

Aliza Barraza

From: caron lutz [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 2, 2023 8:10 AM
To: COB_mail; DSD Planning
Subject: Case #P22CUooo13 - Wolverton Revoc Living TR - S. Sierrita Mtn Rd

Categories: Orange Category

CAUTION: This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

To All Concerned

I am writing once again on this matter to further address this application and the events that have taken place since the last Board Meeting Feb 7th, 2023.

Although the Wolverton's have been good neighbors these past 12 years, my husband and I are opposed to the cell tower. Our personal reasons, noting that studies both pro and con can be cited for the issues, having read samplings on both sides of the issues, our perspective is that there will be a negative impact on property value, negative visual impact, questionable Health concerns due to the RF emissions and modulatable power levels.

That being said I would like to reference Pima County Land Use regulations 18.07.030 Section H subsections 1c, 1g, and 2d, if the proposed site is approved it appears you would be in violation of these codes. The proposed site is in a rustic, rural, residential area consisting of mainly single-story housing. Placing a 110' or even a 65' tower here does not fit the existing character of the area, nor does it preserve the property values of same. There is nothing that would minimize the negative visual impact, faux covered or not, it would not blend into the surrounding vistas of the proposed site. It would stand 60 to 80' above all other objects in the area.

This application has been handled poorly by Clear Blue. On Feb 7th the rep from Clear Blue stood before the Board and said she thought there had been a neighborhood meeting and would look into it as she had to get up to speed on the project after the death of the original rep. At that time there had been NO neighborhood meetings, nor any communication from Clear Blue to the community. After the Feb 7th board meeting there still had been no communication or outreach from Clear Blue until... The first neighborhood meeting on March 31st, last Friday, only 2 landowners (2 couples, 4 people) attended to voice their opinions, both negative by the way.

Why such a low turnout? An invitation letter dated Friday March 24, postmarked Monday March 27th was delivered/received on the afternoon of Wednesday March 29th, 48 hours prior to the meeting time of Friday March 31 at 6 pm. This is not adequate notice. The residents in the 1000' affected area are unlikely to pick up

8
11/11/2023 11:11:11 AM

mail each day as for some it is a trek to the mailboxes, we don't get service to the door or a mailbox at the end of the driveway.

The meeting was held virtually, even though there was over a month to plan otherwise. When asked about that decision the Clear Blue response was "because the planning committee meets virtually, and we were trying to be consistent." Consistent with what, is my question. There was no consideration given to the demographics of the area, some don't have internet access and others are not technologically savvy enough to sign into a virtual meeting or even call in, it takes a tech familiarity that is rarely found in seniors or those that have been out of the workforce, myself included, luckily my husband is an It professional. Actions speak louder than words. Their actions say to us that they were purposely trying to make a proper neighborhood meeting, where all could be heard, pro and con, impossible to hold.

As to the tower location options, On the opposite side of Sierrita Mtn Rd there are acres of state land, an ideal spot to place a cell tower. If state land is not an option, which the reps implied, there are other location options to be had. During the meeting they stated there were few vacant lands available in the search area, in less than 10 minutes on one land listing site, I found 5 undeveloped properties of 1 acre or more, in less populated areas, within their search area and with road access, for sale, to make my point I forwarded this information to the Clear Blue Rep.

We were informed during the virtual meeting that T-mobile is the provider requesting the tower in order to satisfy a requirement to proceed with a purchase of Sprint. This is not about providing the rural community with better service, as with most corporate actions, it's about the bottom line, the money. According to the T-mobile website and coverage map, the area in question currently has full 4G and 5G coverage. The area is covered by many carriers and the service, which once was spotty 10 years ago, has since been improved dramatically.

Thank you for your time and we hope you deny this application.

Caron Lutz
Adjacent to site homeowner