Capitola radio tower still getting static

entinel staff writer

CAPITOLA — The City Council took o action last week on the embattled cellar tower proposal on Rosedale Aveue, but members appear to be inching loser to a thumbs-up vote.

The process was frustrating to local esidents who say they worry the tower's ower output could cause health prob-

ms.

The applicant, John McCoy, also exressed frustration. He sometimes semed exasperated, saying that he had lready worked with residents and the ity government to come up with a workble plan.

At a public hearing Thursday, the priary sticking point for city government as the pole's location on the Rosedale dustrial property. Since the Planning ommission approved the project, the ans have changed slightly, with the oposed pole moving to another part of e property.

McCoy has proposed a taller replaceent for the tower on his property to commodate more telecommunications mpanies. He already ran into controrsy when the original 55-foot tower is put up earlier this spring. Residents is mary Renauer and Arn Johnson id no one alerted them that it was comg, and called it an eyesore.

Evan Shepherd of Nextel Communicans, which would have cellular equipent on the tower if it is approved, said tower's power output would be less an 0.8 percent of federal safety guidenes. "There is a wide margin of safety re," said Shepherd.

Independent consultant Peter Polson, 10 was paid by Nextel to appear at the eting, said the FCC guidelines were dorsed by the federal Environmental offection Agency.

He also said that the power emanating from the tower would actually pass over the neighboring houses. Houses 200 feet from it would receive the maximum exposure, he said.

Polson said the 0.8 percent figure is the result of mathematical equations. He said he couldn't take direct power measurements because the new pole hasn't been built.

He also said annual testing could be done to make sure it never violates FCC standards.

Johnson expressed anger that he had fought hard to keep the tower at least 100 feet from his home. "We settled for that because we couldn't get anything better. Now, this will be several feet from us," he said. "It's back in its previous position.

Another neighbor, Kelly Dunaway, said that if the pole were proposed near a public school, "the outcry would be incredible."

According to federal regulations, local communities have authority regarding the aesthetics of a pole, but much less sway when it comes to health issues, as long as power input falls within federal guidelines.

Dunaway expressed her frustration with the rules. "Ugly? I live in a mobile home park," she said. "Beauty is not my concern."

On July 3, the Planning Commission conditionally approved the 70-foot-high pole that would replace the existing 55-foot pole. But the decision was appealed to the council's higher authority.

Since then, the proposal was redrafted and the position of the proposed tower was changed. McCoy said he was trying to keep the pole as far from neighbors as possible. But Johnson and Renauer said the new position was actually closer than ever to their property line.

McCoy said he could move the pole back to its original spot. This seemed to appease most members of the council, but they also wanted specific measurements and drawings showing exactly where the new pole would be.

McCoy said he'd take measurements. The city will take measurements of its own, in response to a neighbor who said she was worried about bias.

The council also took issue with one of the conditions that the planning commission had approved. This condition stated that McCoy could add small devices to