

Verizon proposal Hearing May 16, 2019
Objection by Liesje Nicolas
Highlands Community Association, President

Zoning hearing officer Grote,

San Mateo Highlands is a (S-1/s 8) single family residentially zoned neighborhood in unincorporated San Mateo County. There is no industry in our residential neighborhood and residents want it to stay that way. Our residents are strongly against Verizon's proposal for a 50 foot tall antenna tower in the front yard of one of our homes. **I have 112 letters of objection for you, from our area residents.**

The proposal for a 5 story tall industrial tower with equipment boxes up and down the pole is aesthetically completely incompatible with our single and 2 story homes. This proposal violates many county zoning regulations, but most blatantly for height, by over 14 feet. That is a significant violation.

We are asking for a continuance of the hearing so the County Staff can provide the documents that were referred to in their report, but not actually supplied. as well as analysis that is missing from this report. Our letter requests proper answers to some 12 points that are not satisfied by the staff report. Such as proof to substantiate Staff's conclusion that "This Facility is NECESSARY for public health, Safety".

I'll talk about just 2 of the many points we have in our letter.

1. Major Fire Safety Issue not addressed in Staff Report.

PG&E cannot be relied upon to tell us that these utility poles are safe.

PG&E has repeatedly failed to ensure a safe environment as it relates to their equipment in our communities. PG&E is not a credible source to evaluate safety, after they repeatedly declare bankruptcy to avoid financial responsibility for loss of life and property.

County staff report does not provide an analysis of the liability of either the applicant nor PG&E in the event of failures. Staff also does not provide a

mechanism of who will pay in the event of loss of life or property in the event of safety failure. What is the County plan for these contingencies?

After the Camp Fires and Malibu fire of 2007 that was caused by cell phone equipment, these are real questions that need answering in this day and age.

Attaching a physically significant 5G cell phone antenna to a telephone pole increases the infrastructure danger to the public which is already at unacceptable levels.

PG&E has not been able to explain 4 separate telephone pole fires that occurred within one month during the summer of 2018 in the Highlands neighborhood. These fires happened immediately after a PG&E inspection of the poles! As well as the fire on Gary's telephone pole, I too had a telephone pole catch fire in front of my house due to lack of maintenance. Placing additional and sizable industrial antenna on infrastructure whose reliability and safety has repeatedly been mis-represented through false records, as we now know has been the case in recent crises elsewhere in the state, is perilous. It also defies common sense.

Local regulations need to be enforced by our County to protect the safety of residents but Staff Report contradicts our own SM Co. zoning regulations as well as contradicting our Supervisor's letter to the FCC opposing FCC recent over reach rules.

My 2nd point is GOOD NEWS, County DOES have some discretion in placement of equipment within the current FCC order. Though Staff's report does not reflect analysis of this.

It is not a material inhibition, or regulatory barrier to achieve the applicants' goals, for SMC to restrict antenna location. Such as to the water tower across the street.

The FCC order articulates a 3 part test for evaluating these restrictions.

According to the Fcc order, such requirements are not preempted if they are:

1. reasonable

2. no more burdensome than those applied to other types of infrastructure deployments, and
3. objective and published in advance.

What that means is County can use it's currently published zoning regulations to restrict the location. As in away from residential homes to a public space, such as a water tower 500 feet away on Tournament Dr. And then this proposal would not be in conflict with SM Co zoning regulations nor FFC rules.

As we heard today from Planner Richstone, Alternative analysis can be located within a few hundred feet.

There is no analysis to prove that this cannot go on a co-location water tower instead of the top of a telephone pole.

In conclusion, the County Staff report points out many times how this current proposal violates SM County zoning regulations of height and location in residential area, so Please enforce our local regulations that are to protect the safety of our taxpayers.

Please represent our residents, and DO NOT let industry come in for financial benefit and a put our residents and their property at risk.

IF a decision of approval is taken today on this item, it would signal that the County has ignored our residents' request for a continuance and requests for proper analysis of the proposal.

Thank you for your time today.