

2/2/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4

PC 2-8-18
#3
2 Pages



Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4

1 message

Ellen Vaughn <ellenvaughn@hotmail.com>
To: "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>

Fri, Feb 2, 2018 at 11:13 AM

February 2, 2018

County of El Dorado

Planning and Building Dept.

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CA F4

Dear Sirs/Madams,

We are writing in opposition to the installation of a monopine cel tower, **Site 3 – Pleasant Valley**, and very near our home. This is one of seven separate wireless telecommunications facilities being proposed in the above referenced conditional use permit.

El Dorado County Code adopted 12/15/15, states:

Section 130.40.130 - Communication Facilities

Applicability. This Section provides for the orderly development of commercial and private wireless communication facilities including transmission and relay towers, dishes, antennas, and other similar facilities. The Board finds that **minimizing the number of communication facilities through co-locations** on existing and new towers and siting such facilities in areas where their potential visual impact on the surrounding area is minimized will provide an economic benefit and will protect the public health, safety and welfare.

1. Communication service providers shall:

a. **Employ all reasonable measures to site their antennas on existing structures as facade mounts, roof mounts, or co-location on existing towers** prior to applying for new towers or poles;

<https://mail.google.com/mail/b/AKVXdwzu7kzmytKffyVxzGfzgCvBBaiW6ukZTGq6NDUONhZSzd8l/u/0/?ui=2&ik=c5aea7cbc3&jsver=RldPbm7drEs.en...> 1/2

18-0161 Public Comment
PC Rcvd 02-02-18

2/2/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Conditional Use Permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4

b. Work with other service providers and the Department to **co-locate where feasible**. Where co-location on an existing site is not feasible, develop new sites which are multi-carrier to facilitate future co-location, thereby reducing the number of sites countywide;

Why is AT&T not co-locating on an existing tower? We use Verizon for our cellular service and the coverage is good in Pleasant Valley so there must be towers that already serve this area. Also, the Pleasant Valley Fire District is in the same vicinity and already has a 100 ft tower. I'm sure they could benefit from the increased rental income that might be realized.

Secondly, in reviewing the other proposed sites, 5 out of 7 of the other parcel sizes range from 10 to 60 acres. The Pleasant Valley parcel is **two acres**. There are 5 homes and one veterinary clinic within approximately 300 feet of the proposed location. Surely there is another suitable location on a larger parcel that wouldn't be exposing homes and people to microwave radiation?

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Floyd & Ellen Vaughn

4611 Pleasant Valley Ct

Placerville CA 95667-9228