

From: [Planning Public Comment](#)
To: [Planning Public Comment](#)
Subject: Automatic reply: Regarding PLN23-00148, installation of a 60-foot-monotree or an alternative 3 lower cell towers in the parking lot by AT&T in Santa Clara First Baptist Church
Date: Monday, December 2, 2024 9:40:37 AM

Auto Reply: Your email has been received in the Planning Public Comment email box.

Code Enforcement complaints should be submitted [via MySantaClara](#) located on the City's website or by downloading the [MySantaClara App](#) from your mobile device.

For more information on services provided by the Planning Division please visit the [City of Santa Clara Planning Division webpage](#). COVID-19 Updates are also available on the [City's website](#).

Thank you for your patience and cooperation. We wish you a happy holiday season!

Thank you,
City of Santa Clara
Community Development Department
Planning Division

From: [Planning Public Comment](#)
To: [REDACTED] [Planning Public Comment](#); [Lesley Xavier](#); [Elizabeth Elliott](#)
Cc: [Eric Crutchlow](#); [Nancy Biagini](#); [Priya Cherukuru](#); [Qian Huang](#); [Lance Saleme](#); [Mario Bouza](#); [Yashraj Bhatnagar](#); [office@scfbc.org](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Regarding PLN23-00148, installation of a 60-foot-monotree or an alternative 3 lower cell towers in the parking lot by AT&T in Santa Clara First Baptist Church
Date: Monday, December 2, 2024 9:40:33 AM
Attachments: [AT&T cell tower rejection signatures 11 26 2024.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Good Morning,

Your email has been received in the Planning Division and will be part of the public record on this item.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your input.

Regards,

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT | Staff Aide II
Community Development Department | Planning Division
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
O : 408.615.2450 Direct : 408.615.2474

From: Yongli Wen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 2:17 AM
To: Planning Public Comment <PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov>; Lesley Xavier <LXavier@santaclaraca.gov>; Elizabeth Elliott <EElliott@santaclaraca.gov>
Cc: Eric Crutchlow <ecrutchlow@santaclaraca.gov>; Nancy Biagini <NBiagini@SantaClaraCA.gov>; Priya Cherukuru <PCherukuru@SantaClaraCA.gov>; Qian Huang <QHuang@Santaclaraca.gov>; Lance Saleme <LSaleme@SantaClaraCA.gov>; Mario Bouza <mbouza@Santaclaraca.gov>; Yashraj Bhatnagar <YBhatnagar@Santaclaraca.gov>; office@scfbc.org; Sudharani Ravi [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Regarding PLN23-00148, installation of a 60-foot-monotree or an alternative 3 lower cell towers in the parking lot by AT&T in Santa Clara First Baptist Church

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm Yongli Wen, the immediate neighbor of Santa Clara First Baptist Church. I'm writing regarding PLN23-00148, installation of a 60-foot-monotree or an alternative 3 lower cell towers in the parking lot by AT&T in Santa Clara First Baptist Church.

Almost all of the neighbors and I strongly oppose the above two cell tower installation plans, our comment is a BIG NO. We stated our comments, the reasons for the objection and the suggestions in the attached letter. So far 29 neighbors signed the letter. We hope you can consider the neighbor's opinions seriously.

Sincerely,

Yongli Wen

Cc: First Baptist Church and AT&T

November 26, 2024

From: Neighborhood Residents

To: Santa Clara Planning Commission Board Members:

Re: Project File No.: PLN23-00148 (“Proposed Installation”)

This letter is regarding the installation of a 60-foot-monotree, or an alternative design with 3 shorter shorted cell towers located in the parking lot by AT&T on the premises of Santa Clara First Baptist Church at 3111 Benton Street.

On the 10/23/2024 meeting, we all knew the proposal of the installation of a 60-foot-monotree had been denied by the planning commissioners, and we already stated our objections and the reasons for the objections.

Our neighborhood community hereby formally submits our letter with signatures opposing this new proposed plan which is the alternative design with 3 shorter shorted cell towers located in the parking lot prior to the meeting which is scheduled for Wednesday, December 4th, 2024.

We are still strongly opposed to the Proposed New Installation as we believe this plan is not in the best interest of our community. Our response to the Proposed New Installation is **a big NO**.

1. There are two parking lots on the premises of the church, not sure which parking lot it will be located in. But on the Google Map, we can see the cell towers will be still less than **500 feet** away from the backyard fence of nearby houses no matter which parking lot it will be.

Meanwhile many municipalities, including in California, have strict requirements for erecting cell towers near residential areas. The following municipalities, districts, or zones have a **MINIMUM of 500 feet setback requirement to 1,000 feet or more** from residential properties and/or **property line**:

requirement to 1,000 feet or more from residential properties and/or property line:

- Los Altos, CA
- Fremont, CA
- Pleasanton, CA
- Laguna Beach, CA
- West Los Angeles, CA
- South Los Angeles, CA
- Hollywood, CA
- San Diego, CA
- Beverly Hills, CA
- Calabasas, CA
- Encinitas, CA
- Palm Springs, CA

2. There are already more than **FIVE** “wireless cell phone base stations” from Verizon at the roof of the main church building, which sits just ~80 feet away from the new AT&T location and is already of major concern.

Therefore, with 3 lower cell towers, there will be more than **EIGHT** wireless base stations on the same premises on the church property, also **3 lower towers** sitting together will make the radiation energy to the nearby residences even more strong, thereby further increasing the potential health risks to the surrounding residents.

3. We, the neighborhood community, have the followings concerns:

A. **The negative health effects caused by wireless radiation from the towers.** There has NOT been a clear conclusion that cell towers are not harmful to health.

This is a serious enough issue that the International Association of Fire Fighters has opposed the installation of cell towers at fire stations, where its fire fighters live.

**Further reading can be done on their website
<https://www.iaff.org/cell-tower-radiation/>**

B. Risk of fire. There is a risk of fire, potentially from a malfunction in equipment, weather related such as a lightning strike, or arson and will be devastating for the neighboring houses should one occur.

Cell towers can catch fire due to the electrical infrastructure required for wireless facilities. Wiring faults can create electrical arcs that reach temperatures up to 35,000 degrees fahrenheit, which is hotter than the surface of the sun, and is often referred to as an "arc flash."

Malfunctions in transmitters, antennas, or wiring can lead to electrical fires. Lightning strikes could also potentially cause a fire. Due to unpredictable weather patterns in recent years, lightning strikes are also of concern. There have also been reports of fires caused by arson. The following are examples of cell phone towers fires:

- **2020- Virginia:** Entire cell tower caught fire overnight. The cause was believed to be equipment malfunction related to a transformer.
- **2019- California:** Cell tower in Sonoma County caught fire, potentially due to an electrical fault.
- **2018- New Jersey:** A fire at a cell tower was attributed to arson. Local authorities investigated the incident due to suspicious circumstances.
- **2017- Texas:** Cell tower fire occurred, likely due to equipment malfunction, as heavy winds and storms were present.
- **2016- Florida:** Cell tower caught fire after being struck by lightning.

- **2015 - Illinois:** Cell tower fire was reported, attributed to equipment failure. The fire spread to nearby vegetation.
- **2014 - North Carolina:** A fire was caused by an electrical issue related to the cell tower's lighting equipment.
- **2012 - Michigan:** Cell tower fire occurred, believed to be caused by an equipment malfunction.
- **2011 - Alabama:** Cell tower fire occurred due to a lightning strike, causing significant damage to the structure.
- **2009 - Georgia:** A fire was reported at a cell tower site, attributed to equipment failure and overheating.
- **2008 - Colorado:** A fire broke out at a cell tower, suspected to be caused by an electrical short circuit.
- **2006 - Ohio:** Cell tower caught fire due to a malfunction in the power supply system.
- **2005 - New York:** A fire was linked to an electrical issue at a cell tower site.
- **2004 - Louisiana:** Cell tower fire was attributed to a lightning strike.
- **2003 - Maryland:** A fire occurred at a cell tower site due to suspected electrical malfunctions.
- **2002 - Florida:** Cell tower fire was reported, believed to be caused by equipment overheating during extreme weather conditions.
- **2001 - Texas:** A fire at a cell tower was linked to an arson investigation, where the tower was set on fire deliberately.

C. Property Values. Even with three lower cell towers, we believe they still can be seen from the backyards or the dindows of nearby houses. Someday, if we decide to sell our houses, we will need to disclose to the buyer that our homes are right under two wireless companies' EIGHT cell phone towers, not to mention that the towers will be extremely conspicuous.

Many real estate professionals agree that potential buyers will not consider purchasing homes in the nearby vicinity of a cell phone tower. As such, the Proposed Installation could negatively impact property values in the neighborhood.

4. Serious aesthetic problems to nearby Pomeroy Green Community

- 1) Putting the monotree at said location would present **serious aesthetic problems**. The 60 foot structure or the lower 3 towers planned are much higher and most trees in the neighborhood and will detract from the overall aesthetic qualities of the complex and neighborhood. At Pomeroy Green, all our utilities are placed underground to create a beautiful environment for our residents.
- 2) Whether it's the 60 foot monotree or 3 shorter monotrees, it will be an eyesore, and will be visible not only to all residents of Pomeroy Green but nearby houses in the surrounding areas.
- 3) It will be inconsistent with the development in the neighborhood. Pomeroy Green. The Pomeroy Green Cooperative housing complex is registered in the **National Register of Historic Places (THE NRHP]** and therefore the tower project may be required to be **reviewed for environmental impacts, including aesthetic, by local and higher government agencies**. The tower project may require a permit from the FCC, making the **project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The range of environmental impacts** may extend to another nearby multifamily complex, Pomeroy West (potentially historic) and the city's Earl Carmichael Park. Those residents and the City's Parks and Recreation Department should be **provided with the notice of public hearing** so that those residents and the public can comment on the project.
- 4) The Project could easily be **located elsewhere in the City** at a location that will solve most of the problems we have enumerated above, as stated **in more detail in our letter of November 14, 2024, also on file and is part of the public record in this item. AT&T has provided no evidence that they have done due diligence in examining other more suitable locations.**

ATT&T cell tower rejection letter and signatures

If AT&T really needs to install a new tower in this area, why don't they choose a location that is not so close to **someone's backyard?**

We respectfully urge you to honor the wishes of this community and reject this plan from AT&T, and let them seek out alternate sites.

Sincerely,

Signatures of the neighborhood residents:

Lynn Wang & Yongli
3190 Humboldt Ave.

Sherry Shinn
3216 Humboldt Ave.

Jesus Rivera
324 Humboldt Ave

YAMBAO JONATHAN
3241 HUMBOLT AVE

Sapna Agrawal
1155 Pomeroy Ave

Sanjay Agarwal
1155 Pomeroy Ave

Colin Wm
1114 Pomeroy Ave

Prabin Bhandari/Smriti Sharma
1149 Pomeroy Ave

Pooarti Gupta
3215, Benton Street.

ATT&T cell tower rejection letter and signatures

Ablishek Vik.

3215 Benton Street.

Satnam Sidhu

3170 Humboldt AV ~~ter~~

Zhiling Wan, Zhong Qian

3160 Humboldt Avenue

Maha Chauhan

3130 Humboldt Ave

3042

P NO L D C

Lin Ma Weili

3141 Humboldt Ave

Yang Lin

3151 Humboldt Ave

Rossen TERORA

3209 Humboldt Ave

Ni Zhu


3161 Humboldt Ave.

Uttam Chauhan

3208 Humboldt Ave

ATT&T cell tower rejection letter and signatures

Melody Xiong
1165 Pomeroy Ave

3208 Humboldt Ave RAJIV PENDYALA



Laura Benton
3232 Humboldt Ave.

Lee Benton
3232 Humboldt Ave.

Violeta Villa Velazquez
3232 Humboldt Ave

David Benton
3232 Humboldt Ave

JUDY ZAMBO
3150 HUMBOLT AVE.



Dino Plancarte
3120 Humboldt Ave



Adriana Garcia
3100 Humboldt Ave
Santa Clara CA 95051 

Vignesh Vivekanaja
3086 Humboldt Ave
Santa Clara CA 95051

Appendix: suggested locations instead of

Re: PLN23-00148, APN 290-27-006

3111 Benton Street,

AT&T telecommunication facility, Installation of 60 foot tall monotree.

Planning Commission Hearing; October 23, 2024 (past) & December 4, 2024 (pending)

Dear Ms. Leslie Xavier,

Please find and consider our suggestions for alternative sites (map attached) for the installation of the telecommunications monotree facility proposed by AT&T at the 3111 Benton Street site. We believe our suggested locations, rather than the 3111 Benton Avenue site, are more compatible with the neighborhood, particularly neighborhood aesthetics, and will provide the signal coverage desired by AT&T.

Please forward our suggested alternatives to AT&T for their consideration and discussion prior to the next Planning Commission meeting hearing on this project scheduled for December 4.

We consulted the AT&T coverage maps (“Existing Sites...Coverage” and “Existing Sites +... Coverage”) provided by AT&T that were included in the attachments for Planning Commission meeting held on October 23. We used those maps to find compatible locations for the monotree in the dark purple and yellow colored areas on the “Existing Sites...” map where indoor coverage is lacking or less reliable in our neighborhood.

The following are our suggested alternatives for the tower in the dark purple areas of the AT&T coverage map (areas of no coverage to date) that should provide equal or better coverage than the 3111 Benton site; these locations are indicated by **red** dots on the attached map):

- └
1. Earl Carmichael Park, 3445 Benton Street, rear of park
 2. Stratford School, 890 Pomeroy Avenue near school or rear parking lot (*Best Location*)
 3. Curtis Field, 890 Pomeroy Avenue, field near Stratford School parking lot
 4. Homesteaders 4-H Ranch, 3450 Brookdale Drive, parking lot
 5. The Church of Jesus of Latter Day Saints, 875 Quince Avenue, rear parking lot
 6. Church in Santa Clara, 3550 Benton Street, parking lot or field next door
 7. Church of Christ of Santa Clara, 850 Pomeroy Avenue, north parking lot, in soil area
 8. Neighborhood Christian Center, 887 Pomeroy Avenue, parking lot or lawn in front

The following alternatives for the tower are located in the yellow colored areas of the AT&T map (areas of less reliable coverage) that should provide enhanced coverage than the 3111 Benton site; these locations are indicated by **yellow** colored dots on the attached map

1. Central Park, 909 Kiely Blvd., especially the area near the baseball field (*Best Location*)
2. Pomeroy Elementary School, 1250 Pomeroy Avenue, north side of site or field in back
3. Kiely Plaza, 1052-1092 Kiely Blvd. southwest corner of intersection with Benton St.
4. Benton Shopping Center, 3565 Benton St., landscaped areas front of the mall

From: [Planning Public Comment](#)
To: [REDACTED] [Planning Public Comment](#); [Lesley Xavier](#)
Subject: RE: AT&T tower proposed for 3111 Benton Street, Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Dec. 4, 2024; another suggested alternative location
Date: Monday, December 2, 2024 9:42:15 AM
Attachments: [AT&T monotree, 3111 Benton Street , Ken Kratz letter to Planning Commission, suggestions; alternative locations for the tower, Salvation Army site.doc](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Good Morning,

Your email has been received in the Planning Division and will be part of the public record on this item.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your input.

Regards,

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT | Staff Aide II
Community Development Department | Planning Division
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
O : 408.615.2450 Direct : 408.615.2474

From: Ken Kratz [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 9:12 AM
To: Planning Public Comment <PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov>
Subject: AT&T tower proposed for 3111 Benton Street, Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Dec. 4, 2024; another suggested alternative location

Dear Planning Department,

Please find attached my letter regarding the AT&T tower project proposed for 3111 Benton Street. Please forward the attachment to the Planning Commission for their meeting scheduled for Dec. 4, 2024.

Thank you,

Ken Kratz
[REDACTED]

November 25, 2024
3283 Benton Street
Santa Clara, California 95051

Leslie Xavier
Planning Manager
Community Development Department
City of Santa Clara
1500 Warburton Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95050
PlanningPublicComment@SantaClaraCA.gov

Re: PLN23-00148, APN 290-27-006
3111 Benton Street (project address),
AT&T telecommunication facility, proposed 60' tall monotree or alternative
Planning Commission Hearing; December 4, 2024 (meeting body & date)

Dear Ms. Leslie Xavier,

Please consider relocating the proposed tower for 3111 Benton Street to the Salvation Army located at 3090 Homestead Road. I also submitted to you in an earlier email sent to you on November 25 many other suggested alternative locations to site the tower(s).

I believe my suggested locations, rather than the 3111 Benton Avenue site, are more compatible with the neighborhood, particularly neighborhood aesthetics, and will provide the signal coverage desired by AT&T. I don't like AT&T's currently proposed alternative to the monotree, the three towers proposed along the frontage of the church at 3111 Benton street will be ugly.

Please forward this suggested alternative to AT&T for their consideration and discussion prior to the next Planning Commission meeting hearing on this project scheduled for December 4.

I consulted the AT&T coverage maps (“Existing Sites...Coverage” and “Existing Sites +... Coverage”) provided by AT&T that were included in the attachments for Planning Commission meeting held on October 23. I used those maps to find compatible locations for the monotree in the dark purple and yellow colored areas on the “Existing Sites...” map where indoor coverage is lacking or less reliable in the neighborhood. The Homestead location is on the border of purple and yellow areas.

Please consider all my suggested alternative locations for the installation of the telecommunications facility proposed by AT&T.

Thank you for considering my alternatives.

Sincerely,

Ken Kratz

From: [Planning Public Comment](#)
To: [REDACTED] [Planning Public Comment](#); [Lesley Xavier](#)
Subject: RE: AT&T tower proposed for 3111 Benton Street, Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Dec. 4, 2024
Date: Monday, December 2, 2024 9:43:04 AM
Attachments: [AT&T tower, 3111 Benton Street, Ken Kratz letter to City Plan Dept. 11-27-2024.doc](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Good Morning,

Your email has been received in the Planning Division and will be part of the public record on this item.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your input.

Regards,

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT | Staff Aide II
Community Development Department | Planning Division
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
O : 408.615.2450 Direct : 408.615.2474

From: Ken Kratz [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 9:41 AM
To: Planning Public Comment <PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov>
Subject: AT&T tower proposed for 3111 Benton Street, Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Dec. 4, 2024

Dear Planning Department,

Please find attached my letter regarding the AT&T tower project proposed for 3111 Benton Street. Please forward the attachment to the Planning Commission for their meeting scheduled for Dec. 4, 2024.

Thank you,

Ken Kratz
[REDACTED]

November 27, 2024
3283 Benton Street
Santa Clara, California 95051



Leslie Xavier
Planning Manager
Community Development Department
City of Santa Clara
1500 Warburton Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95050
PlanningPublicComment@SantaClaraCA.gov

Re: PLN23-00148
APN 290-27-006
Address: 3111 Benton Street
Subject: Conditional Use Permit for unmanned AT&T telecommunication facility
Meeting: Planning Commission Hearing Date: December 4, 2024

Dear Ms. Leslie Xavier,

I object to the above-named project for the following reasons, as explained in my earlier email to you dated October 23, 2024, and request the project be continued to another time until all my concerns below are addressed:

1. Proper public notice not provided.

My complex where I live, Pomeroy Green located directly west of the project location, still did not receive notice of the project. The City Planning Commission's "Notice of Public Hearing" was not mailed to all of the townhouse units in Pomeroy Green nor was the Pomeroy Green Board of Directors nor the Pomeroy Green Property Manager notified of the proposed tower project.

Pomeroy Green Cooperative has a parcel map filed with the County Assessor's Office (Book 290, page 69; attached) as well as water/sewer. Solar system bills; therefore, the City should have mailed the notice to all the townhouses in the complex as well as the Pomeroy Green Cooperative Corporation, not just those residents within 500' of the project. The people in this area should have been provided with proper notice in order to consider the ramifications of such a serious project.

2. Aesthetic concerns that may subject the project to environmental review.

The tower project will cause aesthetic damage to our complex and neighborhood. The 60-foot structures as well as the alternative towers proposed for the front of the church site are much higher

than all the houses and most trees in the neighborhood and therefore will detract from the overall aesthetic qualities of the complex and neighborhood.

At Pomeroy Green all our utilities are placed underground to create a beautiful environment for our residents. If the tower(s) is/are constructed it will be an eyesore that will be visible from all locations within Pomeroy Green. It will aesthetically impact not only Pomeroy Green but also all the surrounding homes too, those to the north and east of the project.

The Pomeroy Green Cooperative housing complex is registered in the National Register of Historic Places (the NRHP) and, therefore, the tower project may be required to be reviewed for environmental impacts, including aesthetic impacts, by local and higher government agencies. The tower project may require a permit from the FCC, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The range of environmental impacts may extend to another nearby multifamily complex, Pomeroy West (potentially historic) and the City's Earl Carmichael Park. Those residents and the City's Parks and Recreation Department should be provided with the notice of public hearing so that those residents and the public can comment on the project.

We request the city provide those notices of public hearings and also have the project reviewed under the City's Architectural Review process.

3. Radiation danger

Radiation and cancer danger to all persons within 500-foot radius of the aforementioned 60 foot telecommunication towers, and all residents of Pomeroy Green, where we live, which has 78 housing units that stand to be impacted by this project. This is a very serious issue because the installation of this tower will generate continuous radiation exposure which will impact health in a negative way according to many medical sources conducted by government agencies, such as Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA) & World Health Organization (WHO), and others.

These tall telecommunication towers will be irradiating us 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. AT&T, as well as the Baptist Church, must not take economic advantage, for economic purpose, while endangering the health and well-being of so many residents.

During my conversation with the manager of the adjacent Baptist Church, he mentioned that AT&T came to them offering monthly compensation for allowing this project. AT&T wants to use the church property; the personnel at AT&T, as well as the most members of the Baptist Church, likely do not live in this area and are only exposed to the radiation a few hours a week.

It is very well known in scientific literature by institutions such as National Cancer Institute (NCI), International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) & Federal Drug Administration (FDA) that radiation is a health hazard, that exposure to RF energy can have harmful effects. We know that we are subject to some radiation, but this project will expose us to 24 hours a day of powerful radiation. We don't want future clusters of cancer in this neighborhood, especially since there are

other areas in Santa Clara where this tower can be placed. For instance, Santa Clara Central Park & open areas not near to residential areas where this project would be such a threat to harm people

4. Attractive nuisance

The proposed tower will create an attractive nuisance. Young people including preteens from our neighborhood and schools nearby (Santa Clara High School, Pomeroy Elementary, Strafford Schools) may find the tower a challenge to climb. Pomeroy Green has problems with young people and children crossing our property and entering our pool area that is surrounded by a 6' high cyclone fence.

5. Project could be located elsewhere in the city

The project could easily be placed in another location in the city that will solve most of the problems we have enumerated above. I provided many alternative locations for the tower(s) in earlier emails to you.

Thank you for considering my concerns and please continue/postpone the project to a later date so that my concerns can be explored and addressed.

Sincerely,

Ken Kratz

From: [Planning Public Comment](#)
To: [REDACTED] [Planning Public Comment](#); [Lesley Xavier](#); [Elizabeth Elliott](#)
Cc: [Eric Crutchlow](#); [Nancy Biagini](#); [Priya Cherukuru](#); [Qian Huang](#); [Lance Saleme](#); [Mario Bouza](#); [Yashraj Bhatnagar](#); [office@scfbc.org](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Lee Benton's letter, Regarding PLN23-00148, installation of a 60-foot-monotree or an alternative 3 lower cell towers in the parking lot by AT&T in Santa Clara First Baptist Church
Date: Monday, December 2, 2024 9:41:28 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Lee's letter.pdf](#)
[image002.png](#)

Good Morning,

Your email has been received in the Planning Division and will be part of the public record on this item.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your input.

Regards,

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT | Staff Aide II
Community Development Department | Planning Division
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050
O : 408.615.2450 Direct : 408.615.2474

From: Yongli Wen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 2:27 AM
To: Planning Public Comment <PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov>; Lesley Xavier <LXavier@santaclaraca.gov>; Elizabeth Elliott <EElliott@santaclaraca.gov>
Cc: Eric Crutchlow <ecrutchlow@santaclaraca.gov>; Nancy Biagini <NBiagini@SantaClaraCA.gov>; Priya Cherukuru <PCherukuru@SantaClaraCA.gov>; Qian Huang <QHuang@Santaclaraca.gov>; Lance Saleme <LSaleme@SantaClaraCA.gov>; Mario Bouza <mbouza@Santaclaraca.gov>; Yashraj Bhatnagar <YBhatnagar@Santaclaraca.gov>; office@scfbc.org; Sudharani Ravi [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Lee Benton's letter, Regarding PLN23-00148, installation of a 60-foot-monotree or an alternative 3 lower cell towers in the parking lot by AT&T in Santa Clara First Baptist Church

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm Yongli Wen, the immediate neighbor of Santa Clara First Baptist Church. I'm sending you a letter on behalf of my neighbor Lee and Laura Benton. Because somehow they can't deliver their letter to you by email.

Their letter is regarding PLN23-00148, installation of a 60-foot-monotree or an alternative 3 lower cell towers in the parking lot by AT&T in Santa Clara First Baptist Church. Please see the attached letter. As almost all of the neighbors, they strongly oppose the two cell tower installation plans.

Sincerely,

Yongli Wen

Cc: First Baptist Church and AT&T

Lee and Laura Benton
3232 Humbolt Ave
Santa Clara CA 95051

November 26, 2024

Dear City Official's Santa Clara Planning Department,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed installation of a communication tower near our property, specifically in close proximity to our backyard. As a resident of this community for over 20 years, I have grown deeply fond of the peaceful and family-friendly environment that Santa Clara offers. The prospect of this tower being constructed in our neighborhood has raised several concerns for my family and me, and I hope that the city will take these issues into careful consideration before moving forward with the project.

1. **Health Concerns:** Our primary concern is the potential health risks associated with the installation of the tower. We are aware of ongoing debates surrounding the safety of electromagnetic radiation and the possible long-term effects of exposure. While we understand that current regulations may deem such installations safe, we are still apprehensive about the proximity of the tower to our home, where our children and family members spend much of their time. We kindly request that the city provide more information about the safety measures in place and the steps being taken to ensure that residents are not exposed to harmful levels of radiation.
2. **Noise and Disruption:** Another concern is the potential noise that may result from the installation and operation of the tower. We are concerned that the equipment could create noise pollution that would disrupt the tranquility of our home and the surrounding area. We ask that the city evaluate the potential for noise disturbance, especially during installation and maintenance periods, and take necessary actions to mitigate this issue.
3. **Preserving the Character of the Neighborhood:** Our family chose to move to Santa Clara two decades ago because of its welcoming and peaceful atmosphere, which is something we deeply value. We are concerned that the installation of this tower so close to residential homes could alter the character of our neighborhood, making it less family-friendly and potentially decreasing property values. We would appreciate the city's consideration of alternative locations for the tower, ideally in areas that are less densely populated and where fewer residents would be affected.
4. **Alternative Locations:** We also believe that there are other locations within the city that would be more appropriate for the tower, such as commercial or industrial areas with fewer homes nearby. We urge the city to explore these options to minimize the impact on the residential areas surrounding the proposed site.

We understand that Santa Clara, like many growing cities, requires infrastructure to support its development. However, we hope that the city will prioritize the health, safety, and well-being of its residents as it moves forward with this project. We respectfully request that the city conduct a thorough review of the proposed tower installation and take all community concerns into account before proceeding.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter. We look forward to your response and to further discussions about how we can work together to ensure that Santa Clara remains a safe and vibrant community for all residents.

Sincerely,
Lee and Laura Benton

Laura Benton

Lee Benton