



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Item 19-0663

1 message

Chris Cockrell <chris@samstowncyclery.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Oct 21, 2019 at 7:58 PM

Supervisors,

In regards to agenda item 19-0663, this taxpayer respectfully request you vote no on Option A and approve Option D. I do feel that the fees charged by the county should not be increased but the process exercised by the county be improved.

Thank you for your efforts!

Sincerely,

Chris Cockrell



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Item 31, Say NO to "Appeal Fee" increase Option A-C&E and Approve Option D.

1 message

Ken Greenwood <kgg@d-web.com>

Tue, Oct 22, 2019 at 3:11 AM

To: BOS Clerk Jim Mitrisin <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear EDCo Board of Supervisors,

Please consider the economic abilities of your "Average Retiree" when setting fee for Appeals. That would suggest there be little or no raise in fees for appeals of items to the Board of Supervisors.

My experience in 2018 with the "Appeal Process" to challenge the Planning Commission's decision on one of the AT&T Cell towers was pretty painful financially, as well as for the other four Appellants. We paid \$239 for each Project. I know it was a significant expenditure for me (especially as I had no dog in the fight other than to illustrate the fact the "Wireless Ordinance" is ineffective).

Please Say NO to Option A and approve Option D! Keep affordable access to the Appeal Process.

This proposed increase to \$947 is over THREE TIMES the existing fee for an Appeal (or far more per other "Options"). There are some considerations in the June 19, 2019 Memo from Tiffany Schmid (your Attachment 14./N) that are worthy of note, but others that are bordering on wishful thinking. One that stands out is the lack of identification of the reason for the "Spike" of appeals in 2018. It is pretty clear that the lack of a meaningful "Wireless Ordinance" that does not adequately address setbacks and fails to require meaningful Alternative Location Analysis would have likely prevented five, if not seven of the 15 Appeals!

Additionally, the increased Appeal fee has the following flaws:

1. This is out of reach of MOST homeowners that may have been saddled with a decision on a ??? Project (**fill in the blank: Dorado Oaks, 100 unit Subdivision or 160 foot Cell Tower set back 20 feet from your property line**, etc.) proposed "next door" that was based on a poor and/or faulty analysis by Staff and of course the issues with the "Wireless Ordinance" described above. As a Retiree, I am (and thousands of other EDCo residents are) on the proverbial "Fixed Income" and this would be a HUGE expense to defend our 5th Amendment Property Rights and provide reasonable access to DUE PROCESS!

2. Beyond the preparation of a relatively short "Staff Memo" to the Board, WHY would Staff need to do **ANY ADDITIONAL WORK** on a project they should have "done right" the 1st time? **NO!!** They should have it air-tight to begin with so that appeals were not likely. Shouldn't they? **The ANSWER is YES!**

So why does a neighbor to a poorly proposed and analyzed project have to pay for the Applicant's absurd project, or the County's lack of adequate review of a project? Seems the Applicant or the Planning Department should pay from their Budget. This would provide a wonderful incentive to do things right from both Planning and Applicants perspectives.

The following from my Facebook feed today seems to sum this up: (Fees really ARE Taxes!)



3. The "Attachment 16./P" the "2018-19 County Comparison - Planning Division Sample of Fees Across Comparator Counties" gives an average of \$867 verses Attachment 14./N Suggestion of \$947. The Lower amount is better, but certainly not affordable for retired people who live here.

4. From a "Philosophical Point of View": An excessive Appeal Fee seems to put all decisions made by El Dorado County on a pretty high pedestal that the common citizen will be unable or unlikely to afford! NO!! Make Applicants and Staff pay the price of these 'mistakes' not the neighbors.

- **>>PLEASE Say NO to Options A-C+E and approve Option D!**

Please help keep "Access to the Process" affordable and say NO to increased Appeal fees!

Thanks,

Ken Greenwood
Citizens For a New Wireless Ordinance

10/22/2019

Edcgov.us Mail - Item 31, Say NO to "Appeal Fee" increase Option A-C&E and Approve Option D.

530-306-6390 (C) krq@d-web.com