

From: [Andrea Wamsley](#)
To: [Al Royse](#); [Christine Krolik](#); [Marie Chuang](#); [Sophie Cole](#); [Larry May](#)
Cc: [Lisa Natusch](#); [Ann Ritzma](#)
Subject: Special City Council Meeting May 27, 2021-Crown Castle Wireless Applications for H05M2: 720 Chateau
Date: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 11:24:15 AM

Comments below should be entered onto the record at the May 27, 2021 Town Council Meeting Regarding Crown Castle Applications for H05M2: 720 Chateau.

Dear Hillsborough Town Council,

We are writing regarding the May 27, 2021 Town Meeting regarding the proposed Crown Castle cell tower at H05M2: 720 Chateau. We must urge Council to **REJECT** the Crown Castle applications for the following reasons:

- **The Town is violating its own laws.** It is obvious that the Town and the City Manager are refusing to enforce the existing Hillsborough design standards. The very design standards that Hillsborough's own lawyers drafted two years ago to conform to Federal law. Why would the Town Council allow for a 35 foot tower when you have a standard for no more than 32 feet? Additionally, the pole base is 50% too large and the pole antenna volume is 50%+ larger. It is unlawful for Council to vote to approve these applications that violate and exceed our existing law!
- **Insufficient setback requirements.** We know that the Town could place the towers a minimum of 150 feet from homes without significant changes to the original Crown Castle plan. Yet, you will not work with Town citizens to look for options to the Crown Castle plan. Los Altos Hills, which has a similar topography to Hillsborough allows for 200 foot setbacks. Why won't our Council push hard for similar setbacks? It is clear that the Town of Hillsborough is taking the easy route with Crown Castle as opposed to doing the real work and using science to find appropriate locations for cell towers.
- **Negative impact on property values.** The Crown Castle plan would put cookie-cutter towers too close to our homes (as close as 25 feet), resulting in irreparable harm to property values (anywhere from 10% - 20% impact based on public comments from leading Hillsborough realtors) and unsightliness.
- **Dangerously precedent-setting.** If Town Council allows these towers to go up, the installations pave the way to a propagation of more cookie cutter towers throughout Hillsborough. This will be because the Town will have established a precedent that other carriers will cite as they bring their same cookie-cutter poles into our town.

We all want better cell coverage; however, Crown Castle's plan is absolutely horrible for Hillsborough. There is a better way, but only if the Town is willing to do the hard work while keeping the charm and aesthetics of Hillsborough.

Sincerely,
Andrea Wamsley and Pasit Phiasivongsa



Lisa Natusch

Subject: FW: Cell Towers

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 12:58 PM

To: Natalie Gribben <ngribben@hillsborough.net>; Lisa Natusch <lnatusch@HILLSBOROUGH.NET>; Sarah Fleming <sfleming@HILLSBOROUGH.NET>; Doug Belcik <dbelcik@HILLSBOROUGH.NET>

Subject: Re: Cell Towers

Hi Natalie,

So sorry, I transposed a couple numbers. It should be [REDACTED]! I appreciate your effort to get back to me. Feel free to call back.

I have copied Lisa, Sarah and Doug on this email. (Lisa you can use the information that follows with my private information redacted. Want to make sure to get into the record) Thank you.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Hillsborough, CA

ph. [REDACTED]

Questions/Comments:

Where specifically may I find information on the removal of trees. Is it in the agenda, in the Crown Castle report, or in another meeting agenda....please direct me. I did find reference in the table following the Agenda Staff Report (May 27, 2021) which is noted in the table as page "2 of3" in column one as "E10 of resolution 19-03," but it does not address what I am referring to in which trees are removed in advance of Town approval. If a tree were surreptitiously removed before official approval of the location and CEQA, what are the consequences? Is a company allowed to come into the Town and begin to remove trees for its own benefit. This impacts wildlife, the neighborhood, and the overall environment. There is no reference to these non-street trees in the table. How is this handled particularly if trees are ancient and not located along a street. We have beautiful old-growth trees in Hillsborough that need to be protected.

Also see on page 9-10 of the Crown Castle (CC) report that the greatest RF exposure is at or near the base of the antennae mounting structure and horizontally at an elevated location near the antenna (p 11 of the CC report). H07 is located along Easton which is in close proximity to an elementary school and under which children and other pedestrians pass the base and under the antenna daily. This concern also is relevant to any cell towers located close to homes and gardens where families enjoy the outdoors of their front and backyards close to the base of a cell structure. Their bedrooms and other living spaces may be in close proximity, which is made even closer, when these rooms are on a second or third story where people sleep and other human habitation takes place for many hours each day and night near the horizontal location of RH exposure of cell tower antennas.

Beyond what is convenient (access, coverage area), are the identified locations truly safe. Are they the best locations for health and safety. Are the tower locations the least intrusive. Now is the time to protect the health and wellbeing of families, wildlife, and the neighborhood in which we live.

Look forward to hearing back.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Hillsborough, CA

ph. [REDACTED]