

To whom this may concern:

I am writing this on behalf of my Husband and myself. We are in STRONG opposition to the unsightly antenna farm that has been constructed at 370 Panamint Road. My family and I are directly affected by this monstrosity. We live two properties down from the farm, and reside at 390 Panamint Road.

How we came to claim residency in the Highlands - After searching for property to build a house on, my husband and I fell in love with the Virginia City Highlands area. We loved the idea of the wide open space, tight knit community and a wonderful environment to raise a family in. After looking at many properties, we came to settle on a parcel that we both felt like it was meant to be for our future home. We purchased this piece of property in 2003 and built our home with our four hands and the help and support of our wonderful family and friends. When we purchased our property, there were two antennas that could be seen from our property. We knew that they were there, and figured we could live with the two that could be seen. I have enclosed a picture taken in 2003 when we purchased our property (see Exhibit A). You can clearly see there were ONLY two towers and they were not that far above the tree line. I took care to read the CC & R's and there was wording in there that said nothing over 15 ft above the roofline of the house. I knew that every structure needed the Architectural Committees review and figured that everyone that lived in the community and signed the same paperwork we did, would have to follow the same rules, codes and laws as we were required to follow. Boy were we wrong in thinking that! It seems that they only apply to certain people.

Staff-Report 2011-010 dated 2/18/2011 states *"While the existing amateur radio antenna towers are in fact visible to the neighboring areas, they do not appear to cause detriment or otherwise impact the "quality of life that presently exists in the residential area."*. I would like to suggest that all of the neighboring properties affected directly by the Antenna Farm be visited by the commission for a full effect of the actions and inconsideration of the Taormina's. In particular, addresses along Panamint Road, Highland Road and Saddleback Road. Some of the views have absolutely been destroyed and deserve the courtesy of an onsite visit. I don't mean just driving to the driveway. The view must be viewed from the actual residence.

After making some financial decisions, my Husband and I decided to try and sell our house back in 2007-2008. We did finally come to our senses and realized that we did not want to move and took our house off the market. On a few different occasions while the house was listed the antennas had become an issue. A realtor was to show our property on a couple different occasions to two separate clients. The clients of the realtor did not even want to drive up the driveway to look at the house because of the display of antennas behind the property. On another occasion a perspective buyer drove up our driveway while we were home, and specifically asked us "do those things glow at night?" (see Exhibit B).

It is said that they do not affect the quality of life? How is that so? There is interference caused by the towers. Interference has affected items from baby monitors, wireless cellular phones to internet service. While there is a process of filing complaints with the FCC, this is not something that most of the neighbors have the time or energy to deal with or really should have to deal with in a residential neighborhood just so someone could have a "hobby". Have the Taormina's EVER come to any of the neighbors to discuss upcoming plans and impact that they

may have on them? NEVER!!!! All of a sudden we blink and there is a new tower erected or extended. Enough is enough!!

This farm is not only an eyesore, but, it is a danger to the community. All of the neighboring houses and all of Highlands are directly affected by the towers. Panamint Road and Highland Road are designated to be fire/fuel breaks for the Highlands. These homes CAN NOT properly be defended in the case of a forest fire. If a helicopter with a bucket is used, they WILL NOT fly around the area of the towers and therefore compromising the ability to defend the homes and community. Knowing that fire is a highly probable threat, I want Storey County to give my family and my neighbors a guarantee that all of our homes and properties can and will be properly protected with the towers standing like they are, or even higher. Also, NONE of the erected towers have ever had building permits, they are all in direct violation of the many Storey County Codes, and have NEVER been approved by the HRPOA Architectural Committee. Is Storey County willing to accept responsibility for the safety of the Highlands residences so that someone can have a "hobby"? I have an email in my possession dated July 2, 2008 from a conversation that Tom Taormina had with Phyllis Blake in regards to the encroachment Tom had on the Blake property. In it Tom states *"If anyone but a tower professional tampers with the guy wires, the tower WILL collapse on itself, throw wire in [sic] steel in random directions and someone could be killed. There are also times when that array has lethal voltages present."* (see exhibit G). Really? In a residential neighborhood? What about acts of God – earthquake, wind, fire? Or even wild animals? He has no control over that. To interpret Tom's words, these towers are DANGEROUS!! I have included a petition that was signed by 106 Storey County residents that are in agreement that they oppose the antenna farm and want something to be done about it. (see separately attached Exhibit I)

PRB-1 does say that the county cannot place unreasonable accommodation but rather that it must reasonably accommodate amateur communications. It does not say that the Taormina's can do whatever they want to do. There is also wording in PRB-1 that gives the County rights to protect the majority of its citizens.

I would like to reference the Staff Report dated 2/18/2011 again.

Page 18, item 10 - *"Reduced setbacks for guy wires, anchor points, and other appurtenances of the tower system shall be subject to the approval of the Storey County Building Department."* Why is this allowed? These setbacks are there for a reason. If a person cannot properly construct a structure within the confines of the codes and laws, then maybe that person shouldn't be able to build it. Why is the Storey County Building Department the ones that will determine if this is allowed? They (SCBD) are the ones that have allowed the Taormina's and the County to get to this point that we are at today. There needs to be some sort of over-site on this. Currently there are wires buried along the property lines, guy anchors are directly at or very close to property lines (one guy base is even questionably crossing the rear line). The towers could not stand safely without the use of guy wires, therefore they should be treated the same as the "structure" they are supporting. These are in direct violation of SCC 17.40.050. (see Exhibits C & D)

Tower #1 that was supposedly erected in 1997 was raised up to 140' on July 17, 2008. This is one day after being issued a Code Inspection Report on permit #8354 stating that *"Owner has been advised that Storey County now is of the opinion that a Special Use Permit is required for the construction of towers over 45' in height, that towers are defined as structures in Storey County*

Code and therefore are subject to set-back requirements. A Special Use Permit has not been applied for at this time. Owner has been advised that continued construction of tower components is at own risk, and that the erection of towers over 45' in height with anchors encroaching set-backs may not be approved by Storey County Officials." (see Exhibit H) So, The Taormina's WERE fully aware of what they were doing and knew exactly what they were trying to get away with (see Exhibits E & F). This tower should NOT be allowed to stay in its present state. I would also request that the back lot line be inspected to verify (by someone other than the building department) that there are no trespasses on the rear property line, by law there should be a 40' set-back here, but that, and so many other things seem to not apply to the Taormina's. The property owner of that vacant lot does not live in-state and his rights need to still be protected, he, too, has signed the homeowner CC&R contract.

Please note that the wording for tower height was taken out of the HRPOA CC&R's in 2003 as a direct result of the Storey County Code 17.12.044 that went into effect in 1999. The HRPOA figured that the Storey County Codes would handle the height restriction and that they would still be able to sign off on any sort of construction requiring a permit since it would have to be submitted to the Architectural Committee prior to approval. This was NEVER done and the association has NEVER approved any such construction.

Whatever happened to following the laws that have been set forth? If the laws are (knowingly) not followed, they should be REQUIRED to be followed. The laws and codes are stated very clearly and there should be no question that the Taormina's ARE in direct violation of several county codes. If these existing towers are allowed to stay or new ones to be erected, what kind of precedence does this set for the rest of the community and county? What is it going to be next???

With all of that being said, we respectfully ask for the Commission to act in favor of the majority of the people that they represent and not to allow any new towers to be erected, I would also ask that the presently illegal standing towers be reduced in size to accommodate the best interest of the community's safety, aesthetics and well being.

Thank you for your time,

Michelle Adkins & Greg Adkins
(775) 847-7097
390 Panamint Road
VC Highlands, NV 89521



Exhibit A: 390 Panamint Road, clearly only 2 antennas shown (January 4, 2003)



Exhibit B: 390 Panamint Road, clearly more than 2 antennas shown. Would you want to buy with that in the background? (July 11, 2008)



Exhibit C: Guy wire in violation of easement codes.



Exhibit D: Another easement violation. Back SE corner of 370 Panamint. When this hole was dug, they actually exposed the side of the original property pin. I believe that is a big No No in itself!!



Exhibit E: Crane working away on tower #1 – doubling the size after being warned the day before that a SUP would be required.



Exhibit F: One day after being warned on that a SUP would be required for over 45 ft. the tower doubled in size. (July 17, 2008)

Exhibit G:

----- Original Message -----

From: [Tom Taormina](#)

To: '[Phyllis Blake](#)'

Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2008 5:33 PM

Subject: RE: Remediation Plan

The reimbursement check will be mailed this week. I would advise against your second option. If anyone but a tower professional tampers with the guy wires, the tower WILL collapse on itself, throw wire in steel in random directions and someone could be killed. There are also times when that array has lethal voltages present.

Tom Taormina, CMC, CMQ/OE

The Taormina Group, Inc.

Storey County Building Department
 P O Box 526 ~ VIRGINIA CITY, NV 89440 ~ (702) 847-0966

Permit #: 8354

Requested: 7/15/08

Ready: 7/16/08

CODE COMPLIANCE INSPECTION REPORT

Site Address: 370 Panamint APN #003-431-18		Area: HR	Lot / Blk 37
Owner: Taormina	Contractor: OB		

INSPECTION(S) REQUESTED:

1. <input type="checkbox"/> Footing <input type="checkbox"/> Stemwall <input type="checkbox"/> Ready to Pour Concrete - Forms in, UFER Ground, Reinf. Stl. In-Place		
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Floor Joists - Mud Sill, J-Bolts and Blocking In as Required; Rough Plumbing Installed		
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Roof Sheet Nailing - Nail Spacing and Sheathing Spacing		
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Framed Complete - Plumbing thru roof, Elect. Boxes in, Wire Pulled, Heating, Gas Piping, Roof Shingled, Siding On, Dry In		
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Insulation a. <input type="checkbox"/> Batts b. <input type="checkbox"/> Blown - CERTIFICATION Required		
6. <input type="checkbox"/> Sheet Rock Nailing		
7. <input type="checkbox"/> Ready to Occupy - a. Sheetrock Finished b. Plumbing c. Electrical d. Heating and e. Grading All Completed		
<input type="checkbox"/> Electrical	<input type="checkbox"/> Electric Service Connections	<input type="checkbox"/> Fuel Burning Stove
<input type="checkbox"/> Mechanical	<input type="checkbox"/> Excavation & Grading	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition
<input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing	<input type="checkbox"/> Foundation	<input type="checkbox"/> Exterior Gas

~ REINSPECTIONS ~

NOTE: It shall be the duty of the person doing the work authorized by a permit to notify the Building Department that such work is ready for inspection and to provide access to and means for Proper Inspection of such work. A re-inspection fee will be assessed for each inspection when such Portion of work for which Inspection is called is not complete or when corrections called for are not made.

Condition of Construction at this Inspection:

- A. Meets ALL Requirements for this INSPECTION C. Non-Compliance - Builder Will Comply Without Delay
 B. Substitutions or Deviations D. Non-Compliance - Builder Does NOT Intend to Comply
 E. Dwelling is habitable, however the following corrections MUST be completed by

Comments: **Inspection of Concrete Base and Anchors for New Towers.**

Owner has been advised that Storey County now is of the opinion that a Special Use Permit is required for the construction of towers over 45' in height, that towers are defined as structures in Storey County Code and therefore are subject to set-back requirements. A Special Use Permit has not been applied for at this time. Owner has been advised that continued construction of tower components is at own risk, and that the erection of towers over 45' in height with anchors encroaching set-backs may not be approved by Storey County Officials.

New Tower Base @ North side of Home = Depth and width according to engineered plans. Rebar cage according to engineered plans. Grounding for tower according to engineered plans.

Tower Anchors for 2 New Towers = Depth and width according to engineered plans. Rebar cages according to engineered plans. Two of the anchors inspected are located adjacent to the property lines as identified and encroach upon set-backs required for structures.

CERTIFICATION - I certify that I have inspected the above property and have reported herein all conditions observed at this time and date to be in variance with any Storey County Ordinances, the U.B.C., and the approved plans and specs.

7/16/08 8:00 a.m.

Inspection Date/Time

Shannon Gardner 7/16/08

Shannon Gardner, Inspector

Mileage:49791

Rev 01-06-04

Exhibit H: The Taormina's were advised and still proceeded with extending tower #1 another 70 ft.