this request. Mr. McDonald stated that his family farms in the area and that cell service is lost before reaching Cothron Lane, Ousley Road, and Nankin Road. He emphasized that reliable cell service is needed throughout the area. Timothy Rosier, 4434 Rocky Road, spoke in favor of the request. Mr. Rosier stated he is a college student and relies on cell service to complete his schoolwork. He added that there have been ongoing issues with calls being dropped or disconnected due to poor reception.

Opposition - Rebuttal:
Kim Watkins Lindsey, 4364 Rocky Ford Road, addressed the commission and stated that improved cell service is needed in the area but asked the commission to consider an alternative location for the proposed tower.

Michael Pochanuk, 4364 Rocky Ford Road, addressed the commission and stated he disagrees with Mr. Brantley's assessment that the requirements outlined in the ULDC had been met.

Support - Rebuttal: No one spoke.