

From: [Gloria Wang Wang](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [Castilleja Expansion](#)
Subject: Please Support Castilleja
Date: Thursday, November 14, 2019 12:38:54 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth and members of City Council,

My name is Gloria Wang Wang and I live in Los Altos, California. I am writing to express my support for Castilleja School's new Master Plan and Conditional Use Permit application.

I am very happy that the DEIR found Castilleja's proposal to be 100% compliant with Palo Alto's Comprehensive Plan. The school and the City predate all of us and have a rich history together. Through this proposal, we hope to create the best possible future for the school, the neighborhood, and the City.

The DEIR supports Castilleja's project in many important and exciting ways, including a new campus design that is more compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood; LEED Platinum Environmental measures that surpass Palo Alto's sustainability goals; a Traffic Demand Management Program that could allow for increased enrollment without increasing daily trips to campus; and an underground garage that is preferred over surface parking.

Castilleja was founded 112 years ago to equalize educational opportunities for women. I support Castilleja because I believe so strongly in their mission to educate young women to become confident thinkers and compassionate leaders in the world. Castilleja is a diverse and inclusive environment that provides a safe environment for girls to learn and develop into honest, curious, and respectful members of our society..

I hope you will support Castilleja as it seeks to modernize its campus and gradually increase high school enrollment while minimizing its impact on the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Gloria Wang

From: [Barbara Kelly](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Re: City says "no" to Downtown North cell towers
Date: Thursday, November 14, 2019 11:10:06 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, Ms. Cormack, Mr. DuBois, Ms. Kniss, Ms. Kou, and Mr. Tanaka,

I was pleased when, in October, City Planning Director Jonathan Lait denied approval to the six cell towers Verizon has applied to install on utility poles in the Downtown North neighborhood. In doing so, he took note of both design and siting inadequacies, and found—as did the Architectural Review Board—that what Verizon has proposed is “not architecturally compatible with the existing sites.” He is right! The ugly towers Verizon proposed have no place in any Palo Alto neighborhood.

It is my understanding that Verizon has appealed Mr. Lait’s decision. I am writing to you to ask you to deny that appeal.

It’s time for Verizon to start designing cell towers and choosing cell tower locations that meet our City’s aesthetic standards. And, as the Architectural Review Board has repeatedly told this company, slapping hundreds of pounds of unsightly equipment on utility poles in residential areas does not meet our City’s aesthetic standards.

Please deny Verizon’s appeal. **And please tell Verizon that your strong preference, as you expressed in unanimously approving Mr. DuBois’s April 15th amendment, is for undergrounded ancillary equipment and for siting that is respectful of the character of our beautiful neighborhoods.**

Thank you,

Barbara Kelly

Washington Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

From: [Chris Robell](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Cell tower setback
Date: Sunday, December 8, 2019 5:16:24 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth and Council Members

I have recently learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th. Twenty feet is only three to four feet longer than the average car. How can that be an acceptable distance for a cell tower from a home?

In April, City Council specifically asked Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides greater protections for Palo Alto residents. But the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment right next to our homes.

It is true that City Staff have prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." But since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception is granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

Please do not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,
Chris Robell
Old Palo Alto resident

From: [Ollia Yenikomshian](mailto:ollia.yenikomshian@cpscstaff.com)
To: [Planning Commission](mailto:Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org)
Subject: Fwd: Concerning Situation
Date: Thursday, November 14, 2019 11:33:06 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Ollia Yenikomshian
Executive Director
Children's Preschool Center
4000 Middlefield Road, T-1
Palo Alto, CA 94303
T-650-493-5770
F-650-493-0736
email: ollia@cpscstaff.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ollia Yenikomshian** <ollia@cpscstaff.com>
Date: Thu, Nov 14, 2019 at 11:33 AM
Subject: Concerning Situation
To: <[lanning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org)>

Hello Members of the Planning and Transportation Commission,

I am writing to advise of a serious concern regarding traffic and safety traffic and young children at Middlefield Road at the Mese turn.

read with enthusiasm that you will be making changes at Middlefield and Charleston, this ming.

We are witnessing another problem, er than simply too many cars on the road.

We have about 140 children at our preschool at Cubberley, along with children entering and exiting both Greendell and the Junior Museum Parking lot areas. Families heading north on Middlefield need to make the left turn into the parking loots on a green light. However there is not enough time between cars running even a yellow light heading southbound.

Our families are asking for a green arrow turn signal to be put at that location.

Can you please advise me of the process to get this evaluated and completed? Should we start a petition to have someone in transportation look into this, or will this email iibegin a process of evaluation?

I am happy to sit down with someone to explain more in detail, too.

Thanks so much and kindly advise,,
Ollia

Ollia Yenikomshian
Executive Director
Children's Preschool Center
4000 Middlefield Road, T-1
Palo Alto, CA 94303
T-650-493-5770
F-650-493-0736
email: ollia@cpscstaff.com

From: [Magic](#)
To: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: Cellular communications equipment
Date: Sunday, December 8, 2019 8:31:07 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Councilmembers,

Telecommunications providers can offer Palo Altans quality services without placing cell towers and associated equipment in residential neighborhoods. Residents have expressed a clear preference that this infrastructure be prohibited in our neighborhoods.

Rather than open a door to endless bickering strongly influenced by industry lobbyists about what warrants an exception, please adopt a resolution and ordinance that state in clear and unequivocal terms with no exceptions that all cellular towers and associated equipment must be at least 100' away from all residential zones in the city.

Thank you for considering this request.

With appreciation,

David Schrom

***** Magic, 1979-2019: forty years of valuescience leadership *****

Magic demonstrates how people can address individual, social, and environmental ills nearer their roots by applying science to discern value more accurately and realize it more fully.

Enjoy the satisfaction of furthering Magic's work by making one-time or recurring gifts at <http://ecomagic.org/participate.shtml#contribute>. Magic is a 501(c)(3) public charity. Contributions are tax-deductible to the full extent permitted by law.

THANK YOU!

www.ecomagic.org ----- [\(650\) 323-7333](tel:6503237333) ----- Magic, Box 15894, Stanford, CA 94309

From: [Kelly Chang](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#); [Colby](#)
Subject: DON'T APPROVE 20 FT SETBACK FOR CELL TOWERS!! - we need 100 feet setback
Date: Sunday, December 8, 2019 9:06:42 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

I have recently learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th. Twenty feet is only three to four feet longer than the average car. How can that be an acceptable distance for a cell tower from a home? **As an example, there is currently a telephone pole that is roughly 20+ feet away from my 2 boys' second story bedroom window. Mrs. Cormack has been to my house herself and can attest to how close and inappropriate it is for 2 young children (ages 4 and 1) to grow up in a house where there will be potentially harmful and noisy cell boxes installed directly outside their bedroom windows. They will be sleeping in these rooms for the next 15-18 years of their lives. Please do not make their home unhealthy for them. Aside from potentially harmful EMF exposure, these cell towers do make a consistent humming noise. In the summer, a lot of families have to open the window to stay cool and will not be able to "avoid the noise" made by these towers. I can't imagine my oldest son having to start kindergarten next August having to sleep through a consistent humming sound for the rest of his childhood summers. Let's please be reasonable and make our children's quality of life and health a first priority!**

In April, City Council specifically asked Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides greater protections for Palo Alto residents. But the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment right next to our homes.

It is true that City Staff have prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." But since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception is granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

Please do not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Kelly and Colby Ranger

2085 Emerson Street

From: [Dena Seki](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Letter for City Council
Date: Sunday, December 8, 2019 8:44:19 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

I have recently learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th. Twenty feet is only three to four feet longer than the average car. How can that be an acceptable distance for a cell tower from a home?

In April, City Council specifically asked Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides greater protections for Palo Alto residents. But the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment right next to our homes.

It is true that City Staff have prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." But since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception is granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

Please do not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Dena Seki

From: [Lynn Hollyn](#)
To: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: NO EXCEPTIONS PLEASE
Date: Sunday, December 8, 2019 6:10:55 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

Most of us have chosen to live in Palo Alto because of the trees, quiet and safety. As we walk, we see and feel nature. Cell towers are absolutely an invasion of this prized neighborhood, and proximity of 20 feet is unacceptable to our health and well-being.

Twenty feet is less than the setback for most homes, this proximity will create the feeling the tower in is our front yard. We must help the earth, the environment and all life by keeping our firm stance against cell towers less than 100 feet from a home. Additionally, it will cause property values to drop.

Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry concede to the aesthetic and well-being values of the Palo Alto neighborhood.

Thank you for supporting this great community.

Best regards,

Lynn Hollyn

455 Seale Avenue

--

lynn.hollyn
www.lynnhollyn.com

1.650.799.1129

From: [Luce, Gwen](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architctural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Revised Wireless Resolution
Date: Sunday, December 8, 2019 8:20:13 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Coldwell Banker 	Gwen Luce, Realtor®	Coldwell Banker 	
	DRE License #00879652 Direct Line: 650.566.5343 gluce@cbnorcal.com		
			

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

I have recently learned that the City Staff is asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th. As 20 feet is only 3-4 feet longer than the average car, how can that be an acceptable distance for a cell tower from a home?

Last April, City Council specifically asked the City Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides *greater* protections for Palo Alto residents. However, the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their noisy, ugly and potentially hazardous equipment right next to our homes!

I am grateful that the City Staff has prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." However, since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception *is* granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

I implore you to not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Gwen Luce

Gwen Luce

650-566-5343

gluce@cbnorcal.com

www.gwenluce.com

Powered by [e-Letterhead](#)

***Wire Fraud is Real*. Before wiring any money, call the intended recipient at a number you know is valid to confirm the instructions.** Additionally, please note that the sender does not have authority to bind a party to a real estate contract via written or verbal communication.

From: [Celia Boyle](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Revised Wireless Resolution-No on 20 foot setback. Yes on a proposed 100 foot setback.
Date: Monday, December 9, 2019 10:05:39 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

We have recently learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th. This is not an acceptable distance.

In April, City Council specifically asked Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides greater protections for Palo Alto residents. But the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment directly next to our homes.

It is true that City Staff have prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." But since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception is granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

Please do not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration and we will see you at the City Council meeting on December 16,

Celia Boyle and Jay Hopkins
Barron Park,
Palo Alto

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [French, Amy](#); [Atkinson, Rebecca](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Clerk, City](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [UAC](#); board@pausd.org
Subject: Wireless Hot Topic Page Updated
Date: Friday, December 6, 2019 4:05:47 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Amy and Rebecca,

Thank you for letting me know that the Wireless Hot Topics Webpage has been updated and that, other than the upcoming consideration of the revised Wireless Resolution by Council, there is no additional wireless-related news. I was glad to see the Update.

Will you now be updating the page as you did in the past, that is, will you now be systematically reporting on cell tower application submissions, resubmissions, reviews, approvals, appeals, hearings, permits, installations, compliance reports, tolling agreements, shot clock extensions and the like?

As always, thank you for your help.

Jeanne

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: 20 foot setback a gift to telecom companies
Date: Monday, December 9, 2019 2:51:34 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

I have recently learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th. Twenty feet is only three to four feet longer than the average car. How can that be an acceptable distance for a cell tower from a home?

In April, City Council specifically asked Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides greater protections for Palo Alto residents. But the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment right next to our homes.

It is true that City Staff have prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." But since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception is granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

Please do not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-151

From: [Annette Rahn](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Cell Tower 20 Foot Setback
Date: Monday, December 9, 2019 10:29:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

I have recently learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th.

Twenty feet is only three to four feet longer than the average car. How can that be an acceptable distance for a cell tower from a home?

In April, City Council specifically asked Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides greater protections for Palo Alto residents. But the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment right next to our homes.

It is true that City Staff have prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." But since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception is granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

Please do not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Annette Rahn

From: [Leo Povolotsky](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#); [Jeanne Fleming](#)
Subject: Cell Tower Update_for tonight"s CC meeting_Please NO Exceptions!
Date: Monday, December 9, 2019 6:28:00 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka,

I have recently learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences, a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution you will be considering on December 16th. Twenty feet is only three to four feet longer than the average car. How can that be an acceptable distance for a cell tower from a home?

In April, City Council specifically asked Staff to prepare this revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy so that it provides greater protections for Palo Alto residents. But the proposed 20 foot setback does the opposite of serving residents' interests. It opens the door for the telecom industry to put their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment right next to our homes.

It is true that City Staff have prepared a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements that residents want. One is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." But since exceptions are permitted, residents need to be protected when an exception is granted—protected from having a cell tower installed only a little more than a car length away from their homes.

Please do not establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish instead a **no-exceptions 100 foot setback**. One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecommunications industry make to the aesthetic standards of Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Leo Povolotsky
Palo Alto resident of 28 years

From: [Rebecca Sanders](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: December 11 - 470 Olive Avenue
Date: Tuesday, December 10, 2019 8:00:37 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Planning & Transportation Commissioners:

I object to the granting of any extension of the amortization of the non-conforming uses at 470 Olive Avenue period:

1. First of all, what about housing? We need housing. Send a clear signal to this applicant and other property owners who are watching. We're serious about preserving "R" zones.
2. The City previously denied any extension. Why is the applicant back? To wear down staff and commissioners and to waste their time. There is no cost to trying again.
3. The property has been in violation of the zoning since 1998. Why should cheaters prosper?
4. Instead of doing what the applicant wants, why don't we fine the applicant in accordance with the law? The applicant has been in violation for years. Why has no penalty been assessed? Such license encourages this property owner and others to continue violating the law, because for them, there are no consequences to not obeying the law.
5. Finally, let the applicant find a legal use for their current property in its R-1 zone and still pursue multifamily housing. They don't need the extension to do that. If they are granted an extension, this precedent will mean that all applicants in poor standing will cry "multi-family" housing in order to get a similar deal.

If you feel you must give the benefit of the doubt to the applicant, then charge them the penalty for the next two years and put it in escrow. And then if no multi-family housing in two years, then the penalty stands.

We are looking to you to uphold the law, live up to the highest standards and to keep faith with the people who elected the council who appointed you.

Thank you.

Rebecca Sanders
Ventura Neighborhood

From: [Suzanne Keehn](#)
To: [Council, City; Planning Commission; Shikada, Ed; City Council](#)
Subject: Fw: [WAPF-SouthBay] Important Court Ruling regarding FCC and Wireless Small Cell Deployments
Date: Monday, December 9, 2019 7:55:41 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

To the Palo Alto City Council, Planning Commission, and City Manager,

There is an important new regulation regarding installation of "small cell antenna" in our neighborhood

The new Federal Court Ruling is requiring Verizon and others to comply with a re- assessment of environmental impact

Please read details below as this needs to be implemented in our communities.

-

Whoa! This is huge! I was actually pulled into a FB discussion in Willow Glen on 5G and pleasantly surprised to see many concerned. This is a great thing to share!

On Tue, Nov 19, 2019 at 12:12 PM Stephanie Vargo swalker@craterdiver.com [WAPF-SouthBay] <WAPF-SouthBay@yahogroups.com> wrote:

All,

This is an important update regarding a recent court ruling that now requires environmental impact assessments for wireless small cell deployments.

Any application for a wireless small cell deployment after August 2019, is now incomplete and needs to be resubmitted with the environmental impact assessment.

Please use the letter below and send to your local City Council members so they have this important information to help them with any current small cell deployment applications.

-Stephanie
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:



The FCC Gets It Wrong on "Small Cells" *(and why this may significantly set back the nationwide 5G rollout)*

Dear Friend,

Every once in a while we have **good news to share**, and this is one of those times!

The [FCC has been reprimanded](#) by the Washington DC Federal Court of Appeals for overstepping its authority, and now, **most pending applications for "small cell" antennas in your community will need to be revised and re-submitted for consideration.**



Here's the story:

There is a federal law called the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) which requires all federal agencies, like the FCC, to analyze and report on the environmental impact of any major action it takes.

Pretty much every application to install an antenna requires some type of [environmental impact assessment](#). So the FCC delegates the responsibility of conducting an environmental assessment to the wireless companies and their contractors that install the antennas.

In 2017, wireless companies complained that the NEPA process was expensive, time-consuming, and unnecessary. So the [FCC decided to release wireless companies from submitting the environmental analyses required under NEPA in March of 2018](#).

"Not so fast," said the Judges in Federal Court in Washington DC. The court ruled that the tremendous deployment of "small cell" antennas could have major environmental impacts. Now, the wireless companies *have* to do NEPA analyses for "small cells" whether they like it or not. You can read the final court decision [here](#).

Lawyers are still scratching their heads about whether or not "small cells" that were approved and/or installed without the proper NEPA paperwork need to be redone. We will keep you informed as events unfold.

So as of right now, what's the bottom-line? All *pending* applications for "small cell" antenna permits may need to be redone and re-submitted with the proper environmental assessments.

Take Action:

Today we're asking that you please spread the news about the recent NEPA court decision by calling or emailing any of your local officials who may be considering applications for "small cells."

Sample Email to Your Local Officials:

Dear ___City of Palo Alto_____,

I wanted to bring to your attention a recent court decision by the Washington DC Circuit Court of Appeals that vacates a recent FCC order to exempt "small cell" wireless installations from the environmental review process required by the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA).

As per the August 2019 ruling, any application for a "small cell" installation is incomplete if it does not include the required NEPA assessment.

***In your email, include *this link to the court order*.**

Thank you for you consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely, _Suzanne Keehn 4076 Orme St. 94306_____

Thanks for all you do!

- The 5G Crisis team

[Donate](#)



Copyright © '5G Crisis.' All rights reserved.

Contact us:

Email report@5gcrisis.com

Call 516-883-0887

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).

Posted by: Pamela Lau <wapf.siliconvalley2@gmail.com>

[Reply via web post](#)

• [Reply to sender](#)

• [Reply to group](#)

• [Start a New Topic](#)

• [Messages in this topic \(2\)](#)

[VISIT YOUR GROUP](#)

Yahoo! Groups



• [Privacy](#) • [Unsubscribe](#) • [Terms of Use](#)

--

From: [Jim Herriot](#)
To: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; [Clerk, City](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: Please NO 100 foot exceptions on cell towers!
Date: Monday, December 9, 2019 12:08:52 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

To the honorable Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou, Tanaka,

Please please don't allow any exceptions to the 100 foot minimum on cell towers' proximity to residences! (Even 100 ft is too close!)

Recent medical studies reported in medical journals now tell us that electromagnetic radiation from cell towers is indeed injuring public health. We're seeing significant patterns of illnesses. As I'm sure you know, this is quite serious.

Also, note that as dangerous as 4G cell towers are, the coming of 5G is even worse. Please assure me and other Palo Alto residents that our city will not allow 5G.

Thanks,
Jim Herriot

784 Rosewood Drive
Palo Alto, CA 94303

From: [Annette Fazzino](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); alisonlcormack@cityofpaloalto.org
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#); board@pausd.org
Subject: Wireless Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, December 10, 2019 9:01:07 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, and Councilmembers Cormack, DuBois, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka:

Oh, dear. I have learned that City Staff are asking you to approve a 20 foot setback for cell towers from residences. This is included as a provision that is part of the revised Wireless Resolution that you, as Council, will be considering on December 16th. Twenty feet is only a yard or so longer than the average car length. In essence, twenty feet is a parking spot; it is certainly not a setback.

When I look at my children, I realize that twenty feet is also the length of my son, cloned twice, and placed end to end with him--3 lengths of my 12 year-old. How can 20 feet possibly be an acceptable distance for a cell tower to be placed near our home?

I was optimistic in April when City Council asked Staff to prepare a revised Wireless Resolution in order to update the City's wireless policy. The instructions and discussions at the time were to provide greater protections for Palo Alto residents. Unfortunately, a twenty foot setback does not protect Palo Alto residents at all. Rather, it opens the door for the telecom industry to place their ugly, noisy, and potentially hazardous equipment right next to my house and so many other homes. This is not right.

In fact, City Staff did prepare a revised Wireless Resolution that includes many important elements. One important provision that residents wanted to be included is the provision that cell towers may not be located in any residential zone unless the City grants the cell tower applicant an "exception." I am appreciative of the efforts of City Staff; however, I am concerned about protections that are granted when an exception comes into play. We need to be protected from having a cell tower installed 20 feet away.

Twenty feet is not enough. It's a car length. It is 3 Matthews (my son) end-to-end. Do NOT establish a 20 foot setback. Please establish what was preliminarily agreed to on April 15th--**a 100 foot setback with NO exceptions.** One hundred feet is a more than reasonable accommodation to insist that the telecoms make to the aesthetic standards of our beautiful Palo Alto.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Annette Evans Fazzino
(650) 799-7414

