

## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Lyn Karol <|  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 3:06 PM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Subject:** I am Opposed to the proposed cell tower in Incline  
**Attachments:** WashoeBOALetter4-1-19.docx

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Board Members,

I own a McCloud unit 6) and wish to express my opposition to the placement of a cell tower in our neighborhood. The attached letter outlines the majority of my objections.

Recently I have become even more health conscious and feel that our society is placing convenience and comfort over health and well being. There are long term consequences to this value system. I do not want to be a "victim" of forces that I cannot control and do not believe is in the best interest of me and my neighbors.

Please require the petitioners to locate the tower somewhere out of town where it will not affect the mental, physical and visual health of so many residents. Even if you find there are no health consequences, the visual existence of it will affect those that do not believe as you do. It may affect property valued (and then tax revenues). It is not worth taking the chance. Do the right thing.

Vote NO.

Respectfully submitted,

Lyn Karol Blumenthal

*The Best Teachers are those who show us where to look  
but do not tell us what to see.*

**Olander, Julee**

---

**From:** JOHN MC DONAGH <[redacted]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 3:03 PM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Subject:** Cell Tower

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

If ever there is a place of visual serenity, please don't destroy

Village Blvd. with yet another cell tower in our community.

John McDonagh

McCloud Owner

## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Eric Edenholm <eeder >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 1:32 PM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Subject:** Incline Village Cell Tower - Opposed

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Hi Julee,

As a long time owner of a McCloud Condominium ( ) and visitor to the Incline Village area (going on 40+ years now), I would like to express my opposition to the cell tower structure and equipment yard being proposed along Incline Village Boulevard.

Aside from wanting better cell coverage and for the property owner's desire to cash in on their property, I don't pretend to know all of the reasons why someone feels the need for this installation. I have always felt that Incline Village is a unique place and a true getaway from the rush of urban life. It seems like a true sacrifice of this idyllic setting to construct a very large tower, and which may also have negative health consequences to those in the immediately surrounding vicinity.

I hope that you reconsider your intention to approve this unnecessary intrusion on this pristine place.

Thanks,

Eric

Eric Edenholm  
(  
[ee](#)

## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Stevan Berardo <scbu...oo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 2:36 PM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Cc:** Darcie HOA McCloud  
**Subject:** Telephone tower- NO!!

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Just for the record, as a home owner in the McCloud development, we are not at all in favor of erecting a cell phone tower on Village Blvd.

Steve & Lynn Berardo



**From:** [m.jacobson](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Vote Against Cell Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 1:20:19 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Ms. Olander,

I am a taxpayer and voter within Incline Village, Washoe County Nevada.

Please vote against the installation of the 117 foot cell tower as proposed. The Tahoe area and Incline Village are in a unique natural setting that requires care and consideration of public utilities such as cell towers.

There are many options that can blend with natural settings that do not require the height and proximity in the center of town as proposed. Smaller more distributed towers, or possibly one that is scaled to be within existing natural scenery and not projecting above treetops.

Thank you for your consideration and representation of your constituents.

Mark Jacobson  
221 E. Hillside Way, Incline Village, NV 89451  
775-270-1077

**From:** [Tom Rosenthal](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 1:19:14 PM

---

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

I live full time in the Mcclouds and don't want a tower that close to that many residents  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [cbwillb@charter.net](mailto:cbwillb@charter.net)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Cc:** [Todoroff, Pete](#)  
**Subject:** Resident opposing Cell Tower installation on Village Blvd, Incline Village  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 1:16:15 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

To: Ms Olander and the Washoe County Board of Adjustment  
From: Carole Black  
Date: 4/3/2019

I am a resident of Incline Village writing to document my opposition to the erection of the proposed cell tower at 231 Village Boulevard, Incline Village, NV. I completely agree with and have signed the summary opposition letter which will be sent from community members to the Washoe Board. Such a potentially dangerous, massive, unsightly installation has no place on a small site within a densely occupied, heavily trafficked area in the middle of a small, quiet, largely residential town and recreational tourist destination particularly when there are many alternatives. It has been opposed by the majority of residents who have attended meetings to date.

Said simply, I believe that this is primarily a commercial venture proposed by revenue seekers and structured optimally for commercial return. The proposed cell tower installation fails to meet the requirements for a Special Use Permit: the described "need" is at best arguable and the proposed "solution" appears biased lacking exploration, comprehensive development and evaluation of viable alternative options including impacts of some which may already be approved. Other than commercial revenue and some potential improved convenience, there is no clear justification of value that can only be satisfied by this proposed tower in this prime site - a site which is likely more suited for alternative uses which better support broader community needs. No tower alternatives are discussed outside of a single large tower installation on a small site within the central community area despite a variety of potential unexplored options including different technical designs to meet any true, clearly substantiated need and/or use of alternative sites within the extensive and mostly undeveloped surrounding geography.

Further, there are significant additional specific concerns related to the installation of such a large industrial entity in this small central site including public safety, noise, potential health concerns, and environmental/scenic/community value impact which further support denial of this permit in favor of exploration of alternative approaches and sites for any truly required service enhancements. Many of these concerns have been articulated in the summary letter from opposed residents (which I have signed as noted above) and/or at previous meetings. I spoke at the recent CAB meeting and plan to attend the Board of Adjustment to again voice my opposition.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns,

Carole Black  
3, Incline Village, NV 89451

**From:** [Viktoria Kolesnikova](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** NO! to IV Cell Tower in Incline Village  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 1:50:28 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Hello -

We are owners of Parcel # 14 in Incline Village.

We do not want a 117-foot monopine cell tower and 1800 sq ft Equipment Yard (with large generator and propane tank) in the middle of Incline Village on the Village Boulevard parcel close to our residence.

Please add our voice to the votes against this monstrous structure.

With respect ,

Viktoria and Aleksandr Kolesnikov  
Parcel #14 Incline Village

**From:** [Jon Crawford](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** IV Cell Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 2:04:07 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Ms Olander,

I'm not at all thrilled with a new cell tower going in on Village Blvd. I currently live part of the year in Santa Barbara, CA and similar issues have concerned SB residents as well.

The best solution for much of Santa Barbara and Montecito has been to install microcells. Residents have tolerated them much better. They address health as well as visibility issues much better than the traditional large cell towers. I would encourage you to look further into small scale installations.

Jon Crawford

12

Incline Village, NV

--

Jon Crawford  
702.440.1100

[www.joncrawford.com](#)

**From:** [eder51@aol.com](mailto:eder51@aol.com)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Cell Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 1:10:20 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

I do NOT support building a cell tower in the middle of Incline Village.

Ed Claridge  
93                    i5



MEMO: Board of Adjustment Members

April 4, 2019

From: Robert and Robin Holman, 2

### **FORMAL NOTICE OF OPPOSITION**

Proposed Project: Construction of 117' Cell Tower, Generator Building, and 220 Gallon Diesel Fuel Tank, 231 Village Bl. in the Commercial and Residential visual corridor of Incline Village. Robert and Robin Holman, residing at 214 Village Blvd., approximately 75 yards across the Village Blvd. visual corridor from the proposed project **object to the location, construction, operation, and inevitable expansion of a visual, noise, and EMF radiation polluting tower and generator.**

In addition to the Washoe County Code's prohibitions for the tower, TRPA, following its guidelines should deny the tower's construction. To paraphrase TRPA's stated responsibility: *"to preserve and enhance the unique natural and human environment, while improving local communities and peoples' interactions with our irreplaceable environment, and ensuring community health and safety for future generations"* leads to the unequivocal basis for a decision to **deny TRPA and Washoe County project approval.** The entire scope of this project has predominately negative environmental, economic, health, and safety consequences and is absolutely contrary to government's stated mission.

There is NO compelling topographic or geographic logic to demonstrate placing the tower in the population center will result in coverage superior to locating the tower on property already approved proximate to the Washoe County Sheriff's substation near the 28/431 traffic circle. TRPA has a responsibility to its constituents in Incline Village to improve the environment, not denigrate it with unsightly and polluting projects. Stop this project now.

The economic impact unbalanced. Modest revenue to the developer from installation of a cellular tower next to homes and businesses benefits only one entity. Meanwhile, the negative impact on proximate property values, demonstrated by numerous studies, is far more serious. If the value of neighboring homes and business falls from 4% to 20% and salability or rent ability becomes difficult or impossible because potential buyers, residents, and tenants do not wish to live or work near a cellular tower, significant negative economic consequences, harming many citizens, will be caused by TRPA approving this proposed permit.

Cellular companies tout benefits: faster data, better service, more coverage. Like the tobacco and drug companies, proponents overlook the ever increasing body of research on the human health effects and safety of the tower emitting radiation and electro-pollution. Should Incline residents become part of the 'great experiment' resulting from oversaturation of electromagnetic and wireless radiation exposure? TRPA should and must eliminate that risk to our population by denying this permit.

The noise pollution resulting from running the generator and day and night trucks performing maintenance is a demonstrable public nuisance. A back up diesel generator, run weekly for maintenance/performance tests, will add to both noise and air pollution in the neighborhood, which is unnecessary especially since there is a much better, and much safer location on available to serve the developer's need.

The tower will grow from the proposed four antennae to more attachments; they all expand. As more radiation emitting facilities are added, the tower will become even a bigger potential danger and eyesore. Property values will be harmed, additional backup generators will be a potential, more diesel pollution, more noise pollution, and more visual pollution all along what is arguably one of Incline Village's most important visual corridors. It is Washoe County's mandate to carefully monitor and protect residents. This is a prime example of where Washoe County can and should protect its citizens by denying the permit.

Washoe County Board of Adjsutment - Special Permit Case #WSUP19-0001  
Reno, NV 89512

Dear Commissioners:

My wife and I are owners and residents of a property located at Southwood Blvd. in Incline Village. We are located approximately 300-400 feet from the proposed cellular tower. RE: Application for installation of 117' cell tower at 231 Village Blvd in Incline Village, NV 89451. It has Washoe Special Permit Case #WSUP-19-0001

**The size and height** of the tower (117 feet) is way out of scale to the character of this mixed commercial-residential area. The tower will supposedly be "concealed" in the shape and color of surrounding trees, but the size is simply out of scale to the neighborhood.

**Compelling public need?** As almost every home and business in the area has high speed Wi-Fi, I do not see the compelling reason for this tower, except to benefit seasonal tourists in our area. Anyone who lived in the Incline Village area last summer, knows that we do not need this additional "benefit" to encourage more tourism in the area. Incline Village and Lake Tahoe is not an urban area. People living and visiting here should not expect complete urban amenities such as "perfect" cellular service. We live in a VERY ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA. It seems to me that our Commissioners have a responsibility first to protect that environment and the residents of the area and second to let Verizon customers get better cellular phone service.

**Property Values?** An overwhelming 94% of home buyers and renters surveyed by the National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy (NISLAPP) say they are less interested and would pay less for a property located near a cel tower. This echos a New Zealand study that found that buyers would pay as much as 20 percent less for a property near a cell tower or antenna. In essence, nearby property owners will be subsidizing the owners of the new cell tower with the depreciation of their property values.

**Health risks?** While I appreciate the public need for cellular service, living in proximity to a cellular tower may **substantially increase risks to my health and others who also live in proximity to the proposed tower.** A cel tower located on school property in Ripon,CA was recently removed after 4 students and 3 teachers contracted cancer. Within 200 feet of this proposed tower lies a sizable housing complex inhabited mostly by non-English speaking residents. Many children live in this complex. Is the potential risk to their health and lives worth less than Verizon's profit. The Ramazzini (Italian) study has shown a direct correlation between cancer risks and health. Reference: <https://ehtrust.org/worlds-largest-animal-study-on-cell-tower-radiation-confirms-cancer-link/> A most interesting paper discussing the health risks of proximate Wi-Fi towers is also indicated in this document: [http://www.wi-cancer.info/antenna\\_sickness.aspx](http://www.wi-cancer.info/antenna_sickness.aspx)

European Wi-Fi radiation standards are 1/10 the US standard. They are erring on the side of caution rather than risking their population's exposure to unknown risks.

Why this location? After the community rejected a similar tower near the Incline Village High School, why here? Why cannot such a tower (if needed) be located at another location that is remote from our population center.

Respectfully:  
Michael Abel [N](#)



**From:** [Alexander Tsigdinos](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Against Incline Village Placement of Cell Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 8:39:22 AM

---

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Ms. Olander,

I share the concerns expressed by my wife, Pamela, about the proposed location and impact of the new cell tower. With this email and details below, please include me as a 'no' vote as well. You can reach me at (775) 298-7305 or contact me via this email if you need additional information. I live in Incline Village at

Thank you,  
Alexander P. Tsigdinos

April 2019

Dear Board of Adjustment Members,

In compliance with the County Code for Special Use Permit requests for Case Number WSUP19-0001 Incline Village Monopole, we members of the Incline Village Community Forum submit this letter asking you to deny the application by Incline Partners (IP) to build a cell tower on their specified site near 231 Village Blvd in Incline Village (IV).

The Board of Adjustment should deny the application because:

**UNDER THE WASHOE COUNTY CODE:**

1. The use is not consistent with the programs, policies, or standards of the Comprehensive Plan and applicable area plan.
2. The use is not physically suitable for the development in the area proposed.
3. The use would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, and would be injurious to the existing property and the improvements of adjacent properties, and is detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

**UNDER THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CODE:**

1. The project is not of a nature, scale, intensity or type to be an appropriate use for the parcel.
2. The project will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the region.
3. The project use will change the character of the neighborhood and alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement and community plan.

**THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA STANDARDS AND WASHOE COUNTY STANDARDS PREVAIL**

WASHOE COUNTY CODE 110.406.10 TRPA STANDARDS. Requirements for development occurring in the Tahoe area including, but not limited to, building placement standards, shall be THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA standards and Washoe Co standards.

**REASON FOR DENIAL #1 – INCLINE PARTNERS HAS NOT PROVED A SIGNIFICANT COVERAGE GAP IN INCLINE VILLAGE THAT CAN ONLY BE FILLED BY THE PROPOSED CELL TOWER**

Section 1: IP states This facility will greatly enhance wireless phone and data coverage within commercial and urban zoning areas of IV. Currently there is poor to no wireless phone and/or data service or other emergency phone service along this main corridor in IV centered near the intersection of Tahoe Boulevard (Highway 28) and Village Drive, particularly as you head south and west from that location.

**1. IP EXISTING COVERAGE MAP IS INACCURATE**

- In looking at IP's **Existing** coverage map, coverage already provided by the Verizon-built Mountain Golf Club tower is adequate (Green) throughout most of IV, with poor service (Yellow) primarily in the lower

Commercial zone and absent service (White) in the area west of Highway 431 (in the Ponderosa Subdivision). From IP's **Proposed** coverage map, the most significant increase in proposed cell coverage will be (a) inside buildings in the IV Commercial zone (Yellow) (b) inside and outside buildings in the area to the west of Highway 431 (White), and (c) inside and outside buildings in Crystal Bay (White).

Alexander P. Tsigdinos (Alex Sig-din'-us)

**From:** [Steve Dance](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed cell phone tower in Incline Village  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 12:55:30 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Ms. Olander,

As a homeowner in the McCloud condominium complex on Village Boulevard in Incline Village I would like to voice my objection to the proposed construction of a cell phone tower on Village Boulevard. Having a large tower on that site in the middle of Incline Village, together with the ancillary equipment that goes with it, is totally inappropriate. It would create an eyesore in the middle of the village, not to mention a potential health hazard, and is inconsistent with the goals of Incline Village to present itself as an upscale, people-oriented community.

I understand that your intention is to recommend approval of the tower construction project, and I respectfully urge you to reconsider your position on this. If such a tower is needed, it should at least be located in an area away from the center of the village where it would be less obtrusive.

Sincerely,

Stephen G. Dance  
McCloud



**From:** [Pamela Mahoney](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Against Incline Village Placement of Cell Tower  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 7:03:54 PM

---

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Ms. Olander,  
I live in Incline Village at 1080 Oxen Road and I am very concerned about the proposed location and impact of the new cell tower. With this email and details below, please include me as a 'no' vote. You can reach me at ( ) 5 or contact me via this email if you need additional information.  
Thank you, Pamela M. Tsigidinos

April 2019

Dear Board of Adjustment Members,

In compliance with the County Code for Special Use Permit requests for Case Number WSUP19-0001 Incline Village Monopole, we members of the Incline Village Community Forum submit this letter asking you to deny the application by Incline Partners (IP) to build a cell tower on their specified site near 231 Village Blvd in Incline Village (IV).

The Board of Adjustment should deny the application because:

**UNDER THE WASHOE COUNTY CODE:**

1. The use is not consistent with the programs, policies, or standards of the Comprehensive Plan and applicable area plan.
2. The use is not physically suitable for the development in the area proposed.
3. The use would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, and would be injurious to the existing property and the improvements of adjacent properties, and is detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

**UNDER THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CODE:**

1. The project is not of a nature, scale, intensity or type to be an appropriate use for the parcel.
2. The project will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the region.
3. The project use will change the character of the neighborhood and alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement and community plan.

**THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA STANDARDS AND WASHOE COUNTY STANDARDS PREVAIL**

WASHOE COUNTY CODE 110.406.10 TRPA STANDARDS. Requirements for development occurring in the Tahoe area including, but not limited to, building placement standards, shall be THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA standards and Washoe Co standards.

**REASON FOR DENIAL #1 – INCLINE PARTNERS HAS NOT PROVED A SIGNIFICANT COVERAGE GAP IN INCLINE VILLAGE THAT CAN ONLY BE FILLED BY THE PROPOSED CELL TOWER**

Section 1; IP states This facility will greatly enhance wireless phone and data coverage within commercial and urban zoning areas of IV. Currently there is poor to no wireless phone and/or data service or other emergency phone service along this main corridor in IV centered near the intersection of Tahoe Boulevard (Highway 28) and Village Drive, particularly as you head south and west from that location.



## 1. IP EXISTING COVERAGE MAP IS INACCURATE

- In looking at IP's **Existing** coverage map, coverage already provided by the Verizon-built Mountain Golf Club tower is adequate (Green) throughout most of IV, with poor service (Yellow) primarily in the lower Commercial zone and absent service (White) in the area west of Highway 431 (in the Ponderosa Subdivision). From IP's **Proposed** coverage map, the most significant increase in proposed cell coverage will be (a) inside buildings in the IV Commercial zone (Yellow) (b) inside and outside buildings in the area to the west of Highway 431 (White), and (c) inside and outside buildings in Crystal Bay (White).

- **Contradicting IP's Existing coverage map**—on streets where IP says coverage does not exist (White)—many residents contend they have adequate cell phone service. IP has purposely omitted street names on their maps. We include an IV street map so it's possible to see exactly what streets will be most affected by the Proposed cell tower coverage. We attach herewith written statements of coverage by residents living on these streets. **That residents attest they have coverage where IP says coverage does not exist calls into question all of IP's Existing coverage map.** IP purposely does not provide details of how the coverage maps were developed and how they were verified.

- **Contradicting IP's Existing coverage map**—AT&T's coverage map shows adequate coverage throughout all of Incline Village (Blue).

## 2. NEW SMALLER TOWERS CAN FILL COVERAGE GAPS IN INCLINE VILLAGE

- According to the Unison website: [www.UnisonSite.com](http://www.UnisonSite.com), new technology exists to provide enhanced coverage without a large monopine cell tower. **Several small towers are already providing cell coverage in IV. A small cell tower has recently been installed at 885 Tahoe Blvd just a few blocks from IP's proposed tower.**

According to the website: *"It's not just cell phones that are getting smaller, less expensive and more capable – cell tower sites are following the same trend too. While giant macrocell sites have been the industry norm for years, carriers are increasingly turning to a range of smaller cell site options as a way to reduce costs and speed network expansion. These include microcells, picocells and femtocells..."*

*Also, when adding network capacity, the use of smaller sites helps carriers avoid the increasingly common resistance to large cell towers in many communities. American consumers love mobile communications, but when it comes to towers, the sentiment is NIMBY - not in my back yard. This is particularly true with macrocells, the largest cell towers. ... Macrocell sites can cover a radius of up to 10 miles in diameter, depending on the terrain. However, they require large upfront capital investments, face burdensome zoning restrictions, and sizeable ongoing expenses for maintenance, site leasing, electrical power and telecom backhaul... The three largest U.S. wireless carriers are all offering [smaller] products. AT&T Wireless, Verizon Wireless, and Sprint."*

**In summation regarding coverage, we request you deny the application because (1) the "gap in coverage" represented by Incline Partners is inaccurate, indicating there is no cell coverage where residents have proven coverage, (2) much proposed coverage will duplicate current Verizon cell tower coverage, (3) the tower will be in the middle of IV but new coverage will primarily be to the west of 431 and into Crystal Bay, and (4) it's unclear whether nearby newly approved cell towers (e.g., Kings Beach) will duplicate IP's proposed coverage.**

### REASON FOR DENIAL #2 – IP TOWER WILL NOT ENHANCE EMERGENCY SERVICE COMMUNICATION

IP States: Section 6: The project will provide important wireless communication service in emergencies to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

### FIRSTNET.GOV PROVIDES ADEQUATE COVERAGE FOR FIRST RESPONDERS IN IV

- In IV, First Responders use a dedicated network [FIRSTNET.GOV](http://FIRSTNET.GOV). They have adequate coverage throughout IV without the IP cell tower. A representative from the North Lake Tahoe Fire Department said they have no problem with cell coverage at the station.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower is not needed to provide enhanced cell phone coverage to IV first responders.**

**REASON FOR DENIAL #3 –IP TOWER WILL BE AN INAPPROPRIATE AND OUT-OF-SCALE USE OF THE PARCEL THAT WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT, ESPECIALLY ON SURROUNDING RESIDENCES**

TRPA Chapter 21.2.2 – Special Uses

A. The project to which the use pertains is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity, and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which and surrounding area in which it will be located;

B. The project to which the use pertains will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water, and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners; and

C. The project to which the use pertains will not change the character of the neighborhood, or detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan, and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

Washoe County:

Section 110.324.70 (c) That the monopole or lattice tower will not unduly impact the adjacent neighborhoods or the vistas and ridgelines of the County. [Added by Ord. 1242, provisions eff. 7/23/04, amended by Ord. 1378, provisions eff. 8/1/08.]

Section 110.810.30 Issuance not detrimental: Issuance will not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and will not change the character of the neighborhood.

Constructing a 117-foot high monopine cell phone tower and associated equipment is an inappropriate use of the parcel located in the very heart of IV near both commercial and dense residential areas.

- The proposed monopine will be 117 feet high (112' + approved 5' variance), which is nearly 80 feet taller than any nearby buildings, and 30 feet higher than surrounding trees. The photos included with IP application intentionally misrepresent how the monopine will look in conjunction with surrounding trees and buildings.

- The “carrier equipment compound” or Mechanical Yard will include 1818 sq ft, much of it covered by cement. Four cement-equipment-shelter-pads will be 8x12 sq ft. The equipment cabinets are 48 cubic feet, and the generator is 84 cubic feet. The diesel fuel tank holds 210 gallons. The driveway into the Mechanical Yard from Village will be cement. Large areas of cement and large pieces of equipment in the Mechanical Yard are incompatible with the surrounding area.

- The proposed 6' synthetic slatted fence will not hide the equipment completely, and will be an eyesore. Because of the slope of the parcel, the Mechanical Yard will need to be leveled by lowering it a foot at the entrance and building up 4 feet in the back. This will require a 10' fence, not 6'. In addition to the large pieces of equipment, there will be up to 18 directional antennas on the monopine, many of which will be visible in spite of fake branches to hide them.

- Even if the generator noise will be heard only during emergency situations, the noise will be a disturbance to the surrounding area and residents.

**We request you deny the application because the cell tower equipment will have a negative visual impact and the nature and scale of the equipment is not an appropriate use of the parcel.**

**REASON FOR DENIAL #4 – THE PROJECT WILL CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND BE POTENTIALLY INJURIOUS TO RESIDENTS**

**1. THE PROJECT WILL DETRIMENTALLY CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA**

• There is a TRPA Class 1 Bike/walking path along the side of the proposed site that is heavily used to traverse Village Blvd from Highway 28 to the Incline Beach and Ski Beach Areas. The Mechanical Yard will be visible to pedestrians and cyclists on the path as well as to people viewing the area from above 6 feet, including those in surrounding buildings.

**2. THE PROJECT WILL BE INJURIOUS TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENJOYMENT OF RESIDENTS**

• Although the parcel is zoned General Commercial, many high-density residential units are located within ¼ mile from the proposed tower site. At least six HOAs are in the affected area housing hundreds of residents. These residents will be affected in several ways.

• High Frequency Radiation *is currently perceived* as a health hazard. For every study professing safety, another study shows harm. Until the research consistently proves cell-tower radiation is safe, those residing within the ¼ mile radius surrounding the tower will worry for their health and the health of their children. (If future study shows an increase in disease in the area closest to the cell tower, liability issues exist. See attached article from the Modesto Bee March 2019.)

• In addition to the risk of High Frequency Radiation, cell towers have been shown to have other potential safety risks. Towers have collapsed from ice, wind, wildfire, and earthquakes. Towers have caught on fire. With a tower in the center of the Village, all of these risks to residents are higher. If the tower collapses in the direction of the Dental Office, it will damage or destroy the building less than 90 feet away. Liability issues exist.

• Because of the public perception of danger to health associated with cell-tower radiation, residential prices will be affected as potential buyers opt to buy in areas without threat. Many of the housing units within ¼ mile of the tower are million dollar homes whose values may drop. Liability issues exist.

• A tower in the middle of the Village is an attractive nuisance. Because the tower will be unguarded, children may attempt to scale the fence and adolescents may attempt to scale the tower. Liability issues exist.

**In summation, we request you deny the application because (1) residents in nearby high-density residential areas will be affected by the perceived health risks of High Frequency Radiation, (2) a tower collapse or fire would be disastrous in the middle of the Village, and (3) these perceived hazards will negatively affect home prices in the surrounding area.**

**REASON FOR DENIAL #5 – THE TOWER NEGATES THE NEW COMMUNITY AREA PLAN POSSIBILITY FOR FUTURE MIXED RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USE ON A VERY VALUABLE CENTRAL PARCEL IN IV**  
IP states: Section 110.810.30 : “Consistency. The proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Comprehensive Plan and the applicable area plan.”

• Currently the IV Community Area Plan is being revised. One future possible use of the property owned by Dr. Cherry (KBS Ltd) on which the Dental Office now sits is for Mixed Commercial and Residential use. If the proposed tower were built, it would preclude consideration of the property for mixed use. No application should be approved until the new Area Plan is finalized.

- Because of coverage issues, the proposed cell tower will prevent any expansion of the Dental Office or its parking lot.
- The parcel is in the very heart of IV and is too central and valuable to be used to hold equipment. If it is redeveloped for mixed use, low-to-moderate income housing could be built that would be central to shopping and schools.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower if built would negate the possible Mixed-Use potential of this very valuable parcel in the middle of IV that could be put to much better use.**

#### **REASON FOR DENIAL #6 – THE ALTERNATIVE SITE ANALYSIS IS INADEQUATE**

Alternative Site Analysis: (3) Maps identifying alternate sites that were considered by the applicant, with a justification by a competent professional for the requested site.

- The proposed site is not the only possible site for a new monopine cell tower in IV. Previously AT&T applied to build a tower near the Washoe County Maintenance Area on Highway 431. That application could be reconsidered. That site is open, without trees, and is higher than the proposed site by 50-100 feet. It's already used as an equipment area and has readily available restrooms for repairmen.
- Given that most of the improved/new coverage is to the west of IV, a cell tower would be more effective if it were built higher up nearer Crystal Bay. The Washoe County Maintenance Area is one preferable spot for a large monopine cell tower.
- The 13 alternative sites IP considered in IV were all within the central Commercial Core so the land could be leased and used commercially. The reasons given by property owners for not wanting the tower built on their properties echo many of the reasons a majority of residents don't want the tower built in the middle of the Village. Given the Kings Beach cell tower is on or near US Forest Land, it may be possible to explore a similar site for a tower near IV.
- As mentioned previously, smaller towers/antennas are now available that may be more appropriate for IV's terrain and will be more appropriate to 5G should that service be offered to IV in the future.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed site is not the only possible site for the tower. It is the only site whose owner is willing to allow construction. A better site would be the County Maintenance Yard or a site located more to the west near Crystal Bay. Other sites need to be researched.**



**From:** [Heather Williams](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Incline Partners Cell Phone Tower Application  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 12:45:26 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Ms Olander:

I am one of the Incline Village residents who are vehemently opposed to the construction of the Incline Partners cell tower. I know of no one in favor of this and residents I have spoken with do not have a problem with cell service – including the Fire Station. Personally, I have never had an issue with cell service or connectivity.

There are 2 recently approved towers – one on top of a commercial building locally and a second in Kings Beach, CA. It seems to me that that will be more than adequate coverage without the addition of yet another cell tower in the middle of the village. My concerns are many but the biggest is the lack of honesty in the Incline Partners proposal. In their notice to residents, they never mentioned an Equipment Yard and tower construction on about 1800 square feet, which will hold the telecom equipment cabinets, the generator, and the propane gas tank. Nor did they mention they will have to level the lot AND build a retaining wall and fence around the equipment. This is not **just** a cell phone tower.

There are other sites in Incline that would be more appropriate. Is this REALLY going to improve cell service? Putting a tower on a sloping lot at near the bottom of the Village does not seem like the most prudent plan. . Finally, how can they attempt to complete this project when their license has been suspended in Nevada?

For all the reasons above, and oh so many more, I strongly urge you to not deny the Incline Partners cell phone tower application.

Respectfully,

Heather Williams

Dear Board of Adjustment Members,

I am writing to protest the installation of a cell tower on village blvd in incline village. I cannot believe that you would issue a special permit for its construction, when it is obviously against the wishes of almost all the nearby residents, stands in violation to the specific wording of the washoe county regulations, is unnecessary (given the number of alternatives including some apparantly already approved), has never been prove safe, and will uglify one of the country's nicer towns.

I don't know much about the politics of this all but I would like to think that you all are on the side of the residents.

Sincerely,

William L Black  
Incline Village, NV



**From:** [Andrew Merrill](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Incline Cell Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 7:46:13 AM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Please build the tower.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

**From:** [Steven Price](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Incline Village Cellular Tower  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 7:25:25 PM

---

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

County Planners: I have attended multiple meetings on the 112+ foot mono-pine cellular tower currently proposed for Incline Village. I have yet to attend any meeting (normally 25+people) at which more than a few individuals favored its erection as presently proposed. The vast majority believe that locating the tower in the midst of a community is unwarranted and unacceptable.

I totally agree with the facts in the letter being sent to you by key members of our community. It summarizes and validates the many substantive problems with the proposal.

Unfortunately, I am currently out of state and thus unable to attend the 4 April meeting.

Steven F. Price

Incline Village  
(I have excellent cellular service-AT&T)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [jay allen](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Incline Village cell tower  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 9:42:33 PM  
**Attachments:** [WashoeBOALetter4-1-19.docx](#)

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Julee Olander - As a resident of Incline Village and resident of the McCloud Condominium complex, I want to let you know that I am totally opposed to the proposed cell tower on Village Blvd. I do not relish living next to such an unsightly structure that is out of character for this part of Incline Village.

In addition to the health concerns of nearby residents, this location does not provide any benefit over other possible sites that are presently available in Incline.

I am in total agreement with the attached letter and hope that the Board of Adjustment can see to vote this proposed location down.

Thank you,  
Jay Allen

**From:** [Linda Schafer](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed cell tower in Incline Village  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 9:31:12 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Good morning Julee,

I received information recently regarding the proposed cell tower in Incline Village. My husband and I have been full-time residents and business owners in Incline for the past five years and are opposed to this project. We do not feel this tower would fit into the natural beauty and landscape of Tahoe. Please forward my e-mail on to the board that will be voting on this proposed new venture.

Thank you!

Best regards,



**Linda Schafer**  
President, LGS Group, Inc.  
P 775 831 1111  
E [lschafer@lgs.com](mailto:lschafer@lgs.com)  
A  
Incline Village, NV 89451

LGS Group Proprietary & Confidential. The information contained in this email and any attachments is strictly confidential and is for the use of the intended recipient. Any use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of any part of this email or any attachment is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by return email and delete all copies including attachments.

## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Mary Bale <marybethbale@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 10:39 AM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Subject:** Incline Village cell tower  
**Attachments:** cell tower WashoeBOALetter4-1-19.docx

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Julee,

Please review the attached letter to the Board of Adjustment Members. I am in full agreement that the Board of Adjustment should deny the application for building the proposed cellular tower in Incline Village. I request that you deny the application because the proposed site is not the only possible site for the tower. if the tower is built as planned it would negate possible mixed-use potential of this parcel in the middle Incline Village that could be put to much better use.

Thank you,

Mary Bale

April 2019

Dear Board of Adjustment Members,

In compliance with the County Code for Special Use Permit requests for Case Number WSUP19-0001 Incline Village Monopole, we members of the Incline Village Community Forum submit this letter asking you to deny the application by Incline Partners (IP) to build a cell tower on their specified site near 231 Village Blvd in Incline Village (IV).

The Board of Adjustment should deny the application because:

**UNDER THE WASHOE COUNTY CODE:**

1. The use is not consistent with the programs, policies, or standards of the Comprehensive Plan and applicable area plan.
2. The use is not physically suitable for the development in the area proposed.
3. The use would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, and would be injurious to the existing property and the improvements of adjacent properties, and is detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

**UNDER THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CODE:**

1. The project is not of a nature, scale, intensity or type to be an appropriate use for the parcel.
2. The project will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the region.
3. The project use will change the character of the neighborhood and alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement and community plan.

**THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA STANDARDS AND WASHOE COUNTY STANDARDS PREVAIL**

WASHOE COUNTY CODE 110.406.10 TRPA STANDARDS. Requirements for development occurring in the Tahoe area including, but not limited to, building placement standards, shall be THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA standards and Washoe Co standards.

**REASON FOR DENIAL #1 – INCLINE PARTNERS HAS NOT PROVED A SIGNIFICANT COVERAGE GAP IN INCLINE VILLAGE THAT CAN ONLY BE FILLED BY THE PROPOSED CELL TOWER**

Section 1: IP states This facility will greatly enhance wireless phone and data coverage within commercial and urban zoning areas of IV. Currently there is poor to no wireless phone and/or data service or other emergency phone service along this main corridor in IV centered near the intersection of Tahoe Boulevard (Highway 28) and Village Drive, particularly as you head south and west from that location.

**1. IP EXISTING COVERAGE MAP IS INACCURATE**

• In looking at IP's **Existing** coverage map, coverage already provided by the Verizon-built Mountain Golf Club tower is adequate (Green) throughout most of IV, with poor service (Yellow) primarily in the lower Commercial zone and absent service (White) in the area west of Highway 431 (in the Ponderosa Subdivision). From IP's **Proposed** coverage map, the most significant increase in proposed cell coverage will be (a) inside buildings in the IV Commercial zone (Yellow) (b) inside and outside buildings in the area to the west of Highway 431 (White), and (c) inside and outside buildings in Crystal Bay (White).



• **Contradicting IP's Existing coverage map**—on streets where IP says coverage does not exist (White)—many residents contend they have adequate cell phone service. IP has purposely omitted street names on their maps. We include an IV street map so it's possible to see exactly what streets will be most affected by the Proposed cell tower coverage. We attach herewith written statements of coverage by residents living on these streets. **That residents attest they have coverage where IP says coverage does not exist calls into question all of IPs Existing coverage map.** IP purposely does not provide details of how the coverage maps were developed and how they were verified.

• **Contradicting IP's Existing coverage map**—AT&T's coverage map shows adequate coverage throughout all of Incline Village (Blue).

## **2. NEW SMALLER TOWERS CAN FILL COVERAGE GAPS IN INCLINE VILLAGE**

• According to the Unison website: [www.Unisonsite.com](http://www.Unisonsite.com), new technology exists to provide enhanced coverage without a large monopine cell tower. **Several small towers are already providing cell coverage in IV. A small cell tower has recently been installed at 885 Tahoe Blvd just a few blocks from IPs proposed tower.**

According to the website: *"It's not just cell phones that are getting smaller, less expensive and more capable – cell tower sites are following the same trend too. While giant macrocell sites have been the industry norm for years, carriers are increasingly turning to a range of smaller cell site options as a way to reduce costs and speed network expansion. These include microcells, picocells and femtocells..."*

*Also, when adding network capacity, the use of smaller sites helps carriers avoid the increasingly common resistance to large cell towers in many communities. American consumers love mobile communications, but when it comes to towers, the sentiment is NIMBY - not in my back yard. This is particularly true with macrocells, the largest cell towers. ... Macrocell sites can cover a radius of up to 10 miles in diameter, depending on the terrain. However, they require large upfront capital investments, face burdensome zoning restrictions, and sizeable ongoing expenses for maintenance, site leasing, electrical power and telecom backhaul... The three largest U.S. wireless carriers are all offering [smaller] products. AT&T Wireless, Verizon Wireless, and Sprint."*

**In summation regarding coverage, we request you deny the application because (1) the "gap in coverage" represented by Incline Partners is inaccurate, indicating there is no cell coverage where residents have proven coverage, (2) much proposed coverage will duplicate current Verizon cell tower coverage, (3) the tower will be in the middle of IV but new coverage will primarily be to the west of 431 and into Crystal Bay, and (4) it's unclear whether nearby newly approved cell towers (e.g., Kings Beach) will duplicate IPs proposed coverage.**

**REASON FOR DENIAL #2 – IP TOWER WILL NOT ENHANCE EMERGENCY SERVICE COMMUNICATION**  
IP States: Section 6: The project will provide important wireless communication service in emergencies to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

### **FIRSTNET.GOV PROVIDES ADEQUATE COVERAGE FOR FIRST RESPONDERS IN IV**

• In IV, First Responders use a dedicated network FIRSTNET.GOV. They have adequate coverage throughout IV without the IP cell tower. A representative from the North Lake Tahoe Fire Department said they have no problem with cell coverage at the station.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower is not needed to provide enhanced cell phone coverage to IV first responders.**

**REASON FOR DENIAL #3 –IP TOWER WILL BE AN INAPPROPRIATE AND OUT-OF-SCALE USE OF THE PARCEL THAT WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT, ESPECIALLY ON SURROUNDING RESIDENCES**

TRPA Chapter 21.2.2 – Special Uses

A. The project to which the use pertains is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity, and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which and surrounding area in which it will be located;

B. The project to which the use pertains will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water, and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners; and

C. The project to which the use pertains will not change the character of the neighborhood, or detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan, and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

Washoe County:

Section 110.324.70 (c) That the monopole or lattice tower will not unduly impact the adjacent neighborhoods or the vistas and ridgelines of the County. [Added by Ord. 1242, provisions eff. 7/23/04, amended by Ord. 1378, provisions eff. 8/1/08.]

Section 110.810.30 Issuance not detrimental: Issuance will not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and will not change the character of the neighborhood.

Constructing a 117-foot high monopine cell phone tower and associated equipment is an inappropriate use of the parcel located in the very heart of IV near both commercial and dense residential areas.

- The proposed monopine will be 117 feet high (112' + approved 5' variance), which is nearly 80 feet taller than any nearby buildings, and 30 feet higher than surrounding trees. The photos included with IPs application intentionally misrepresent how the monopine will look in conjunction with surrounding trees and buildings.

- The "carrier equipment compound" or Mechanical Yard will include 1818 sq ft, much of it covered by cement. Four cement-equipment-shelter-pads will be 8x12 sq ft. The equipment cabinets are 48 cubic feet, and the generator is 84 cubic feet. The diesel fuel tank holds 210 gallons. The driveway into the Mechanical Yard from Village will be cement. Large areas of cement and large pieces of equipment in the Mechanical Yard are incompatible with the surrounding area.

- The proposed 6' synthetic slatted fence will not hide the equipment completely, and will be an eyesore. Because of the slope of the parcel, the Mechanical Yard will need to be leveled by lowering it a foot at the entrance and building up 4 feet in the back. This will require a 10' fence, not 6'. In addition to the large pieces of equipment, there will be up to 18 directional antennas on the monopine, many of which will be visible in spite of fake branches to hide them.

- Even if the generator noise will be heard only during emergency situations, the noise will be a disturbance to the surrounding area and residents.

**We request you deny the application because the cell tower equipment will have a negative visual impact and the nature and scale of the equipment is not an appropriate use of the parcel.**

**REASON FOR DENIAL #4 – THE PROJECT WILL CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND BE POTENTIALLY INJURIOUS TO RESIDENTS**

**1. THE PROJECT WILL DETRIMENTALLY CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA**

- There is a TRPA Class 1 Bike/walking path along the side of the proposed site that is heavily used to traverse Village Blvd from Highway 28 to the Incline Beach and Ski Beach Areas. The Mechanical Yard will be

visible to pedestrians and cyclists on the path as well as to people viewing the area from above 6 feet, including those in surrounding buildings.

## **2. THE PROJECT WILL BE INJURIOUS TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENJOYMENT OF RESIDENTS**

- Although the parcel is zoned General Commercial, many high-density residential units are located within ¼ mile from the proposed tower site. At least six HOAs are in the affected area housing hundreds of residents. These residents will be affected in several ways.
- High Frequency Radiation *is currently perceived* as a health hazard. For every study professing safety, another study shows harm. Until the research consistently proves cell-tower radiation is safe, those residing within the ¼ mile radius surrounding the tower will worry for their health and the health of their children. (If future study shows an increase in disease in the area closest to the cell tower, liability issues exist. See attached article from the Modesto Bee March 2019.)
- In addition to the risk of High Frequency Radiation, cell towers have been shown to have other potential safety risks. Towers have collapsed from ice, wind, wildfire, and earthquakes. Towers have caught on fire. With a tower in the center of the Village, all of these risks to residents are higher. If the tower collapses in the direction of the Dental Office, it will damage or destroy the building less than 90 feet away. Liability issues exist.
- Because of the public perception of danger to health associated with cell-tower radiation, residential prices will be affected as potential buyers opt to buy in areas without threat. Many of the housing units within ¼ mile of the tower are million dollar homes whose values may drop. Liability issues exist.
- A tower in the middle of the Village is an attractive nuisance. Because the tower will be unguarded, children may attempt to scale the fence and adolescents may attempt to scale the tower. Liability issues exist.

**In summation, we request you deny the application because (1) residents in nearby high-density residential areas will be affected by the perceived health risks of High Frequency Radiation, (2) a tower collapse or fire would be disastrous in the middle of the Village, and (3) these perceived hazards will negatively affect home prices in the surrounding area.**

### **REASON FOR DENIAL #5 – THE TOWER NEGATES THE NEW COMMUNITY AREA PLAN POSSIBILITY FOR FUTURE MIXED RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USE ON A VERY VALUABLE CENTRAL PARCEL IN IV**

IP states: Section 110.810.30 : “Consistency. The proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Comprehensive Plan and the applicable area plan.”

- Currently the IV Community Area Plan is being revised. One future possible use of the property owned by Dr. Cherry (KBS Ltd) on which the Dental Office now sits is for Mixed Commercial and Residential use. If the proposed tower were built, it would preclude consideration of the property for mixed use. No application should be approved until the new Area Plan is finalized.
- Because of coverage issues, the proposed cell tower will prevent any expansion of the Dental Office or its parking lot.
- The parcel is in the very heart of IV and is too central and valuable to be used to hold equipment. If it is redeveloped for mixed use, low-to-moderate income housing could be built that would be central to shopping and schools.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower if built would negate the possible Mixed-Use potential of this very valuable parcel in the middle of IV that could be put to much better use.**

## **REASON FOR DENIAL #6 – THE ALTERNATIVE SITE ANALYSIS IS INADEQUATE**

Alternative Site Analysis: (3) Maps identifying alternate sites that were considered by the applicant, with a justification by a competent professional for the requested site.

- The proposed site is not the only possible site for a new monopine cell tower in IV. Previously AT&T applied to build a tower near the Washoe County Maintenance Area on Highway 431. That application could be reconsidered. That site is open, without trees, and is higher than the proposed site by 50-100 feet. It's already used as an equipment area and has readily available restrooms for repairmen.

- Given that most of the improved/new coverage is to the west of IV, a cell tower would be more effective if it were built higher up nearer Crystal Bay. The Washoe County Maintenance Area is one preferable spot for a large monopine cell tower.

- The 13 alternative sites IP considered in IV were all within the central Commercial Core so the land could be leased and used commercially. The reasons given by property owners for not wanting the tower built on their properties echo many of the reasons a majority of residents don't want the tower built in the middle of the Village. Given the Kings Beach cell tower is on or near US Forest Land, it may be possible to explore a similar site for a tower near IV.

- As mentioned previously, smaller towers/antennas are now available that may be more appropriate for IV's terrain and will be more appropriate to 5G should that service be offered to IV in the future.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed site is not the only possible site for the tower. It is the only site whose owner is willing to allow construction. A better site would be the County Maintenance Yard or a site located more to the west near Crystal Bay. Other sites need to be researched.**



To Whom It May Concern,

March 9, 2019

I am a property owner in Incline Village and reside at 875 Southwood Blvd, Unit 15 Incline Village Nevada.

I am strongly in favor of placing the proposed Cellular Tower in the location proposed near Village Blvd. We currently have terrible cell coverage which is challenging, especially when trying to be in contact with business associates.

I would like to see the proposed Cell Tower built and definitely In Favor of this.



Pati Fehr  
916-955-3340  
875 Southwood Blvd #15  
Incline Village NV 89451

To:

Julee Olander  
Planner|Community Services Department- Planning & Building Division  
1001 E. Ninth St., Bldg A., Reno, NV 89512  
Email: jolander@washoecounty.us

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in reference to the application by Incline Partners, LLC before the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency ("TRPA") and Washoe County Planning Department to allow the construction of a 117 foot monopine within the commercial zone in Incline Village, Nevada (subject property: APN#: 132-221-11, vacant land next to 231 Village Boulevard).

The area surrounding the proposed monopine is underserved by the wireless industry. Improved cellular telephone coverage would add tremendously to the safety and welfare of the Incline Village population.

The tower location is in the commercial zone and the monopine will blend with the surrounding area. Accordingly I support the approval of this facility by Washoe County and TRPA.

Very truly yours,

Teresa Sathe

Name

PO Box 6510

Address

Incline Village, NV 89450

Address

Teresa Sathe

Signature

B-25-19

Date

**Olander, Julee**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 03, 2019 3:12 PM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Subject:** Incline Cell Tower....No!!!!

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

April 2019

Dear Board of Adjustment Members,

In compliance with the County Code for Special Use Permit requests for Case Number WSUP19-0001 Incline Village Monopole, we members of the Incline Village Community Forum submit this letter asking you to deny the application by Incline Partners (IP) to build a cell tower on their specified site near 231 Village Blvd in Incline Village (IV).

The Board of Adjustment should deny the application because:

**UNDER THE WASHOE COUNTY CODE:**

1. The use is not consistent with the programs, policies, or standards of the Comprehensive Plan and applicable area plan.
2. The use is not physically suitable for the development in the area proposed.
3. The use would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, and would be injurious to the existing property and the improvements of adjacent properties, and is detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

**UNDER THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CODE:**

1. The project is not of a nature, scale, intensity or type to be an appropriate use for the parcel.
2. The project will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the region.
3. The project use will change the character of the neighborhood and alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement and community plan.

**THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA STANDARDS AND WASHOE COUNTY STANDARDS PREVAIL**

WASHOE COUNTY CODE 110.406.10 TRPA STANDARDS. Requirements for development occurring in the Tahoe area including, but not limited to, building placement standards, shall be THE MOST RESTRICTIVE OF TRPA standards and Washoe Co standards.

**REASON FOR DENIAL #1 – INCLINE PARTNERS HAS NOT PROVED A SIGNIFICANT COVERAGE GAP IN INCLINE VILLAGE THAT CAN ONLY BE FILLED BY THE PROPOSED CELL TOWER**

Section 1: IP states This facility will greatly enhance wireless phone and data coverage within commercial and urban zoning areas of IV. Currently there is poor to no wireless phone and/or data service or other emergency phone service along this main corridor in IV centered near the intersection of Tahoe Boulevard (Highway 28) and Village Drive, particularly as you head south and west from that location.

**1. IP EXISTING COVERAGE MAP IS INACCURATE**

• In looking at IP's **Existing** coverage map, coverage already provided by the Verizon-built Mountain Golf Club tower is adequate (Green) throughout most of IV, with poor service (Yellow) primarily in the lower Commercial zone and absent service (White) in the area west of Highway 431 (in the Ponderosa Subdivision). From IP's **Proposed** coverage map, the most significant increase in proposed cell coverage will be (a) inside buildings in the IV Commercial zone (Yellow) (b) inside and outside buildings in the area to the west of Highway 431 (White), and (c) inside and outside buildings in Crystal Bay (White).



• **Contradicting IP's Existing coverage map**—on streets where IP says coverage does not exist (White)—many residents contend they have adequate cell phone service. IP has purposely omitted street names on their maps. We include an IV street map so it's possible to see exactly what streets will be most affected by the Proposed cell tower coverage. We attach herewith written statements of coverage by residents living on these streets. **That residents attest they have coverage where IP says coverage does not exist calls into question all of IPs Existing coverage map.** IP purposely does not provide details of how the coverage maps were developed and how they were verified.

• **Contradicting IP's Existing coverage map**—AT&T's coverage map shows adequate coverage throughout all of Incline Village (Blue).

## 2. NEW SMALLER TOWERS CAN FILL COVERAGE GAPS IN INCLINE VILLAGE

• According to the Unison website: [www.Unisonsite.com](http://www.Unisonsite.com), new technology exists to provide enhanced coverage without a large monopine cell tower. **Several small towers are already providing cell coverage in IV. A small cell tower has recently been installed at 885 Tahoe Blvd just a few blocks from IPs proposed tower.**

According to the website: *"It's not just cell phones that are getting smaller, less expensive and more capable – cell tower sites are following the same trend too. While giant macrocell sites have been the industry norm for years, carriers are increasingly turning to a range of smaller cell site options as a way to reduce costs and speed network expansion. These include microcells, picocells and femtocells..."*

*Also, when adding network capacity, the use of smaller sites helps carriers avoid the increasingly common resistance to large cell towers in many communities. American consumers love mobile communications, but when it comes to towers, the sentiment is NIMBY - not in my back yard. This is particularly true with macrocells, the largest cell towers. ... Macrocell sites can cover a radius of up to 10 miles in diameter, depending on the terrain. However, they require large upfront capital investments, face burdensome zoning restrictions, and sizeable ongoing expenses for maintenance, site leasing, electrical power and telecom backhaul... The three largest U.S. wireless carriers are all offering [smaller] products. AT&T Wireless, Verizon Wireless, and Sprint."*

**In summation regarding coverage, we request you deny the application because (1) the "gap in coverage" represented by Incline Partners is inaccurate, indicating there is no cell coverage where residents have proven coverage, (2) much proposed coverage will duplicate current Verizon cell tower coverage, (3) the tower will be in the middle of IV but new coverage will primarily be to the west of 431 and into Crystal Bay, and (4) it's unclear whether nearby newly approved cell towers (e.g., Kings Beach) will duplicate IPs proposed coverage.**

### REASON FOR DENIAL #2 – IP TOWER WILL NOT ENHANCE EMERGENCY SERVICE COMMUNICATION

IP States: Section 6: The project will provide important wireless communication service in emergencies to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

### FIRSTNET.GOV PROVIDES ADEQUATE COVERAGE FOR FIRST RESPONDERS IN IV

• In IV, First Responders use a dedicated network [FIRSTNET.GOV](http://FIRSTNET.GOV). They have adequate coverage throughout IV without the IP cell tower. A representative from the North Lake Tahoe Fire Department said they have no problem with cell coverage at the station.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower is not needed to provide enhanced cell phone coverage to IV first responders.**

### REASON FOR DENIAL #3 –IP TOWER WILL BE AN INAPPROPRIATE AND OUT-OF-SCALE USE OF THE PARCEL THAT WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT, ESPECIALLY ON SURROUNDING RESIDENCES

A. The project to which the use pertains is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity, and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which and surrounding area in which it will be located;

B. The project to which the use pertains will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water, and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners; and

C. The project to which the use pertains will not change the character of the neighborhood, or detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan, and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

Washoe County:

Section 110.324.70 (c) That the monopole or lattice tower will not unduly impact the adjacent neighborhoods or the vistas and ridgelines of the County. [Added by Ord. 1242, provisions eff. 7/23/04, amended by Ord. 1378, provisions eff. 8/1/08.]

Section 110.810.30 Issuance not detrimental: Issuance will not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and will not change the character of the neighborhood.

Constructing a 117-foot high monopine cell phone tower and associated equipment is an inappropriate use of the parcel located in the very heart of IV near both commercial and dense residential areas.

- The proposed monopine will be 117 feet high (112' + approved 5' variance), which is nearly 80 feet taller than any nearby buildings, and 30 feet higher than surrounding trees. The photos included with IPs application intentionally misrepresent how the monopine will look in conjunction with surrounding trees and buildings.

- The "carrier equipment compound" or Mechanical Yard will include 1818 sq ft, much of it covered by cement. Four cement-equipment-shelter-pads will be 8x12 sq ft. The equipment cabinets are 48 cubic feet, and the generator is 84 cubic feet. The diesel fuel tank holds 210 gallons. The driveway into the Mechanical Yard from Village will be cement. Large areas of cement and large pieces of equipment in the Mechanical Yard are incompatible with the surrounding area.

- The proposed 6' synthetic slatted fence will not hide the equipment completely, and will be an eyesore. Because of the slope of the parcel, the Mechanical Yard will need to be leveled by lowering it a foot at the entrance and building up 4 feet in the back. This will require a 10' fence, not 6'. In addition to the large pieces of equipment, there will be up to 18 directional antennas on the monopine, many of which will be visible in spite of fake branches to hide them.

- Even if the generator noise will be heard only during emergency situations, the noise will be a disturbance to the surrounding area and residents.

**We request you deny the application because the cell tower equipment will have a negative visual impact and the nature and scale of the equipment is not an appropriate use of the parcel.**

## **REASON FOR DENIAL #4 – THE PROJECT WILL CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND BE POTENTIALLY INJURIOUS TO RESIDENTS**

### **1. THE PROJECT WILL DETRIMENTALLY CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA**

- There is a TRPA Class 1 Bike/walking path along the side of the proposed site that is heavily used to traverse Village Blvd from Highway 28 to the Incline Beach and Ski Beach Areas. The Mechanical Yard will be



visible to pedestrians and cyclists on the path as well as to people viewing the area from above 6 feet, including those in surrounding buildings.

## **2. THE PROJECT WILL BE INJURIOUS TO THE HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENJOYMENT OF RESIDENTS**

- Although the parcel is zoned General Commercial, many high-density residential units are located within ¼ mile from the proposed tower site. At least six HOAs are in the affected area housing hundreds of residents. These residents will be affected in several ways.

- High Frequency Radiation *is currently perceived* as a health hazard. For every study professing safety, another study shows harm. Until the research consistently proves cell-tower radiation is safe, those residing within the ¼ mile radius surrounding the tower will worry for their health and the health of their children. (If future study shows an increase in disease in the area closest to the cell tower, liability issues exist. See attached article from the Modesto Bee March 2019.)

- In addition to the risk of High Frequency Radiation, cell towers have been shown to have other potential safety risks. Towers have collapsed from ice, wind, wildfire, and earthquakes. Towers have caught on fire. With a tower in the center of the Village, all of these risks to residents are higher. If the tower collapses in the direction of the Dental Office, it will damage or destroy the building less than 90 feet away. Liability issues exist.

- Because of the public perception of danger to health associated with cell-tower radiation, residential prices will be affected as potential buyers opt to buy in areas without threat. Many of the housing units within ¼ mile of the tower are million dollar homes whose values may drop. Liability issues exist.

- A tower in the middle of the Village is an attractive nuisance. Because the tower will be unguarded, children may attempt to scale the fence and adolescents may attempt to scale the tower. Liability issues exist.

**In summation, we request you deny the application because (1) residents in nearby high-density residential areas will be affected by the perceived health risks of High Frequency Radiation, (2) a tower collapse or fire would be disastrous in the middle of the Village, and (3) these perceived hazards will negatively affect home prices in the surrounding area.**

### **REASON FOR DENIAL #5 – THE TOWER NEGATES THE NEW COMMUNITY AREA PLAN POSSIBILITY FOR FUTURE MIXED RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USE ON A VERY VALUABLE CENTRAL PARCEL IN IV**

IP states: Section 110.810.30 : “Consistency. The proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Comprehensive Plan and the applicable area plan.”

- Currently the IV Community Area Plan is being revised. One future possible use of the property owned by Dr. Cherry (KBS Ltd) on which the Dental Office now sits is for Mixed Commercial and Residential use. If the proposed tower were built, it would preclude consideration of the property for mixed use. No application should be approved until the new Area Plan is finalized.

- Because of coverage issues, the proposed cell tower will prevent any expansion of the Dental Office or its parking lot.

- The parcel is in the very heart of IV and is too central and valuable to be used to hold equipment. If it is redeveloped for mixed use, low-to-moderate income housing could be built that would be central to shopping and schools.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower if built would negate the possible Mixed-Use potential of this very valuable parcel in the middle of IV that could be put to much better use.**

## **REASON FOR DENIAL #6 – THE ALTERNATIVE SITE ANALYSIS IS INADEQUATE**

Alternative Site Analysis: (3) Maps identifying alternate sites that were considered by the applicant, with a justification by a competent professional for the requested site.

- The proposed site is not the only possible site for a new monopine cell tower in IV. Previously AT&T applied to build a tower near the Washoe County Maintenance Area on Highway 431. That application could be reconsidered. That site is open, without trees, and is higher than the proposed site by 50-100 feet. It's already used as an equipment area and has readily available restrooms for repairmen.

- Given that most of the improved/new coverage is to the west of IV, a cell tower would be more effective if it were built higher up nearer Crystal Bay. The Washoe County Maintenance Area is one preferable spot for a large monopine cell tower.

- The 13 alternative sites IP considered in IV were all within the central Commercial Core so the land could be leased and used commercially. The reasons given by property owners for not wanting the tower built on their properties echo many of the reasons a majority of residents don't want the tower built in the middle of the Village. Given the Kings Beach cell tower is on or near US Forest Land, it may be possible to explore a similar site for a tower near IV.

- As mentioned previously, smaller towers/antennas are now available that may be more appropriate for IV's terrain and will be more appropriate to 5G should that service be offered to IV in the future.

**We request you deny the application because the proposed site is not the only possible site for the tower. It is the only site whose owner is willing to allow construction. A better site would be the County Maintenance Yard or a site located more to the west near Crystal Bay. Other sites need to be researched.**

Deahn Boies  
McCloud Homeowner