



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA CALIFORNIA

MONTECITO PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNTY ENGINEERING BUILDING
123 E. ANAPAMU STREET
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93101-2058
PHONE: (805) 568-2000
FAX: (805) 568-2030

November 29, 2012

Crown Castle
Attn: Sharon James
890 Tasman Drive
Milipitas, CA 95035

MONTECITO PLANNING COMMISSION
HEARING OF NOVEMBER 28, 2012

**RE: Crown Castle Distributed Antenna System Upgrade; 12CUP-00000-00018,
12CDP-00000-00038**

Hearing on the request of Sharon James, agent for the applicant, Crown Castle to consider Cases No. 12CUP-00000-00018 and 12CDP-00000-00038, [application filed on May 17, 2012] for a Conditional Use Permit and Coastal Development Permit allowing additions to an existing telecommunications facility network, at five locations, in compliance with Section 35-172 of the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance, on properties zoned 2-E-1, 7-R-1, and 20-R-1; and to determine that the project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Sections 15301(b), 15303(d) and 15304(f) of the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. The application involves coastal County rights-of-way (no assigned Assessor Parcel Numbers), in the Montecito area, First Supervisorial District.

Dear Ms. James:

At the Montecito Planning Commission hearing of November 28, 2012, Commissioner Phillips moved, seconded by Commissioner Eidelson and carried by a vote of 3 to 1 (Gottsdanker no; Overall absent) to:

1. Make the findings for denial of the project, provided at the hearing of November 28, 2012;
2. Determine that the denial of the project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15270; and
3. Deny the project, Case Nos. 12CUP-00000-00018 and 12CDP-00000-00038.

The attached findings reflect the Montecito Planning Commission's actions of November 28, 2012.

The action of the Montecito Planning Commission on this project may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors by the applicant or any aggrieved person adversely affected by such decision. To qualify as an aggrieved persons the appellant, in person or through a representative, must have informed the Montecito Planning Commission by appropriate means prior to the decision on this project of the nature of their concerns, or, for good cause, was unable to do so.

Appeal applications may be obtained at the Clerk of the Board's office. The appeal form must be filed along with any attachments to the Clerk of the Board. In addition to the appeal form a concise summary of fifty words or less, stating the reasons for the appeal, must be submitted with the appeal. The summary statement will be used for public noticing of your appeal before the Board of Supervisors. The appeal, which shall be in writing must be filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors within the 10 calendar days following the date of the Montecito Planning Commission's decision. In the event that the last day for filing an appeal falls on a non-business of the County, the appeal may be timely filed on the next business day. This letter or a copy should be taken to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in order to determine that the appeal is filed within the allowed appeal period. **The appeal period for this project ends on Monday, December 10, 2012 at 5:00 p.m.**

Final action by the County on this project may be appealed to the Coastal Commission by the applicant, an aggrieved person, as defined above, or any two members of the Coastal Commission within the 10 working days following the date the County's Notice of Final Action is received by the Coastal Commission.

Sincerely,



Dianne M. Black
Secretary to the Montecito Planning Commission

cc: Case File: 12CUP-00000-00018, 12CDP-00000-00038
Montecito Planning Commission File
Montecito Association, P.O. Box 5278, Montecito, CA 93150
Engineer: Cornell Design Group, 26455 Rancho Parkway South, Lake Forest, CA 92630
County Chief Appraiser
County Surveyor
Fire Department
Flood Control
Community Services Department
Public Works
Environmental Health Services
APCD
Supervisor Carbajal, First District
Commissioner Eidelson
Commissioner Burrows
Commissioner Phillips
Commissioner Overall
Commissioner Gottsdanker
✓ Rachel Van Mullem, Chief Deputy County Counsel
✓ Megan Lowery, Planner
Planner

Attachments: Findings for Denial

DMB/dmv

COASTAL FINDINGS FOR DENIAL

2.2.1 The facility will be compatible with existing and surrounding development in terms of land use and visual qualities. (Article II, Section 35-144F.7.1.)

The facilities are proposed to be mounted on existing utility poles in a semi-rural residential area. The proposed design does not camouflage the facilities adequately. Rather, the antennas, and for the site TSR02, the equipment cabinet, would be mounted directly on the existing pole. Furthermore, the poles on which the facilities would be mounted are in the public rights-of-way and are readily visible by road users and nearby residents. The design of the facilities adds clutter to the existing poles in addition to equipment that is already present. Therefore the proposed project does not preserve the existing semi-rural residential streetscape character of the area and this finding cannot be made.

2.2.2 The facility is located so as to minimize its visibility from public view. (Article II, Section 35-144F.7.2.)

The proposed facilities are located squarely in the public road rights-of-ways on existing utility poles, many of which are already encumbered by additional equipment (SCE, Cox, etc.) The proliferation of equipment is aesthetically unsatisfactory and does not minimize the facilities from public view. Therefore the facilities do not minimize their visibility from public view and this finding cannot be made.

2.2.3 The facility is designed to blend into the surrounding environment to the greatest extent feasible. (Article II, Section 35-144F.7.3.)

The proliferation of additional equipment boxes and antennas contributes to the visual clutter in the public road rights-of-ways. These poles are separated from the surrounding urban forest, highlighting the visual prominence of these facilities. As such, the facilities do not blend into the surrounding environment and this finding cannot be made.

