



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

S17-0016 appeal to Board of Supervisors

Bruce Person <bperson03@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Aug 28, 2018 at 2:33 AM

Reply-To: Bruce Person <bperson03@sbcglobal.net>

To: "jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us" <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>, "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bostthree@edcgov.us" <bostthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Evan Mattes <evan.mattes@edcgov.us>, Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>, Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

Regarding the project S17-0016 which met the Planning Commission denial on February 8, 2018, and was placed on the agenda for February 22nd with recommendations from the Planning Department Staff to deny all seven projects!.

Please consider the growing support for a better and safer program for the development of cell infrastructure in El Dorado County. The program now in place is flawed and inconsistent with the ideals of the County in that the health and welfare of the residents of El Dorado County are being negatively impacted by a sweetheart deal that the FCC enacted with the Government in 1996. We came out in large numbers to oppose the projects back in February, and the Commissioners actually saw merit in the arguments presented by neighboring residents to every cell tower in this project, and voted to deny the projects on that day.

Problems with inappropriate setbacks from neighboring parcels including inadequate fall zones, placement of 120' to 160' tall fake trees in residential neighborhoods which negatively impacts aesthetics and creates negative impacts to private roads and property values, access to the prospective sites has not been mitigated or provided for by guarantees by the applicant, the applicant did not show that alternative site analysis was researched in any significant way, and co-location possibilities were not addressed in a realistic or adequate way. The project that was denied by the Planning Commission came back as significantly the same project, but with fewer safeguards, and still not even one suggestion for an alternate location. All of the applicants attention has been focused on the same seven sites from the preplanning phases of this project! The idea to combine seven sites in completely different locations and conditions under one project number is not the way to provide for public safety or consistency with requirements of the General Plan, the Wireless Ordinance, or CEQA. These types of projects need to be presented as individual projects and taken on the merits of each site. To "bundle" these projects like a "cell plan" is entirely ludicrous and wrong! Saving money and time for the applicant cannot be a driving concern for continued proliferation of cell towers in our County!

At the re-representation of these seven sites, a statement was made by the planning staff that thirty six letters in favor of the projects had been submitted, and only twelve in opposition. This comment was totally misrepresented by staff, and may have influenced the Commissioners on their second chance of hearing these projects. Petitions and letters were submitted to the planning staff that clearly included hundreds of signatures of people joining in the fight against inappropriate locations for cell infrastructure, and the thirty six letters in support of "Broadband Internet Coverage in El Dorado County" were general support for better service, and not at all connected to these sites or this project!

Please listen to the residents of your districts and stop this project until a real effort is made to assess the implications of hundreds of new towers in our community!

Thank you for your consideration!

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

18-1300 Public Comment
BOS Rcvd 08-28-18