

PC 2-8-18
#3
2 Pages



Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CELLPHONE TOWER -SITE 5 LATROBE

1 message

McClure. Debra <McClureD@saccounty.net> Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 1:20 PM
 To: "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>, "Gary.milller@edcgov.us" <Gary.milller@edcgov.us>,
 "bostwo@edugov.us" <bostwo@edugov.us>, "jvegna@edcgov.us" <jvegna@edcgov.us>, "jeff.hansen@edcgov.us"
 <jeff.hansen@edcgov.us>, "james.williams@edcgov.us" <james.williams@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us"
 <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>
 Cc: "easytiger@att.net" <easytiger@att.net>, "McClure. Debra" <McClureD@saccounty.net>, "efomalley@ucdavis.edu"
 <efomalley@ucdavis.edu>

To Whom It May Concern:

AT&T has proposed installing a cellphone tower on Dragon Point Road in Shingle Springs. We are the owners of a 20+ acre parcel which is located at 7240 Dragon Point Road, Shingle Springs, parcel #: 087-181-14-100.

We never received a written notice of this proposed installation but were informed by our neighbors of such. We are under the belief that by law the county is obligated to make us aware of this and allow us sufficient time to respond to this action.

Dragon Point Road is a privately owned road which is maintained by the residents who reside there. No residents that reside on Dragon Point are in support of the cellphone tower installation with the exception of the resident who is planning to financially gain from this installation.

We are strongly opposed for a multitude of reasons to include the following:

- Aesthetics
- Negative impact on our property value
- Noise pollution
- Health hazards
- Fire hazards: as there are several structures that are assumed to be non-permitted already on the proposed installation site.
- Negative impact on private road and easements
- **The mission of the Planning Department is to: Guide land use and development consistent with the General Plan, Building Codes and related regulations, by providing accurate, timely and courteous professional and technical services to our customers, to maintain the County's unique quality of life, protect public safety and the environment and to promote economic vitality for current and future generations.**

This is why we chose to move to our location from Sacramento County and invest in our rural community in the beautiful county of El Dorado.

Your thoughtful consideration is respectfully requested.

1/30/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CELLPHONE TOWER -SITE 5 LATROBE

Sincerely,

Patrick O'Malley and Débra McClure

7240 Dragon Point Road

Shingle Springs, CA 95682

County of Sacramento Email Disclaimer: This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by other than the County of Sacramento or 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 thereto.

PC 2-8-18

3

2 pages

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>



Conditional use permit S17-0016/AT&T CAF4

1 message

Bruce Person <bperson03@sbcglobal.net>
 Reply-To: Bruce Person <bperson03@sbcglobal.net>
 To: "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 11:57 AM

Attention County Planner Evan Mattes

I am a concerned neighbor opposing the location of a cell tower in the Newtown area at Snows Rd. and Clouds Rest Rd. Please include my objection to the tower at the meeting to be held on February 8th at the Planning Commission.

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to request a negative vote on the proposed project for construction of an AT&T Mobility facility to be constructed at Snows Rd. and Clouds Rest Rd. in the Newtown Area. I have never considered myself an alarmist, but the more data I read concerning exposure to Low Intensity Electromagnetic Radiation, the more worried I become for the potential exposure of all of us within 1000 meters of the site. The Negative Declaration cites no ill effects to any living organisms, no effect on the birds and bees, or any effects to bat populations, but nowhere do they address the voluminous reports of other scientists that have noted serious health risks to many nesting birds associated with close proximity to Cell Tower Masts and Towers. In the recent past, we have been aware of a nesting pair of Eagles on property adjoining the parcel in the proposal. Also many hawks and owls and other nesting birds inhabit the area proposed as the site for the cell tower. Migrating ducks and geese also frequently are found in the immediate area during the Fall and Spring migrations.

Also of concern to me is the growing body of evidence that points to increased risks of a number of neurological problems, and increased cancer risks to humans in close proximity to Cell Tower Sites. Many studies have produced undeniable results of EMR as a health risk, and the World Health Organization has classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as a carcinogen in the same category as lead, DDT, and asbestos. Another disturbing result of Cell Towers is the decrease in property values on adjoining parcels after construction and operation of cell sites. It has been widely reported that a drop in values of as much as 20% is common, and it is combined reasons of aesthetic disturbance, and the perceived health dangers associated with the Cell Sites. Who will compensate the neighbors for loss of value in their property?

I have four beautiful grandchildren, two of them living with me on my property at Clouds Rest Rd. that I absolutely adore and love. It is a very disturbing thought that they will be growing up in an environment that will increase the risks to their health that are being documented and corroborated with numerous studies reported in many medical journals and research papers by world renown scientists and doctors. I ask what the need for this tower is based on, and I ask if the concerns of negative impacts have been adequately addressed. Please look into the growing body of evidence that EMR (Electromagnetic Radiation) is detrimental to the health of almost every living organism, and especially those in close proximity to the radiation emitted by Cell Towers!

Concerns regarding placement of cell tower at Clouds Rest Rd.

The survey monuments for the parcel where the tower is proposed are not clearly marked, and may even be missing. If the markers are not clearly identified, how can setbacks be properly measured. It appears that one of the survey monuments may have been disturbed during prior grading on the parcel. If the marker has been disturbed, it is the responsibility of the owner to have the markers re-surveyed and replaced by a licensed land surveyor.

This area of Newtown has had a significant historical importance in El Dorado County. There are numerous accounts of mining activities during the Gold Rush in this immediate area. Tunnels and mine shafts riddle the area along with evidence of a significant canal system and hydraulic mining. At one time there were over 5000 people living in this immediate area, and prior to that the area was inhabited by large populations of Native Americans. Years ago I requested the presence of Mr. George Peabody, a noted County Historian to visit this area in an effort to bring more notice to the early inhabitants of this area. When he arrived and explored the many sites of Native Americans, he told me had been looking for this significant site for almost 40 years! He called this area "Greystone" which had been mentioned in many historical accounts that Mr. Peabody had heard or read during his historical investigations in El Dorado County. He was very excited and relieved to finally have this key piece of the historical puzzle in place. He mentioned that for many hundreds of years, possibly more than a thousand years based on his assay of the sites, the tribes from the plains would come to trade with the local tribes (Nisenan, Miwok, and Maidu). The legends told of the shelter caves and canyons, springs and readily available food sources, and Mr. Peabody determined that "Greystone" was right here near Clouds Rest!

As a cell phone user I am not against cell towers if they are not located in residential areas! When I was an ATT customer I was disappointed with the level of service provided by ATT. My option was to seek a provider that gave me better service at my home. I noticed that my friends with Verizon had very good coverage at my home, so I opted to sign up with Verizon. My service now is excellent! My question is why does Verizon work so well at my location with the existing towers, and yet ATT has not made attempts to place their facilities on the existing towers? Other Counties have denied the applications for cell towers based on the fact that existing towers are available, and providers are not trying to use those towers to provide better coverage. Has ATT attempted to negotiate with existing tower locations to better serve their clients?

Bruce M. Person
4221 Clouds Rest Rd.
Placerville, Ca. 95667

PC 2-8-18
#3
3 pages

2018 JAN 30 AM 11: 52
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

January 23, 2018

County of El Dorado
Planning and Building Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: Condition Use Permit S17-0016/A T&T CAF4
Site 1 - Cool

To Whom This Concerns:

I am one of two El Dorado County residents with property on Triple Seven Road in the Cool Care, Supervisorial District 4. I challenge AT&T'S Mobility application for a Conditional Use Permit for a new mono pine tower on Site 1 - Cool. Site 1 is located on Accessor's Parcel Number 071-032-15.

Initially, the idea seems impractical. There is an existing Verizon/Nextel monopine, or cell phone tower approximately one quarter of a mile from this cell phone tower's proposed location. Close by, or approximately one mile from this Verizon tower is another mono pine or cell phone tower near the intersection of Highway 49 and Catecroft Way. This area in square miles must already have suitable cell phone reception with these two towers to satisfy the public domain.

I was curious about the zoning on Triple Seven Road for cell phone towers. On January 18, 2018, I spoke with the Planning Commissions director for Site 1. I wanted to determine if my local government offered substantial evidence to justify their zoning decision for this cell phone tower per the Federal Telecommunications Act. The Commission's

director for Site 1 offered no evidence to justify this proposed third cell phone tower. Additionally, the U.S. government's standard for the cell phone tower is based upon legislation passed in the 1990s which indicated that the preferred installation for cell phone towers be in commercial and industrial areas; not residential. Site 1 on Triple Seven Road is in a residential and rural area of El Dorado County.

My doubts about the necessity for this Site 1 cell phone tower installation increased when AT&T informed me that my AT&T internet connection which is currently consistently fast and constant, could be upgraded if I chose the new broadband connection furnished by the Site 1 proposed cell phone tower. I do not need the proposed cell phone tower's broadband, and I wonder about my other rural neighbor's needs or satisfaction with internet connections.

The argument in favor of this cell phone tower would appear to be weak considering the above stated facts. I am hopeful that I will receive reasonable and thoroughly researched arguments to counter my simple facts.


If El Dorado County's Planning Commission accepts AT&T Mobility's application for the Site 1 Conditional Use Permit despite my challenge against this installation, I question their decision. The Planning Commission must also consider in my challenge against AT&T's right to use the private road, Triple Seven Road, and the the bridge on the road to install the cell phone tower and maintain the tower. This road and the bridge were created to provide the sole ingress and egress for the two residences on Triple Seven Road; 3060 and 3100 Triple Seven Road. The single lane wooden bridge crosses an irrigation ditch on Triple Seven Road which then intersects Highway 193. With the Conditional Use Permit, AT&T will drive many truckloads of concrete, lumber, fencing, metal fabrications, and sections of the tower across this small wooden bridge during the installation of the proposed cell phone tower. Additionally, after the tower is installed, AT&T will continue to drive over the bridge and the road to maintain the cell phone tower. The wooden bridge will gradually sink under the weight of AT&T vehicles and their heavy loads into the irrigation ditch. With a sinking bridge, a period of normal rainfall will insure that the bridge will be flooded, or covered by

irrigation ditch water, prohibiting the egress and the ingress for the individuals living on Triple Seven Road. I want an independent civil engineer to assess this bridge's ability to maintain, despite AT&T's heavy traffic and loads.

The repair of this wooden bridge and Triple Seven Road will be at the expense of myself and my neighbor. With AT&T traffic and the traffic's heavy loads, the bridge will become useless in a short period of time. Concurrently, AT&T will continue to encroach, driving on the private road crossing my property. I am against AT&T Mobility's application for a Conditional Use Permit on Site 1 based primarily upon this expected damage to the wooden bridge, and the encroachment on my property, using the Triple Seven Road nonexclusive easement.

I have sought legal counsel of this last challenge against AT&T Mobility's Site 1. I appreciate this opportunity to express my challenge against this cell phone tower installation. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,



Ann Gualtieri

Property Owner on Triple Seven Road

cc: District 4 Ranalli



PC 2-8-18
#3
Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>
3 pages

Deny the proposed conditional use permit for AT&T Cell Tower Site 5 on parcel APN #087-181-10 – 7160 Dragon Point Road

1 message

Brad Nicholson <brad@vaminvest.com>

Mon, Jan 29, 2018 at 6:40 PM

To: "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>, "gary.miller@edcgov.us" <gary.miller@edcgov.us>
Cc: "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "jvegna@edcgov.us" <jvegna@edcgov.us>, "jeff.hansen@edcgov.us" <jeff.hansen@edcgov.us>, "james.williams@edcgov.us" <james.williams@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>

Gary, and other district commissioners,

My wife and I are the property owners 7220 Dragon Point Road, which is a very short distance from where this proposed tower is to be built. We are sending you this letter to strongly encourage you to deny the permit for the proposed cell tower as listed and referenced in the subject line.

Part of your Planning Services own stated goals are "maintain the County's unique quality of life, protect public safety and the environment and promote economic vitality for current and future generations." After looking at the implications of the cell tower there are a number of factors that in you mission statement that would not be achieved if you were to approve this project.

1. **Aesthetics** – We and many of the surrounding neighbors are situated on beautiful ridges with views of the Sierra's to the east and the valley to the west. While our property lots are generally in size of 20 acres most homes find themselves along the ridgelines so we are indeed very close to the tower's location which would take prominent view for all homes either to the east, west or along Dragon Point Ridge where I live. We have some Oak Trees and Digger Pines but they would be dwarfed by the size and vertical structure of 120-160 ft. tower that would increasingly have additional satellites and antenna's attached to it. It would definitely destroy the unique views we all moved to this area to enjoy.
2. **Negative for surrounding property values** – It is a well-known fact amongst realtors and property owners that buyers do not want to buy houses under or near a visible cell phone tower. In a study by the National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy published in June 2014 titled "Neighborhood Cell Towers & Antennas – Do They Impact a Property's Desirability?" found that 94% of buyers and renters are less interested and would pay less for a property located near a cell tower or antenna. Of the respondents 79% said that under no circumstances would they every purchase or rent a property within a few blocks of a cell tower or antennas – I think this is even an understatement given the type of buyer that wants to move to our rural community. Most of our properties are zoned for 20-40 acre minimums currently so promotion of future economic vitality is achieved by protecting our property values as future development will be minimal.
3. **Impact on private road and easements** – Dragon Point Road is a private road that was paid for and maintained by individual community members. Additional heavy equipment and traffic on that road not only comes at the expense of the other neighbors but also without permission to the 3 lot owners with easement rights to the road. All three are opposed to the cell tower and will not give approval. Your assistant planner Evan Mattes said this would be considered a civil issue but these parties will engage in lawsuits if their consent is not achieved and the project is moved forward.

4. **Noise Pollution** – that was covered in their MND as the tower has a generator that if it was being tested or power went out would kick on and could cause noise that would echo through our canyon which has very sensitive acoustics given our deep canyons and ridges. The rural and private feel of our properties would be interrupted by a constant low buzz interrupted by generator, and maintenance vehicles.

5. **Proximity of other towers** – There are plenty of other towers and antenna's in the area that could be cohabitated within 4 mile radius. There is no need to add an additional tower right in the middle of our community based on big company expansion and federal grant objectives over the benefit of the overall community.

6. **Unknown health concerns** - while this is potentially the most damaging long term, especially for those in close proximity, we are aware that this will not be considered in a decision to approve or decline the permit. However, we would be dishonest if we did not say that we are concerned about the unknown long term health effects that a constant (and increasing) usage tower would have on our health, including those nearest the tower.

7. **Did not notify local residents of project or give proper time to analyze** – Many residents did not receive notification of the project including some on Dragon Point Road. Additionally, I was told I would receive a PDF copy of the MND report via email which was never send so to this day so the 30 day window for the community to review the project has not been honored. The same was true of a biological report which I was promised a link to disseminate to the community which was never received.

It is because of these numerous factors that we don't think the planning department would be accomplishing its stated mission by the placement of this particular tower and would request you deny the permit. Thanks for your consideration.

Brad Nicholson, CFP®

Senior Vice President

Van Hulzen Asset Management

4370 Town Center Blvd., Suite 220

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

USA

+1 916-608-4284 (direct)
+1 800-709-5379 (toll free)

brad@vaminvest.com

www.vaminvest.com

There is an old maxim that "the pessimist complains about the wind; the optimist expects it to change; the realist adjusts the sails."

1/30/2018 Edcgov.us Mail - Deny the proposed conditional use permit for AT&T Cell Tower Site 5 on parcel APN #087-181-10 – 7160 Dragon Point Road

PLEASE READ THIS WARNING: All e-mail sent to or from this address will be received or otherwise recorded by the Van Hulzen Asset Management corporate e-mail system and is subject to archival, monitoring and/or review, by and/or disclosure to, someone other than the recipient. This message is intended only for the use of the person(s) ("intended recipient") to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender as soon as possible and delete the message without reading it or making a copy. Any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this message or any of its content by any person other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. Van Hulzen Asset Management have taken precautions to screen this message for viruses, but we cannot guarantee that it is virus free nor are we responsible for any damage that may be caused by this message.

Van Hulzen Asset Management only transacts business in states where it is properly registered or notice filed, or excluded or exempted from registration requirements. Follow-up and individualized responses that involve either the effecting or attempting to effect transactions in securities, or the rendering of personalized investment advice for compensation, as the case may be, will not be made absent compliance with state investment adviser and investment adviser representative registration requirements, or an applicable exemption or exclusion.