



PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

The following is public correspondence received by the City Clerk's Office after the posting of the original agenda. Individual contact information has been redacted for privacy. This may *not* be a comprehensive collection of the public correspondence, but staff makes its best effort to include all correspondence received to date.

To send correspondence to the City Council, on matters listed on the agenda please email PublicComment@losaltosca.gov

From: [Roberta Phillips](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Public Comment](#)
Subject: May 10 the Council meeting Item #9/ Wireless Ordinance
Date: Saturday, May 7, 2022 6:42:32 PM

Dear Council Members

I noticed on the Wireless Ordinance Report #2 subsection #4 is states for locations that :

"c. A minimum of 25 feet from the nearest residential dwelling unit. In no case, however, shall any portion of a wireless communications facility be permitted within 10 feet of a residential dwelling unit. "

Ten feet is an unreasonably small distance from a residential unit. I can't imagine anyone accepting 10' from a bedroom window is acceptable.

At a minimum there should be 25 feet.

Please adjust this section .

Sincerely

Roberta Phillips



From: [Pat Marriot](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT Item 9 May 10, 2022
Date: Sunday, May 8, 2022 3:08:24 PM

Council Members:

I'm confused by this section of the proposed wireless ordinance:

4. Permitted wireless telecommunications facilities within Residential Zoning Districts Municipal Code Sections 14.04.010 A-J, M, U, W are preferred to be located:

- a. Within a median where one is present;
- b. Where no residential dwelling unit is present;
- c. A minimum of 25 feet from the nearest residential dwelling unit. In no case, however, shall any portion of a wireless communications facility be permitted within 10 feet of a residential dwelling unit.

The second sentence (10 feet) seems to contradict the first sentence (minimum of 25 feet).

Since this is an issue of "public health, safety and welfare," I hope this will be clarified and corrected before you approve the ordinance.

Thank you,

Pat Marriott

From: [Monica Waldman](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Item 9
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 8:25:11 AM

Dear City Council Members,

As stated in the packet for Agenda Item 9, two of the goals for the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance and Design Guidelines for Los Altos state “Cell towers should be placed in commercial areas and within the medians of major streets rather than within residential neighborhoods close to people’s homes” and “Los Altos neighborhood aesthetic guidelines and property values are among the main reasons people are willing to stay in this great City.”

One of the recommended revisions to proposed “Ordinance No. 2022-___” includes placing small cell facilities “That are 25 feet or more from residential dwelling units and requiring that no wireless facility be located within 10 feet of a residential dwelling unit.” Ten or 25 feet seems a very small buffer for a small cell facility when cities such as Los Gatos have maintained “Installation of a facility on residential streets, abutting or within fifty (50) feet of residences on any streets, or within one hundred (100) feet from a school campus will not be permitted.”

<https://www.losgatosca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/22613/Small-Cell-Streetlight-Guidelines>)

Please increase the buffer between residential dwelling units and small cell facilities to protect our residents and our neighborhood aesthetics.

Thank You,
Monica Waldman

From: [Heather Lattanzi](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Please create a 3 tier preference element in the wireless ordinance
Date: Monday, May 9, 2022 11:50:50 AM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I would like to request that Council create a 3-tier preference element in the wireless ordinance (Most preferred, less preferred, and least preferred) as presented in the council meeting on 4/12/22. San Diego County first came up with the tiered order of preference 20 years ago so that industry would go to industrial zones first, and residential last. The County of San Diego had 4 different tiers. They pioneered this order of preference for the entire country because when Sprint sued County of San Diego, San Diego defended their right to suggest an order of preference for telecom coming into their communities. This case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court and was upheld. Therefore, this tiered order preference has been challenged to the highest court in the land and upheld.

We are only asking for 3 tiers. We would like to have residential and schools including daycare centers in the third and most protected tier.

We have been advised by a Fire Consultant that cell tower fires are electrical fires, and they cannot be extinguished conventionally. First the power has to be cut and then someone from PG&E has to arrive on scene before the firefighters can fight the fire through conventional means. Otherwise, anyone attempting to extinguish the fire will be electrocuted. Because of this unique fire risk and the need for escape, we are asking for more time to escape for certain groups of people. Anyone caring for babies or young children in the daycare setting should be allowed to have this extra time & space for escape, as should a classroom full of children of any age, and the same for residential. We have residents in Los Altos who have special needs in a variety of ways from the wheelchair-bound with ALS, to those walking with walkers, and some residents with cognitive decline who are going to need assistance.

The recent fires have been a lesson in which many cities understand how important having a 3-tier order of preference would be to ensure public safety. Having the additional tier will limit fire exposure and provide time for residents to be able to escape safely. Please make public safety a top priority and return it to the 3 tiers of preferences.

Sincerely,

Heather Lattanzi
Los Altos