



# 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

May 23, 2014

Crown Castle  
Attn: Sharon James  
695 River Oaks Parkway  
San Jose, CA 95134

MONTECITO PLANNING COMMISSION  
HEARING OF MAY 21, 2014

**RE: Crown Castle DAS Montecito Inland; 13CUP-00000-00009**

Hearing on the request of Sharon James, agent for applicant, Crown Castle to consider Case No. 13CUP-00000-00009, [application filed on April 23, 2013] for a Conditional Use Permit allowing the installation of 18 new telecommunications facilities as part of a distributed antenna system network, in compliance with Section 35.472.060 of the Montecito Land Use and Development Code, on properties zoned 1-E-1, 2-E-1, 5-E-1, and RMZ-40; and to adopt the Negative Declaration 14NGD-00000-00004 pursuant to the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. As a result of this project, significant but mitigable effects on the environment are anticipated in the following categories: aesthetics/visual resources, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and transportation/circulation. The application involves inland 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 May 21, 2014, Commissioner Brown moved, seconded by Commissioner Eidelson and carried by a vote of 3 to 0 (Burrows and Phillips absent) to:

1. Make the required findings to deny the project, including CEQA findings;
2. Determine the project denial to be exempt from CEQA pursuant to Guideline Section 15270; and
3. Deny the project (Case No. 13CUP-00000-00009).

***The attached findings reflect the Montecito Planning Commission's actions of May 21, 2014.***

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 together with the accompanying applicable fee 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 day 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, June 2, 2014 at 5:00 p.m.**

If this decision is appealed, the filing fee for both non-applicant and applicant is \$643 and must be delivered to the Clerk of the Board Office at 105 East Anapamu Street, Room 407, Santa Barbara, CA at the same time the appeal is filed.

Sincerely,



Dianne M. Black  
Secretary to the Montecito Planning Commission

cc: Case File: 13CUP-00000-00009  
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 Brown  
Jenna Richardson, Deputy County Counsel  
Megan Lowery, Planner

**Attachments: Attachment A – Findings**

DMB/dmv



**CROWN CASTLE – MONTECITO INLAND  
CASE NO. 13CUP-00000-00009  
FINDINGS FOR DENIAL**

**1.1 CEQA Exemption**

The Montecito Planning Commission finds that the denial of the proposed project is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15270.

**2.1 Conditional Use Permit Findings**

**2.1.6 *The proposed project will comply with all applicable requirements of this Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan including the Montecito Community Plan***

The proposed facilities are inconsistent with visual resource Goals LU-M-1 and LU-M-2, policies LU-M-2.1, VIS-M-1.1, and VIS-M-2.1. The facilities are proposed to be mounted on existing utility poles in a semi-rural residential area. Required support equipment and electrical power would be stored in ground mounted pedestals ranging in size from 4'6" to 5' in height. The ground mounted components would be located in the public rights-of-way and are readily visible to residents in the immediate vicinity and to those traveling on the streets. The design of these facilities creates a visual blight in addition to already existing utility poles. Therefore, the proposed project does not preserve the existing semi-rural residential streetscape character of the area as required by the Montecito Community Plan and therefore this finding cannot be made

**2.2 Commercial Telecommunication Facility Findings**

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

The facilities are proposed to be mounted on existing utility poles in a semi-rural residential area. Required support equipment and electrical power would be stored in ground mounted pedestals ranging in size from 4'6" to 5' in height. The ground mounted components would be located in the public rights-of-way and are readily visible to residents in the immediate vicinity and to those traveling on the streets. The design of these facilities creates a visual blight in addition to already existing utility poles. Therefore, the proposed project does not preserve the existing semi-rural residential streetscape character of the area as required by the Montecito Community Plan and therefore this finding cannot be made

**2.2.2 *The facility is located to minimize its visibility from public view.***

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.) In addition, the ground mounted pedestals would generally be the only above-ground utility structures in the area. The proliferation of equipment is aesthetically unsatisfactory and does not minimize the facilities from public view. Therefore, this finding cannot be made.

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

The proliferation of ground mounted pedestals contributes to the visual clutter in the public road rights-of-ways. These pedestals are immediately adjacent to the roadways and separated from the any existing vegetation thereby highlighting the visual prominence of these facilities. As such, the facilities do not blend into the surrounding environment and this finding cannot be made.

**2.2.6 *The applicant has demonstrated a need for service (i.e. coverage or capacity) and the area proposed to be served would not otherwise be served by the carrier proposing the facility.***

The applicant has not demonstrated substantial evidence to support a gap in coverage and therefore a need for service. The testimony provided indicated that the proposal was providing additional data capacity and not cell phone coverage. Furthermore, the coverage maps provided do not demonstrate a need for service. Therefore, this finding cannot be made.