



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Project S-14-0009

Planning Unknown <planning@edcgov.us>
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 8:09 AM

Hi Char,

Please see email.

Thank you, Debbie Ercolini

——— Forwarded message ———

From: **Lori London** <attorneylondon@yahoo.com>

Date: Sun, Jan 11, 2015 at 2:22 PM

Subject: Project S-14-0009

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

Cc: "dave.livingston@edcgov.us" <dave.livingston@edcgov.us>

Dear planning commission,

I am writing for two reasons. First, the above project was placed on the January 22, 2015 agenda at the December 14, 2014 planning commission meeting. At the December 14 meeting the commissioners "conceptually" denied the project and staff was directed to return at the January 22, 2015 meeting with "findings of denial" that the commissioners were then going to adopt.

My review of the agenda for the January 22 meeting does not include an agenda item for the consideration and adoption of the findings and denial for this project. Instead there is simply an agenda item with a request by the proponent of the project to continue the matter to February 26, 2015. While the proponent may be able to request a continuance the agenda should include the return for the vote on the "findings of denial." I spoke with county counsel Dave Livingston and he agreed with me. The Commissioners do not have to continue the matter at the request of the proponent of the project and can go forward with the adoption of the "findings of denial." To that end I checked the web site and do not see the draft of the findings of denial that staff was directed to prepare.

I strongly oppose the request by the proponent to continue the matter. The only supporting information for the request for a continuance is a one page letter requesting the continuance without any supporting information as stated in the letter such as "significant coverage gap" information as well as other additional data referenced in the letter. Even if such information exists and has been provided the proponent was given every opportunity to present all data at the December 14 meeting. The proponents failure to adequately support his request for the project should not support his request to continue the denial.

The people of El Dorado County most notably, the people affected by this project, have a right to finality. Meeting after meeting about the project held in a place 60 miles away from those affected, places a hardship on the citizens of El Dorado County directly affected by this project. The planning commission of El Dorado County should be protecting the interests of the People of El Dorado County and not the project proponents (AT&T).

My second reason for writing is that I am going to attend the January 22 meeting. I am an attorney and have a court calendar that day. I have appearances in two departments (3 and 12) in South Lake Tahoe that the court has kindly delayed until 11:00 a.m. so that I can attend the Planning Commission meeting. I am respectfully requesting that you place this matter first on the agenda so that the court and litigants will not be delayed by my inability to appear as scheduled at 11:00 a.m.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Lori G. London
Attorney at Law
attorneylondon@yahoo.com

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.