



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

<https://www.edcgov.us/devservices>

PLACERVILLE OFFICE:

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

BUILDING

(530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 Fax

bdgdept@edcgov.us

PLANNING

(530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 Fax

planning@edcgov.us

LAKE TAHOE OFFICE:

924 B Emerald Bay Road

South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

(530) 573-3330

(530) 542-9082 Fax

tahoebuild@edcgov.us

DATE: February 21, 2018 Agenda of: February 22, 2018
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Evan Mattes, Assistant Planner
SUBJECT: S17-0016/AT&T CAF 4; Findings for Denial

The AT&T CAF 4 Sites 1-7 (S17-0016) (“Project”) was considered by the El Dorado County Planning Commission at a duly noticed public hearing on February 8, 2018. The Conditional Use Permit would allow for seven new wireless facilities, including new towers, to be constructed and operated at seven individual parcels located in the rural regions of El Dorado County. The proposed towers would range in height from 120 to 160 feet. Upon conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning Commission rendered seven separate motions with each site receiving a 2-2 vote to approve the project subject to findings and conditions of approval. As the project did not receive a majority votes for approval, the project was considered to be denied. A motion was made to continue each of the sites to the February 22, 2018 Planning Commission meeting to allow staff to prepare appropriate Findings of Denial based on aesthetics, compatibility with neighboring land uses, co-location possibilities, alternative site analysis, and access. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission make the following Findings in support of its action to **deny the Project**:

SITE 1 COOL (PILOT HILL 2) ZONING FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the alternative site analysis, in accordance with Section 130.40.130.A, did not adequately analyze potential co-locations within the project vicinity. Moreover, as a result of the applicant’s narrowly-defined project objectives, the project alternative site analysis examined only potential sites within a half mile search radius. Accordingly, the applicant failed to provide prima facie evidence to support its claim that there are no feasible alternate sites.

SITE 1 COOL (PREVIOUSLY PILOT HILL 2) CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed 122-foot tall stealth monopine tower would unavoidably impact the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Triple Seven Road, an existing private road, currently provides access to the parcel, which the project would be located on. While there is an existing access, which had been previously reviewed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation, the Planning Commission determined that adequate access does not exist for the project site.
3. The project site is surrounded by residential uses to the south, east and west with State Highway 193 to the north. The surrounding residential parcels are zoned Residential Two-Acres (R2A) and Residential Estate Five-Acres (RE-5) and range in size from two to 154 acres in size. Communication Facilities, including communication towers, are allowed within Residential zones with the approval of a conditional use permit. Some written and verbal testimony was provided in opposition of the project. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed

communication tower is an incompatible use with the surrounding residential land uses and zones.

SITE 2 NEWTOWN ZONING FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the alternative site analysis, in accordance with Section 130.40.130.A, did not adequately analyze potential co-locations within the project vicinity. Moreover, as a result of the applicant's narrowly-defined project objectives, the project alternative site analysis examined only potential sites within a quarter-mile search radius. Accordingly, the applicant failed to provide prima facie evidence to support its claim that there are no feasible alternate sites.

SITE 2 NEWTOWN CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed 120-foot tall stealth monopine tower would unavoidably impact the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Snows Road, an existing private road, currently provides access to the parcel, which the project would be located on. While there is an existing access, which had been previously reviewed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation, the Planning Commission determined that adequate access does not exist for the project site.
3. The project is surrounded by residential uses to the north, east and west with industrial uses to the south. The surrounding residential parcels are zoned Residential Estate Five-Acres (RE-5) and range in size from 1.5 to 14 acres in size. The 16 acre parcel to the south is zoned Light Industrial (IL). Communication Facilities, including communication towers, are allowed within Residential and Industrial zones with the approval of a conditional use permit. Considerable written and verbal testimony was received in opposition of the project site. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed communication tower is an incompatible use with the surrounding residential land uses and zones.

SITE 3 PLEASANT VALLEY ZONING FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the alternative site analysis, in accordance with Section 130.40.130.A, did not adequately analyze potential co-locations within the project vicinity. Moreover, as a result of the applicant's narrowly-defined project objectives, the project alternative site analysis examined only potential sites within a quarter mile search radius. Accordingly, the applicant failed to provide prima facie evidence to support its claim that there are no feasible alternate sites.

SITE 3 PLEASANT VALLEY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed 160-foot tall stealth monopine tower would unavoidably impact the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Stein Road, an existing private road, currently provides access to the parcel, which the project would be located on. While there is an existing access, which had been previously reviewed by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation, the Planning Commission determined that adequate access does not exist for the project site.
3. The project is surrounded by residential uses to the north, east and west with commercial uses to the south. The surrounding residential parcels are zoned Residential Two-Acres (R2A) and range in size from 1.4 to 6.7 acres in size. The 1.3 acre parcel to the south is zoned Community Commercial (CC). Communication Facilities, including communication towers, are allowed

within Residential zones with the approval of a conditional use permit. Considerable written and verbal testimony was received in opposition of the project site. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed communication tower is an incompatible use with the surrounding residential land uses and zones.

SITE 4 SOAPWEED ZONING FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the alternative site analysis, in accordance with Section 130.40.130.A, did not adequately analyze potential co-locations within the project vicinity. Moreover, as a result of the applicant's narrowly-defined project objectives, the project alternative site analysis examined only potential sites within a one mile search radius. Accordingly, the applicant failed to provide prima facie evidence to support its claim that there are no feasible alternate sites.

SITE 4 SOAPWEED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed 160-foot tall stealth monopine tower would unavoidably impact the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Stope Road, an existing private road, currently provides access to the parcel, which the project would be located on. While there is an existing access, which had previously been reviewed by El Dorado Department of Transportation, the Planning Commission determined that adequate access does not exist for the project site.
3. The project is surrounded by forest resource uses to the north, east and west with residential uses to the south. The surrounding forest resource parcels are zoned Forest Resource 40-Acres (FR-40) and range in size from 9.5 to 40.5 acres in size. The 6 acre parcel to the south is zoned Residential Estate Five-Acres (RE-5). Communication Facilities, including communication towers, are allowed within Residential and Forest Resource zones with the approval of a conditional use permit. One member of the public provided verbal testimony in opposition of the project. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed communication tower is an incompatible use with the surrounding residential land uses and zones.

SITE 5 LATROBE ZONING FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the alternative site analysis, in accordance with Section 130.40.130.A, did not adequately analyze potential co-locations within the project vicinity. Moreover, as a result of the applicant's narrowly-defined project objectives, the project alternative site analysis examined only potential sites within a quarter mile search radius. Accordingly, the applicant failed to provide prima facie evidence to support its claim that there are no feasible alternate sites.

SITE 5 LATROBE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed 160-foot tall stealth monopine tower would unavoidably impact the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Dragon Point Road, an existing private road, currently provides access to the parcel, which the project would be located on. While there is an existing access, which had previously been reviewed by El Dorado Department of Transportation, the Planning Commission determined that adequate access does not exist for the project site.
3. The project is surrounded by rural residential uses on all sides. The surrounding rural residential parcels are zoned Rural Lands 20-Acres (RL-20) and Rural Lands 40-Acres (RL-40) and range in

size from 20 to 60.25 acres in size. Communication Facilities, including communication towers, are allowed within rural zones with the approval of a conditional use permit. Considerable written and verbal testimony. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed communication tower is an incompatible use with the surrounding rural residential land uses and zones.

SITE 6 ZEE ESTATES ZONING FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the alternative site analysis, in accordance with Section 130.40.130.A, did not adequately analyze potential co-locations within the project vicinity. Moreover, as a result of the applicant's narrowly-defined project objectives, the project alternative site analysis examined only potential sites within a half mile search radius. Accordingly, the applicant failed to provide prima facie evidence to support its claim that there are no feasible alternate sites.

SITE 6 ZEE ESTATES CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed 160-foot tall stealth monopine tower would unavoidably impact the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Gate Lane, an existing private road, currently provides access to the parcel, which the project would be located on. While there is an existing access, which had previously been reviewed by El Dorado Department of Transportation, the Planning Commission determined that adequate access does not exist for the project site.
3. The project is surrounded by agricultural uses to the north, south and east with residential uses to the south and west. The surrounding agricultural parcels are zoned Limited Agriculture Ten-Acres, Limited Agriculture 20-Acres and Limited Agriculture 40-Acres and range in size from 25 to 145 acres in size. The surrounding residential parcels are zoned Residential Estate Five-Acres (RE-5) and range in size from five to 26 acres in size. Communication Facilities, including communication towers, are allowed within Residential and Agricultural zones with the approval of a conditional use permit. Some written and verbal testimony was received in opposition and in support of the project site. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed communication tower is an incompatible use with the surrounding residential land uses and zones.

SITE 7 GOLD HILL ZONING FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the alternative site analysis, in accordance with Section 130.40.130.A, did not adequately analyze potential co-locations within the project vicinity. Moreover, as a result of the applicant's narrowly-defined project objectives, the project alternative site analysis examined only potential sites within a three-quarter mile search radius. Accordingly, the applicant failed to provide prima facie evidence to support its claim that there are no feasible alternate sites.

SITE 7 GOLD HILL CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed 160-foot tall stealth monopine tower would unavoidably impact the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Gods Way, an existing private road, currently provides access to the parcel, which the project would be located on. While there is an existing access, which had previously been reviewed by El Dorado Department of Transportation, the Planning Commission determined that adequate access does not exist for the project site.

3. The project is surrounded by residential uses to the north and east with rural residential uses to the west and open space to the south. The surrounding residential parcels are zoned Residential Estate Ten-Acres (RE-10) and are five acres in size. The 10 acre parcel to the west is zoned Rural Lands Ten-Acres (RL-10). The 80 acre open space parcel to the south is zoned Open Space (OS). Communication Facilities, including communication towers, are allowed within Rural Residential and Open Space zones with the approval of a conditional use permit. Two members of the public provided verbal testimony in opposition of the project site. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed communication tower is an incompatible use with the surrounding residential land uses and zones.

CONCLUSION

The Planning Commission made the above Findings in support of its actions to **Deny** S17-0016/AT&T CAF 4.