

## Fogg, Mindy

---

**From:** Buz <beannerd@charter.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 26, 2020 1:06 PM  
**To:** Welch, Jennifer  
**Cc:** Chaffee, Thomas  
**Subject:** Planning No. PL 19-0040 (cell tower appeal)

This correspondence is to present our comments regarding this appeal. Just because Mussel Shoals was not defended by Ventura County officials when Caltrans in recent years installed a mass of ugly paint stripes, signs, bollards, crash barriers, etc. at our entrance, does not mean that our community does not care how we are looked upon.

The approval by Ventura County for installation of this ugly cell tower at this location in Mussel Shoals, by AT&T's subcontractor, is simply not appropriate. Considering that there are other viable sites in the general area, it seems irresponsible on the part of AT&T to ignore the needs and desires of the residence of this small village. To pick a spot to plunk down this unsightly pole and related facilities, on a residential street facing single family homes, is just plain thoughtless. Please do not let it go forward as presently planned. Please!

Some members of this community have expressed an interest in removing existing utility poles and overhead wires to improve the appearance of the area in general. Of course this is an expensive and difficult task which we would hope would not be made more costly by the need to relocate a newly installed cell tower.

My companion and I live here at Mussel Shoals full time and care very much about having it a community which we can admire and be proud of,

Bancroft M Benner  
6776 Breakers Way  
Mussel Shoals  
Ventura, CA 93001

County of Ventura  
Planning Commission Hearing  
Case No. PL19-0040  
Exhibit 10 - Public Comments  
as of 7-27-20

## **Fogg, Mindy**

---

**From:** Pamela Worden <pew5840@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 2:26 PM  
**To:** Welch, Jennifer  
**Cc:** Chaffee, Thomas  
**Subject:** PL 19-0040

Dear Planning Division

Even though the meeting was postponed which I had planned to attend, I want to express my concern regarding the AT& T Cell Tower. I believe it is a health risk to my grandchildren. We have several rusted metal boxes already as well as an ugly transmission pole at the end of our street. None are maintained.

In addition, there are various birds who live in the area which would be cleared. They are much more pleasant than another cell tower. We are a small residential community not an industrial park. If AT & T wants a tower, put it on the other side of the freeway and railroad tracks where no one lives.

I have lived in Mussel Shoals for 47 years. I have supported Ventura County in various ways but for the protection of our community, please deny this request.

Pamela Worden  
6660 Old PCH, Ventura, CA 93001

April 17, 2020

County of Ventura  
RMA Planning Division  
Case #PL19-0040  
800 S Victoria Ave  
Ventura, Ca 93009-1740  
Attn: Thomas S. Chaffee

I, Janet Brunner, have been a resident of the community of Mussel Shoals since 1972. I reside at 6640 Old PCH, 82 Ln feet from the proposed ATT cell tower at the highest point of structure 34 feet from grade. Our neighbor at 6646 Old PCH is 57 Ln feet from the tower.

I am writing to request the County of Ventura deny the approval of AT&T's cell tower location in Mussel Shoals. It appears that the County of Ventura owns the land where they wish to place the tower, this would be a huge conflict of interest. The community should be allowed to say no to this cell tower request even though the county wants the lease revenue which puts us as a community in a major disadvantage. I am not alone when I state I have issue with the county allowing this project to be built here.

It surely appears that the community does not have any chance of stopping this tower when on April 3<sup>rd</sup> the very next day after the appeal meeting which was postponed AT&T ordered a company to come here and map out all the surrounding utilities including the proposed trench location that extends to the other cell tower down the street. Why was this performed for a project that supposedly does not have the final go ahead and we are trying to shut down?

The location of this tower is right next to an extremely popular cycle and pedestrian lane named the California Trail. Many authorities state that cell towers should safely be placed at least a half mile from housing. ATT was allowed to place a very large metal box containing controls just across the street way back in 2014 when the bike trail and 101 was redone here. Our community was never informed as to why this equipment was placed there, why obviously the location was to be part of a future very large cell tower.

The area that ATT wants to also place a 40 x40 slab to house their generators which is home to so many species of birds and animals which will be permanently injured and lose important habitat for them.

Lastly it is well documented that homes will lose on average at least \$200,000 of property value due to the proximately of the tower being within view of this eyesore. The bottom line is this cell tower is a huge negative presence in our little community and we are asking that another site be picked for this tower. ATT should look into placement across the 101 freeway where it can still offer more coverage for area curve of the 101.

Janet Brunner  
6640 Old Pacific Coast Hwy  
Ventura, CA 93001  
805 648 6334

## Fogg, Mindy

---

**From:** Chaffee, Thomas  
**Sent:** Monday, July 27, 2020 9:20 AM  
**To:** Fogg, Mindy  
**Subject:** Fwd: Appeal No. PL19-0040, Hearing Thursday, July 30, 2020, 8:39 a.m., remote

---

**From:** Chris Provenzano <Chrispy@West.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 26, 2020 1:55:12 PM  
**To:** Chaffee, Thomas <Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org>  
**Subject:** Appeal No. PL19-0040, Hearing Thursday, July 30, 2020, 8:39 a.m., remote

Dear Mr. Chaffee,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond a second time in opposition to this project. Please be sure to review my March 25, 2020 letter as well as today's email. I am constrained in my efforts to effectively present my opposition due to in-person restrictions, the Virus causing government building closures and the County accepting only remote response. IN MY OPINION, THE PUBLIC HAS BEEN TREATED UNFAIRLY THE WAY THIS HEARING IS BEING CONDUCTED. This formal proceeding has not been carried out in accordance with established rules and principals and should be rescheduled.

I am told the first site for this wireless cell tower was near the Cliff house, away from both public eye and the bike path. Owner of the Cliff house complained it would negatively affect his business, so AT&T is considering the new site at issue. It was unfair and an act of discrimination against all remaining property owner's, affected by the cell tower, not to receive the same consideration as the Cliff house owner.

Environmentally sensitive Saltbush and Opuntia/Giant Prickley pear inhabit the site across the street from 6646/6648 Old PCH. This is where the "cabinet" will go. The project will impact these environmentally sensitive plants. A new site should be explored.

Thank you,

Chris Provenzano-Chernof

Chris Provenzano-Chernof  
6646/48 Old Pacific Coast Hwy.  
Mussel Shoals, Ca 93001

March 25, 2020

Mr. Thomas Chaffee  
Ventura County Planning Dept.  
800 Victoria Ave.  
Ventura, Ca 93009-1740

RE: Case No. PL19-0040  
Environmental Doc. Exempt CEQA 15302-3

Dear Mr. Chaffee:

Thank you for an opportunity to provide additional information regarding installation of AT&T's Cell phone tower/wireless facility.

An appeal to AT&T's project was filed and required them to stop work until the appeal was resolved. It shocked me one morning when I heard someone cutting up the California Trail, which was built by Caltrans. A worker was drilling a hole into the Trail's concrete base, and I asked him what he was doing. He said he was working on the AT&T cell tower they were going to install. I don't believe AT&T should have been working on this project until this appeal is resolved.

My measurements show the cell phone tower will be 52' (fifty-two feet) from my house. Does this comply with safety/health risks? Why wasn't I sent Notice of Public Hearing like the Brunner residence, 6649 Old PCH, was? The tower is in front of my house, not Brunner's. I would have appreciated being notified to discuss my concerns. Also, please clarify if the tower is on Ventura County or Caltrans' (California, state) property, because it appears to be on both.

As a 30-year owner/occupant of Mussel Shoals, I'm deeply concerned about environmental, health, recreational and aesthetic impacts here. I believe AT&T's planners failed to consider Mussel Shoals' sensitive issues, and this project could negatively impact this environmentally sensitive habitat, discourage recreational use of

our California Trail and spoil natural aesthetics of this quaint seaside community. The following issues should be considered:

1. Many indigenous shrubs, trees (such as avocado, orange, pepper, pine), cactus, etc. which provide a habitat for residents, birds (Osprey, kingfisher, hummingbird, crow, cormorant, blue heron, night heron, egret, dove, pigeon), others (such as skunk, opossum, raccoon, squirrel, snakes & lizards). The cell tower will be placed within this sensitive habitat and will present a negative impact to inhabitants.
2. Mussel Shoals is Ventura County's "piece of paradise," a recreational destination offering the California Trail and beach. Since Caltrans' California Trail was built here cycling clubs & major cycling events run through Mussel Shoals. Joggers, people with baby strollers, dog walkers, roller skaters, bicycle commuters and elderly people exercise on the trail. AT&T's cell tower conduit/cable will run under the trail & the tower rises adjacent to the trail. Will this discourage trail use, and will the "unknowing" public fear health risks from the cell tower? Anything that gets the public out of their cars to use alternative transportation and reduce carbon emissions is helpful to Global Warming. I believe the California trail offers that opportunity.

The cell tower will present an unappealing aesthetic placed next to the California Trail entrance. Guests of The Cliff House Inn and general public will be greeted by this giant AT&T cell phone tower.

I was surprised work on AT&T's cell tower began the first week of January, 2020 before final issuance of their permit. Workers from Martin Construction drilled holes in & cut up part of the California Trail that day. A worker told me the work was for the AT&T cell tower. Attached is picture of their patch on the California Trail.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Provenzano-Chernof

[chrispy@west.net](mailto:chrispy@west.net)

[www.chrisprovenzano.com](http://www.chrisprovenzano.com)

Attachments







## Fogg, Mindy

---

**From:** Karen Borchard <kborchard@me.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 27, 2020 10:56 AM  
**To:** Fogg, Mindy  
**Cc:** Chaffee, Thomas  
**Subject:** Re: Planning #: PL 19-0040

Thank you Mindy. The information in the letter is still current and valid. Our community appreciates the opportunity to voice our concerns and greatly hope this location will be moved.

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 27, 2020, at 10:42 AM, Fogg, Mindy <Mindy.Fogg@ventura.org> wrote:

Good Morning Mrs. Borchard,  
We still have your email below to convey to the Planning Commission about this project. Is this still up to date or do you have anything else to add. Feel free to call or email me with questions/comments.

Thank you!

**Mindy Fogg** | Planning Manager  
Commercial & Industrial Permitting Section  
[mindy.fogg@ventura.org](mailto:mindy.fogg@ventura.org)  
805.654.5192

---

**From:** Karen Borchard <kborchard@me.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 20, 2020 6:48 PM  
**To:** Chaffee, Thomas <Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org>; Welch, Jennifer <Jennifer.Welch@ventura.org>  
**Subject:** Planning #: PL 19-0040

March 20, 2020

To: Jennifer Welsh, Ventura Planning Commission  
  
Thomas Chaffee, Ventura Planning division

RE: Planning #: **PL 19-0040**

Thank you for giving our neighborhood the chance to voice our opinions regarding the installation of a cell tower in our neighborhood.

My husband and I saved forever to be able to purchase a home in this quaint Mussel Shoals community. We loved the ocean, but quickly fell in love with the comradery and closeness of the neighbors in this small oasis. The neighborhood has also been very open to our renting our home out at a vacation home to be able to afford the neighborhood.

A new cell tower promises many issues. I don't understand why it would have to be placed on our side of the highway when there are vast areas of uninhabited space on the other side of the 101. In addition, there is extremely scarce parking in our neighborhood, extra vehicles for installation as well as maintenance would be an issue. The wonderful new bike path crosses right here as well, and that is a traffic concern we don't need additional cars or poles blocking site. And lastly, we all don't really know what the effect of being so close to these towers has, it would be detrimental to us locals, and have a perceived danger to my vacation rental tenants.

Can you really tell me why this cannot be on the other side or perhaps in the parking lot area of the beach parking south of us at Sea Cliff?

Thank you for your time – I hope this helps sway the tower to be installed at a different location.

Karen Borchard

6694 Breakers Way

Ventura CA 93001

805-415-2346

## Fogg, Mindy

---

**From:** Chaffee, Thomas  
**Sent:** Monday, July 27, 2020 10:48 AM  
**To:** Fogg, Mindy  
**Subject:** Fwd: VC Planning Hearing, July 30, agenda item #6, PL 91-0040  
**Attachments:** Cell Tower Cond of Approval page 13.jpg

---

**From:** Dennis Longwill <dlongwill123@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 25, 2020 2:16:21 PM  
**To:** Chaffee, Thomas <Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org>  
**Subject:** VC Planning Hearing, July 30, agenda item #6, PL 91-0040

Thomas - Please allow this email to be distributed to the Commissioners and placed into the record of the meeting.

Dennis Longwill

### **Future Collocation of additional facilities and equipment doubles the impact on our community**

Collocation is a practice that allows another carrier to place additional ground equipment and hang additional antennae from the permitted tower.

Please refer to The Conditions of Approval for Case No. PL 19-0040 document, Dated October 8, 2019, Page 13 of 14, Item 21 (see attachment).

This section begins with an acknowledgement that the number of communication facilities should be reduced to *“minimize the potential environmental impacts associated with such facilities”*.

**“Requirement:** *The Permittee shall make the facility and site available to other telecommunication carriers,....”*

*“c. the Permittee shall make its facilities and site available for collocation...”*

**“Documentation:** *Permittee shall demonstrate..... engineered in a manner that can accommodate supplementary antennas to collocate at least one additional telecommunication carrier”*

Conditional approval of this project allows for future placement of equipment by another carrier if they apply for permission. In fact, the Conditions imply that, upon submission of a compliant application, permission for collocation would be granted.

It is quite possible that, in the future, our community would be looking at four eleven foot cross arms, eight 6-foot tall antennas, eight remote radio units and eight amplifiers. There would also be an additional 40-square foot equipment pad with associated five foot tall rusting cabinets, cables, etc.

We ask the Planning Commission to realize the total impact of this project on our community. Please approve the appeal.

Submitted by Dennis Longwill, 6628 Old Pacific Coast Hwy

**Conditions of Approval for Case No. PL19-0040**

**Permittee:** AT&T

**Date of Public Hearing:** August 29, 2019

**Date of Approval:** October 8, 2019

**Location:** Adjacent to 6671 Old Pacific Coast Highway (No Assigned Address)

**Page 13 of 14**

actions to ensure that the Permittee conducts grading and construction activities in compliance with this condition, consistent with the requirements of § 8183-5 of the *Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance*.

**21. Future Collocation of Wireless Communication Facilities and Equipment**

**Purpose:** To reduce the number of communication facilities and minimize the potential environmental impacts associated with such facilities.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall make the facility and site available to other telecommunication carriers, and, in good faith, accommodate all reasonable requests for collocation in the future, subject to the following parameters:

- a. the party seeking the collocation shall be responsible for all facility modifications, environmental review, mitigation measures, associated costs, and permit processing;
- b. the Permittee shall not be required to compromise the operational effectiveness of its facility or place its prior approval at risk;
- c. the Permittee shall make its facilities and site available for collocation on a non-discriminatory and equitable cost basis; and,
- d. the County retains the right to verify that the use of the Permittee's facilities and site conforms to County policies.

**Documentation:** Permittee shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that the wireless communications tower associated with the subject facility is engineered in a manner that can accommodate supplementary antennas to collocate at least one additional telecommunication carrier.

**Timing:** Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction, the Permittee shall submit evidence to the Planning Division that the facility is engineered to accommodate the collocation of at least one additional carrier.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, Building and Safety inspectors and Planning Division staff have the authority to inspect the facility to confirm that it is constructed as approved.

**PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY (PWA) CONDITIONS**

**Watershed Protection District (WPD)**

**County Stormwater Program**

## Fogg, Mindy

---

**From:** Chaffee, Thomas  
**Sent:** Monday, July 27, 2020 10:48 AM  
**To:** Fogg, Mindy  
**Subject:** Fwd: Appeal hearing, July 30, PL19-0040, Agenda item #6  
**Attachments:** Cell alternate site arial.jpg

---

**From:** Dennis Longwill <dlongwill123@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 25, 2020 2:55:31 PM  
**To:** Chaffee, Thomas <Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org>  
**Subject:** Appeal hearing, July 30, PL19-0040, Agenda item #6

Thomas - Please distribute this email to the Ventura County Planning Commissioners and allow it to be placed into the record of the meeting.

### PL 19-0040 AT&T Cell Tower- ALTERNATE SITES

I would like to enter my objection to the proposed AT&T Cell Tower in my neighborhood. There are many issues of concern: visual impact, property values, physical hazards, traffic, health and environmental issues. All of these negative impacts on our community are valid and will be addressed in detail by other neighbors in their letters and at the Appeal hearing before the County Planning Commission.

The purpose of this correspondence is to focus on the required "Alternative Site Analysis" found on page two of the AT&T Application of Conditional Use Permit. See Exhibit – 6. I believe that the Agent, Eukon, was not diligent in an attempt to find a viable alternative location to place the cell tower. The application states, ***"The proposed design and location in the right of way result in the least intrusive means of improving wireless services to the area."***

There are other sites nearby that would be far less "***intrusive***" and still allow the required service coverage. The land on the North side of 101 Freeway is not inhabited, has existing road access, a nearby power source and is owned by Cal Trans. This alternate site is better suited for broadcasting to the East and West at the curve of the highway. Please see the attached aerial image taken from AT&T "Exhibit 2-Maps" as submitted in their application.

I have labeled the Exhibit 2 map to show an alternative site that was not addressed as an alternative in the application.

AT&T may have to extend more effort and expense to locate the site away from our homes and public space. This location, however, would mitigate most of our concerns and offers a favorable compromise for all.

Dennis Longwill

6628 Old Pacific Coast Hwy

Ventura, Ca 93001



## Fogg, Mindy

---

**From:** Chaffee, Thomas  
**Sent:** Monday, July 27, 2020 10:49 AM  
**To:** Fogg, Mindy  
**Subject:** Fwd: PL#19-0040  
**Attachments:** Mr.docxCell Tower Letter April 1, 2020.pdf; 20200401\_130001 (2).jpg; 20200401\_130221 (1).jpg

---

**From:** Jeannette Longwill <jml123ca@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 25, 2020 3:23:01 PM  
**To:** Chaffee, Thomas <Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org>  
**Subject:** Fwd: PL#19-0040

**CAUTION:** If this email looks suspicious, DO NOT click. Forward to Spam.Manager@ventura.org

Appeal Hearing PL 19-0040, Agena Item #6  
Please distribute this email to the Commissioners and place it into the record of the meeting..

Dear Thomas

Please include my letter and images in the Appeal hearing on the above project. Keep me informed of all proceedings relating to this matter.

Jeannette Longwill

6628 Old Pacific coast Hwy

Ventura, CA 93001

Mr. Thomas Chaffee  
Ventura County Planning Department  
800 Victoria Avenue  
Ventura, CA. 93009-1740

RE: Case No. PL 19-0040

Dear Mr. Chaffee,

I am writing in opposition to the placement of a cell tower at the entrance to our community of Mussel Shoals. It seems a shame to place such a monstrous structure in our little neighborhood. We are located next to our lovely bike path that is used by many people. There is a beautiful habitat for a variety of birds that neighbors have created for them. That would be destroyed by the installation of the AT&T cell tower. Please see the attached photo of an existing meter pedestal and associated equipment owned by T-Mobile. This is approximately 200 yards to the west from the proposed AT&T site. I have also attached a photo of the existing landscape adjacent to the proposed AT&T site. This lovely green space would be destroyed by the construction of the required ground structures.

It isn't just the visual ugliness of the tower but also some safety concerns are an issue. The tower would be located only 52 feet from some of our neighbors. There is more and more evidence that that could be some damaging effects from mobile tower radiation on individuals especially children.

I understand that there could possibly be another potential site across the freeway which would not impact individual residents the way this site would. Why hasn't this option been explored?

Sincerely,  
Jeannette Longwill  
6628 Old Pacific Coast Highway  
Ventura, CA. 93001

**IN CASE OF  
EMERGENCY  
CALL**  
**1-888-662-4662**  
Site No: SV00939A

**NOTICE**  
GENERAL INFORMATION FOR WORKING  
IN THE AREA OF ANTENNAS  
• All personnel entering this site must be authorized.  
• Obey all posted signs.  
• Assume all antennas are active.  
• Maintain minimum distance of 3 feet clearance  
from antennas.

**NOTICE**  
  
Radio frequency fields beyond  
this point may exceed FCC  
general public exposure limit.  
Obey all posted signs and site guidelines  
for working in radio frequency  
environments.  
T-Mobile



**NOTICE**  
GENERAL INFORMATION FOR WORKING  
IN THE AREA OF ANTENNAS  
• All personnel entering this site must be authorized.  
• Obey all posted signs.  
• Assume all antennas are active.  
• Maintain minimum distance of 3 feet clearance  
from antennas.





STOP

Wait