

PLANNING COMMISSION

ADDITIONAL ITEM ADDED AFTER DISTRIBUTION OF PACKET

Agenda # 2

- Email/Letter from Elliot Herman
dated 6/12/14

Date 6/26/14

Time 2:55 PM

From: Elliot Herman [email@elliotherman.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2014 11:13 AM
To: Leichter, Rosalia; CityClerk; Planning Commission
Cc: Desmond, Jim; Orlando, Chris; Romero, Lydia; Jones, Rebecca; Jabara, Kristal; Jenkins, Sharon; Backoff, Jerry; Griffin, Jack; teri.figueroa@utsandiego.com
Subject: Proposed Cell Tower Ordinance.

I have three items that I believe should be addressed in the new ordinance. The ordinance is principally designed to control the placement of new cell towers based upon their visual impact on surrounding properties. I like the preferred vs NON-preferred designations. However, I believe that towers placed in NON-preferred areas should be additionally regulated to prevent towers from being installed too close to otherwise non permitted areas.

My first objection is with the setback requirement of only 100 feet from the property line. I believe that it should be a minimum of 500 feet. This would be for sites proposed in NON-Preferred areas only. It makes no sense that the standard 100 foot rule should be used for this kind of structure. It is an eyesore and will dominate your view if placed that close to the property line which could be 110 feet from a home whether the tower is camouflaged or not. Visual blight studies have shown the distance would need to increase to 1,000 feet to reduce the impact to nil. Just because you live next to a property with 100 acres, that owner should not be able to locate this visual eye sore closer to neighbors home than their own dwelling which is possible.

Second, the minimum acreage for 3 or more towers should be 15 acres. Right now towers in NON-preferred areas can be doubled up to allow two carriers on each pole. Those who live close to them are already taking one, two, three or four for the team. Asking them to take 5 or 6 is just not fair. The visual impact of so many towers cannot be adequately camouflaged.

Third, towers in NON-preferred areas, should be limited to 35 feet. It is not appropriate to co-locate cell carries on one poll in a NON Preferred area unless it can be done on a tower of 35 feet or less. We do not need the ugly 50 or 60 foot towers to dominate our view of the mountains. A ridgeline ordinance was passed

to avoid ugly structures being built. This is no different. A tower higher than 35 feet will be very difficult to camouflage, so the top will stick out like a sore thumb.

Please get back to me with any reason why these changes should not be incorporated into the new cell tower ordinance.

Elliot Herman
San Marcos resident