

---

**Fw: public comment 24-1821 #6**

---

**From** Aurora M. Osbual <Aurora.Osbual@edcgov.us>

**Date** Thu 10/24/2024 7:28 AM

**To** Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

 1 attachments (12 MB)

cell tower comment.pdf;

Sincerely,

**Aurora Osbual**

Clerk of the Planning Commission

Planning Division

**County of El Dorado**

Planning and Building Department

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

Direct Line: (530) 621-5351

Main Line: (530) 621-5355

[aurora.osbual@edcgov.us](mailto:aurora.osbual@edcgov.us)

---

**From:** Katie Pierman <katiepierman@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 23, 2024 4:48 PM

**To:** Aurora M. Osbual <Aurora.Osbual@edcgov.us>; Tom R. Purciel <tom.purciel@edcgov.us>

**Subject:** public comment 24-1821 #6

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Hello please add this to the public comment for 24-1821 item number 6 for the cell tower ordinances.

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for allowing public input during this process of amending our ordinances. I would like to bring up a problem that I see with removing the vocabulary of preferring multiple smaller towers. I agree that having one large tower in certain areas of El Dorado County is absolutely preferred but in response to that most areas of El Dorado County would benefit from multiple smaller towers especially if they are on county property or preexisting utilities and utility facilities. If we could use 3 or 4 towers to triangulate a coverage area near a residential area using county properties this would be much preferred than a larger more hideous tower in the center of that residential or agricultural community. I have attached several photos of towers in our surrounding communities that would show case my point. I think it would be very confusing to the applicant to remove the previous language about smaller towers without clarification or verbiage pointing them in the right direction because they will assume we want fewer larger towers, and this has been made clear by many in the community of not being true. I think some kind of language to this preference must be made clear in our ordinances and the during the CUP process the committee and community can decide if the tower is an appropriate height. Omitting all language about preferring smaller towers is misguided. Some of the towers I saw on existing structures even had extensions so that the tower could be even taller than the equipment it was attached to. Also, if we have lights installed for a neighborhood and multiple smaller towers attached to those lights it would be much more palatable and less intrusive to the neighborhood or if the small utility poles follow along a neighborhood or road, it again would be a better decision to have multiple small towers attached to those than one large intrusive tower. Our residential and agricultural communities deserve better, and we need to preserve our viewsheds.







