

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please no macro antenna at 590 Second Ave
Date: Friday, March 19, 2021 9:51:00 AM

From: Brooke Kuhn <brookekuhn@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 11:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please no macro antenna at 590 Second Ave

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

Dear Supervisors,

On Tues, March 23, at 3pm, the Board of Supervisors will hear an appeal on File No. 210240. **AT&T has recently pushed the Planning Department to approve installation of a macro antenna (10 antennae vs the typical one antenna) at 590 Second Ave; as a homeowner just two doors down, I'm writing to ask you to not allow this installation to proceed.**

I believe all Supervisors should be concerned about what AT&T is doing in my neighborhood (the Inner Richmond) because the company will continue to try to do this elsewhere in the city, if this is allowed to proceed. Please see my concerns about this project below:

- 1) The 2 -23 feet long 6 ft tall structures are visible, obtrusive and out of character in the neighborhood.
- 2) The structure defies Planning Department guidelines. It would be in the most disfavored site (7 being the most undesirable, this site is a 7, according to the Planning Department's own guidelines).
- 3) A macro cell site with 10 antennae is unnecessary and too large on a residential roof.
- 4) No other cell site on a residential roof in SF is as visible and unsightly as this would be.
- 5) Middle class areas such as the Richmond are being targeted for macro cell sites. There are none in Pac Heights and other wealthier districts. The sites in these districts are much smaller and less visible.
- 6) Statistics show that property values decrease up to 20% near macro cell sites.
- 7) AT&T did not do their due diligence. There was no follow up from letters sent out. They received one reply and couldn't guarantee owners even received the letters.
- 8) There were over 40 letters of opposition from neighbors to this project received by the planning commission. Their final report says 4 letters were received.
- 9) This installation could set a precedent that AT&T can continue to put these macro sites wherever they would like.
- 10) Long-term health studies on living in such close proximity to macro antennae don't exist, because these macro antennae are new. We should be erring on the side of caution and not allowing macro antennae installation at all in the city.

Smaller antennae should be considered in general throughout the city in less residential areas.

Thank you for considering the long-term vision of our city as you consider this request.

Best regards,
Brooke Kuhn
604 Second Ave
415-577-5624

From: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: AT&T Letter re. Wireless Facility Application and Appeal - Board of Supervisors File No. 210240 - Planning Case No. 2019-015984CUA
Date: Friday, March 19, 2021 9:52:29 AM
Attachments: [AT&T Letter March 19 2021.pdf](#)

From: Shank, Aaron M. <AShank@porterwright.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 7:05 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Wong, Jocelyn (BOS) <jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org>
Cc: SANDERS, WILLIAM (CAT) <William.Sanders@sfcityatty.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Agnihotri, Kalyani (CPC) <kalyani.agnihotri@sfgov.org>; cb720d@att.com; DI BENE, JOHN (Legal) (jd3235@att.com) <jd3235@att.com>
Subject: AT&T Letter re. Wireless Facility Application and Appeal - Board of Supervisors File No. 210240 - Planning Case No. 2019-015984CUA

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

Dear Board President Walton and Supervisors Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, and Stefani, and Mr. Sanders, Mr. Starr, and Ms. Agnihotri: Please accept this letter from John di Bene on behalf of AT&T to support AT&T's application and respond to the appeal with respect to AT&T's proposed facility at 590 2nd Avenue. Please include this letter in the record for this matter, and please consider this letter and materials in connection with the public hearing on appeal from the Planning Commission's approval of this application. Thank you.

Aaron M. Shank
Outside Legal Counsel for AT&T

AARON M. SHANK

Porter Wright Morris & Arthur LLP
[Bio](#) / ashank@porterwright.com
D: 614.227.2110 / M: 614.578.5036 / F: 614.227.2100
41 South High Street, Suites 2800 - 3200 / Columbus, OH 43215

/ MANSFIELD CERTIFIED PLUS

We are moving the needle on diversity, equity, and inclusion. [Learn more](#)

NOTICE FROM PORTER WRIGHT MORRIS & ARTHUR LLP:

This message may be protected by the attorney-client privilege. If you believe that it has been sent to you in error, do not read, print or forward it. Please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error. Then delete it. Thank you.

END OF NOTICE

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Cell towers at 590 2nd Ave
Date: Friday, March 19, 2021 9:55:23 AM

From: David Sherman <artmonkistheman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 9:01 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Cell towers at 590 2nd Ave

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

To whom it may concern,

I am writing you to state my opposition to the installation of multiple cell towers on the roof of the building at 590 2nd Avenue. As someone who lives just a block away at 580 3rd Avenue, I am concerned for the safety of my family and neighbors and wonder why these towers are being constructed in a residential area in the first place.

The studies that have been done on the effects of cell tower radiation are inconclusive, which is a threat in and of itself. The towers would be a complete eyesore as well. Currently I'm looking out of my kitchen window at the beautiful church of St. Ignatius on the hill. The proposed towers would be directly blocking this serene view.

I know that a lot of my fellow neighbors are really unhappy about this proposal and I want to join them in expressing my concern and opposition.

Regards,
David Sherman

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: No macro antenna - 2nd Ave!!!!
Date: Friday, March 19, 2021 10:00:38 AM

From: Elizabeth Chernack <echernack@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 9:19 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>
Subject: No macro antenna - 2nd Ave!!!!

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This letter is to voice my continued concern. I have written to you in the past, but need you to act now so an AT&T antennae project on the Northeast corner of 2nd Ave/Balboa is rejected and redirected.

We live at 607 2nd Ave. (2 adults and 2 young children). You would feel the same way if you lived on our corner with your family!

Not only will the antenna be an eyesore and inconsistent with houses in our neighborhood, but according to the SF Planning Department Siting Guidelines, 590 2nd Ave. is labeled a least desirable location.

All existing cell sites in San Francisco are installed on bigger and taller buildings that do not have this visual impact on neighbors. There are many buildings in the area that would be more suitable. Plus, with this proposal, the antennae are much closer to people, and the health risks and potential dangers outweigh all other concerns!

A macro cell site with 10 antennas is unnecessary and too large on a residential roof. You don't find these towers on a residential roof in wealthier SF neighborhoods. This could set a precedent that AT&T can put these macro sites anywhere.

Property values near antennae have been shown to decrease significantly, up to 20%, which would hurt several current homeowners, such as ourselves who bought in the height of the market.

We were also not made aware that AT&T did its due diligence in finding a more appropriate

site.

Thank you for your efforts in making the best decision for our neighborhood, keeping in mind not only the aesthetic and financial concerns for the neighborhood but the health concerns for the people who live here.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Chernack and David Greenstein, owner 607 2nd Ave.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Appeal file #210240 - 590 2nd Ave., S.F. CA 94118
Date: Friday, March 19, 2021 8:18:27 AM

From: Rosemary Almada <rtalmada@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 1:32 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Appeal file #210240 - 590 2nd Ave., S.F. CA 94118

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

As a native, third generation San Franciscan who cares about her city, I object to the proposed location of the AT&T antennas at 590 2nd Ave. in the Richmond district. The macro cell site is way too large for the small roof and would be visible from all points. The design and size are totally out of character for this residential neighborhood. This is also not a favored site per the San Francisco Planning Department guidelines. It is the only cell site in the city with such a negative impact on families residing in the neighborhood. I urge you to make AT&T find another solution which would give enough coverage without such a negative impact on the community. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Rosemary Almada

Respectfully,
Rosemary Almada

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: File# 210240
Date: Friday, March 19, 2021 8:24:09 AM

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

From: Mark Devost <mdevost@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 5:25 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: File# 210240

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

This letter pertains to 590 2nd ave.

This letter is out of frustration in trying to save my neighborhood. It seems that big business is winning again, pushing this cell tower in a neighborhood we're no one wants it.

We have no problem with our reception of WiFi. What we will have a problem with is sun light, this Hugh tower will cast a shadow and block what little bit of sun we do get. ATT say they don't have any place else to put, then don't install it. As I said our reception is just fine.

The other issue is future health issues, I know the jury is still out on this but there are similar towers and power equipment that have been proven to cause health problems.

The next issue is the sight doesn't meet your own planning commission's requirements, but they are not doing anything about. If I build something on my house that doesn't meet code and city requirements I have to remove it and or get a fine, red tag and possibly my house condemned, why does ATT get to do what ever they won't.

PLEASE SAFE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD

Frustrated Resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: cell towers at 590 2nd Avenue SF - File #210240
Date: Friday, March 19, 2021 8:24:39 AM

From: Patricia DeVost <pgdevost@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 5:27 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: cell towers at 590 2nd Avenue SF - File #210240

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

Dear Sirs,

I am writing this email with great concern over the possible installation of the cell tower at 590 2nd Avenue.

As a citizen living in this area I would like to ask you to consider these concerns in making a decision. The cell tower is very large for the size of the roof at this apartment building. It would be an eye sore for the neighborhood and visible from all view points as this is on a corner. It definitely does not blend in with the rest of the structures in the neighborhood in design or size. From my understanding and research, this is not a favored site per the SF Planning Department guidelines.

This is the only cell tower in SF with such a negative impact on surrounding homes and neighborhood. I am sure that AT&T can find another place that would not have this negative impact.

Another concern is that if this cell tower is allowed to be installed at 590 2nd Avenue that it could set a precedent for future cell sites in the city. I am a native of San Francisco born in 1950 and hate to see whats happening to our city when things like this are approved and the people who live in the neighborhood and support the city are not listened to or considered.

Please consider my opinion as to stop the installation of this cell tower.

Thank you

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: File No. 210240
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 1:08:50 PM

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

From: Gabriella <gzpapale@pacbell.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 12:10 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: re: File No. 210240

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

I am writing in opposition of the installation of the ten panel antennas and ancillary equipment on the rooftop of 590 2nd Avenue.

The roof is narrow, and the two structures would be highly visible from all angles, and very obtrusive. The north structure would be on the very edge of the building. This would be 100 percent visible and potentially dangerous.

Also, the site guidelines are specific that this location is a disfavored site. These antennae are not compatible with neighborhood homes and character.

I strongly disapproved the installation of this structure at this location.

Regards,
Gabriella Papale
578-580 3rd Avenue

March 17th, 2021

619 2nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco CA 94102

Re: Public Hearing 3/23 on File No 210240, 590 2nd Avenue

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing in regard to the aforementioned hearing about the AT&T Wireless project proposed for 590 2nd Avenue.

I believe all Supervisors should be concerned about this project, as AT&T is likely to use this exceptional situation as a new precedent for other projects. It's our understanding that this tower doesn't meet planning commission guidelines, would be one of the largest (if not the largest) cell phone antenna installations in a residential neighborhood anywhere in SF, and is strongly opposed by the neighborhood.

There are a number of more suitable, more commercial sites very close by. While the Planning Commission did ask AT&T to investigate alternative locations for this site, **AT&T did not progress the investigation of alternative sites in good faith.** It is my understanding AT&T did not have a single conversation with any other landlords nearby. Given that many owners of mixed-use retail buildings are under unusual financial pressure at the moment, the fact that AT&T couldn't engage with any other landlords in other locations is evidence of their lack of effort. Some of us in the neighborhood also wonder whether Rossi Park (currently under renovation, located just one block away) could be an alternative that the City could offer.

I think I can speak for many in the neighborhood in saying that we are not trying to block progress and are not objecting to AT&T's legitimate business interest in installing infrastructure to provide good service. **We are objecting to the process that was followed, the lack of good-faith pursuit of alternative sites and the fact that this specific type of antenna is especially large, intrusive and without precedent in this type of neighborhood in SF.**

The 2 -23 feet long 6 ft tall structures will be highly visible, obtrusive and out of character with the surrounding low-rise residential area. The structure defies Planning Department guidelines. It would be in the most disfavored site (7 being the most undesirable, this site is a 7, according to Planning Department own guidelines).

I did attend the recent Planning Commission meeting and it seemed that this project was rubber stamped despite strong and legitimate objections from local stakeholders due to some fear of AT&T's lawyers. I also noted that while there were over 40 letters of opposition from neighbors to this project received by the planning commission, their final report says 4 letters were received.

The sentiment from the impacted area of this project is clear. The Board of Supervisors has received signatures from ~35% of our neighborhood objecting to the project. The actual percentage of the neighborhood objecting to this project is much higher - we were able to get these signatures together in just a few days, even with COVID making it challenging to see people face-to-face or get people to answer their door.

Based on the facts of this case, the City has strong grounds to push back on this project and we hope you will disapprove it. If approved, it will not only cause needless harm our neighborhood in the Richmond but increase the risk that this type of project will come to neighborhoods around the City.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "NK Sheikh". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized.

Nadeem Sheikh

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Public comment - File No 210240 / 590 2nd Ave - Hearing 3/23
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 8:22:10 AM
Attachments: [Nadeem Sheikh note to SF Board of Supervisors re 590 2nd Ave.pdf](#)

From: Nadeem Sheikh <nadeem.k.sheikh@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 2:19 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public comment - File No 210240 / 590 2nd Ave - Hearing 3/23

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please find attached a letter with comments regarding the above-referenced hearing this Tuesday. As I may not be able to attend the meeting, wanted to share my feedback in writing.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

Best regards,
Nadeem Sheikh

From: [bruno](#)
To: [Lew, Lisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: 2019-015984CUA- AT&T Cell site Antennas
Date: Monday, March 15, 2021 4:20:13 PM
Attachments: [Proposal 3 on AT&T.docx](#)

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

Above find my written comments on the proposed project at 590 2nd Avenue in San Francisco. I am opposed to the installation. Lisa, I'm sending this to you because I was unable to email this to Angela. Please forward to the right person. Thank you

Once more I am speaking out against the proposed installation of telecommunication panel antennas on the roof of an apartment building at 590 2nd Ave. I do not believe AT&T conducted a thorough enough search for an alternate location for the antennas. They are insistent about installing the antennas on the roofs of our residential streets. I believe it is wrong to expose taxpaying residences to such dangerous exposures. Especially, when such a location, according to City's Cell Site Siting Guidelines, ranks as a poor and disfavored type of site for the antennas.

We do not understand what hold AT&T has on the planning commission, that would cause them to ignore the concerns of its residents and alter the character and aesthetics of the Inner Richmond District. If you believe AT&T's proposal is competent and constructive planning, I and several others would beg to differ. Time and time again we have pointed out that this project at the location of 2nd Ave, is a bad idea.

We pray that you deny AT&T the permit they are seeking and that no antennas would be installed on the roof of 590 2nd Ave apartment building.