

Trina Barton [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 7:51 AM

To: Yesenia Jimenez <yeseniajuran@gmail.com>; shane pavonetti <s.pavonetti@gmail.com>; Sandy Brown <Sandy.Brown@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Trina Barton <Trina.Barton@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Renee Shepherd <renee@reneesgarden.com>; SCPCD2@outlook.com; rizcon@earthlink.net; triciawynne1@gmail.com

Cc: Sheila McDaniel <Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Justin Graham <Justin.Graham@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Nicholas Brown <Nicholas.Brown@santacruzcountyca.gov>

Subject: Minutes Correction for Feb 12

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Dear Planning Commissioners and staff,

My apologies to the Commission for missing our February 26th meeting. I'd like to request the minutes from the February 12th meeting be corrected for item 8, 186 Summit Drive, to more accurately reflect the substance of the motion and to remove excess verbiage.

Below is the corrected motion, shown first with strikeouts and underlined additions and, second, as it should read:

WITH STRIKEOUTS AND UNDERLINED ADDITIONS:

ACTION: Deny application based on substantial evidence contained in the written record, ~~which we have a lot of,~~ As a Planning Commission we are required to make particular findings in order to approve this application. Based on the evidence provided below, it is not possible to make these findings: ~~as it has been stated. We have to make the written findings that:~~

Finding #1: There is no alternative to the proposed wireless communications facility:

This finding cannot be made based on the information in the record. ~~When you look at The~~ Propagation maps of Summit Drive and Patrick Road it indicates equal coverage at 150 feet. If, while Summit Drive provides more coverage to the south, Patrick Road provides more coverage to the north. Therefore, ~~you can't and actually, if there is an existing facility with the potential to be utilized for co-location, we have to go with that.~~ Additionally,

Finding #2: The proposed facility eliminates substantial gaps in coverage:

As part of the record, the appellant has provided pictures and maps of the carrier's (the proposed tenant's) own commercial maps of coverage. ~~And, I'll be darned if indeed it does not~~ These maps indicate 4G, 5G and 5G plus coverage in the area. ~~So, that is certainly purported by AT&T, the carrier themselves, and that's provided information that is now part of the record that there are not coverage gaps. It is in our record. We have~~ Both screen shots and narrative about that document this coverage.

Finding #3: ~~Also,~~ The facility is located in the least visually obtrusive site:

~~We know that is not the case, it is~~ The proposed facility would be located in the middle of an active neighborhood. ~~We saw All the homes will be able to see it and they are going to look at it every single day. This isn't in the middle of nowhere right, it is a neighborhood, with kids, with older folks, with folks walking. This-~~ The proposed facility is not visually appealing, and it is visually disruptive to the neighborhood. ~~I am thinking from a neighborhood perspective and also what's in the record. That is what I can say, indeed, we can't make these findings. That is my motion to deny.~~

CLEAN

ACTION: Deny application based on substantial evidence contained in the written record. As a Planning Commission we are required to make particular findings in order to approve this application. Based on the evidence provided below, it is not possible to make these findings:

Finding #1: There is no alternative to the proposed wireless communications facility:

This finding cannot be made based on the information in the record. The Propagation maps of Summit Drive and Patrick Road indicate equal coverage at 150 feet. While Summit Drive provides more coverage to the south, Patrick Road provides more coverage to the north. Therefore, there is an existing facility with the potential to be utilized for co-location.

Finding #2: The proposed facility eliminates substantial gaps in coverage:

As part of the record, the appellant has provided pictures and maps of the carrier's (the proposed tenant's) own commercial maps of coverage. These maps indicate 4G, 5G and 5G plus coverage in the area. AT&T provided information that is now part of the

record that there are not coverage gaps. Both screen shots and narrative document this coverage.

Finding #3: The facility is located in the least visually obtrusive site:

The proposed facility would be located in the middle of an active neighborhood. All the homes will be able to see it and they are going to look at it every single day. This isn't in the middle of nowhere, it is a neighborhood. The proposed facility is not visually appealing, and it is visually disruptive to the neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Trina

TRINA BARTON

Wireless Communication Facility Use Permit Findings

(A) That either:

- (1) The development of the proposed wireless communications facility as conditioned will not significantly affect any designated visual resources, environmentally sensitive habitat resources (as defined in the Santa Cruz County General Plan/LCP Sections 5.1, 5.10, and 8.6.6.), and/or other significant County resources, including agricultural, open space, and community character resources; or
- (2) There are no other environmentally equivalent and/or superior and technically feasible alternatives to the proposed wireless communications facility as conditioned (including alternative locations and/or designs) with less visual and/or other resource impacts and the proposed facility has been modified by condition and/or project design to minimize and mitigate its visual and other resource impacts.

This finding cannot be made based on the information in the record. The propagation maps of Summit Drive and Patrick Road indicate equal coverage at 150 feet. While Summit Drive provides more coverage to the south, Patrick Road provides more coverage to the north. And the County Code requires co-location if there is an existing facility with the potential to be utilized for co-location.

(B) For sites located in one of the prohibited and/or restricted areas set forth in SCCC [13.10.660](#)(C), that the applicant has provided documentation to enable the decision-making body to make the findings in SCCC [13.10.660](#)(C)(4)(a) and (b).

(C) That the subject property upon which the wireless communications facility is to be built is in compliance with all rules and regulations pertaining to zoning uses, subdivisions and any other applicable provisions of this title and that all zoning violation abatement costs, if any, have been paid.

A maximum of 75-foot maximum height is allowed in the residential zone district unless a Height Exception is sought, including written justification providing the need for a facility of that height.

Required Height Exception findings cannot be made in that:

- (a) The proposed facility eliminates or substantially reduces one or more significant gaps in the applicant carrier's network; and

As part of the record, the appellant has provided pictures and maps of the carriers, the proposed tenants (AT&T's), own commercial maps of coverage indicating 4G, 5G and 5G plus coverage. That is certainly purported by the AT&T carrier themselves and part of the record. The screen

shots and narrative are contained in the record and publicly available. Therefore, this finding cannot be made.

- (b) The proposed facility is located on the least visually obtrusive site and least visually obtrusive portion of the site, where the applicant provides substantial evidence that it chose the best solution for the community after a meaningful comparison of alternative sites and designs, including but not limited to considering less sensitive sites, alternative system designs, alternative tower designs, placement of antennas on existing structures, and other viable, technically feasible, and environmentally (i.e., visually) equivalent or superior potential alternatives.

This finding cannot be made, the facility is located in the middle of an active neighborhood. All the homes can see it and residents can see it everyday. This is not in the middle of nowhere, it is in a neighborhood with kids, with older folks, with folks walking. It is not visually appealing, and it is visually disruptive to the neighborhood. These facts are contained in the record.

- (E) That the proposed wireless communication facility, as conditioned, will not create a hazard for aircraft in flight.

From: Andrew Schifffrin <aschiff@ gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:53 AM

To: Trina Barton [REDACTED]

Cc: Yesenia Jimenez <yeseniaj@ gmail.com>; shane pavonetti <s.pavonetti@ gmail.com>; Sandy Brown <Sandy.Brown@ santacruzcountyca.gov>; Trina Barton <Trina.Barton@ santacruzcountyca.gov>; Renee Shepherd <renee@ reneesgarden.com>; SCPCD2@ outlook.com; rizcon@ earthlink.net; triciawynne1@ gmail.com; Sheila McDaniel <Sheila.McDaniel@ santacruzcountyca.gov>; Justin Graham <Justin.Graham@ santacruzcountyca.gov>; Nicholas Brown <Nicholas.Brown@ santacruzcountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: Minutes Correction for Feb 12

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Looks good. Let's hope Renee follows through. Good luck, Sandy.

On Tue, Feb 25, 2025, 7:51 AM Trina Barton <trinabarton@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Planning Commissioners and staff,

My apologies to the Commission for missing our February 26th meeting. I'd like to request the minutes from the February 12th meeting be corrected for item 8, 186 Summit Drive, to more accurately reflect the substance of the motion and to remove excess verbiage.

Below is the corrected motion, shown first with strikeouts and underlined additions and, second, as it should read:

WITH STRIKEOUTS AND UNDERLINED ADDITIONS:

ACTION: Deny application based on substantial evidence contained in the written record., ~~which we have a lot of,~~ As a Planning Commission we are required to make

particular findings in order to approve this application. Based on the evidence provided below, it is not possible to make these findings: as it has been stated. We have to make the written findings that:

Finding #1: There is no alternative to the proposed wireless communications facility:

This finding cannot be made based on the information in the record. ~~When you look at~~ The Propagation maps of Summit Drive and Patrick Road ~~it indicates equal coverage at 150 feet. If,~~ while Summit Drive provides more coverage to the south, Patrick Road provides more coverage to the north. ~~Therefore, you can't and actually, if there is an existing facility with the potential to be utilized for co-location, we have to go with that. Additionally,~~

Finding #2: The proposed facility eliminates substantial gaps in coverage:

As part of the record, the appellant has provided pictures and maps of the carrier's (the proposed tenant's) own commercial maps of coverage. And, I'll be darned if indeed it does not These maps indicate 4G, 5G and 5G plus coverage in the area. So, that is certainly purported by AT&T, the carrier themselves, and that's provided information that is now part of the record that there are not coverage gaps. It is in our record. We have Both screen shots and narrative ~~about that~~ document this coverage.

Finding #3: ~~Also,~~ The facility is located in the least visually obtrusive site:

~~We know that is not the case, it is~~ The proposed facility would be located in the middle of an active neighborhood. ~~We saw All the homes will be able to can see it and they are going to look at it every single day. This isn't in the middle of nowhere right, it is a neighborhood, with kids, with older folks, with folks walking. This-~~ The proposed facility is not visually appealing, and it is visually disruptive to the neighborhood. ~~I am thinking from a neighborhood perspective and also what's in the record. That is what I can say, indeed, we can't make these findings. That is my motion to deny.~~

CLEAN

ACTION: Deny application based on substantial evidence contained in the written record. As a Planning Commission we are required to make particular findings in order to approve this application. Based on the evidence provided below, it is not possible to make these findings:

Finding #1: There is no alternative to the proposed wireless communications facility:

This finding cannot be made based on the information in the record. The Propagation maps of Summit Drive and Patrick Road indicate equal coverage at 150 feet. While Summit Drive provides more coverage to the south, Patrick Road provides more coverage to the north. Therefore, there is an existing facility with the potential to be utilized for co-location.

Finding #2: The proposed facility eliminates substantial gaps in coverage:

As part of the record, the appellant has provided pictures and maps of the carrier's (the proposed tenant's) own commercial maps of coverage. These maps indicate 4G, 5G and 5G plus coverage in the area. AT&T provided information that is now part of the record that there are not coverage gaps. Both screen shots and narrative document this coverage.

Finding #3: The facility is located in the least visually obtrusive site:

The proposed facility would be located in the middle of an active neighborhood. All the homes will be able to see it and they are going to look at it every single day. This isn't in the middle of nowhere, it is a neighborhood. The proposed facility is not visually appealing, and it is visually disruptive to the neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Trina

TRINA BARTON

From: Allyson V <SCPCD2@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 1:23 PM
To: Nicholas Brown <Nicholas.Brown@santacruzcountyca.gov>
Cc: Sheila McDaniel <Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcountyca.gov>
Subject: PC minutes 2/12/25

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Hi Nick,

I had a chance to look at the draft minutes from February 12th that are being considered by the Planning Commission tomorrow. While I will not be able to attend tomorrow's meeting, I am hoping staff can offer a correction to item 10, relating to the SCCC 13.10.640 You will recall that I made a friendly amendment to the motion that was accepted for staff work with counsel to work on clarifying language, and in particular, produce stands should only be open during the growing season. Thanks for your help.

-Allyson