

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Rebecca](#)
To: board@pausd.org; [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: City Council meeting regarding the Cubberly redesign.
Date: Tuesday, February 12, 2019 1:00:59 PM

Hi,

Thank you so much for all the work you and the city are putting into the Cubberly redesign. As a close neighbor in Greenmeadow as well as a DAILY user of Cubberly and Greendell I am excited to see all the work. I attended the first 2 meetings but could not attend the 3 or tonight's meeting so I wanted to enter a few brief thoughts into the discussion.

1. From the beginning of this process, much of the feedback has come from elderly participants who have time and energy to participate in local politics. However, this space is used by many young families that weren't represented in the initial input and more information should be gathered. Also one group not represented at all, that COULD be huge users is a teenage population, which should also be asked for input. Due to the older group, one very important item left off is a playground. There is of course a preschool playground open to use at Greendell but an elementary playground would be used a lot with all the field use. Additionally all the current "private" playgrounds at the day cares are behind fences and not for general use. This needs to be added on for this to be a big space to be used.

2. I am THRILLED they incorporated Greendell & Athena. However the first round of plans includes PSF/TK/Y5's with adult school. Which is a current problem to have unchecked and some random adults tramping through an area for young children during the morning time when kids are there and is not safe. These two populations have very different needs and have just been thrown together for convenience. The Adult School attendees would much prefer to be with the larger Cubberly campus with access to a cafe and social spaces- which they have none. This was just replicated how it is now, and currently it doesn't work and it's a great chance to re-work that. And an opportunity to make PSF & TK/Y5's smaller.

3. Regarding building style, it looks like at meeting #3 Arts & Crafts won out. I want to remind you how many people participating were not neighbors and this is their personal taste (which also ages older due to the high number of older participants) and did not realize this property lives in the Greenmeadow neighborhood which is on the national registry of historical places and is a historically protected mid-century modern neighborhood. We can not change the look or style of our homes and I think preserving or creating a modern mid century style would be important for the integrity of the neighborhood.

4. On a separate note, I am a huge fan of adding an Ohlone/Connections High School at this site in the very near future. With all the pressure and suicides and depression at Gunn and Paly there needs to be an alternative. Every time there is a tragedy they say things will change, but they don't as many people are happy with the status quo, which is fine. But there needs to be an alternative and if one is not available through the district, I would look at this site as an option for a Charter High School.

Thank you again. I've been attending meetings on this since Foothill/Cubberly City council days and this is going great. I'd just like a few of my points to be shared and considered.

Thank you,
Rebecca Marasco

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Penny Ellson <pellson@pacbell.net>
To: 'gmca-discuss' <gmca-discuss@googlegroups.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2019, 9:03:54 AM PST
Subject: [gmca-discuss] Cubberley goes to City council TONIGHT

Dear Greenmeadow and Greendell Neighbors,

Tonight, February 11, 5:30pm City Council will conduct a Study Session on the Cubberley Master Planning process in City Council

Chambers , 1st Floor City Hall, 25 Hamilton Avenue.

At this meeting, citizens can offer any comments they may have about the process or the project, including: programming, traffic circulation, building placement or size/height of buildings, etc. An agenda and staff report with visuals can be found here https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/cou/council_agendas.asp

My key concerns relate to traffic and circulation. I want to make sure that driveways, parking and bike/pedestrian facilities are set up to minimize auto traffic intrusion and safety impacts on neighborhood streets/school routes. I want to make sure that neighborhood bike/pedestrian connections are retained with adequate capacity for a future high school's bell time traffic surges. (Note: Gunn & Paly draw 930 bikes each per day.)

As most of you know, the project has been expanded to 43 acres, including Greendell and 525 San Antonio (the current site of Athena Academy). There is a lot to like in the project, but thoughtful direction of citizens who understand the site and surrounding neighborhoods can still help them improve on the current designs.

Citizens are invited to attend. (You can find project plans in the staff report that is linked to the agenda.) They have incorporated a lot of what participants have requested. These meetings will be our last opportunity to provide comment before they develop the final plans to be revealed in March. If there is something missing, if you haven't had opportunity to attend and provide comment, now is your moment.

If you cannot attend this meeting, there are other ways you can comment:

1). There are two other meetings where comments will be received:

- PAUSD Board Study Session, February 12, time TBA
- Planning & Transportation Commission Study Session, February, 13, 6:00pm

2). You can write to your electeds and commissioners and project consultants:

board@pausd.org

city.council@cityofpaloalto.org

planning.commission@cityofpaloalto.org

Best,

Penny Ellson

GMCA Civic Affairs

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "gmca-discuss" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to gmca-discuss+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to gmca-discuss@googlegroups.com.

Visit this group at <https://groups.google.com/group/gmca-discuss>.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/gmca-discuss/9AAC13C629554620987DA3CBE089AC3A%40PennyPC>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Ben Shomer](#)
To: board@pausd.org; [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Cubberley Master Planning process
Date: Tuesday, February 12, 2019 8:25:46 PM

Hi,

Thank you so much for all the work you and the city are putting into the Cubberly redesign. As a close neighbor in Greenmeadow as well as a daily user of Cubberly I am excited to see all the work. I attended the first 2 meetings but could not attend the 3 or tonight's meeting so I wanted to enter a few brief thoughts into the discussion.

My key concerns relate to traffic and circulation. I want to make sure that driveways, parking and bike/pedestrian facilities are set up to minimize auto traffic intrusion and safety impacts on neighborhood streets/school routes. I want to make sure that neighborhood bike/pedestrian connections are retained with adequate capacity for a future high school's bell time traffic surges

From the beginning of this process, much of the feedback has come from elderly participants who have time and energy to participate in local politics. However, this space is used by many young families that weren't represented in the initial input and more information should be gathered. Due to the older group, one very important item left off is a playground. There is of course a preschool playground open to use at Greendell but an elementary playground would be used a lot with all the field use. Additionally all the current "private" playgrounds at the day cares are behind fences and not for general use. This needs to be added on for this to be a big space to be used.

Regarding building style, it looks like at meeting #3 Arts & Crafts won out. I want to remind you how many people participating were not neighbors and this is their personal taste (which also ages older due to the high number of older participants) and did not realize this property lives in the Greenmeadow neighborhood which is on the national registry of historical places and is a historically protected mid-century modern neighborhood. We can not change the look or style of our homes and I think preserving or creating a modern mid century style would be important for the integrity of the neighborhood.

Thank you again.
Benjamin

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19


From: [Jerry Fan](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: 2/4/2019 City Council hearing on Planning Director's decision re: cell towers
Date: Monday, February 4, 2019 1:09:41 PM
Attachments: [3715 Whitsell Avenue.pdf](#)

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

I am writing to specifically ask you to overturn the *interim* Planning Director's ill-informed decision regarding ARB's decision to reject Verizon's plans for cell towers in our neighborhoods.

I support ARB's recommendation to put the ancillary equipment for the cell towers underground and not install the equipment on utility poles nor on street lights in University South, Downtown North, and Barron Park neighborhoods.

When I presented at ARB for Barron Park neighborhood, the neighbors next to the proposed cell tower installation near 3715 Whitsell were 100% against the proposal. I submitted the document to ARB and have also attached a slightly outdated version here.

From,
 Whitsell Ave
Whitsell Ave
Magnolia Dr

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Mary Dimit](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: 2/4/2019: Cell Tower Hearing
Date: Monday, February 4, 2019 2:49:36 AM

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

I am writing to ask you to overturn the interim Planning Director's University South decision regarding cell towers that is against the recommendation of the experts on the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

I support ARB's recommendation to put the ancillary equipment for the cell towers underground and not install the equipment on utility poles nor on street lights in University South, Downtown North, and Barron Park neighborhoods.

I urge you to direct the ARB to review the cell tower design and equipment locations in a public hearing as required by Palo Alto's Municipal Code.

Sincerely,
Mary Dimit
30-year resident and former city employee

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [April Eiler](#)
To: [Kou, Lydia](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Cell towers
Date: Sunday, February 3, 2019 8:56:52 AM

Dear Ms. Kou,

I am very upset that Planning Director, Jonathan Lait, disregarded the recommendation of the ARB for putting cell towers underground.

I hope the Palo Alto City Council will overturn the decision for South Palo Alto and make sure that there will never be above ground cell towers in Downtown North or any other neighborhood.

I am a Verizon stock holder but I do not want them on my neighborhood utility poles. It is not just unsightly, but also unhealthy.

Thanks for all you do,

April Eiler
(Palo Alto resident since 1967)
(Palo Alto home owner since 1972)
(Downtown North since 1978)

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Bryan Chan](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Opposition to University South Cell towers
Date: Sunday, February 3, 2019 5:43:29 PM

Dear Mayor Filseth and members of the City Council,

I am a resident of Palo Alto and I am writing to you about the disturbing decision by the Interim Planning Director Jonathan Lait to unilaterally overrule the decision by the ARB to reject the cell towers proposed for University South region. Specifically, I would like you to:

1. Condemn the interim Planning Director's outrageous disregard both for residents' rights and for the judgment of the experts on the ARB;
2. Overturn the interim Planning Director's University South decision; and
3. Ask Jonathan Lait to send the new cell tower design he approved for University South where it should have gone in the first place: to the Architectural Review Board for review in a public hearing.

Thank you,
Bryan

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Luce, Gwen](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Clerk, City](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Please note my request!
Date: Sunday, February 3, 2019 5:38:44 PM

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

I am in support of the appeal to overturn the decision to allow Crown Castle/Verizon to install ancillary cell tower equipment on top of streetlights in the University South neighborhood—a decision made against the recommendation of the experts on the Architectural Review Board and without regard for residents' right to a public hearing.

Thank you.

Gwen Luce
[redacted] Laguna Way, Palo Alto 94306

Gwen Luce
[redacted]
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.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Whitney Leeman](#)
To: [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Re: Please vote against approving the amended Wireless Ordinance
Date: Monday, February 4, 2019 2:09:41 PM

Dear Councilmembers, I am writing again in support of United Neighbors' appeal of Palo Alto's interim Planning Director's decision to allow Crown Castle/Verizon to install ancillary cell tower equipment on top of streetlights in the University South neighborhood. This decision was made against the recommendation of the experts on the Architectural Review Board and without regard for residents' right to a public hearing.

I am hoping that you will respond favorably to the appeal submitted by United Neighbors and overturn the interim Planning Director's recent decision to allow the installation of unsightly and potentially harmful cell tower equipment in the University South neighbors (and really, in any other area of Palo Alto).

Sincerely,

Whitney Leeman, Ph.D.

On Mon, Jan 28, 2019 at 9:21 AM Whitney Leeman <whitney.r.leeman@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Councilmembers, I am writing to ask that you support United Neighbors' Appeal and set aside the Director of Planning's extraordinary January 4th decision to: 1) dispense with required procedure; 2) dispense with the Architectural Review Board's recommendations, and; 3) unilaterally approve a new, street-light-pole-mounted cell tower design in the University South neighborhood.

I am extremely concerned that City Staff have brazenly turned their backs on the advice of the experts on the Architectural Review Board, cutting residents out of the review process, and doing exactly what they want to do: allowing the telecom industry to install cell towers in residential neighborhoods however they want, where ever they want .

In fact, only a couple of days ago, the Planning Director again ignored the Architectural Review Board, this time the Board's recommendation to deny the cell towers in Barron Park. Instead, the Planning Director decided to push forward and allow the installation of hundreds of pounds of ugly, noisy, potentially hazardous equipment on utility poles in Barron Park.

Again, the evidence that RF/microwave radiation may be unsafe is mounting:

<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DEODC/EHIB/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Cell-Phone-Guidance.pdf>

<https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/results/areas/cellphones/index.html>

Please do not subject your constituents to the great human experiment conducted by the cellular providers, who are trying to fill every cubic centimeter of public space with RF/microwave radiation at densities unheard of in the past. As you know, there are major conflicts of interest between cellular providers, local/state/federal/international governments, and the public:

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/11/23/palo-alto-tech-chief-whose-junkets-triggered-ethics-complaint-says-hes-quitting/>

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5504984/>

Sincerely,

Whitney Leeman, Ph.D.

On Tue, Jan 8, 2019 at 1:53 PM Whitney Leeman <whitney.r.leeman@gmail.com> wrote:

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

I am writing to ask you to vote against approving the amended Wireless Ordinance that City Staff is asking you to approve.

The Planning Director and the City Attorney may tell you that the proposed amendments represent only minor adjustments to the Ordinance, adjustments required to bring it into compliance with an FCC order that goes into effect in mid-January.

Unfortunately, the proposed new language gives authority over aesthetics of cell towers to the Planning Director, instead of to City Council and the people (both residents and businesses) of Palo Alto.

The amended Ordinance, in giving the Planning Director the sole authority to establish aesthetic standards—more specifically, the sole authority to replace the City of Palo Alto's core aesthetic standards expressed in Section 18.76.020(d) of the Code with those of his own devising—does so a) without stating what the standards should be, b) without requiring that the Architectural Review Board provide the Planning Director with recommendations, and c) without giving either City Council or residents/businesses any say in the matter.

In 2017, the ARB put forward a thoughtful set of guidelines that should serve as the starting point for any cell tower-related aesthetic standards the City establishes. But the amended Ordinance ignores these guidelines and, as written, empowers the Planning Director to establish whatever aesthetic standards he chooses, with input from no one.

If you approve this amended Ordinance, you will be:

- 1) pre-approving, sight unseen, whatever a single City employee—an employee who has no particular qualifications to establish aesthetic standards and who is not accountable to voters—wants to do;
- 2) allowing him to make critical quality-of-life and quality-of-neighborhood decisions without any recommendations from the Architectural Review Board—i.e., from the people best qualified to establish aesthetic standards; and
- 3) setting in motion a process in which the residents and businesses of Palo Alto are given no opportunity to participate.

The proposed amended Ordinance establishes a process that is undemocratic: residents and businesses should have a say regarding what small cell towers look like, sound like, and where they should be located.

Additionally, the evidence that RF/microwave radiation may be unsafe is mounting:

<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDC/DEOD/EDD/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Cell-Phone-Guidance.pdf>

<https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/results/areas/cellphones/index.html>

Please do not subject your constituents to the great human experiment conducted by the cellular providers, who are trying to fill every cubic centimeter of public space with RF/microwave radiation

at densities unheard of in the past. As you know, there are major conflicts of interest between cellular providers, local/state/federal/international governments, and the public:

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/11/23/palo-alto-tech-chief-whose-junkets-triggered-ethics-complaint-says-hes-quitting/>

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5504984/>

The amended Ordinance makes no provision for anyone to know what standards the Planning Director has in mind until after City Council has approved his sole authority to establish them. Why doesn't the amended Ordinance you are being asked to approve state, at least in general terms, the aesthetic standards the Planning Director wishes to incorporate into the Wireless Ordinance? Staff have had since October to prepare the Ordinance.

The proposed amended Ordinance ignores the wishes of the ARB and the concerns of the Planning & Transportation Commission and the people of Palo Alto.

The ARB, in its public hearings, has repeatedly said that ancillary cell tower equipment must be installed underground, where it can't be seen. In addition, the California Public Utilities Commission, because of the fire hazard utility poles and aboveground equipment pose, has now begun a process that will lead to moving most of them underground.

Only two weeks ago, the Planning and Transportation Commission 1) expressed grave doubts about the safety of aboveground ancillary cell tower equipment; 2) urged the City to consider joining dozens of other municipalities plus the League of California Cities (to which Palo Alto belongs) in suing the FCC; and 3) urged the City to obtain expert legal advice on the lawfulness of the FCC's order and on how best to amend Palo Alto's Wireless Ordinance. Why are the PTC's recommendations being ignored?

Please, reject the amended Ordinance that City Staff has submitted to you and insist that it be modified to establish:

- 1) the Architectural Review Board as the lead—not the Planning Director—in setting standards for the siting and appearance of cell towers;
- 2) that there be a series of community meetings so that residents may learn what standards are being proposed, ask questions of ARB members and City Staff, and offer their own ideas for consideration; and
- 3) require that, once these standards have been created, City Council must approve them before they become part of the City's Wireless Ordinance.

The 12/12/18 Staff Report notes that cities may take up to 180 days following the effective date of the FCC regulations to develop and publish their aesthetic standards. There is no need to rush.

Sincerely,

Whitney Leeman, Ph.D.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Robert Lum](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Stop Cell Tower Placements
Date: Monday, February 4, 2019 3:51:25 PM

As long-time residents of Palo Alto and homeowners adjacent to the site we are **strongly** opposed to the PCE director's decision to unilaterally disregard the ARB's decision to not allow these unsightly, hazardous, and financially irresponsible towers to be installed throughout the city.

Reconsider the INTERIM Planning Directors outrageous disregard for residents rights and the ARB and stop the placement of any new nodes in Palo Alto.

As the elected Palo Alto City Council, overturn the interim Planning Directors decision and stop the placement of new nodes.

We need the Palo Alto City Council to reconsider the design and placement of ANY new nodes and any redesign should abide by the ARB's recommendations.

We are appealing the PCE's decision and do NOT want a tower on CPAU Pole #0238.

Tier 3 WCF Node 154, CPAU Pole #0238, this pole is located at the intersection of Barron Ave and Josina with traffic flowing through from El Centro. This is a highly traveled street for school drop-off and pick-up so it is visually obtrusive. We already have a cell tower on Barron Avenue near La Donna, and with existing overhead power/phone lines and other "boxes" on the poles, adding more overhead equipment will make this area even more ugly impacting property value and the beauty of the neighborhood.

Additionally, there is a legacy tree on the front lawn of 785 Barron and the proposed location of Node 154 would interfere with the tree's flowing branches.

Sincerely,

Anne and Robert Lum

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [NTB](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: University South Cell Tower decision
Date: Sunday, February 3, 2019 12:42:56 PM

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

As you well know, in government there are procedures in place to act as checks and balances to make sure that all voices are heard and considered. When one individual is permitted to bypass the system and unilaterally make a decision without following the correct procedures, the whole system is at risk. That is what has happened with the cell tower situation in Palo Alto.

The Architectural Revue Board (ARB) clearly stated their position to the City and to the telecom companies that the ancillary equipment for streetlight cell towers proposed for University South should be put underground. The ARB further recommended that cell towers should not be installed on utility poles in Barron Park and Downtown North. The City's Planning Director is supposed to defer to the recommendations of the ARB as the ARB is there to determine whether a proposal conforms to Palo Alto's aesthetic standards.

Unconscionably, the current interim Planning Director took it upon himself to make a unilateral decision. He threw out the ARB's recommendation entirely with respect to the University South cell towers, approving instead a new aboveground cell tower design. All of this has been done without following the prescribed procedure of taking the new aboveground design back to the ARB for review in a public hearing. In addition, he has continued with his unilateral decision making by throwing out the ABR's recommendation for Barron Park cell towers as well.

If the interim Planning Director chooses to disregard government processes, it is hoped that you, our elected officials, will at least follow the prescribed procedures. It is important that you overturn the interim Planning Director's University South decision and require that the new cell tower design, inappropriately approved by the interim Planning Director, be sent to the ARB for review in a public hearing.

It is important that you overturn it not only because it fails to follow the prescribed procedure but also because people need to be held accountable to follow the rules and not act unilaterally. The successful functioning of our City depends on it.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Nina Bell

Los Palos Ave
Palo Alto

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Tina Chow](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Greg Tanaka](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: please support residents
Date: Monday, February 4, 2019 10:58:41 AM

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

I am writing to urge you to overturn the interim Planning Director's decision to place small cell towers in the University South neighborhood. This decision demonstrates disregard both for residents' rights and for the judgment of the experts on the ARB. The ARB should review any new cell tower designs in a public hearing where residents have a voice. Please direct city staff to work together with city residents on this important issue rather than doing away with protocol for the sake of "convenience", which just makes the process of finding good solutions take longer overall.

Best regards,
Tina Chow
Barron Park

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Magic](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Cell towers
Date: Thursday, January 31, 2019 11:23:47 AM

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

I'm writing to express my concern about the actions of interim planning director Jonathan Lait with regard to placement of cell phone system equipment in Palo Alto.

As you are aware, Mr. Lait overruled the Architectural Review Board, a body comprised of people selected for their demonstrated expertise in such matters. He ignored the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of Palo Altans who've expressed preferences regarding this issue. And he made necessary an appeal to you and a demand on your, your staff's, and your constituents' lives which displaces other activities by which all of us might serve our community.

Please overturn Mr. Lait's decision with respect to University South, and remand the design he approved to the Architectural Review Board for proper vetting in a public hearing. In addition, though this action might seem to some sufficient to apprise Mr. Lait of your disapproval of his actions, I think all might benefit by your explicitly advising him that you want him to evidence greater respect for residents, ARB members, and you in the future.

Thank you for considering these views.

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

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#); "Sharon Espar"
Subject: FW: Cell towers
Date: Thursday, January 31, 2019 1:33:11 PM

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

From: Sharon Espar <sharonespar@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 1:22 PM
To: jeanne fleming <JJF@Right-Thing.net>
Subject: Cell towers

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice Mayor Fine, Ms.Cormack, Mr.Dubois, Ms. Kniss, Ms.Kou, Mr. Tanaka- We in the community of Palo Alto are shocked that you disregard residents' rights and the recommendations if the ARB. It is critical that you overturn the Planning Director's University Avenue South unworthy decision. Please send designs for new cell towers to the correct location: the ARB. They are the ones to oversee the public review. We as members of the Palo Alto community need and expect to be part of the decision making process by employees hired and paid by the citizens of our community to fulfill the needs and wishes of the community. This is core. Please remember this essential aspect of your tenure on the City Counsel. With respectful regards- Sharon Espar

Sent from my iPhone

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Francesca](#)
To: [Elieth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(Internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Please vote in favor of United Neighbors' Appeal
Date: Thursday, January 31, 2019 11:31:26 AM

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

Please support the United Neighbors' Appeal of the Director of Planning, Jonathan Lait's decision to dispense with required procedure by rejecting the Architectural Review Board's December recommendation to locate underground the cell towers Crown Castle/Verizon has applied to install in the University South neighborhood and instead approve a Crown Castle street-light-pole-mounted cell tower design, without even seeing what it looks like.

Please stop the shot clock so that the Architectural Review Board can hold a public hearing to consider Crown Castle/Verizon's application to install ancillary cell tower equipment and give the public an opportunity to review the design at a public meeting and/or a mock site.

Please do as Sebastopol, Santa Rosa, Capitola, Spokane, Washington, Lebanon, Tennessee, Juneau, Alaska, and many other cities all over the country are doing and declare a moratorium on any further cell nodes in our residential neighborhoods. This would give the city time to write new cell-tower regulations, which should keep the towers 1,500 feet or more away from residential areas or schools, and require liability insurance from all the wireless telecommunication companies.

The towers add unsightly equipment, overload poles, devalue property, are noisy and dangerous. Verizon can rent space on rooftops of commercial, industrial and city owned buildings for their equipment, without destroying our neighborhoods. (See photos below)

The Palo Alto City Staff should be working for all of its citizens and not just doing what is most convenient or breaking the law. Those of you in favor of the cell towers, please ask yourselves honestly if you would be willing to have one on the telephone pole nearest your home. This is a David and Goliath kind of situation, please be on the correct side of it.

Thank you for your consideration,

Francesca Kautz

Telecommunication nodes at 100 Birch Street, Palo Alto:









Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Mary Thomas](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: University South Cell Tower Appeal
Date: Thursday, January 31, 2019 5:13:36 PM

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

We are writing to express our great displeasure with the interim Planning Director's disregard for Palo Alto resident's rights as well as the judgment of the experts on the Architectural Review Board with respect to the University South cell towers. In throwing out the ARB's recommendations, Mr. Lait approved a new aboveground cell tower design without either the ARB review or a mandated public hearing.

We ask you to overturn Mr. Lait's University South decision and to also send the new cell tower design which he approved for University South where it should have gone in the first place - to the Architectural Review Board, for review in a public hearing.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tom and Mary Thomas
■ Santa Rita Avenue
Palo Alto 94301

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 2-13-19

From: [Annette Fazzino](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [Alison Cormack](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: University South Cell Towers Appeal
Date: Friday, February 1, 2019 10:38:59 AM

Dear Mayor Filseth; Vice-Mayor Fine; and Council Members Cormack, Kniss, Kou and Tanaka:

I am writing to you today because I am unable to attend the council meeting on Monday, February 4th.

I continue to be very concerned about the cell tower proposed installations in our city. This time, I am writing specifically about the towers located in University South. I am flummoxed about why the interim Planning Director, Jonathan Lait would essentially go rogue and disregard the Architectural Review Board's recommendation that the equipment go underground.

The ARB has clearly and plainly determined that the cell towers in University South should go underground. Please overturn Jonathan Lait's decision and send this design that he approved to the Architectural Review Board for review in a public hearing. The City Wireless Ordinance requires this step. Please do not allow City Staff to run roughshod over the process.

This equipment is heavy, noisy, ugly, and a potential fire hazard. The equipment belongs underground. Period. Full Stop.

Thank you for your consideration. Please keep our residential areas in Palo Alto, peaceful and beautiful.

Yours truly,

Annette Evans Fazzino