

# Minutes

October 1, 2014

Fair Oaks CPAC

**NOTE: Minutes posted are drafts until approved at the following meeting by the CPAC. Corrected Minutes will be posted if changes are made.**

Absent

Harry Azar

CTO: 6:35 pm

Pledge of Allegiance

Presentation: Melinda Avey, Chair, HSSC Advisory Committee

6:48 pm Planning Items for Review:

FAIR OAKS BLVD MONOPOLE Use Permit

Gary Mapa, Verizon Wireless / Epic Wireless Group

Best actual location is slightly to the east in residential neighborhood. Not enough room on ground and not enough height in res zone. This is the best location with ground space within the search ring.

John Wallace to County Staff:

What is the adjoining zoning? L-C and then Residential.

What is the setback? 25 ft

Do they meet setback? No, they don't meet setback to interior residential setback (25') nor the requirement that the setback be 3x the height of the pole. That's why this application goes to PC instead of Zoning Administrator. They are about 110' from R zone, development standard calls for 195'.

John Wallace to Applicant:

Why can't you go to the church? Existing infrastructure can't physically support co-location.

Why can't you retrofit the tower at the church? We could.

I can't support this with cyclone fence, what about an 8' block wall? We can do that.

Why can't you do a monopine? We could, but it increases the footprint required (to protect against falling icicles).

Jahn Wallace, general comments:

Can we move the project site south?

Andrew Campbell:

What is the typical coverage of a site like this? It's not coverage so much as capacity.

So why can't we go to the church? Two structure that are there now won't accommodate more equipment.

Three issues:

1. Proximity to residences
2. Pole disrupts the tree line.
3. Look into colocation - it's County policy. Not in favor of a new pole.

Elisa Sabatini, questions to applicant:

Decibels from generator? No sure. But will only run in power outages and for weekly testing (15 min)

Would the block wall attenuate the noise from the generated from the generated? Yes. But not sure how much.

Thomas Zlotkowski, comments:

Not sure that the CPAC has enough information to suggest alternatives. How long until we have 2 poles there?

Elisa Sabatini, follow-up question:

Is the tower, as proposed, tall enough to accommodate future co-location? Maybe. Depends on the carrier.

Ralph Carhart, questions/comments:

Asked property owners (????) about the L-C zoning...it's always been that way. They ran GC business from the home w/ home office. He's now retired.

Asked applicant if he had explored park/church sites. Applicant explained that he was given a dot on a map and 1,000' radius. Those sites weren't within that radius.

Thomas Zlotkowski asked for public comment

Property owner:

48,000 watt generator seems excessive, and is a big concern.

Not sure if there are any health impacts associated with the equipment.

Concerned about visual impact. Pole will be visible from bedroom windows.

Why can't you co-locate on existing SMUD towers? TZ: SMUD is not co-location friendly.

conclusions:

JW: Would make motion to deny. Would support site across the street.

AS: Agree. Feel strongly in favor of colocation.

JW: No one is obligated to allow this applicant to co-locate; perhaps the tower owner would decline.

RC: Not sure what the capacity of each pole is in terms of co-location. Would additional carriers require larger footprint for each carrier's equipment. applicant: Yes.

AS: I'm not an expert, but it looks like there's room on the existing poles at New Life Christian Church.

TZ: Doesn't feel like there's enough information to make a decision for recommendation of approval/denial.

RC: Would rather continue and have the applicant come back with alternatives.

AC: Would like to hear from an expert - someone to answer our questions.

Applicant: Would like to try to make new pole work; open to moving it around on site. Will also look at shorter pole to decrease setback requirement.

AC: That's a nice offer, but I'm not convinced that the colocation has been fully explored.

TZ: Is there a motion to continue or deny?

JW: Want to get Verizon their capacity, but can't get over variance from development standard.

MOTION (AC)

Motion to deny the request.

RC: Discussion/justification? Do we want alternatives?

TZ: "We vote for denial based on the lack of alternatives?"

AC: Is anyone in favor on seeing the pole moved around on the site?

Applicant: If Verizon comes back with a design that met all the requirements, would that work?

JW: I'd still need to know that co-location was investigated before I voted for approval.

VOTE: Unanimous vote in favor of denial. (6-0)