Albert Viana

From: Sent: To: Subject:

Nancy Osborn [nj-osborn@att.net] Tuesday, January 08, 2013 1:01 PM

Lilly Schinsing Late Mail

Attachments:

RodAveHwy101Pcsr121212.pdf

RECEIVED

JAN -- 8 2013

CITY OF SAUSALITO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

To: Sausalito Planning Commissioners From: Nancy Osborn

2 Kendell Ct.

Sausalito, CA 94965 Phone: 415-331-2387

LATE MAIL regarding CUP/DR 97-03

I apologize for using Late Mail to update you on a new appeal I intend to present at tomorrow night's hearing. I've had a cough that makes it difficult to talk at length. I also think my proposal will make it easier to understand by giving you advance information on what it will entail.

I've attached the Supplemental Staff Report as much of what I propose is from information in it...thus the following refer to pages in that report plus a few later pages referring to included hard copies of CUP/DR 09-030.

For background, please refer to my letters, Item 1, Page 3 & 4 and Item 1, Page 5, but ignore any dates as I still can't get it straight as to what the time relationship was between AT&T being denied its request for going on the 2nd pole at Rodeo/Hwy 101, the date of adoption of Ordinance 10.45, the moratorium when the Ordinance was adopted and the fact that the original application was from Cellular One but at the time of the final decision it had been sold to AT&T. They are the ones whose cell tower is now on what I refer to as Cypress Ridge to distinguish it from the Sprint site, both are called Rodeo Ave./Hwy 101 in official documents

However, the main emphasis of my appeal is depicted as Item 1, Pages 11 & 12. As you can see AT&T has created a visual travesty--this situation needs The opportunity to force the co-location of Sprint to the to be corrected! Cypress Ridge site while at the same time forcing AT&T to correct their site is too good to pass up. (Please refer to copies provided of pages 3 & particularly 4F of CUP/DR 09-30 to see how far this site has deviated from the original FINDINGS. I also refer you to ATTACHMENT 2: CONDITIONS OF APPPROVAL, page 5, Item 7).

I am proposing that you make the decision to take these actions and totally remove the Sprint Rodeo/Hwy 101 site. For reasons pointed out in my letter, Item 1, Page 5, I truly believe this site would not have been allowed if the City Ordinance 10.45 had been in place when it came before the Planning Commission in 1997. Again I refer you to some of my reasons for this move in my letter, Item 1 Page 3 & 4.

I know Sprint, via their engineering firm, Streamline Engineering, labeled in the Supplemental Report Item 1, Pages 9 thru 12, has given many reasons why they feel the co-location can't take place. However in the final page summary they mention the possibility of a "new site with a new pole".

I suggest another independent engineering firm, paid by both Sprint & AT&T, be engaged to see just how that new site can actually consist of a co-location between the two and what solutions can be reached for a correction of the abominable site as created by AT&T and exists not withstanding the rulings of CUP/DR 09-30.

I intend to refer to this LATE MAIL tomorrow night and hope to able to clarify any points without having to reiterate my entire proposal.

Again, I apologize for this inconvenience and appreciate your taking the time to consider my suggestions.

Nancy Osborn