Copperleaf

8619 Goldleaf Lane, Dublin, Ohio 43017 793-1300

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

April 10, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

Danbury Meadows
APARTMENTS
480 C Candlestick Court
Galloway, Ohio 43119
(614) 878-0993

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

April 10, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial -- The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and -- more importantly-- a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

forest creek apartments

947 Forest Creek Drive East Columbus, Ohio 43223 276-8900
April 10, 1996

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

Greene Countrie
APARTMENTS
480 C Candlestick Court
Galloway, Ohio 43119
(614) 878-0993

April 10, 1996

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

HEATHER GLEN

2607 Roehampton Court ♦ Columbus, Ohio 43209 ♦ (614) 236-0100

April 10, 1996

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

Heritage Way Apartments

1355 Western Avenue, Chillicothe, Ohio 45601

April 10, 1996

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

HIBERNIA

APARTMENT • HOMES • OF • DISTINCTION

April 10, 1996

RECEIVED

APR 12 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial -- The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and -- more importantly-- a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

5680 Hibernia Drive • Columbus, Ohio 43232 • (614) 866-6282 • Fax (614) 866-7604

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

Highland Park

2796 Prendergast Place • Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068
(614) 868-0511

April 10, 1996

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

Karric Place

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

April 10, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial -- The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and -- more importantly-- a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

(614) 766-0722 · Fax: (614) 766-8137
3970 Brelsford Lane · Dublin, Ohio 43017

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

the Lakes of Westdale
5746 Lakewell Court
Galloway, Ohio 43119
851-8000

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

April 10, 1996

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial -- The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and -- more importantly-- a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

mallard's landing

2514 Mallard's Landing Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43229
(614) 794-2500

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

April 10, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

THE
MILLINGTON
At Mill Run

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

April 10, 1996

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial -- The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and -- more importantly-- a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.

3140 Mill Run Drive • Hilliard, Ohio 43026 • (614) 876-7800 • FAX (614) 529-8551

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Cordially,

John D. Wymer
President

JW:hm

NICHOLAS SQUARE
APARTMENT HOMES
532 Nicholas Square • Circleville, Ohio 43113
(614) 474-3521

RECEIVED
APR 12 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM

April 10, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulations of Satellite Earth Stations, IB Docket No. 95-59

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on March 11, 1996, regarding preemption of certain local regulations of satellite earth station antennas, and proposing to prohibit enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions on such antennas that are less than one meter in diameter (the "FNPRM"). We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Oakwood Management Company is in the residential real estate business. We manage over 45 communities in the central Ohio area totaling approximately 10,000 units.

We are concerned that the proposed rule prohibiting enforcement of nongovernmental restrictions will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for several reasons.

First, the FNPRM incorrectly states that "nongovernmental restrictions would appear to be directed to aesthetic considerations." Aesthetic considerations are not trivial – The appearance of a building directly affects its marketability. Most people prefer to live in attractive communities, and the sight of hundreds of satellite antennas bolted to the outside walls and railings of apartment units would be extremely unappealing to present and future residents. Aesthetic considerations have definite economic ramifications.

Second, the weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and – more importantly– a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by Water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening on concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair.

Third, the technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access.