

APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Submit to: Clerk of the Board  
County Administration Building  
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

2012 JUN -4 AM 8:16

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA  
CLERK OF THE  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RE: Project Title Verizon Cell Site Relocation to Montecito Switch Station #11553  
Case Number 12 CUP-00000-00007  
Tract/ APN Number 011-200-015 and 011-200-016  
Date of action taken by Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator, or Surveyor May 23, 2012

I hereby appeal the approval with conditions of the Montecito Planning Commission  
(approval/ approval with conditions/ or denial) (Planning Commission/ Zoning Administrator/ or County Surveyor)

Please state specifically wherein the decision of the Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator, or Surveyor is not in accord with the purposes of the appropriate zoning ordinance (one of either Articles I, II, III, or IV), or wherein it is claimed that there was an error or an abuse of discretion by the Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator, or Surveyor. {References: Article I, 21-71.4; Article II 35-182.3, 2; Article III 25-327.2, 2; Article IV 35-475.3, 2}

Attach additional documentation, or state below the reason(s) for this appeal.

see attached documentation pg. 4

Specific conditions being appealed are:

see attached documentation pgs. 4-7

Name of Appellant (please print): <u>CO- Mary E. Goolsby, MD</u>	<u>Martha Goolsby Kay</u>
Address: <u>2961 1/2 Clairemont Drive</u>	<u>1743 Overlook Lane</u>
(Street, Apt #)	<u>Santa Barbara, CA 93103</u>
<u>San Diego, CA 92117</u>	
(City/ State/ Zip Code)	
Home: (619) 684-1650	Home: 962-3891 (Telephone)
Office: (858) 657-5475	
Appellant is (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agent for Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Third Party <input type="checkbox"/> Agent for Third Party	

Fee \$ 643.00 {Fees are set annually by the Board of Supervisors. For current fees or breakdown, contact Planning & Development or Clerk of the Board. Check should be made payable "County of Santa Barbara".}

Signature: Mary E. Goolsby, MD Date: 6/1/12  
Martha E. Kay 6/1/12

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Hearing set for: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Received: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_ File No. \_\_\_\_\_

12APL-00000-00011  
VERIZON RELOCATION TO MONTECITO SWI  
512 SANTA ANGELA LN 6/4/12



**Other Attachments include:**

1. Two letters written by property owners on Santa Angela Lane.
2. Questions from Upper Village neighbors, families, business owners, & workers to Jay Higgins, agent for Verizon, and his Answers.
3. Photographs taken during the construction of the parapet erected on the back of the Verizon, Ca, Inc. building in late 2006 which indicate Cingular's 3 antennae placements. (View is from Post Office and 2<sup>nd</sup> story businesses in the Village facing the alley.)
4. Verizon reduced copy of Antenna/Roof Plan available in Staff Report 5/23 Montecito Planning Commission Special Hearing.
5. Photograph taken 5/27/12 of the Verizon Cell facility on QAD property that is being decommissioned.
6. Photograph of a stump of a very large tree recently removed from East side of the property near the alley. (Photo taken 6/1/12)

\*\*\*\*\*

As part of the groundwork in filing this appeal, Martha Kay, co-appellant, made phone contact with Lorenzo Zilioto, on 5/31/12 to ask if he would sign a list of aggrieved appellants for the Verizon Project. Lorenzo is the owner of the property that is presently leased to Verizon, CA, Inc and he lives at 580 Santa Angela Lane with his sister, Maria Zilioto. When Martha asked if she could stop by for his and Maria's signature, Lorenzo said that he and his sister are elderly, in fragile health and were unable to attend the Montecito Planning Commission Special Hearing on May 23<sup>rd</sup> due to his heart condition. He shared that they watched the Montecito Planning Commission on local TV channel 20. Lorenzo said he was very upset that the Planning Commission had voted to accept the Verizon Project. He stated that he wanted to sign our list of aggrieved parties, but feared that he would be sued by the lessee Verizon, Ca Inc if he were to sign.

Before we ended our phone conversation Lorenzo wanted to share that he and his family have continued to receive the same monthly lease payment as originally negotiated 47 years ago. He also told Martha that he does not receive any revenue from Cingular Wireless, which presently operates 3 antennae on the rooftop of the Verizon, Ca, Inc. building.

Mary Goolsby and Martha Kay, co-appellants, feel that the lease between the Zilioto family and the current lessee(s) needs to be further examined to insure that the current lessee(s) is /are in compliance with the lease, especially in light of the impact of the proposed use of this property on the surrounding community. Historically the original facility was used as a switching station for telephone landlines.

With telecommunication technology rapidly changing to cellular/wireless, does this lease allow for such changes and is this company taking advantage of elderly and frail lessor/s?

After attending the Montecito Planning Commission meeting on May 23, 2012, hearing the vote to accept Verizon's Proposal, and taking the Staff Report home to read more carefully, it became quite clear that we did not have much time to respond with an appeal to this action. In fact, the 10 day window of time allowed for appeal, meant it would have to be filed at the County Office by 4:30pm on Friday, June 1<sup>st</sup>. An added deterrent was the fact that Memorial Day weekend of May 26,27,28 landed right in the middle of "our precious 10 day window".

We scrambled to find a meeting site, put up flyers around the neighborhood, generated questions from the Staff Report, and on Wednesday, May 30, 2012 at 7:00pm a group of concerned parents of preschoolers at El Montecito Preschool, neighbors from Santa Angela Lane, San Ysidro and Pimiento Roads and persons working in the Upper Montecito Village area gathered to ask questions of Jay Higgins, agent for the Applicant Verizon Wireless, just one week after the Special Hearing of May 23, 2012. One of our first questions, on a list of 14 questions we had submitted to Mr. Higgins earlier in the week was:

**#2 Did Verizon Wireless seek out another site other than Santa Angela Lane for this collocation project and where?**

There was no mention in the Staff Report to the Montecito Planning Commission Special Hearing that other possible sites exist. There was no mention of a study and no comprehensive look at alternative sites, as well. In Question #2, (see attached copy of Mr. Higgins' handout), we asked Jay specifically what other sites for collocation had been considered? He told us that Verizon had contacted Montecito Water District, but Verizon was unable to come to business terms with MWD because the monthly lessor fee demanded by the Montecito Water District was exorbitant. He then ended his comments on Question #2 by saying, "the Verizon landline Switch Station at 512 Santa Angela Lane appeared to be the ideal location for this collocation project."

We, the aggrieved parties of this appeal, contend that this property at 512 Santa Angela Lane. is indeed, not the ideal site for the collocation of the proposed nine additional antennae installation from the Verizon cell tower on the QAD property.

## GROUNDINGS FOR THE APPEAL

1. The decision of the Montecito Planning Commission is inconsistent with the provisions and purposes of the County's Zoning Ordinance.
2. There was error in the decision.
3. The decision is not supported by the evidence presented for consideration.

## REASONS:

A) The decision grants approval of a proposed project that is inconsistent with the Montecito Land Use Development Code sections 6.3.2, 2.11, 22.1 and 2.2.4.

B) The Additional Findings of 35.474C.7 cannot reasonably be made to grant approval of this proposed project.

C) The RF Emissions and Compliance Report by Hammett & Edison, Inc. is incomplete and inadequate as a basis for the Montecito Planning Commission to make required findings. It should be revised.

D) The proposed project does not meet provisions of E-M-1.1 and is inconsistent with this provision based on inadequate setbacks as required by the County's Zoning Ordinance and E-M-1.1

***"Policy E-M-1.1. In reviewing permits for EMF sensitive uses (e.g., residential, schools, etc), RMD shall require adequate building setback from EMF-generating sources to minimize exposure hazards."***

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION for the above stated REASONS:

A) The decision grants approval of a proposed project that is inconsistent with the Montecito Land Use Development Code sections, 2.1.1, 2.2.1 and 2.2.4; and Sec. 35.444.010.D.1 Development Standard 6.3.2; and Montecito Community Plan Policy LUG-M-1.1

6.3.2 is a Development Standard that addresses setbacks. This project is being given approval without complying to standard County setback requirements of 50' from the centerline of Santa Angela Ln., and 10' from the east property line. This decision is based on the erroneous assumption that because it was originally part of the 1965 Conditional Use Permit (47 years ago when Montecito was a far different place) it is still appropriate today. This is unwarranted and unjustified by any reasonable

assessment. If anything, the commercial intensification of the proposed project within an area of quiet residential development, and a nearby pre-school at Montecito Presbyterian Church should have made for more stringent conditions, not a waive of County setback requirements.

The project does not comply with setback requirements that would be applied to any other applicant. Why is the County giving preferential treatment to Verizon in this matter, over the complaints and legitimate concerns of local residents and business owners?

The 1965CUP setback exemptions may have been appropriate in 'the middle part of the last century' but they are not reasonable today. The Verizon project conditions should mandate a re-design of the property buildings and project subject to the 50' and 10' usual County-code setbacks.

B) The Additional Findings of 35.474C.7 cannot reasonably be made to grant approval of this proposed project.

There are mandatory "findings" the Planning Commission must make, supported by substantial evidence in the record. These findings cannot be made for the Verizon project as submitted and approved.

***"Sec.35-474C.7. Additional Findings (AmendedbyOrd.4461,5/7/02)***

***In addition to the findings required by be adopted by the decision-maker pursuant to Sections 35- 482, 35-483 and 35-485, in order to approve an application to develop a Telecommunication facility, the decision-maker shall also make the following findings:***

***1. The facility will be compatible with existing and surrounding development in terms of land use and visual qualities.***

The project as proposed is highly incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Verizon's project will introduce incompatible land uses and impacts that are inconsistent with the Montecito Land Use Development Code Sections 2.1.1, 2.2.1 and 2.2.4. The project site is inadequate in terms of location, physical character size, shape and particularly, property setbacks. It is inconsistent with existing land uses that will be subjected to new and intensified commercial impacts. The proposed project does not meet all development standards (setbacks).

The purpose of a Conditional Use Permit is entirely ignored with approval by the Planning Commission - to reopen and reconsider whether the conditional" use is still appropriate. A CUP process must consider new impacts, within an existing environmental setting that may have changed during the last years since the original CUP was approved. This original CUP allowing exemptions of mandatory setbacks was granted in 1965 - the middle part of the last century. The setback for the east property boundary is 10', but this project asks for a 2' setback. There are

numerous occupants to the east in existing office buildings that will be negatively impacted. The original setback of 10' should be restored. The 50' setback from the center of Santa Angela was reduced from 50' to 35' in 1965. If then the Verizon telecommunications project can be 'shoe-horned' into what is left - given today's environmental and residential conditions, then let them resubmit a revised application.

Many things in the character of this neighborhood have changed since 1965, and it is now a quiet residential neighborhood, with a semi-rural character that the Community Plan specifically protects throughout Montecito. The Planning Commission erred in approving this project in violation of existing land use policies in the Montecito Land Use Development Code and ignored the basic purpose of having a Conditional Use Permit - which is intended to re-evaluate the appropriateness of conditions and exemptions granted in earlier years. This approval fails both tests. The residential area to the west, and the pre-school to the south are both sensitive receptors as described in MLUDC 2.2.4 which characterizes them as 'sensitive land use areas'.

***3. The facility is designed to blend into the surrounding environment to the greatest extent feasible.***

It is not a reasonable finding that this commercial intensification of use can be considered to "blend into the surrounding environment" when it will require neighbors to alter the way they have use and enjoyment of their properties, are required to make disclosure of a noxious and potentially harmful environment created by this commercial use of the Verizon building (for which it was originally only a switching-station), and which will lower the desirability of the residential area for both renters and new homeownership. Property devaluation is a recognized negative impact in proximity to wireless antenna facilities, and must be disclosed under provisions of the State Subdivision Act like properties near landfills and dumps.

The noise generated by this facility is not even characterized in the case file - although the application says that HVAC and generators will be in use on the property.

The project as proposed cannot be said to blend in" with the surrounding neighborhood when it intensifies noxious commercial uses within a quiet residential neighborhood. Generators and HVAC equipment will be needed, and they introduce noise, an incompatible impact.

***4. The facility complies with all required development standards unless granted a specific exemption by the decision-maker as provided in Section 35-474C.4.***

The project does not comply with setback requirements that would be applied to any other applicant. Why is the County giving preferential treatment to Verizon in this matter, over the complaints and legitimate concerns of local residents and business owners?

**5. *The applicant has demonstrated that the facility will be operated within the allowed frequency range permitted by the Federal Communications Commission and complies with all other applicable health and safety standards.***

The report by Hammett and Edison, Inc. does not correctly address this provision. A revised RF Emissions Report is necessary. There are numerous questions about whether the report correctly characterizes predicted radiofrequency radiation levels, so the conclusions are not supported as presented in this report.

D) The project approval is inconsistent with the Montecito Community Plan Policy LUG-M-1.1 which says development shall respect the small town, semi-rural character. This project introduces intensive new commercial development, including noise from the HVAC and generators very close to existing quiet semi-rural residential neighborhood. Expansion of the commercial nature of the Verizon building is out of character within the residential area it abuts, and will interfere with the quiet use and enjoyment of residential property owners; and it will require disclosure for any rental or home sale transactions. It will likely lower property values and result in a greater burden on homeowners.

Respectfully submitted for your careful reading and consideration,

Mary Goolsby, MD and

Martha Goolsby Kay, co-appellants

**\*Please read the attached letters submitted by:**

Mary Goolsby, MD  
Property owner of Record  
537 Santa Angela Lane  
Written on May 31, 2012

Brent and Lizzie Peus  
Home owners at  
525 Santa Angela Lane  
Written on May 31, 2012



May 31, 2012

To Whom It May Concern,


As the closest house to the proposed project (525 Santa Angela), we are concerned about the increase in radiofrequency levels. Our property line is probably 60-80 feet from the project, and our house is only slightly further away. Per the Hammett & Edison report, the proposed project would increase exposure levels at our house from 0.47% to 9.5%, more than 20-fold! The way our house is configured, the children's bedrooms are closest to the street and the project. We have a 3 year old in one bedroom, and 12 and 10 year olds in the adjacent bedroom. As Cindy points out, there is no study that proves that alternative sites do not exist.

Given a 20x increase in exposure levels (an exponential difference that is hardly insignificant), we should demand that another study is prepared to corroborate the assertion that all is safe. Furthermore, I agree with the notion that a CUP should in fact be "conditional" and reevaluated over time. Clearly, the neighborhood has changed a great deal since 1965. The commission holds homeowners to extremely rigid standards with respect to structural improvements that require permitting. How can Verizon be held to a different standard?

In addition to introducing potential health risks for our children, this project will clearly have a negative impact on our property value. Our house is easily our most significant asset. How can the planning body in good conscience green light a project, without requiring further studies, that might affect the health of all neighbors and with certainty will affect the values of nearby properties? We will be obligated to disclose the RF exposures when we sell our house. Verizon should compensate us for the reduction in value.

Given the above, it is only reasonable to insist that Verizon prove that no alternate sites exist.

Thank you.



Brent and Lizzie Peus

May 31, 2012

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to oppose the proposed project by Verizon to relocate a cell site detailed in the letter I received (CASE NUMBER: 12CUP-00000-00007) to Montecito Switch Station #115535 located at the preexisting facility at 512 Santa Angela Lane, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

I am the owner and trustee of record for the property located at 537 Santa Angela Lane (Goolsby, Daisy V TR 5-19-88), across the street and next door to the property owned by the Peus' home. The property at 537 Santa Angela Lane is my childhood home since 1955, and my brother and I played at the vacant lot and subsequent construction site at 512 Santa Angela Lane before anything was ever built there.


Now comes Verizon with their proposal. It is impossible to believe that such a project is going to be placed in such proximity to a residential area comprised of nearby private homes, a church with a preschool, the library and assorted small businesses, where adults and young children will be spending most of their time, without an exhaustive search to identify and evaluate more suitable and less inhabited potential sites. Furthermore, cell technology and its attendant RF emissions concentrated at sites in inhabited areas are part of a still evolving science, with the effects on human development and disease causation yet to be fully elucidated, regardless of what the FCC says. It may take decades to fully know what these effects are.

Also, I have yet to receive any information from Verizon or anyone else as to the impact of this project on the property values of nearby homes and businesses. In this current sluggish economy with a continuing fall in home and commercial real estate values, this project would most likely have a further negative impact, and would require property owners to disclose the Verizon project to any potential buyers/ renters. Most people would not want to live or work near such an installation.

I am currently a physician residing in San Diego and was unable to attend the public hearing on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 due to required clinical responsibilities. While away, I have rented the property at 537 Santa Angela Lane to a very nice family with several elementary school age children for the past 3 years. As residents of the property, they also received a notice from the County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Office early in May. They have now expressed serious concerns about continuing to reside there in light of the proposed project by Verizon. They are worried about their children living and growing up near this facility, especially with the modifications described in the letter.

Please consider our appeal to Verizon's project very seriously before making your decision. Please require Verizon to prove that no other more suitable sites exist for this project. Please also consider that many residents and business owners in proximity to the proposed site are only just now becoming aware of what Verizon wants to do.

Thank you,

  
Mary E. Goolsby, MD  
Owner and Trustee for Goolsby, Daisy V TR 5-19-88  
537 Santa Angela Lane

To: Jay Higgins, ACE Wireless and Agent for Verizon Applicant from Martha

Re: Verizon's Proposed Development Plan brought to the Montecito Planning Commission requesting permission to collocate the Verizon cell tower equipment from their soon to be decommissioned Ortega Ridge Rd. QAD site location to the Verizon switch station located at 512 Santa Angela Ln.

## Questions from Upper Village neighbors, families, business owners, and workers:

### APPLICANT RESPONSES IN BLUE (DATED May 30, 2012)

1. Is there a copy of the Hammett & Edison report of May 2, 2012 on the RF emissions at the QAD Verizon site, and the Verizon Cingular site on Santa Angela Ln. that can be shared with us? And what are the RF exposure limits, as set forth by the FCC, near a cellular base station?

See attached report. The maximum RF signal is modeled at 0.051mW/cm<sup>2</sup>, which is substantially less than the FCC's limitations. Figure 3 in the Hammett & Edison Report depicts how the measured signal strength from the existing AT&T site will relate to the modeled Verizon Wireless signal strength. The signal strength is generally cumulative, but in this case, and practically all cases, because of the differing orientation of the antennas, there is not a 'doubling' effect of both carriers signals surrounding the site.

2. Were there any other sites beside Santa Angela Ln. investigated or considered by Verizon for collocating their QAD antennas prior to settling on Santa Angela Ln. site?

Yes, several properties that would not work for RF engineering b/c the buildings were too short, or properties whose owners could not come to business terms with Verizon Wireless.

3. The original 1965 conditional use permit to build the Verizon switch station was for a land-line telecommunication facility. This permit has been in effect for 47 years. This permit (65-CP-081) allowed for modifications of setbacks from Santa Angela Ln. to 35 feet instead of the required 50 feet, and 2 feet instead of the required 8 feet on the "alley" side of the property. In 2002 the Verizon facility added a Cingular equipment shelter building and 3 antennas on the rooftop. Now, 10 years later, we are faced with Verizon quadrupling the number of antennas on the same rooftop, with the prospect that they will be allowing more wireless carriers to join them on the rooftop in the near future. Are people walking on Santa Angela Ln. and down the alley within 50 feet or less of the antennas in danger of being exposed to RF emissions?

(11)

No. The FCC has established a public exposure limit and the maximum modeled signal strength of both carriers operating in a 'worst case' scenario is within 9.5% of the safety standard. As the report indicates, in all likelihood, the actual operational signal strength after installation will be less than what is modeled.

4. Where are the nearest Cellular base stations and relay stations located here Montecito? Is there a coverage map of their locations available for us to review?

The County Planning Department keeps a list of all cell sites for all carriers. In addition, some carriers publish coverage maps on their websites. In addition, there is a website called cellreception.com that maintains some cell site locations, but we cannot vouch for its accuracy.


5. How many antennas were on the QAD cellular site? Was this the original number of antennas installed in 1989 or were more added during Verizon's 23 year lease of the site?

We do not have the exact specifications for the QAD site currently or whether it has changed over time. However, 9 antennas with 3 per sector is a typical design. It's possible the site was constructed with omni direction 'whip' antennas and later converted to panel type antennas. Panel antennas break up the signal and channels for more efficient reuse of the spectrum, allowing more customers in an area to be on the network at the same time.

6. What are the inherent dangers faced by maintenance workers and personnel that are required to access the roof area where the antennas will be installed?

There are no dangers because all sites are designed to comply with OSHA regulations and Verizon Wireless, or any carrier, cannot put its employees in danger.

7. In the proposed collocation plan there will be a total of 4 antennas on the west side of the parapet facing the Village businesses (1 Cingular and 3 Verizon) There are 2 story buildings located along the alley on the west side of the facility. It would appear that these buildings would be very close to the RF emissions arriving and leaving these antennas in a horizontal plane close to that of the parapet. Has this been considered?

 The design of the facility takes into consideration the existing parapet such that no architectural changes to the building are necessary. Otherwise, the antenna design may necessitate additional roof features that may not be architecturally combatable with the building and neighborhood.

8. What is the significance of the names alpha, beta, and gamma, describing the 3 sectors of new Verizon antennas destined for the parapet area?

The alpha/beta/gamma nomenclature is for the engineering group and it deals with how Verizon Wireless splits the signals and available channels for more efficient reuse of the network for additional customers.

9. The GPS antennas to be installed on the equipment shelters appear to be attached to the corner of the building's roof. Have these GPS antennas been tested for RF emissions? Are there any sound emissions associated with the equipment shelter structure and the HVAC cooling equipment therein.

GPS antennas are 'receive only' and therefore do not need to be tested or regulated. The HVAC equipment will run occasionally but is sound-rated for residential neighborhoods. In addition, because the AC units are behind the existing block wall, there will be minimal sound that can be detected from Santa Angela Lane.

10. Is there any way we can explore the possibility of El Montecito Church being designated as a 125 year old historical landmark (therefore existing altogether too close to this Verizon cellular base station site)? ( Standard 1d, pg. 11 of the Staff Report.)

This research may have already been conducted and our office can follow up with a response.

11. If the Verizon facility is only monitored once a month by a staff person what is the procedure for monitoring emission levels in an emergency situation? Is there a regular schedule for taking these measurements other than once every 5 years?

Verizon Wireless can come to the site and monitor the actual RF signal post installation. Signal strengths do not change over time, but if they did and were out of compliance with FCC regulations, Verizon Wireless (or any carrier) would be in jeopardy of losing its licenses.

12. On page B-6 of the Staff Report, "Tel-10 Collocation" it is stated that the Permittee (Verizon) shall avail its facility and site to other telecommunication carriers and, in good faith, accommodate all reasonable requests for collocation in the future to the Santa Angela Ln. site. Will these new carriers be required to apply to collocate before the Montecito Planning Commission, as well?

Additional carriers that request to be on the roof will need discretionary permits by the County of Santa Barbara.

13. On page B-7 of the Staff Report it is stated that the Permittee shall post a performance security which shall equal 10 percent of the installation value of the facility at the time of granting the building permit. What is the valuation of this proposed collocation project, if you don't mind my asking?

The bond amounts that Verizon Wireless typically pays at building permit are approximately \$15,000. The bond is typically required for the removal of the facility.

14. When cellular base stations are collocated to residential and business areas, how has this impacted the neighboring property values? Can you share any reports and/or research being done in this area?

We are aware of some recent court cases that have confirmed that cell sites do not have a detrimental impact on property values. We can conduct further research on the subject

and follow-up, however, our preliminary research returns cases where properties are adjacent to large towers.

13)

15. Is a homeowner who lists their property for sale in an area near a cellular base station, obligated to disclose its presence nearby? Is the owner liable if this information is not disclosed?

We are not aware of any real estate law that requires a disclosure.

16. Why can't we just build a water tower in the foothills, (where fewer people live) that is taller than the Verizon parapet on Santa Angela Ln. and attach these antennas to it and see "if they can hear me now" without endangering the small children at the preschool in the new gamma sector antenna installation, the families with children on Santa Angela Ln. in the new alpha sector antenna installation, and the business people in the "amped up" beta sector (4 antennas aimed at the Village and San Ysidro Rd. on the west side of the parapet?)

There is no danger from the installation.

14

**Additional Questions:** but were submitted too late to be answered by Mr. Higgins @ 5/30/12 meeting.

1. For existing antenna located in or around similar density business/residential areas (especially in Santa Barbara County or other nearby counties) what has been the impact (both beneficial and detrimental on residents (including adults and infants/children), and on pets, other bird and animal/insect populations in these sites. How long (and how often) have these sites been monitored for RF emissions, noise, odors (chemical & electrical), unintended problems (outages, repairs, effects on other electronics and electrical appliances, e.g. radios, phones, security systems/alarms, TV's, computers, pacemakers, defibrillators), etc.

My biggest concern is that use of this technology (especially the combining (collocation) and concentration of antennae at a single site) is too new in high density residential/school and business areas to have generated much meaningful data to determine the full impact, especially if Verizon begins adding more antennae and increasing signal density over time.

2. Please explain the antenna cellular bandwidth operation PCS & LTC on pg. 3 of the Staff Report. How does this differ from the Cingular antennae operation presently on the building?

3. How many years remain on the lease agreement between Zillioto Family (owners of the land) and Verizon Calif., Inc. (A landline telecommunications Co. and owners of the building.)


4. On pg. 7 of the Staff Report it states that the majority of Verizon's wireless coverage of Montecito comes from the QAD Ortega Rd. facility. Their lease has expired after 23 years and it is being decommissioned. What exactly is collocating to Santa Angela Ln. from this facility? Coverage maps are mentioned. Are they available for public viewing, and where?




Photo of Cingular installation taken in front of post office in the Village. (12/2006)



Dec. 2006 photos of installation of Cingular antennae on the roof of Verizon parapet.




photos taken from area closest to the building in the Village.











Picture taken on 5/7/12 of QAD site Verizon Cell tower

Large tree recently removed on the East side of Verizon property near the alley.



Lots of fresh sawdust. (Picture taken 6/1/12.)

**CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS** Signatures must be completed for each line. If one or more of the parties are the same, please re-sign the applicable line.

23

Applicant's signature authorizes County staff to enter the property described above for the purposes of inspection.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the information contained in this application and all attached materials are correct, true and complete. I acknowledge and agree that the County of Santa Barbara is relying on the accuracy of this information and my representations in order to process this application and that any permits issued by the County may be rescinded if it is determined that the information and materials submitted are not true and correct. I further acknowledge that I may be liable for any costs associated with rescission of such permits.

Print name and sign - <del>Applicant</del> <b>APPLICANT</b>		Date
Mary E. Goolsby, MD	Mary E. Goolsby, MD	6/1/12
Print name and sign - Preparer of this form and <del>Co-Applicant</del>		Date
Martha E. Kay	Martha E. Kay	5/1/2012
Print name and sign - <del>Applicant</del>		Date
Dagny Dehlsen	Dagny Dehlsen	6-1-12
Print name and sign - <del>Agent</del>		Date
Cece. Maeton	Cece Maeton	6-1-12
Print name and sign - <del>Landowner</del>		Date
DAVID KAY	Marisol Kay	6-1-12



**CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS** Signatures must be completed for each line. If one or more of the parties are the same, please re-sign the applicable line.

24)

Applicant's signature authorizes County staff to enter the property described above for the purposes of inspection.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the information contained in this application and all attached materials are correct, true and complete. I acknowledge and agree that the County of Santa Barbara is relying on the accuracy of this information and my representations in order to process this application and that any permits issued by the County may be rescinded if it is determined that the information and materials submitted are not true and correct. I further acknowledge that I may be liable for any costs associated with rescission of such permits.

Additional Aggrieved Party Signatures:

Print name and sign - <del>Firm</del>		Date
<u>Georgette Topakes</u>	<u>Georgette Topakes</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
Print name and sign - <del>Preparer of this form</del>		Date
<u>Ray Hiaz</u>	<u>Raymond A. Hiaz</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
Print name and sign - <del>Applicant</del>		Date
<u>Susan Crosby</u>	<u>Susan Crosby</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
Print name and sign - <del>Agent</del>		Date
<u>Geoffrey Crosby</u>	<u>Meghan Crosby</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
Print name and sign - <del>Landowner</del>		Date
<u>DONALD H. ARCHER</u>	<u>Donald H. Archer</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>

<u>Ronniez Régine Atwater</u>	<u>R. Atwater</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
<u>Galit Shan Asayag</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
<u>Yossi Asayag</u>	<u>YA</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
<u>Elizabeth L. Peus</u>	<u>Elzein I Peus</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>
<u>Ann Rick Behrke</u>	<u>Ann Rick Behrke</u>	<u>6/1/12</u>






**CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS** Signatures must be completed for each line. If one or more of the parties are the same, please re-sign the applicable line.

25)

Applicant's signature authorizes County staff to enter the property described above for the purposes of inspection.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the information contained in this application and all attached materials are correct, true and complete. I acknowledge and agree that the County of Santa Barbara is relying on the accuracy of this information and my representations in order to process this application and that any permits issued by the County may be rescinded if it is determined that the information and materials submitted are not true and correct. I further acknowledge that I may be liable for any costs associated with rescission of such permits.

Additional Aggrieved Party Signatures:

Print name and sign - <del>Firm</del>		Date
Mazmin Stickenberger		5/1/12
Print name and sign - <del>Preparer of this form</del>		Date
Heather Guenn		6-1-12
Print name and sign - <del>Applicant</del>		Date
AUN Ricciuto		6-1-12
Print name and sign - <del>Agent</del>		Date
Mia Voehl		6-1-12
Print name and sign - <del>Landowner</del>		Date
Ronald Atwater		6-1-12

**CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS** Signatures must be completed for each line. If one or more of the parties are the same, please re-sign the applicable line.

Applicant's signature authorizes County staff to enter the property described above for the purposes of inspection.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the information contained in this application and all attached materials are correct, true and complete. I acknowledge and agree that the County of Santa Barbara is relying on the accuracy of this information and my representations in order to process this application and that any permits issued by the County may be rescinded if it is determined that the information and materials submitted are not true and correct. I further acknowledge that I may be liable for any costs associated with rescission of such permits.

Additional Aggrieved Party Signatures: From: El Monteito Presbyterian Church

Print name and sign - ~~Firm~~ \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Print name and sign - ~~Preparer of this form~~ \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Print name and sign - ~~Applicant~~  
JOYCE HUTCHINSON Joyce Hutchinson \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6/3/11

Print name and sign - ~~Agent~~  
Greta Fairchild Greta Fairchild \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6/3/11

Print name and sign - ~~Landowner~~  
M. Marguerite Amer M. Marguerite Amer \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6/3/2012

JANE BRAKELY  
Jane Brakely \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6.3.2012

Ann Chaves \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6/3/2012

Luan Edmonston \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6/3/2012

Charles E. Williams CHARLES E. WILLIAMS \_\_\_\_\_ Date June 3, 2012

R. F. FAIRCHILD R. F. Fairchild \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6-3-12

Ann Swon Ann Tesar \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6-3-12

JAMES N FAUOR James N. Fauor \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6/3/12

RONALD T. MULDER Ronald T. Mulder \_\_\_\_\_ Date 6/3/12

KERRI HEDDEN Kerri Hedden \_\_\_\_\_ Date 4/3/12