

1/11/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Tiger Lily/Victory Mine tower

PC 1-11-18

(Distributed at hearing)

#4

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>



Tiger Lily/Victory Mine tower

1 message

Holly Merrill <hollymerrill06@yahoo.com>
To: planning@edcgov.us

Wed, Jan 10, 2018 at 4:25 PM

I'm writing to oppose placing a tower on Tiger Lily and Victory Mine. Although many can state that the need for the tower is great this is not the only location that is possible. Many home values will decrease. This will add to the alarming issue happening already in El Dorado County. With decreased Home prices means we also have an increase in crime and homelessness. The impact that it will have not only on adults but also children and their future medical concerns cannot be ignored. Not to mention all the animal that are in sanctuary around that location.

I urge you as representatives of this county to consider how this would affect you if you lived here. How would you feel if your home value was decreased without your opinion being considered? How would you feel if the decline in your home value and those surrounding it brought unsavory groups to your neighborhood? How would you take it if your child was subjected to such exposure that could shorten their life?

It is time to listen to the people of the county, the people who have dedicated their lives to our culture, to the beautification of our lands, and in the growth that we have all enjoyed.

Please stop the Victory Mine tower from being built.

Respectfully,

Holly Merrill

Life long El Dorado County Resident

1/11/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Tigerlily/Victory Mine tower

PC 1-11-18



(Distributed at hearing)

#4

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Tigerlily/Victory Mine tower

1 message

William Hallock <capthallock@yahoo.com>

Wed, Jan 10, 2018 at 4:37 PM

To: "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>

Hello, I am writing in opposition to the Tigerlily/Victory Mine cell tower project. These towers are better suited commercial areas. Fire stations, DOT yards, EID facilities should provide coverage. While this may provide a windfall for the individual property owner where the tower is located it places an undue burden on the surrounding property owners without compensation. extra wear and tear on the private road that is paid for by all. lowered property values. There are alot more negatives than positives in my opinion. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
William Hallock

1/11/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - S17-0007 /AT&T CAF2

PC 1-11-18

(Distributed at hearing)

#4

2 pages

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>



S17-0007 /AT&T CAF2

1 message

Gordon Flowers <gcflower@sbcglobal.net>
To: planning@edcgov.us

Wed, Jan 10, 2018 at 11:01 PM

Dear Planning Commission and Staff:

Please consider postponing adoption (and perhaps cancellation) of the "Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration For Conditional Use Permit S17-0007, Site 3 (Tiger Lily) for the following reasons:

1. EL DORADO COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE FOR RL-10

(Section 130.40.130, subsection A.1, et. seq.)

ISSUE: Lack of strict adherence to the requirements for collocating wherever possible.

There is already full strength 4G LTE signal in that area. A review of the coverage maps of AT&T, T-Mobile, Verizon and Sprint shows "full saturation" in Tiger Lily and surrounding areas. In fact, the coverage maps show "full saturation" in virtually all of the areas covered by S17-0007. By "full saturation" I mean the color shown on the relevant companies' coverage map that shows their strongest signal coverage (4G LTE).

Since the wireless service providers' own maps already show "full saturation" in the S17-0007, Site 3 Tiger Lily area, it appears that collocation should be possible on one (or more) of the existing towers in the area as required by the ordinance.

For your convenience, here are links to the coverage maps:

AT&T – <http://goo.gl/uflwz>

Sprint – <http://goo.gl/V65UE0>

T-Mobile – <http://goo.gl/mx4hIO>

Verizon – <http://goo.gl/yWD7bs>(Scroll down once you go to this page)

(Darkest areas on these coverage maps indicate best coverage.)

2. EL DORADO COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE FOR RL-10

(Section 130.40.130, subsection B.6 and H.1)

ISSUE: Lack of sufficient distance from residential area and/or children.

The ordinance states: "...within 500 feet of any residential zone..." in subsection B.6.

Subsection H states in part: "...in order to...protect school children from safety hazards..." and H.1 states: "If the proposed wireless facility is located within 1,000 feet of a school..."

The Hallock residence, which has two adults and two small children (ages 3 and 1), is only 264 ft. from the proposed Tiger Lily site and the Kramer residence is only 250 ft. The Kramer's will be receiving monthly lease revenue and do not have small children, which may be enough of a mitigating factor for them to support the proposed site.

Please consider "auditing" and/or verifying the results of the study provided by the vendor's consultant (Epic Wireless, LLC) to determine if there are, in fact, no suitable co-location sites within the Tiger Lily area. If an existing tower is not "tall" enough, they have already started the Conditional Use Permit process that would be required to replace/enhance an existing facility. There would be no need for the Tiger Lily site.

Please consider the many, capable resources available to the County as potential "auditors". The Sheriff and other public safety radio systems support staff may already possess the signal strength meters and other technology to enable them to test signal strength and propagation in the Tiger Lily area.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Best Regards,

Gordon Flowers