



November 20, 2019

Wireless Facility Workshop Summary

Break-Out Group Comments Summarized

Opinion on Existing Wireless Communications Infrastructure

1. Not good
2. Not Adequate in all places
3. Cell service is good enough
4. South Lake Tahoe is not a city and should maintain mountain character
5. New facilities only benefit the provider/wireless carrier who installs them
6. Service is impacted during peak demands; weekends and holidays
7. Some providers provide better service

Location

8. Prohibit new facilities in residential land uses
9. Identify preferred location zones for streamlined approvals
10. Interest to prohibit within a 1,000 / 1,500' of a residential, schools, and parks
11. Require alternative site analysis
12. Prioritize siting on existing light/utility poles
13. Prioritize colocation
14. Impacts on scenic resources
15. Require setbacks from adjacent residences for small cells (i.e. to a front window)
16. Should be located in commercial districts
17. Should not be located near schools
18. Require minimum distances between small cells
19. Limit concentration/density of small cells

Public Safety/Nuisance

20. Concern over fire hazards
21. Impacts of cooling fans when covered by snow
22. Responsibility for ongoing maintenance; city should not be responsible
23. Require independent consultant to review RFE reports
24. Cabinet/accessory equipment damage/vandalism responsibility
25. Unknown health impacts
26. City resources should not be impacted
27. Noise reports should be required
28. Site should be "totally self-contained"; no exhaust, no noise, no heat
29. Health concerns of 5g
30. Heat analysis should be required

Aesthetics

31. Facilities visually “stick out”
32. Increase setbacks in residential areas
33. Macro towers should have a maximum height and should not be located in residential areas
34. Develop a master plan of preferred sites
35. Monopines are ugly; use built structures instead
36. Scenic beauty negatively impacted
37. Stealth design should be required

Transparency

38. Need to be more transparent
39. Renters don’t get notified
40. Expand noticing distance
 - a) Notify properties within ¼ mile (2 times)
 - b) Notice every person within 1/3 mile
41. Public Notices should be sent via certified mail, at cost of applicant
42. Post notice of application on site
43. Suggest flyers/door hangers
44. Improve website for current applications
45. Require certified mail notification of application
46. Longer notice in advance of public hearing; 4 weeks.
47. Post to City website and allow polling of application approval
48. Dual noticing for application and public hearing
49. Use TV ads and radio to notify of applications

Other

50. Building permits should be required
51. City should fight to change laws and participate in legislative updates
52. City should protect the residents
53. Don’t cave to FCC citizens
54. More studies needed on effects of 5g
55. Property value impacts
56. Unknow health concerns
57. Concerns over privacy issues; surveillance / personal data breaches
58. Initial study for all special use permits by a 3rd party
59. Proof there is no surveillance