

**From:** [Margaret Martini](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Cc:** ["Marsha Berkgigler"; jmarchetta@trpa.org](#)  
**Subject:** cell tower location in Incline Village  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 27, 2019 1:01:15 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.]

Hello Julee,

Since I have a scheduling conflict I may not be able to attend the Commission meeting and would like to express my concerns and opposition to this proposal of a cell tower in the middle of Incline Village.

I have lived in Incline Village since 1964 and have been active in community matters for many years.

This is a really objectionable proposal in many ways.

I have never ever seen a 'camo' cell tower that looks decent. The hired artists make it look acceptable by deceiving the actual ugliness of fake tree cell towers.

This tower proposal is many feet above even the tallest tree in the neighborhood. It will be able to be seen from the lake. I am hoping that someone in the TRPA will get off their duff and figure this out as a scenic corridor faux pas.

There are many pros and cons about health issues of cell towers and one can argue all day about that. Just the fact that there are credible studies out that support the negatives should be enough of a concern to not locate the tower in the middle of a residential area and close proximity to schools.

There are other locations that will maximize service without this egregious and contentious location.

This is not a "NIMBY" issue. It is a scenic community issue and perhaps a health issue.

I am hoping that the Commission will deny this request as there are other options for locations available.

Thank you and please add my comments to the minutes of the meeting.

*Margaret Martini  
Incline Village, NV*

**From:** [Jeffry Poindexter](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Cell Tower  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 27, 2019 11:16:36 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.]

Julee,  
I want to state my strong support for installation of the proposed cell tower in Incline Village.

As a businessman (Realtor) in Incline Village I had to change carriers from Verizon to AT&T because I could not make a call from my home in the Ponderosa Subdivision nor from my office directly across from the Railey's shopping area. I made this change when the corporate offices of Verizon said they "could not provide the coverage" and recommended I go to another carrier. The lack of coverage in Incline Village and surrounding areas is a common complaint and continued attempts to delay installation of a cell tower serves no purpose and hurts the residents, businesses, and visitors to this area.

Jeff Poindexter  
Incline Village, NV 89451

--



[SignaSource](#)

Julee Olander  
Planner/Community Services Department  
Planning & Building Division  
1001 E. Ninth Street  
Building A  
Reno, NV 89512

March 29, 2019

RE: WSUP19-0001

Dear Julee:

My name is Susanne Sims.

Five years ago I moved to Incline Village to retire. After considering numerous places, both in the United States and abroad, I settled here. I chose Incline for the following reasons:

Incline Village is truly is a village. This means everything can be accessed within walking distance. People now days want to reduce their carbon footprint, and a location's "walking score" has become a factor in one's decision making.

I also chose Incline Village because it is a healthy place, with with a recreation center, beaches, tennis, golf, swimming, hiking and more. Residents here pride themselves on staying healthy, and fit.

I am stunned that a cell phone tower is now being proposed for the center of this village, precisely where the village is

most densely populated with businesses, residences and schools and our hospital. **There could not be a worse location!**

There is ample evidence that cell phone towers lead to cancer and other illnesses. This recent article from Modesto, CA reports that 4 students now have cancer since a cell tower was placed on their school grounds.

**The Modesto Bee March 12, 2019:**

**Fourth Ripon student has cancer. Parents demand removal of cell tower from school**

<https://www.modbee.com/news/article227459649.html>

Not only will this tower harm our residents, it will also be a visual blight. I believe a cell tower in town could lower property values because in this day and age, **no one wants to live or work next to a cell phone tower.**

If this cell tower does end up just 3 blocks from my home, I will be forced to sell my residence and relocate elsewhere.

Cell towers belong as far away from the public as possible. By permitting this sort of utility right in the center of our town, in the most densely populated area, you are subjecting people to tremendous risk and harm.

**The Board of County Commissioners must vote no on this!**

Thank you,  
Susanne Sims





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,

Name

Address

Address

Signature

Date

To:

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

  
Bob Alston

Name

1001 E. NINTH ST., BLDG A., RENO, NV 89512  
Address

INCLINE VILLAGE, NV 89451  
Address

  
Signature

3/20/2019  
Date

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,

Sarah Kerflett  
Name

one [unclear] AB  
Address

Incline Village, NV 89451  
Address

Sarah Kerflett  
Signature

3/22/19  
Date

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,

  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

Incline Village, NV 89451  
Address

Julee Olander  
Signature

3/22/2019  
Date



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,

WILLIAM FERRARI  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

Incline Village NV 89451  
Address

  
Signature

3-22-19  
Date

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,

Steve Sathre

Name

Address

Incline Village, NV 89451

Address

Signature

Date

I sometimes lose calls on my cellphone at my house, so please help us improve our service.

Thank you

RE: WSUP19-0001

March 29, 2019

I am writing with my concerns about the new cell tower being planned for Incline Village. I am a resident of Incline Village at Pinebrook Condominiums, which is just a few blocks from the proposed site.

Let me start with a brief intro. I hold a Ph.D. in Natural Health Sciences, am licensed both as an acupuncturist and an East Asian medical practitioner and have been testing homes and offices for electromagnetic “smog” for well over a decade.

I received my training in this work primary from Dietrich Klinghardt, M.D., Ph.D. Dr. Klinghardt has been a pioneer in sounding the alarm against wireless technologies for over 20 years and sees more and more patients with sensitivity to these frequencies.

My other colleague is Olle Johansson Ph.D. who is a Professor of Neurology at the Karolinska Institute in Sweden. They are charged with administering the Noble Prize in medicine. Dr Johansson is generally considered to be perhaps the world’s leading expert on electropersensitivity, a term he coined, and a condition considered to be a functional impairment in Sweden. Dr Johansson and I communicate regularly.

If you were to Google either of these men you would discover just how credible they are. It’s important to recognize that, much like regarding the tobacco industry of a few decades ago, there are two distinct bodies of research on this topic. Industry sponsored research shows little risk. The other body of research shows substantial risk.

Symptoms include headaches, sleeplessness, anxiety, depression, and more. Particularly concerning are the links to dementia and cancer. Sadly, we are the guinea pigs in this wireless experiment and it will likely be decades before the full impact and damage are realized. By then too much harm will have been done to an unsuspecting public.

I would urge you to please explore the independent research prior to allowing this tower to proceed. It is easily accessible on line. I would also be happy to offer further information via the phone if you'd like.

As much as the wireless industry would label me a quack, I have done enough research to be confident in my position, and would wish you would err on the side of caution before exposing our community to this invisible but real, risk.

Thanks for your kind consideration.

Sincerely

Richard Diehl Ph.D., M.Ed., L.Ac.

(80

## **PETER TODOROFF PRESENTATION TO BOA - 3 minutes**

**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 proposed site in Incline Village (IV).**

**We base our request on six reasons for denial that are detailed in the letter I've distributed to you and which I now summarize.**

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

**Regarding coverage, we request you deny the application because**

- (1) the “gap in coverage” represented by Incline Partners coverage map is inaccurate, indicating there is no cell coverage where residents have proven coverage,**
- (2) most proposed coverage in IV will duplicate current Verizon cell tower coverage,**
- (3) the proposed tower will be in the middle of IV but new coverage will primarily be to the west of 431 and in Crystal Bay, and**
- (4) it's unclear whether nearby newly approved cell towers (e.g., Kings Beach) will duplicate Incline Partners proposed coverage.**

### **OUR SECOND REASON FOR DENIAL – INCLINE PARTNERS TOWER WILL NOT ENHANCE EMERGENCY SERVICE COMMUNICATION AS THEY SUGGEST.**

**Firstnet.gov provides adequate coverage for first responders in IV. We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower is not needed to provide enhanced cell phone coverage to IV first responders.**

### **OUR THIRD REASON FOR DENIAL–INCLINE PARTNERS TOWER WILL BE AN INAPPROPRIATE USE OF THE PARCEL PER TRPA**

**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.**



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

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.

**OUR FIFTH REASON FOR DENIAL – THE TOWER NEGATES POSSIBLE FUTURE MIXED RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USE ON A VERY VALUABLE CENTRAL PARCEL IN IV**

We request you deny the application because the proposed cell tower if built would negate the possible Mixed-Use potential of this parcel in the new Community Area Plan. This very valuable parcel in the middle of IV can be put to much better use.

**OUR SIXTH REASON FOR DENIAL – THE ALTERNATIVE SITE ANALYSIS BY INCLINE PARTNERS IS INADEQUATE**

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.

All of these reasons for denial are detailed in the letter already distributed to you together with the coverage maps and signature page.

THANK YOU FOR CONSIDERING OUR REASONS FOR ASKING YOU TO DENY THE APPLICATION. WE ARE ALL FOR BETTER CELL COVERAGE BUT NOT TO THE DETRIMENT OF INCLINE RESIDENTS OR THE VILLAGE ITSELF.

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 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.**

**From:** [Edee Campbell](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Cell Tower Incline Village  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 5:27:06 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 in Incline.

I am in favor of the cell tower.

Kind Regards,  
Edee Campbell

**From:** [Jeffry Poindexter](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Incline Village Cell Tower  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 7:22:24 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.]

Julee

It appears the Incline Village Community Forum is again stating they are opposed to the proposed cell tower. I am a member of this group but am out of town for my Mother's 92nd birthday.

I do not agree with the Forum and again strongly support the installation of the proposed cell tower in Incline Village. Please proceed with you recommendation that the tower be approved.

Jeff Poindexter

--





April 1, 2019

Washoe County Board of Adjustment  
c/o Department of Planning and Building  
1001 E. Ninth Street, Build C, Second Floor  
Reno, Nevada 89505

**Re: Case # WSUP19-0001 (Incline Village Monopole)**

Dear Board of Adjustment Commissioners,

The purpose of this letter is to express our concern as a nearby group of property owners related to a proposed 117-foot tall monopole (cellular tower) to be located approximately 100 feet south of the intersection of Incline Way and Village Boulevard in Incline Village. Although Washoe County staff is recommending approval of the Special Use Permit (SUP) to be considered by your Board, it appears that the staff report fails to address key components of the Washoe County Development Code that apply to this specific request.

Specifically, the staff report fails to adequately address visual impacts and provides no discussion on land use compatibility. The staff report includes photo-simulations prepared by the applicant that depict the proposed monopole in context with the surrounding environment. However, the simulations fail to provide any dimensions whatsoever as to the height of surrounding trees, etc. In all of the simulations provided, the proposed monopole is lower than surrounding trees yet on page 16 of the staff report it is stated that the *"tower is taller than the trees on the site."* Furthermore, there is discussion within the staff report, and the applicant's submitted application, that the tower needs to be taller than surrounding vegetation in order to be effective. This appears to conflict with the provided simulations. On page 15 of the staff report it is noted that a tree will be removed to allow for the construction of the equipment enclosure. It is not stated as to whether or not the simulations provided reflect the removal of this tree which could help to further screen the tower. In the simulation titled *"View 3"*, included on page 11 of the staff report, the simulation shows two dead trees that help obscure the view of the proposed tower. It is highly likely that these trees will be removed based on TRPA standards which not only make the simulation inaccurate, but will reduce screening of the tower as well.

Without an accurate reference to existing tree heights, vegetative cover, and proposed post-tower conditions (i.e. removal of the existing tree), it is not possible to determine if the simulations provide an accurate depiction of the proposed facility. Without this information, it is impossible for the Board of Adjustment to make an informed decision on the SUP approval.

The staff report has very little discussion or analysis related to the proposed equipment enclosure. Neither Washoe County nor the applicant has provided any architectural elevations as to what this enclosure will look like or whether it is compatible with existing structures in the area. The staff report notes that a cyclone fence with wood-colored synthetic slats and barbed-wire will be used to screen the enclosure along with the addition of native vegetation. A cyclone fence with barbed wire is clearly inconsistent with surrounding uses and will not blend with the natural or built environment surrounding the site. It is also stated that the enclosure will sit atop "raised platforms" within the enclosure area but fails to address whether the proposed fence is at existing grade or at the level of the platform(s). It is unclear whether the fence will fully screen a raised equipment shelter or, if the fence is at platform level, whether or not additional visual impacts are created. There is no analysis whatsoever of what the tower base and surrounding structures will look like or if they are compatible with the surrounding area other than the referenced cyclone/barbed wire fence. This critical analysis is needed and must be considered by the Board of Adjustment, yet it is not provided in the staff analysis.

The applicant states on page 3 of their submitted application that "up to four (4) equipment shelters or equipment cabinet configurations located on up to four (4) concrete pads or raised platforms, with service lights that are only used during routine maintenance or emergency situations" are proposed. The site plan depicts these "shelter/pads" on all four corners of the site and also labels a "multi-carrier equipment compound" on the plan. It is not clear as to whether or not the four pad areas are included in the equipment compound or are separate and the staff report provides for no clarification. Additionally, the staff report fails to address potential visual impacts associated with the equipment pads and structures. There is no analysis related to the height of the structures, architectural character, etc. Once again, it is not possible for the Board of Adjustment to make an informed decision without the knowledge of these basic design features.

The staff report notes that a back up generator will be located onsite and will only be used during an emergency outage. The report goes on to note that "the applicant states that the generator will meet or exceed Washoe County noise regulations." However, the conditions proposed by staff fail to memorialize this claim and provide for no enforceable requirement that ensures noise compliance.

There are a variety of legal findings that the Board of Adjustment must make in order to recommend approval of the SUP. Although these findings are listed in the staff report and addressed by Washoe County staff, there is inadequate analysis to support statements that are made, including the following:

Finding 1 – Consistency. *That the proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Tahoe Area Plan.*

Staff indicates that they reviewed the Master Plan and Tahoe Area Plan and did not identify "any provisions that are offended by the project." The staff report provides no analysis whatsoever. There are a variety of policies within the Tahoe Area Plan including policy ICCP.1.1 that addresses compatibility with adjacent land uses including sufficient buffering. Policy ICCP.2.1.2 requires that all new structures include a "New Tahoe" image as defined in the Area Plan. The staff report makes no reference to this and completely fails to address the architectural design or compatibility of the equipment shelters.

Finding 3 – Site Suitability. *That the site is physically suitable for a telecommunications facility (monopole) for the intensity of such development.*

Staff's analysis simply states that "the parcel is vacant with numerous large trees on the property and site is physically suitable for a monopole." Once again, there is no analysis to defend this claim. Considerations such as the removal of the onsite tree or adjoining dead trees, existing tree heights, etc. are not discussed or analyzed. There is no consideration given as to whether the site is suitable from a visual impact perspective nor whether or not it is suitable to locate a cyclone fence with barbed wire adjacent to the uses that surround the site. There is a significant lack of analysis to determine if this finding can be met.

Finding 4 – Issuance Not Detrimental. *That issuance of the permit will not be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare; injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties; or detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.*

Staff addresses this finding by stating that the project complies with FCC standards related to electromagnetic frequencies and thus "full complies" with this finding. This analysis blindly ignores the consideration of whether or not the tower will be injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties. While it is recognized that electromagnetic fields and radiation is not within the reviewing purview of staff or the Board of Adjustment, no consideration is given whatsoever as to whether or not construction of this facility will be detrimental to adjoining properties based on design, screening, etc. Given the facts and supporting material included in the staff report, basic information needed to make this finding is not available. It is unclear whether or not the photo simulations are accurate, no details are provided on equipment shelters, and a barbed wire security fence is completely out of character with the surrounding area. Based on these considerations, this finding cannot be met.

Section 110.324.75 of the Washoe County Development Code establishes supplemental standards and findings for telecommunication facilities. On page 17 of the staff report, it is stated that "staff has reviewed all of the standards and conclude that the standards have been met" in reference to the requirements outlined in sections 110.324.40 through 110.324.60 of the Development Code. This statement is false. The following provisions of section 110.324.60 have not been addressed by the applicant or Washoe County staff:

- 110.324.60(12) – *Color Palette* – No color palette for equipment structures, fencing, etc. has been submitted for public review. No color palette for the pole structure itself is included either.
- 110.324.60 (15) – *A minimum of eight (8) panoramic, true color photographs. The photographs must display the north, south, east and west views of the site and views of the adjacent properties. The Director of Community Development shall determine the final choice of color palette submitted by the applicant. The color chosen shall blend the background and surroundings and best meet the intent of this subsection.* While the staff report does include 8 photo simulations, there are no photographs representing what the facility will look like at a ground level/human perspective. Furthermore, the photo simulations do not depict the proposed 6-foot cyclone fence with barbed wire. Lastly, no color palette is referenced or included with the staff report. If submitted by the applicant, it has not been made available for public review and input.

- *110.324.60 (16) – Landscape Plans.* It is a code requirement that landscape plans be submitted to Washoe County for review. The staff report indicates that the applicant originally proposed no landscaping and that staff has added a requirement to install native landscape improvements in order to better screen the site. However, no formal landscape plan was submitted and the condition placed on the SUP is inadequate. The condition does not specify where native landscaping will be added, nor does it include species, size (at time of planting), etc. Thus, based on the facts and conditions included in the staff report, it is not possible to analyze if the landscaping condition will adequately provide for screening of the site. No analysis was completed to determine this.

*Finding 7 – That public input was considered during the public hearing review process.* Staff's response to this finding is that the project was presented at the Citizens Advisory Board and that the Board may not consider environmental impacts associated with radio waves. However, staff makes no mention of the numerous other comments made by concerned citizens at the CAB meeting including those related to visual impacts, neighborhood consistency, land use compatibility, etc. Staff completely ignored and failed to address any of these additional concerns in their analysis. The CAB comments are included as an attachment and provide strong evidence to this claim.

*Finding 8 – That the monopole or lattice tower will not unduly impact the neighborhoods or vistas and ridgelines of the County.* The staff report states that based on the photo simulations and addition of native vegetation, this finding can be met. This analysis is grossly inadequate. As mentioned previously, the photo simulations seem to conflict with statements made in the staff report related to height and do not depict the removal of the existing onsite tree, proposed fencing, or the addition of native landscaping. Furthermore, no landscape plan has been submitted to demonstrate that screening of the facilities can be achieved. The Board of Adjustment simply cannot make this finding if not given the basic exhibits and analysis needed to do so. The staff report fails to address ground level impacts and relies entirely on photo simulations provided by the applicant. These simulations focus solely on tower height and provide no documentation or depiction of ground level improvements such as fencing, equipment buildings, screening, etc. and are incomplete based on the requirements included in section 110.324.60 of the Washoe County Development Code (as previously discussed).

Based on the information presented in this letter, it is my opinion that the Board of Adjustment has not been provided the necessary facts and analysis to properly consider the SUP request. Without this supplemental information, it is impossible for the Board to make an informed decision. Washoe County staff seems to have "hung their hat" on the fact that the tower is in compliance with FCC regulations. However, that does not exempt the facility from Washoe County Development Code regulations and polices contained within the Forest Area Plan. These considerations have essentially been ignored and are not addressed within the staff report. For this reason, I encourage the Board of Adjustment to deny this request based on the inadequate materials submitted and lack of proper land planning and compatibility analysis included in the staff report.

Thank you for your consideration. While we are aware that monopoles are necessary to provide adequate cellular communications in Incline Village. Analysis and facts supporting a tower at this particular location are simply not provided with the current SUP request. Additionally, ground level impacts related to equipment enclosures and fencing (specifically barbed wire) and not consistent with the surrounding area and have the strong potential to negatively impact property values in the area.

This letter has been submitted electronically (via email) to Julie Olander with the Department of Planning and Building with the specific request that it be included as part of the public record. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Concerned Incline Village Residents

cc: Washoe County District Attorney's Office  
Washoe County Board of Commissioners

**From:** [Stephen Barney](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** cell tower  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 7:26:12 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.]

We are in favor of the tower proposal. Stephen & Cherry Barney,  
Incline Village

--  
Stephen A. Barney

[t](#)

Denver, CO 80237

**From:** [Ramona Bigelow](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Cc:** [Todoroff, Pete](#)  
**Subject:** IV cell tower proposal  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 3:50:54 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.]

As a home owner in Incline Village I want to communicate my opposition to this project. There are numerous reasons to oppose which have been covered by many people. There needs to be a better location and better way to get better cell service  
Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Michele Koch](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Cell tower in Incline Village near dentists office  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 4:04:41 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.]

Julee,

I am a full time resident and have lived in Incline Village for almost 23 years. I am a homeowner (always have been) currently living with my family in the MillCreek subdivision. My husband and I have also have a business in town on Incline Way.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE the installation of the proposed cell phone tower itself, it's footprint in the center of town, I'm VERY concerned with the health risk it may present, the eyesore it will be to the landscape of our village and I'm also concerned with the ramifications of property values in that area as well as surrounding neighborhoods. My husband and I looked at property to possibly purchase just 9 months ago in that neighboring area!

With the foot traffic, the offices located right next to the proposed tower, and the multiple unit dwellings (homes) near there, how are these people not all at risk?

**PLEASE vote NO on this issue!**

Thank very much for your time.  
Michele Koch

Sent from my iPad



**From:** [Jack Dalton](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Cell Tower Incline  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 12:58:18 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 am opposed to the cell tower in Incline. Besides the potential biological risk, the tower is inappropriate at the location. Thanks Jack Dalton  
Incline Village NV 89451

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jane Barnhart](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** cell tower in Incline village, NV  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 5:40:43 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.]

Hi! Julee!

It just seems to me there could be a better place to put this TALL cell tower than right in the middle of Incline Village. Jane Barnhart and Michael Jordan, 9<sup>th</sup> St, NV 89451

## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Mary Bale  
**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 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. 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

875 Southwood Blvd  
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  
Address

Incline Village, NV 89450  
Address

Teresa Sathe  
Signature

3-25-19  
Date

**From:** [Melissa Eisele](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Opposed to IP's application for IV Cell Tower  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 4:57:17 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.]

Julie,

I want to state my strong opposition to the Incline Partners building a cell tower on Village Blvd. in Incline Village. I am asking that you deny their application to build a cell tower on their specified site near 231 Village Blvd in Incline Village (IV) for the following reasons:

**UNDER THE WASHOE COUNTY CODE:**

- The use is not consistent with the programs, policies, or standards of the Comprehensive Plan and applicable area plan.
- The use would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, and is detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

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

- The project is not of a nature, scale, intensity or type to be an appropriate use for the parcel.
- 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.
- The project use will change the character of the neighborhood and alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement and community plan.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Melissa Eisele

**From:** [Katie Stevenson](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Cell Tower  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 6:02:51 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,

As a resident and homeowner in Incline Village I would prefer a different location for the cell tower. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

--

Katie Stevenson

**From:** [Sara Schmitz](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Cc:** [Berkbigler, Marsha](#)  
**Subject:** RE: recap of CAB meeting related to the proposed cell tower in Incline Village  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 11:40:27 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.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.]

Ms. Olander,

I have again included the highlights from the IV CAB meeting for your review. As I recall, the CAB did not vote on the proposed variance and has instead sent this issue to the BOA. This is unfortunate, since had they voted our community's voice would have been heard and represented. I understand their role is to rule on variance requests. Their lack of a vote has created more angst in our community and is the reason for my writing you today. I will not be able to attend and speak in person due to a health issue.

Being an unincorporated community, it seems to be a challenge having local governance in alignment with the wishes of the residents. I understand the growing need for cell capacity. I also understand the desire to have a vibrant community with thriving businesses. Placing a cell tower at the center of our community isn't the highest and best use for the property. The proposed location is best served by having a commercial/residential build out, not a cell tower.

Other locations in the application didn't include public land, which offers better locations and opportunities for an additional cell tower. To serve my community, I'm offering to engage a group of citizens to work with Washoe County and businesses in our community to identify an alternative location. If our community feels we need improved coverage, allow our community to unite and find a solution. By approving the plan, you're not giving our citizens an opportunity to solve our own problems. Let's work together to solve the problem, not create a new one.

I am respectfully requesting the application for the Incline Village cell tower be denied and instead appoint a local citizen's advisory group to take on the challenge and bring forth a recommendation to the cell carriers and the county.

Sara Schmitz



Sara Schmitz

**From:** Olander, Julee [mailto:JOlander@washoecounty.us]

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 5, 2019 2:02 PM

**To**

**Subject:** FW: recap of CAB meeting related to the proposed cell tower in Incline Village

Ms. Schmitz,

I am the planner assigned this case WSUP19-0001 and the Board of Adjustment (BOA) is the approval Board for this special use permit application . The BOA hearing is on 4/4/19 at 1:30 at the Washoe County complex on 9<sup>th</sup> Street in the Board of County Commissioners chambers. I Let me know if you have further questions.

Thank you,



**Julee Olander**

**Planner | Community Services Department- Planning & Building Division**

[jolander@washoecounty.us](mailto:jolander@washoecounty.us) | Office: 775.328.3627 | Fax: 775.328.6133

1001 E. Ninth St., Bldg A., Reno, NV 89512



Connect with us: [cMail](mailto:) | [Twitter](https://twitter.com/) | [Facebook](https://www.facebook.com/washoecounty/) | [www.washoecounty.us](http://www.washoecounty.us)

**From:** Sara Schmitz

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 5, 2019 10:27 AM

**To:** Berkbigler, Marsha <[MBerkbigler@washoecounty.us](mailto:MBerkbigler@washoecounty.us)>; Solaro, David <[DSolaro@washoecounty.us](mailto:DSolaro@washoecounty.us)>

**Cc:** Young, Eric <[EYoung@washoecounty.us](mailto:EYoung@washoecounty.us)>

**Subject:** Re: recap of CAB meeting related to the proposed cell tower in Incline Village

Folks on social media are interested in when a decision is to be made and by whom.

Sent from [REDACTED]

On Mar 5, 2019, at 10:02 AM, Sara Schmitz <[sc](mailto:sc)>

wrote:

### **CAB Cell Tower Summary - Meeting on 3/4/2019**

The following are my observations related the discussions at the March 4<sup>th</sup> CAB meeting. The Incline Village cell tower being proposed is near the

intersections of Incline Way and Village Boulevard.

- There is a need for additional cell communications capacity, especially to the west and in the summer months.
- People questioned the location of the proposed tower (it will be as large with as many antenna as the one in Galena).
  - Concerns were expressed regarding the aesthetics in the center of our community.
  - It was suggested the proposal be placed on hold until the Area Plan is complete. There may be better use for this location.
  - It was suggested that to add capacity, especially to the west, that a location atop a hotel in Crystal Bay or the Washoe County maintenance property may be better locations.
  - The current cell tower locations are at the Mountain Golf course, atop the Hyatt (not planning to continue long term), and Diamond Peak. There was an unanswered question about adding capacity at the existing locations.
  - There were many expressing health concerns with the proposed location.

I copied Eric Young because he was in attendance.

Sara

Sara Schmitz

**From:** [Barbara Perlman-Whyman](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** WashoeBOALetter4-1-19.docx  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 5:53:07 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.]

Julee,

I feel strongly that this request should not be approved for many of the reason so stated in the attached letter! I would be there in person as a 25 year resident of Incline Village but I am out of the state at this time. I am currently President of the National Association of Conservation Districts' President's Association, past 10 year Member on the National Clean Energy Summit, National Conservation Foundation Board Trustee, as well as an elected Supervisor on the Nevada Tahoe Conservation Districts Board for the past 12 years.

Please recognize that an enormous number of citizens have expressed concern and outrage at this proposal and how much required information has not been forthcoming (Speak to Wayne Ford for examples.)

Thank you for transmitting this to the committee. I look forward to meeting you and working with you as I had with Eva over the past 17 years since the 'Pathway ' years.

Dr. Barbara Perlman-Whyman

Mailing address:  
Incline Village, NV 89451  
1(

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Susan Sanders](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** County Code for Special Use Permit requests for Case Number WSUP19-0001 Incline Village Monopole  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 2:48:41 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.]

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 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**

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.**

Susan Meade Sanders

Crystal Bay, NV 89402  
[suemeadesanders@gmail.com](mailto:suemeadesanders@gmail.com)



## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Bruce Powel  
**Sent:** Friday, March 15, 2019 10:17 AM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Subject:** IV cell phone tower project

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

Bruce Powell

Incline Village NV 89451

Sent from my iPhone

## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Karen Hovorka  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 27, 2019 10:48 AM  
**To:** Olander, Julee  
**Subject:** Support for Special Use Permit application for Incline Village 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.]

Hi Julee,

I am a resident of Incline Village, and I fully support the Special Use Permit application for the proposed Incline Village cell tower (WSUP19-0001). I'm unable to attend the meeting on April 4th so wanted to provide my support via email.

Better cell phone coverage and service for several carriers is needed in Incline Village. Based on the publicly available application materials, I'm satisfied the applicant conducted thorough site analysis, and environmental, noise, etc. impact studies, and coverage maps to come up with the proposed location, which looks to be ideal for carriers to improve their coverage and service in the area.

Thank you,  
Karen Hovorka



**From:** [NevJim](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** IV Cell Tower  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 1:37:19 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.]

I am in favor of the proposed cell tower.  
Thank you  
Jim Mancuso  
Sent unedited from my iPhone



**From:** [jimberes@comcast.net](mailto:jimberes@comcast.net)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Cc:** [Robin Beres; scj](#)  
**Subject:** Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP19-001 (Incline Village Monopole)  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 3:05:55 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 Board of Adjustment Members,

My wife and I hereby request you **deny the application** for the proposed Incline Village Monopole. We are full time residents of Incline Village whose house is less than one block from the proposed site. The reasons we object and ask you to deny the application are as follows:

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

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

- **IP's submitted coverage map is misleading** - Coverage already provided by the Verizon-built Mountain Golf Club tower is adequate throughout most of IV, with poor service primarily in the lower Commercial zone and absent service 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 (b) inside and outside buildings in the area to the west of Highway 431, and (c) inside and outside buildings in Crystal Bay.
- **Contradicting IP's Existing coverage map**—on streets where IP says coverage is poor or does not exist, such as ours, we and many residents contend they have adequate cell phone service. IP has purposely omitted street names on their maps. 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.

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

- **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.”

- **Enhanced Voice over IP Service is offered free of charge by carriers such as AT&T and Verizon and greatly enhances indoor coverage.** Residential and Commercial customers are offered free enhanced wireless coverage by using voice over IP services in their homes and businesses. When their mobile phones are connected to WiFi, their phone service is automatically and seamlessly connected to their mobile service (e.g. AT&T WiFi or Verizon WiFi) which has the effect of making their phones work as if they have the maximum bars even when there is little or no coverage. These services negate the requirement for more powerful transmissions to supply indoor service where mobile phones are often used.

**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, (4) it’s unclear whether nearby newly approved cell towers (e.g., Kings Beach) will duplicate IPs proposed coverage, and (5) Voice over IP services currently offered by wireless service providers help to mitigate the need for more powerful signals in the area.**

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

##### **1. [FIRSTNET.GOV](http://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**

1. **Inappropriate use of the parcel.** 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. Part of the project requires the removal of at least 6 trees that would obstruct the transmission due to their location and height as well as to provide the space for the 1818 sq ft mechanical yard at its base. The images provided in the application do not illustrate the removal of these trees. Thus not only will the tower be significantly taller than the nearby trees, the tower will stand out in a large clearing.
- 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.
- Leak prevention and detection for the diesel fuel tank are not adequately planned and provided and provide a potential environmental hazard. Being so close to the lake, a spill of 210 gallons of diesel fuel could prove disastrous. It is surprising that TRPA did not take note of this potential hazard.
- The proposed 6' synthetic slatted fence will not hide the equipment completely, and will be an eyesore. It was noted that the image supplied by IP implies a solid fence. This is certainly not how it will look. Further, 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 such as ours.

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

**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. For residents such as ours, property values may be negatively impacted.

## **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, including ours, 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 such as ours that are 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. Animals such as bears and coyotes may also attempt to enter the mechanical yard, particularly if trash is tossed there. Liability issues exist.

**In summation, we request you deny the application because (1) residents such as us 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**

- 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.**

**Given these 6 reasons, my wife and I do not support the proposed tower and**

**respectfully ask you to deny the applicant's request.**

Regards,

Jim and Robin Beres

M:

Confidentiality Note: This e-mail message and all attachments to it are intended only for the named recipients and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not one of the intended recipients, please do not duplicate or forward this email message and immediately delete it from your computer.

**From:** [Linda Offerdahl](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** YES to the cell tower in Incline Village  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 1:18:04 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.]

Linda Offerdahl,

***Life is a not a dress rehearsal!***



**From:**  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** Stop the Cell tower in Incline Village  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 2:18:45 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.]

Please add my vote to the anti-cell tower in the heart of Incline village.

Steve Dolan

101 TAILOE BLVD.

Incline Village, NV 89451

( )

**From:** [allen\\_kozinski](mailto:allen_kozinski)  
**To:** [TahoeHills@att.net](mailto:TahoeHills@att.net); Olander, Julie  
**Subject:** Proposed Cell Tower in Incline Village  
**Date:** Monday, April 01, 2019 9:48:16 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 am writing to you to voice my opposition to the proposed cell tower in the middle of Incline Village. I have lived in Incline for over 17 years near Raleys and while many things could be improved, cell coverage is not one of them. I have never experienced inadequate signal strength at my location or elsewhere in Incline such as the Rec Center, Beach or Diamond Peak. Secondly a tall tower however disguised is not compatible with the low height of buildings near the center of town. Finally, as technology moves to G5, the need for this tower is questionable. Thank you for considering my comments.

Allen Kozinski

Incline Village NV

**From:** [David Koch](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** New Cell tower In Incline Village  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 02, 2019 11:41:33 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.]

Ms Olander

I am very much opposed to the location of the proposed new cell power in Incline Village! It would seem that there should be a better location away from every day traffic both pedestrian and vehicle as the new tower

and support building & access road [etc.is](#) highly visible! I would think there are other locations out of the way that may be more appropriate

please vote no on this issue!

Dave Koch

Alpine Custom Interiors

775.333.1011

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