

PLANNING COMMISSION

ADDITIONAL ITEM ADDED AFTER DISTRIBUTION OF PACKET

Agenda # 2

1). Email from Suzanne Anderson

Date 12/18/13

Time 5:40 PM

Kiss, Lisa

From: Brindley, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 5:25 PM
To: Kiss, Lisa
Cc: Backoff, Jerry
Subject: FW: Ordinance Comments

Here is another email for tonight's hearing.

Karen

From: Suzanne Anderson [mailto:suzanne@recrepublic.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 16:52 PM
To: Brindley, Karen; Backoff, Jerry
Cc: Constance Signorino; Email@elliotherman.com Herman; E Clifton
Subject: Re: Ordinance Comments

Karen and Jerry:

My business flight has been delayed and I may be late to the meeting. I wanted you to know that our views and opinions are in line with the Signorio, Herman and Clifton families. Please consider the input they give at the meeting as ours in this regard. I have high hopes to attend at some point but it may be later in the secession.

Best Regards,

Suzanne Anderson
C: 415.846.1980833 Orion Way
San Marcos 92078

On Dec 18, 2013, at 3:38 PM, "Brindley, Karen" <KBrindley@san-marcos.net> wrote:

Mrs. Signorino,

Thank you for your voicemail and this follow up email. Staff responses are included below. Please note additional materials for tonight's hearing have been uploaded to the City's website (Planning Commission agendas).

Hi Karen,

I looked through the ordinance and have some questions/comments:

Sec. 20.465.040 (A) – When it says "Encourage the use of existing structures rather than introducing new structures" does that apply to existing cell tower structures such as the T-Mobile and recently approved AT&T? If that is the case, then we would have potentially 4 carriers at that site? This would be completely unacceptable to the neighbors.

Staff Response:

4 carriers could potentially locate at a site; however, any proposed WTF would be subject to all provisions of the draft Ordinance including, but not limited to, the technical requirements of 20.465.030.B.1 and 20.465.-040.D.1

Sec. 20.465.040 (B) – What is the current height specification of our A-1 AG zone?

Staff response:

Within the A-1 zone, for structures within 100' of the property line, the maximum height is 35'. For non-residential structures that are 100 feet or greater from the property line, the maximum height is 50'.

Sec. 20.465.040 (D) (1) – The last sentence reads, "In residential and agricultural areas, no more than (2) collocated Wireless Telecommunication Facilities may be permitted on any existing Wireless Telecommunications Facility"— Does this mean again that we can potentially have 4 carriers at 2080 Golden Eagle Trail?

Staff response:

See first response above.

Sec. 20.465.040 (F) – How does this apply when access must include using private roads (owned by multiple property owners) in order to get to the site. How will this be interpreted?

Staff response:

Staff is recommending a clarification to Section 20.465.040 F to read:

F. Legal Access is Required: In all applications for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities on public and private property, an applicant/operator must show that it has the written agreement of the applicant and the owner of the property which is the subject of the application to legally access the wireless telecommunications facility and that the applicant/operator will have legal access to the utilities necessary to operate and maintain the wireless telecommunications facility.

Sec. 20.465.050 (A) - #8 – "A preferred location is "specific plan areas that include land use regulations for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities" – If I am not mistaken, I believe we live in such a location (specific plan w/WTF land use regulations). Am I correct?

Staff response:

The zoning of your property is A-1 (Agricultural) not Specific Plan Area.

Thank you,

Connie Signorino

Sincerely,

Karen

Karen Brindley
Principal Planner

City of San Marcos
1 Civic Center Drive
San Marcos, CA 92069

760 744-1050 ext. 3220
kbrindley@ci.san-marcos.ca.us

From: Constance Signorino [<mailto:jcsiggy@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 14:58 PM
To: Brindley, Karen
Cc: Email@elliotherman.com; Suzanne Anderson; E Clifton
Subject: Ordinance Comments

Hi Karen,

I looked through the ordinance and have some questions/comments:

Sec. 20.465.040 (A) – When it says “Encourage the use of existing structures rather than introducing new structures” does that apply to existing cell tower structures such as the T-Mobile and recently approved AT&T? If that is the case, then we would have potentially 4 carriers at that site? This would be completely unacceptable to the neighbors.

Sec. 20.465.040 (B) – What is the current height specification of our A-1 AG zone?

Sec. 20.465.040 (D) (1) – The last sentence reads, “In residential and agricultural areas, no more than (2) collocated Wireless Telecommunication Facilities may be permitted on any existing Wireless Telecommunications Facility”— Does this mean again that we can potentially have 4 carriers at 2080 Golden Eagle Trail?

Sec. 20.465.040 (F) – How does this apply when access must include using private roads (owned by multiple property owners) in order to get to the site. How will this be interpreted?

Sec. 20.465.050 (A) - #8 – “A preferred location is “specific plan areas that include land use regulations for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities” – If I am not mistaken, I believe we live in such a location (specific plan w/WTF land use regulations). Am I correct?

Thank you,

Connie Signorino