



FW: Opposition to Sly Park Hills Cell Tower

From Steven C. Osborn <Craig.Osborn@edcgov.us>
Date Tue 1/13/2026 4:12 PM
To Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

1 attachment (15 KB)
SPECIAL REQUEST FOR NOTICE FILLABLE.pdf;

Sincerely,

Craig Osborn
Associate Planner
County of El Dorado Planning and Building Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5697
Craig.Osborn@edcgov.us



Elevate to El Dorado
A Great Place to Live, Work & Play

From: Kim Barbieri <kim.barbieri@vsp.com>
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 7:14 PM
To: Steven C. Osborn <Craig.Osborn@edcgov.us>
Cc: Kim Barbieri <kim.barbieri@vsp.com>
Subject: RE: Opposition to Sly Park Hills Cell Tower

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Steven,

My apologies for not being able to provide my feedback earlier. Competing priorities has not helped.

I've attached my request for notifications on this project. I may not have used the correct project number, which may be CUP24-0013/AT&T.

As you know, I am not a proponent of this project. In no particular order, here are my concerns broken down into themes:

Notification

1. The submitter is following county ordinance, which requires notification within so many feet of the tower placement. I am not sure if this was done. I would question if an attempt was made or if all parties were successfully notified?
2. I would argue that notification should be expanded in such cases where community and owner access is limited to one road thus requiring all to see and drive under or by the proposed sight. Sly Park Hills has only one entrance from Sly Park Road. We will ALL be impacted.

Alternative Sight Analysis

1. I would like to have a better understanding around the alternative site analysis. It is to my understanding that the two other sights – one that fell through because of property sale and another that wasn't interested – both qualified as alternatives. When a property is sold, how does that qualify as an alternative? Also, I am wondering if EID does have towers on other EID-owned properties or if EID, as a business decision regularly turns these down? In which case, EID would not qualify as an alternative sight. I would ask if the public can see why EID turned this down. As EID owns significant acreage in the immediate area, I would question if the submitter proposed a general ask or a specific location?

Proposed Location

1. The Sly Park Hills community only has one access road. The proposed sight of the tower is on the main artery of this subdivision. Everyone who comes into or leaves this subdivision will be forced to see this. Given that we all will be aesthetically impacted by this project, the county ordinance for notification is insufficient. Expanding notification to the entire Sly Park Hills community is the right step to take.
2. Additionally, the tower location is in a location where the entire community is reminded of the beauty of the mountains. As you leave the subdivision, there is not a day that goes by where we all don't look over to see the snowcapped sierras. This will obstruct and spoil that view for all – except the property owners, ironically.
3. Real estate value. Industry-funded analyses on property value impacts are always “no measureable effect.” Of course, we all know this not to be true. A 2018 study in the Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics (analyzing U.S. data) found a conservative decline of 2.46-2.65% for homes within .72km of the closest tower. When the tower was visible, a conservative 9.78% decline. Another analysis shared a 7.6% decline in value for those homes within 1,000 feet. Now, anecdotal reports from realtors, appraisers, and community surveys often cite higher perceived or localized losses of 20-35% driven by buyer aversion due to aesthetics, health concerns, or reduced marketability.
 - a. The typical/median home value in Sly Park Hills is \$405k. This is a reduction of about 8.8% over the past year. Current listings range \$388k-\$399k.
 - b. Members of this community predominantly moved into Sly Park Hills because of the aesthetics, proximity to outdoor recreation and affordability. Many were able to buy here because of the affordability. There is also a certain smaller percentage that are second homeowners or on the short-term rental market for people looking to get away from technology.
 - c. A tower placed in the main artery for the subdivision won't just impact those in closest proximity. It will impact the entire subdivision and our home values.
4. Requested location on the property owner's parcel. Locating along Rainbow vs along Loch Leven. I would like to understand why the property owner is agreeing to this location vs other options?
5. Electricity and Access: Part of the location decision is accessibility to power and road access. I would imagine that the location provides the least amount of impact for the property owner and AT&T while providing easy access to power. There are so many other possible locations that would meet this need without impacting the community. Land and power lines are abundant. Why here? I would want to know if the property owner approached AT&T or the reverse? I would like to think that the property owner is doing this to bring greater value to the community. However, with attractive payments to the property owner, I would just like to understand that more.

Cell Tower Design, Size and Operation

1. I believe the community would like to see the monopine design. Who pays for this design? 140 feet tall is not blending in with the surroundings with the average utility pole being 40-60 feet. There is no amount of lipstick you can put on this pig when you are forced to drive by every day within 20 feet of it. Again, along highway 50 it might make sense with all of the billboards. At the

top of Park Creek in Pollock Pines, it might make sense because there are an abundance of trees providing a buffer aesthetically.

2. I would question the size of the tower vs. community need. There are some newcomers to Sly Park Hills who see the value in having a tower. However, it is to my understanding that this tower is to serve populations well beyond Sly Park Hills. Is this size necessary? Will the people of Sly Park Hills get fixed rates because we are carrying to brunt of this accessibility for surrounding communities? I highly doubt it.
3. Is the community aware that AT&T comes in to set up these towers, then sells to a third party who then operates and rents access to various carriers? Is the third party required to carry liability insurance? With one access road in and this tower at the beginning of this road, does that not open up concerns for liability? What is their coverage? I certainly hope fire is included and it's not offered as commercial through the Fair Plan.
4. I did not see any environmental impact report. Outside of the radio frequency report, is that required? The location is filled with lava rock. That is why there are no trees – specifically evergreens – on this lot. I would hate for AT&T to start building and then come across lava rock and be forced to move locations.
5. How much would construction impact the community? Again, one road in and one road out.
6. AT&T is valued at \$169.93B. Do they really care about the community of Sly Park Hills or our property values or what we will have to live with in perpetuity? I think not. This location will change our community forever. We will no longer be known as the subdivision just past the lake and, instead be known as the subdivision with the tower. AT&T also has enough funds to find another location that is delivering coverage for the community in a location hidden by the beauty of the trees and away from the population. This is opportunistic and they are banking on the ordinances to run cover for their greed.

Safety Considerations

1. Many also moved into this subdivision with the understanding that there are natural inconveniences to living in the mountains. This includes big wind and snow storms knocking power out. Trees also fall onto roads making home access delayed, difficult or impossible at times.
2. I am not arguing against the modern conveniences technology brings for emergency responders. But, at what price?

Summary:

My husband and I have lived in Sly Park Hills for 30 years. We love it here. We love the community. We naturally default to the property owner having the best of intentions. There are really good people here. And we've seen that community spirit time and time again – from clearing downed trees, to checking on neighbors, to clearing driveways of snow to the Caldor Fire, which was when we were at our best. I have a daughter with a congenital heart defect among other life-threatening issues. I had to call 911 in late 2025. The attraction to emergency response is a great sales pitch. And is not lost on me. I also had to wait an hour for another 911 call for a neighbor suffering from hypothermia because our medics had to come from Pleasant Valley when the roads were closed from a snowstorm. So, I get it. But we all moved here knowing these risks – albeit from fire, snow, wind, etc. The risks have always been here. I also believe strongly in maintaining the best our little community has to offer. I think there is another way – a better way – to go about improving our access to emergency services without destroying the one thing that makes the approach to our community so attractive. It's that view. I can't stand by and watch a few benefit while the majority suffer by controlling that view and our home values at the same time. This is not the location. This is not the size. This is not the right way to go about community feedback. I guarantee the majority of Sly Park Hills residents have no idea this in motion. Is that the right thing to do? How will that reflect on everyone involved here? Not well, with one road in and one road out. The Board has the power to reject this location, protect the value of our properties, hold a billion-dollar company accountable to find a better way. Please don't let this happen.

Thank you,
Kim Barbieri
530-903-9403
5229 Loch Leven Drive

From: Steven C. Osborn <Craig.Osborn@edcgov.us>

Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2025 4:47 PM

To: Kim Barbieri <kim.barbieri@vsg.com>

Subject: [EXT] Phone Call

You don't often get email from craig.osborn@edcgov.us. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Kim,

It was very nice talking with you today. Thank you for remaining calm and reasonable, we don't always get that around here which can sometimes make us a dread returning a call! By all means, craft an email that outlines your positions on both the positive and negative aspects of the project and send that to me directly and I will place it in the public comments file which will be forwarded to the Planning Commissioners before the hearing. We still have plenty of time before this project goes to hearing so don't feel like you need to rush. Also find attached the Special Notice Form that will allow you to receive advance notice of the hearing directly. If you have any more questions, feel free to reach out again.

Sincerely,

Craig Osborn
Associate Planner
County of El Dorado Planning and Building Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5697
Craig.Osborn@edcgov.us



Elevate to El Dorado
A Great Place to Live, Work & Play

WARNING: This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.

NOTICE: This message is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and destroy or delete this communication immediately.



Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP24-0013 – AT&T Monopine on Loch Leven Drive

From Tom Chandler <tomchandler10@gmail.com>
Date Tue 1/13/2026 3:35 PM
To Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Project: Conditional Use Permit CUP24-0013, the proposed AT&T monopine on Loch Leven Drive submitted by Public Safety Towers, LLC.

I live directly across the street from the proposed site at 1640 Canna Lane, Pollock Pines, CA 95726. This installation would significantly detract from the character of our neighborhood. In my view, it would be a visual eyesore and would materially obstruct the natural view that residents in this area currently enjoy.

Given its negative aesthetic impact and proximity to existing homes, I respectfully request that this project be disapproved.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,
Tom Chandler