

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Hearing on March 23 rd. File number 210240 macro cell site 590 2nd Avenue
Date: Monday, March 22, 2021 4:45:37 PM
Attachments: [sun on upper deck in Nov.PNG](#)

From: Ann Green <anniegsf@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 4:16 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>

Subject: Hearing on March 23 rd. File number 210240 macro cell site 590 2nd Avenue

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good Afternoon Supervisors,

My name is Ann Green, and I live next door to the north of the proposed project and am the appellant in the hearing. My husband will be presenting our case before you tomorrow, but I felt the need to show you the impact that the proposed macro cell site will have on our family. AT&T has not shown you a drawing of the north facing structure, which they plan to put on the very edge of the building, 23 foot long, 6 foot high, and less than 20 feet from our deck and living area. We have looked at many commercial and residential cell sites in SF, and there is not one that has a macro cell site on the edge of a building, looming over a neighbor's deck and yard. It is unprecedented and AT&T has shown no effort in the past year to modify the negative impact of this, or to find other engineering solutions to mitigate the harm.

Of all of the drawings AT&T has submitted, none show this structure on the edge of the building. We are seniors who have lived in our home for 35 years, and this has caused us and our neighbors extreme stress, and disbelief that this could happen. This would affect several other neighbors to the north as well. We do not have the resources to produce a professional mock-up of what it would be like, but my husband did a sketch as seen below, in proportion to what AT&T plans to do.

We realize that cell coverage is necessary, but in all of our research, we find that nowhere is it stated that local government cannot require the phone company to adhere to the SF Planning Department's Site Guidelines, and minimize the impact of cell sites to adjoining neighbors and residences. AT&T can find other workable solutions that will not have such a negative and, to us, devastating impact. It is unprecedented in its size, scope, negative impact, and will be highly visible to neighbors in all directions.

I do not feel that AT&T has the legal or moral right to place a macro cell site on a very narrow roof, where it cannot be set back in order to minimize impact. The responsibility lies with them to find a workable solution for adequate cell coverage. A macro cell site on the edge of the building looming over our yard and deck does not show that this has been attempted in any form. It is blatantly ignoring the Planning Departments's own guidelines in order to provide a quick fix for AT&T.

Below is a sketch my husband did, and though not professionally done, it is in proportion to the cell site measurements, and would be frighteningly looming over our deck less than 20 feet away.

Please require AT&T to find an appropriate location for their macro cell site. There are other more appropriate choices in the area, and it can be done, as we have seen in the Richmond and other areas of the city.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Ann Green



Sent from my iPad