

Miyuki Yokoyama

From: Larry Friedberg <larry.friedberg@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 2:55 PM
To: Miyuki Yokoyama
Cc: Shawn Christianson; Al Royse; Jay Benton; Larry May; Marie Chuang; Ann Ritzma; Larry Friedberg
Subject: Public Comment for 9/14/20 Town Council Meeting
Attachments: HTC-Meeting-09.14.20-Friedberg(Public_Comment).docx

Hi Miyuki,

Below and attached please find my public comment for this evening's Town Council meeting. Please enter it into the public record. Thank you.

Larry

Hillsborough Town Council Meeting – Public Comment

September 14, 2020

My name is Larry Friedberg and I live at 870 Longview Road.

Council Members,

The Town's 2018 denial of the 16 Crown Castle towers was totally justified and backed by substantial evidence. But now the Town has breached its duty to the citizens by capitulating to Crown Castle and conceding to an unfavorable settlement and tacitly agreeing to weaken the design standards.

The City Manager's initial denial was supported by "substantial evidence" contained in the staff report from the following sources:

Staff input. The staff prepared a "node-by-node" analysis of the 16 sites and identified hundreds of individual violations, including 207 specific violations of the wireless design standards ordinance alone.

Legal counsel advice.

CTC advice and input: "In summary, in light of our analysis and the relevant portions of the Hillsborough Municipal Code requiring the consideration of factors such as whether the applicant's proposal "is the least intrusive means of closing" a "significant gap," we believe that Crown Castle, in its application, has not adequately explored technically feasible alternatives that may be less intrusive and more consistent with the character of the community."

WCAC unanimous recommendation and findings: "After much discussion, the WCAC unanimously agreed that the City Manager's denial with Contingencies should be upheld and, further to that, that all 16 applications should be denied unconditionally and without any contingencies."

Thousands of pages of input from citizens, including land use planners, real estate agents, and lawyers.

The City Manager and the Town Council found that Crown Castle's application violated ALL of the 6 substantive factors governing application review, any SINGLE violation of which is fatal to the application. The City Manager and the Council determined that the Crown Castle applications violated the general plan's edict to preserve the Town's rural character, the need to close a significant gap with the least intrusive means, the design standards citing 207 specific violations, the public's use of the right-of-way, the need for utility box approval, and the need to consider alternative designs.

So not only should the settlement agreement be invalidated because it was the product of illegal closed-door legislative deliberations, but it should be rejected on its own terms because Hillsborough's denial of the towers is bullet-proof. It is an abdication of the Town's duty of loyalty to the citizens to make concessions when the Town's denial was so obviously righteous in every respect.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry

Miyuki Yokoyama

From: Gary Goodman <MobileInvestors@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 3:15 PM
To: Ann Ritzma; Miyuki Yokoyama
Subject: September 14th City Council Meeting

Please put the following comments into the "public comment" record for tonight's meeting:

We continue to be beyond frustrated with the cell plan "endorsed" by the city. We would like to understand from the council why something as important as a permanent structure in excess of 32 feet would not require a story pole and neighborhood input. I believe the story poles were discussed by the cell advisory committee (Eric Nyhus) and they deemed it logistically difficult to install story poles based upon the necessity for guy wires. There are other engineering solutions to accomplish a temporary story pole....the city (and the cell advisory committee) must investigate these options....especially when the cost of the story pole is absorbed by the applicant and there are a limited number of installations.

The newly proposed cellular pole plan is in direct conflict with not only the design standards we so vehemently worked on implementing 2 years ago, but also demonstrates a lack of leadership and creativity in this critical time. The Hillsborough ordinance has emphasized the underground use of utilities because of sight lines, eyesores and visual noise. The proposed pole at 3467 Ralston violates every esthetic standard that exists in our city.

- 1) We have ZERO overhead utilities in our area.
- 2) The sight lines heading west while driving (up) Ralston will present a shocking monolith standing alone and rising far above all existing trees and structures.
- 3) The oversized cabinet that houses the equipment is above ground (not buried) and will be highly visible at eye level to cars traveling on Ralston in both directions.
- 4) All homeowners who built/remodeled homes in this area have been held to the standard of buried utilities and height restrictions.
- 5) No story pole has been constructed (or planned) to demonstrate the impact/context of the proposed pole.

We are in FAVOR of quality cell coverage and we are not against poles if they are the only viable option. What we are against is a shroud of secrecy for something so important to our community, especially after the widespread outcry from hundreds of our citizens looking for a better solution.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary and Lynn Goodman
3480 Ralston
25 year residents