

March 23 Appeal of Conditional Use Authorization of roof mounted macro cell site antennas at 590 2nd Ave

Good afternoon Supervisors. Thank you for the opportunity to present our appeal. My name is David Green. I and my wife Ann grew up in San Francisco and have lived at 588 2nd Ave, adjacent to and north of the subject apartment building since 1987. We are retired and hope to remain in our home as long as possible.

We are not opposed to mobile phone networks. We use cell phones ourselves and recognize that cell phones are a part of life at this time and serves the public interest.

We have 4 points to make

1: This cell site is more visible and obtrusive to neighboring residences than any other cell site we could find in San Francisco.

2: Most of residents and property owners contacted by us are opposed to this project

3: This cell site violates the WTS guidelines which require visual impact on residences to be minimized.

4: AT&T has both engineering and siting alternatives to this macro cell site

We went around our neighborhood and showed pictures of the installation to residents. The vast majority of residents we were able to talk to were opposed to this project. 40 letters were received by Planning opposed and only 4 in favor. We were able to obtain petition signatures of almost all of the owners we were able to contact personally, and did get 34% of the owners within 300 feet of the project to sign in opposition to the project. This in spite of the fact that it took two weeks for DCP staff to provide us with owners names and addresses.

I was shocked at the impact this project would have on us personally, so checked the Planning Dept map of cell sites in San Francisco to see if this was something that was typically allowed. Most AT&T cell sites are macro antenna sites with many high power antennas, supplemented occasionally with single antennas on utility poles. The other two networks shown on the map, Verizon and Clearview(Sprint) primarily use single antennas on utility poles.

This reason I mention this is to assert that network providers have more than one way to obtain desired coverage. They can add both mini and macro antenna sites into their networks as necessary to comply with the guidelines.

This project proposes to install two screens with a combined East West length of 40 feet on an 80 foot long roof. The screens will be larger and more visible to the surrounding buildings than any other cell site I could find in San Francisco, and will set a precedent to encourage other more obtrusive sites in other residential neighborhoods.

As required by the Guidelines for disfavored residential sites, and due to community opposition, AT&T wrote letters to owners of 14 suitable buildings in the area to try to find an alternate site. They only received one response and that turned out to be unsuitable. The guidelines then allow disfavored residential sites to be considered.

But the guidelines also require the aesthetic, visual, and use impacts on adjacent residential areas to be considered, and require the visual impacts on habitable living areas of residential units which directly face the antenna within 100 feet horizontal distance to be minimized. See WTS page 30 Section 9 subsection 2.

We submit that this the site is so small and narrow that the screening cannot be set back enough to adequately mitigate the visual impact as required by the guidelines.

Even worse for us at 588 2nd Ave, the 23 feet long by 6 foot high north facing screen to the south of us is only 20 horizontal feet from our 3rd level back yard deck. It is sited on the edge of the roof above a 6 feet deep by 30 foot long lightwell, and therefore is 100% visible from our deck, and also visible from our south facing family room window and back yard. It will loom over us, and will reduce the sun we receive significantly during the fall and spring. I submitted supporting documentation to detail this.

Following are pictures of the cell site, the view from our deck, and a selection of the most visible cell sites I could find in residential areas throughout the city to illustrate the fact that this site has a greater visual and shading impact on neighboring properties than any other site.

We respectfully ask the board to reject this project on the grounds it has excessive impact on neighbors and violates the siting guidelines.