

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
NUMBER:**

For Planning Commission Agenda of:

Consent Agenda Item	Item Number:
Continued Hearing Item	Item Number:
Public Hearing Item	Item Number:
Department Report	Item Number:
Old Business	Item Number:

Re:

Record Number:

Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): See below

Area: Foster Ave, Arcata

Attached for the Planning Commission's record and review is the following supplementary information:

From: [Janet Neebe](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit PLN-2020-16754
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 10:04:22 AM

*To: Humboldt County Planning Department
Humboldt County Planning Commission*

We are writing to oppose the current cell phone projects proposed near Foster Avenue in the unincorporated portion of Arcata, including New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit PLN-2020-16754 and PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit PLN-2021-17005.

The County has not yet adopted its Communications Facility Ordinance to allow for planning of siting of and need for additional cell phone towers. There is no evidence for a need for an additional cell phone tower(s) in this area.

This area is part of the Arcata Greenbelt and provides open space and agricultural areas that are incompatible with cell phone towers. It is too near residential developments, schools, and farms.

An obtrusive project such as a cell phone tower that will be viewed from miles around and has multiple impacts requires greater community education and input. We only found out about this project yesterday (the day before the comment deadline) from a friend, even though we live in the unincorporated portion of Arcata. The Planning Department staff and the Planning Commissioners need to reconsider their responsibility to their constituencies in unincorporated portions of the County, and grant us the information, input, and respect we deserve.

(In addition, it is not acceptable, logical or respectful to posit "two were proposed and we only approved one.")

*Janet Neebe
Benjamin Duff
2021 Upper Bay Road, Arcata*

cc

Steve Madrone

Mike Wilson

City of Arcata Planning Division

From: [Janet Neebe](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit PLN-2021-17005
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 10:06:23 AM

*To: Humboldt County Planning Department
Humboldt County Planning Commission*

We are writing to oppose the current cell phone projects proposed near Foster Avenue in the unincorporated portion of Arcata, including New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit PLN-2020-16754 and PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit PLN-2021-17005.

The County has not yet adopted its Communications Facility Ordinance to allow for planning of siting of and need for additional cell phone towers. There is no evidence for a need for an additional cell phone tower(s) in this area.

This area is part of the Arcata Greenbelt and provides open space and agricultural areas that are incompatible with cell phone towers. It is too near residential developments, schools, and farms.

An obtrusive project such as a cell phone tower that will be viewed from miles around and has multiple impacts requires greater community education and input. We only found out about this project yesterday (the day before the comment deadline) from a friend, even though we live in the unincorporated portion of Arcata. The Planning Department staff and the Planning Commissioners need to reconsider their responsibility to their constituencies in unincorporated portions of the County, and grant us the information, input, and respect we deserve.

(In addition, it is not acceptable, logical or respectful to posit “two were proposed and we only approved one.”)

*Janet Neebe
Benjamin Duff
2021 Upper Bay Road, Arcata*

cc

Steve Madrone

Mike Wilson

City of Arcata Planning Division

From: [lee torrence](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: PLN-2020-16754 and PLN-2021-17005.
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 10:09:01 AM

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I fought the cell tower they tried to put in in 2003.

Is there a significant need for these to be put in? And why two so close together?

Points of concern (by no means exhaustive):

Please consider: From the recently approved (2017) Humboldt County General Plan re: Communication Facilities. Goal T-G4.

T-G4 Communication Facilities. Orderly planning and appropriate development of communication facilities within the County to achieve reliable access while protecting public health and safety; minimizing visual blight; and preserving the County's rural character including the protection of scenic, natural, and cultural resources.

1) Humboldt County has not yet developed their Communications Ordinance which would identify adequate setbacks for towers from residences, schools, daycare centers and hospitals.

Implementation Measures: T-1 M1 Communications Facilities Ordinance. Adopt a Communications Facilities Ordinance that ensures compatibility of communications facilities with nearby land uses, is proactive in the design and siting of wireless communications facilities, provides incentives for unobtrusive and compatible wireless antennas, and establishes clear standards for such facilities.

2) Evidence of Need for towers has not been adequately demonstrated-General Plan states no need for additional towers in this area.

3) Monitoring and Evaluation of Compliance not identified.

- 4) Diminished property values-negative impact.
- 5) No Environmental Analysis or Document-A categorical exemption cannot be used when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place are significant.

Environmental Review: Categorical Exemption, Class 3

- 6) Conversion of Prime Agricultural soil does not comply with County General Plan and Code (see below):

Conditionally permitted uses that would convert zoned agriculture exclusive or AE zone land to nonagricultural uses shall not be approved unless the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

- A. There are no feasible alternatives that would prevent or minimize conversion;
- B. The facts support an overriding public interest in the conversion; and
- C. For lands outside of designated urban development boundaries, sufficient off-setting mitigation has been provided to prevent a net reduction in the agricultural land base and agricultural production. This requirement shall be known as the “no net loss” agricultural lands policy. “No net loss” mitigation is limited to one (1) or more of the following:
 - Replanning of vacant agricultural lands from a nonagricultural land use designation to an agricultural plan designation along with the recordation of a permanent conservation easement on this land for continued agricultural use; or
 - The retirement of nonagricultural uses on lands planned for agriculture and recordation of a permanent conservation easement on this land for continued agricultural use; or
 - Financial contribution to an agricultural land fund in an amount sufficient to fully offset the agricultural land conversion for those uses enumerated in subsections (C)(1) and (C)(2). The operational details of the land fund, including the process for setting the amount of the financial contribution, shall be established by ordinance.
 - No consideration of the general welfare and safety of

persons in the area of proposed towers.

- No alternate sites for towers have been analyzed
- Co-location (required as per General Plan) on other towers to fulfill "assumed" need has not been fully analyzed.
- Melatonin levels of cows are adversely affected by EMF's causing a reduction in milk production.
- In 2003 the Board of Supervisors denied a similar project which was located close to the currently proposed towers following an appeal by the City of Arcata.
- No analysis as to how this would affect migratory birds found moving through the area.
- No analysis of how this would affect wetlands and biological resources in the area.

I oppose these cell phone towers.

Very Sincerely,
Lee Torrence

From: [Carol McFarland](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to Cell Towers
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 10:42:05 AM

The the Humboldt County Planning Commission

In regard to New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit and PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit and Special Permit Record Numbers PLN-2020-16754 and PLN-2021-17005, I would like to express, as a resident on Foster Avenue, that I am opposed to such an application and its installation.

Please consider: From the recently approved (2017) Humboldt County General Plan re: Communication Facilities. Goal T-G4.

T-G4 Communication Facilities. Orderly planning and appropriate development of communication facilities within the County to achieve reliable access while protecting public health and safety; minimizing visual blight; and preserving the County's rural character including the protection of scenic, natural, and cultural resources.

1) Humboldt County has not yet developed their Communications Ordinance which would identify adequate setbacks for towers from residences, schools, daycare centers and hospitals.

Implementation Measures: T-1 M1 Communications Facilities Ordinance. Adopt a Communications Facilities Ordinance that ensures compatibility of communications facilities with nearby land uses, is proactive in the design and siting of wireless communications facilities, provides incentives for unobtrusive and compatible wireless antennas, and establishes clear standards for such facilities.

2) Evidence of Need for towers has not been adequately demonstrated-General Plan states no need for additional towers in this area.

3) Monitoring and Evaluation of Compliance not identified.

4) Diminished property values-negative impact.

5) No Environmental Analysis or Document-A categorical

exemption cannot be used when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place are significant.

Environmental Review: Categorical Exemption, Class 3

6) Conversion of Prime Agricultural soil does not comply with County General Plan and Code (see below):

Conditionally permitted uses that would convert zoned agriculture exclusive or AE zone land to nonagricultural uses shall not be approved unless the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

- A. There are no feasible alternatives that would prevent or minimize conversion;
- B. The facts support an overriding public interest in the conversion; and
- C. For lands outside of designated urban development boundaries, sufficient off-setting mitigation has been provided to prevent a net reduction in the agricultural land base and agricultural production. This requirement shall be known as the “no net loss” agricultural lands policy. “No net loss” mitigation is limited to one (1) or more of the following:
 - Replanning of vacant agricultural lands from a nonagricultural land use designation to an agricultural plan designation along with the recordation of a permanent conservation easement on this land for continued agricultural use; or
 - The retirement of nonagricultural uses on lands planned for agriculture and recordation of a permanent conservation easement on this land for continued agricultural use; or
 - Financial contribution to an agricultural land fund in an amount sufficient to fully offset the agricultural land conversion for those uses enumerated in subsections (C)(1) and (C)(2). The operational details of the land fund, including the process for setting the amount of the financial contribution, shall be established by ordinance.
 - No consideration of the general welfare and safety of persons in the area of proposed towers.

- No alternate sites for towers have been analyzed
- Co-location (required as per General Plan) on other towers to fulfill "assumed" need has not been fully analyzed.
- Melatonin levels of cows are adversely affected by EMF's causing a reduction in milk production.
- In 2003 the Board of Supervisors denied a similar project which was located close to the currently proposed towers following an appeal by the City of Arcata.
- No analysis as to how this would affect migratory birds found moving through the area.
- No analysis of how this would affect wetlands and biological resources in the area.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol McFarland
1983 Foster Avenue
Arcata, CA 95521
707.296.4836

From: [Ramona Fair](#)
To: [Planning Clerk; brian@landlogistics.com](#)
Subject: Opposition to PLN-2021-17005 and PLN-2020-16754
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 12:05:06 PM

I am writing to voice my opposition the the 2 proposed cell towers for the Arcata Bottom, PLN-2021-17005 and PLN-2020-16754.

The one proposed for Janes x Foster Ave. is an inappropriate location as it's on AE land, close to 2 schools & a church and would be a visual blight on the landscape. *There are NO 'water towers' in this area and it would be in conflict with the landscape. Also, it being Summer, the said schools are out of session and therefore have had no opportunity to weigh in on this matter.

The one proposed for the Sun Valley property is a poor location because it's way too close to neighbors to the west and would be a visible blight from all directions. Cell service out in the Arcata Bottom area/s is fine- if these towers are to serve area/s of South Mckinleyville, etc., they should be located closer to that area/s- there are areas near Giuntoli/West End road that are more industrial in use & visuals and that would be a more appropriate location/s.

IF it were to proceed in the Arcata Bottom, it should be One tower with co-location and located on the farside of the old mill buildings, in the NorthEast corner which would be less visible because those buildings are taller and also it's further away from residents on that side.

Thank you,
Ramona Fair

From: [Alan Butler](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 1:09:26 PM

In approval of cell tower on Jane's road it would blend in fine with environment being enclosed in water tower. Would also as emerengency tower for the county, in case of deserter.
Thanks AlanButler

From: [Doug Boileau](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Support for Special Project Faux Water Tower
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 2:17:00 PM

Please accept this letter of support for the construction of a faux water tower to house an AT&T Cellular project on the Butler Ranch on Foster Ave. Arcata. The tower will enhance cellular communications for those on the AT&T network , and the structure as planned won't detract from the rural character of the neighborhood.

Doug Boileau
Arcata-Mad River Ambulance

From: [Dona Moxon](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: proposed cell tower on Butler property-Foster & Janes Rd., Arcata
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 2:19:15 PM

Hello,

Please add my support to the application for a cell tower on the Butler property in Arcata. The addition of cellular coverage that would increase and boost service to Northern Humboldt County areas would surely be a benefit to all. The coverage that is currently available to us is weak and sporadic at times, especially during the academic year and throughout the winter months.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dona Moxon
3104 Bay School Rd
Arcata, CA 95521



Virus-free. www.avast.com

June 28, 2021

Dear Humboldt County Planning Commissioners,

Re: New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit and PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit and Special Permit Record Numbers PLN-2020-16754 and PLN-2021-17005

I am opposed to the approval of any of the two cell towers proposed for the Arcata Bottom off Foster Avenue.

The Board of Supervisors denied a similar project in 2003 and the follow up to this was that the County would develop an ordinance that would flesh out the issues identified during this controversy, many of them specific to the Arcata Bottom.

As a result of the discussions that happened around this issue, the recently approved 2017 Humboldt County General Plan identified a commitment to increasing fiber optic broadband as a solution to an endless demand for less reliable cell towers that are intrusive, potentially harmful, property value diminishing and damaging to birds and in the case of agricultural regions, damaging to prime agricultural land and the productivity of dairy cows.

In the recently approved 2017 Humboldt County General Plan's Telecommunications Chapter the number one Implementation Measure listed is the Telecommunications Ordinance, but it has not been achieved and therefore approving any cell towers for the Arcata Bottom would be premature in it's absence.

1. **T-IM1. Communications Facilities Ordinance.** Adopt a Communications Facilities Ordinance that ensures compatibility of communications facilities with nearby land uses, is proactive in the design and siting of wireless communications facilities, provides incentives for unobtrusive and compatible wireless antennas, and establishes clear standards for such facilities.

A number of issues that came up in the prior project that was denied are still relevant today and would best be explored through the development of this ordinance, are:

- 1) Setbacks to residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers and places of work.
- 2) Impacts to biological resources, including migratory birds, often found moving through the landscape on the Arcata Bottom,
- 3) Impacts to prime agricultural soils and dairy cow productivity.
- 4) Development of wireless free quiet zones for those suffering from electro-sensitivity, a recognized disability.
- 5) Development of Monitoring requirements of ambient microwave radiation and analysis of microwave effects.
- 6) Identification of areas best suited for accommodating cell tower placement throughout the County.

Until the County implements the development of this ordinance, any towers approved on the Arcata Bottom would be an insult to the public trust bestowed upon you as Planning Commissioners.

Sincerely,


Lisa Brown, Arcata



PLANNING DIVISION
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

3015 H STREET

EUREKA, CALIF. 95501-4484

PHONE (707) 445-7541

**For BOS/PC Workshop of August 18, 2003
(5:30 pm to 7:30 pm in the Board Chambers)**

DATE: August 11, 2003
TO: Board of Supervisors & Planning Commission
FROM: Kirk Girard, Director of Community Development Services
SUBJECT: Workshop to Discuss Several Options For Drafting a County Wireless Telecommunications Facilities (WTF) Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Receive a staff presentation for local telecommunications regulations, and
2. Receive comments from industry representatives and the public; and
3. Discuss the options and comments received with the Planning Commission, consultant and Planning staff.

Prepared by: Kirk Gothier

CAO Approval: _____

REVIEW:

Auditor _____ County Counsel _____ Personnel _____ Risk Manager _____ Other _____

TYPE OF ITEM: cc: WTF Interest List

- ☐ Consent
☐ Departmental
☐ Public Hearing
☒ Other

PREVIOUS ACTION/REFERRALS:

Board Item No. __, Meeting May 1, 2001
Board Item No. F2, Meeting January 23, 2001
Board Item No. C4, Meeting September 10, 2002,
Meetings of June 4, 2002 & January 28, 2003

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT
Upon the motion of Supervisor _____
seconded by Supervisor _____
and unanimously carried by those members present,
the Board hereby adopts the recommended action
contained in this report.

Dated: _____
Lora Canzoneri, Clerk of the Board

by: _____
Deputy

DISCUSSION

On June 4, 2002, your Board approved a contract with Dyett & Bhatia for the preparation of a technical background report, General Plan policies, Draft Ordinance for Wireless Telecommunication Facilities, and Initial Study as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

On January 28, 2003 your Board conducted a joint workshop with the Planning Commission to provide direction to the consultant in drafting the policies and ordinance. Attachment 1 includes the options for telecommunications policies and regulations that were discussed at that workshop. Based on that feedback, the consultant prepared a draft WTF Ordinance for staff review. Attachment 2 includes the draft WTF Ordinance, as revised by Planning Staff to conform with standards and procedures in the County Zoning Regulations.

To insure that this draft is headed in the direction that your Board and the Commission intended, staff scheduled this workshop to discuss key sections of the draft ordinance.

Key sections in the Draft Ordinance that should be discussed during the workshop include:

Section 8.2	Zones where WTF are permitted
Section 8.3F	Required alternatives analysis
Section 8.3H	Required independent review
Section 8.4	Development Standards
Section 8.6A	Certification of Facilities

Discussions on these topics will enable staff to proceed towards a set of General Plan WTF policies and a draft ordinance to include in the overall General Plan Update. The General Plan Update process, which will offer additional opportunities for public involvement, will culminate in a set of proposed Plan policies, a preferred EIR Plan alternative and a draft ordinance consistent with the proposed Plan policies.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

Funding for this contract is covered as a part of the County's General Plan Update program. The contract for Dyett & Bhatia's work is for \$18,000.

ALTERNATIVES

The Board could choose not to conduct the workshop. However, local needs can be discussed and the consultant's work can be further focused as a result of conducting the workshop.

REVIEW BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS

The Consultant's Draft Ordinance has been reviewed and revised by County Counsel and Planning Staff.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Options for WTF Regulations (From 1/28/03 Joint BOS/PC Workshop)

Attachment 2: Draft WTF Ordinance

Attachment 1

OPTIONS FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS REGULATIONS

County staff and the Consultant recommend adoption of a tiered permitting system with permit processes that vary depending upon the physical characteristics of the facility, its location, and its compliance with specific development and performance standards. The standards would deal with siting, design, visibility, construction impacts, on-going operation, and other characteristics that affect the compatibility and environmental and safety impacts of proposed facilities. Some other regulatory options for the Board to consider include:

1. *Avoid variances by allowing for a waiver or modification to standards and requirements based on specific findings showing non-detriment and necessity.*

The County could, for example, waive co-location requirement based on a finding that an existing structure does not have the capacity to support weight or wind loads from additional equipment, that retrofitting of older towers or monopoles would be technically difficult or too costly to achieve, or because a new location would be less visible. Regulations should also include process for granting waiver when regulation may create violation of Federal law.

2. *Require applicants to demonstrate that the proposed facility meets FCC radio frequency requirements.*

Local agencies may not, however, regulate the placement, construction, or modification of facilities based on radio frequency effects to the extent that they comply with FCC emission regulations and guidelines.

3. *Establish technical committee or retain an independent radio frequency engineer to review special exception, conditional use, building, or other permits related to personal wireless service facilities.*

Local agencies can require applicants to pay reasonable costs associated with technical analysis including feasibility of co-location or alternate sites, compliance with FCC standards, necessity based on adequacy of coverage.

4. *Establish distance requirements between monopoles/towers or buffers surrounding "sensitive" uses including residential uses as long as such requirements do not cause technical interference or have the effect of preventing the provision of wireless services.*

5. *Express locational preferences, such as requiring carriers to co-locate facilities on existing monopoles or find space on existing tall buildings and structures (e.g. utility towers/poles, water tanks, lighting standards, church steeples, billboards, etc.) before considering a new monopole or tower.*

6. *Require applicants to produce evidence of the efforts to locate on those alternative structures.*

7. *Encourage siting in industrial areas or at remote areas or sites, away from existing residential structures when it is not possible to place antennas on existing buildings or structures.*

Regulations may provide appropriate setbacks from residential properties, but any requirement for setbacks should provide an opportunity for a waiver of those setbacks to allow facilities on steeples or in a more concealed location due to tree cover or topography.

8. *Impose requirements to minimize the appearance of installations including colors, materials, incorporation into architectural features, and restrictions on lighting that are not inconsistent with other state or federal regulations.*

Regulations can require applicants to demonstrate that the design incorporates all feasible measures to reduce visibility.

9. *Adopt standards for equipment buildings and cabinets as well as antenna structures to ensure that design and siting of equipment buildings or equipment cabinets is compatible with surrounding existing and proposed land uses.*

The County could consider limiting maximum size and height of these structures, requiring compatible building materials or style of structure, and specifying standards for landscaping, lighting, and signage.

10. *Limit noise from air conditioners and electrical generators near sensitive receptors.*

11. *Consider mounting unobtrusive equipment buildings or cabinets on the roof of existing buildings or requiring installation inside buildings where antennas are mounted.*

12. *Require photo simulations, models, or balloon tests with photographs of balloons from various vantage points around the test site to show visual impact of proposed facility.*

These photos can be enhanced for presentation and exhibit purposes by digitizing computer enhancements of the proposed monopole or tower.

13. *Use environmental studies required by federal and state agencies by requiring submission of documents as part of process for certifying compliance with federal and state requirements.*

For example, environmental impact assessment is required by NEPA when facilities are located in officially designated wilderness or wildlife areas; facilities threaten endangered species or critical habitats; facilities affect historic sites or structures; facilities are to be located in floodplains; and when facilities will significantly change a surface area involving wetlands, deforestation or water diversions.

14. *Avoid blanket requirements for special exception/conditional use permits unless there is demonstrable evidence of potential adverse impacts. In many cases, well-disguised (i.e. stealthed) wall and roof-mounted antennas may be barely visible. Many facilities will generate little or no physical activity or traffic, noise, lighting, or odor effects.*

If discretionary review is required, ensure that process and evaluation criteria are reasonable in light of requirements for other commercial uses (e.g. permitted by right when not readily visible, sited in general commercial or industrial areas, or when placed upon existing structures, including existing monopoles, towers and buildings).

Discretionary review is appropriate when monopoles and towers are located within residentially zoned or developed areas, agricultural and farmland preservation areas, historic districts and sites, transitional areas proposed for residential use, etc. Prohibitions may be appropriate in floodplains, wetlands, and areas with steep slopes and erodible soils.

McClenagan, Laura

Subject: FW: New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit and PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit and Special Permit Record Numbers PLN-2020-16754 and PLN-2021-17005

From: Monica Coyne <monicoyne@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, June 27, 2021 11:48 AM

To: Planningclerk@co.humboldt.ca.us <Planningclerk@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Brian Millar <brian@landlogistics.com>

Subject: New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit and PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit and Special Permit Record Numbers PLN-2020-16754 and PLN-2021-17005

Hi,

My name is Monica Coyne. My husband and I own 23 acres of pasture land on the south side of Foster Ave. We do not have an address there yet. The APN # is 505-171-004. Our mailing address is Colum and Monica Coyne, PO Box 1178, Redway, Ca 95560. Please put us on your list for notifications in this area.

We have not received any notification of the proposed cell towers in the neighborhood. One of the towers is across the street from us.

We have looked at the proposal through a neighbor.

We are opposed to these cell towers in the Arcata Bottom. If you put towers at the lowest geographical location in the area then they have to be ridiculously tall and intrusive to the surrounding neighborhood. There is a zoned height limit of 40ft. We are planning on building a house and barn on our property on Foster. Are you changing the height limit zoning?

The proposed tower on Foster is a 100 ft tall fake water tank. There are no other water tanks in the area that are anywhere near 100 ft tall. This will be an eyesore and stand out as an effort to hide a huge cell tower. There are many other property owners in the area. It has been shown that cell towers lower property values considerably.

Here is one of many articles about property values and cell towers.

<https://scientists4wiredtech.com/what-are-4g-5g/cell-tower-installation-plans-lower-property-values/>

linked from the National Association of Realtors.

A study of 1000 respondents found:

- 94% said a nearby cell tower or group of antennas would negatively impact interest in a property or the price they would be willing to pay for it.
- 94% said a cell tower or group of antennas on top of, or attached to, an apartment building would negatively impact interest in the apartment building or the price they would be willing to pay for it.
- 95% said they would opt to buy or rent a property that had zero antennas on the building over a comparable property that had several antennas on the building.
- 79% said under no circumstances would they ever purchase or rent a property within a few blocks of a cell tower or antennas.
- 88% said that under no circumstances would they ever purchase or rent a property with a cell tower or group of antennas on top of, or attached to, the apartment building.

- 89% said they were generally concerned about the increasing number of cell towers and antennas in their residential neighborhood.

Why should one property owner be able to reap the benefits of a cell tower rental while the rest of us suffer the consequences of lower property values.

Thank you,
Monica and Colum Coyne

From: [Moxon, Delilah](#)
To: [McClenagan, Laura](#); [Lippre, Suzanne](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to PLN-2021-17005 and PLN-2020-16754
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 3:48:10 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

This may already be included in public comments. Please verify.

Thank you,



Delilah Moxon

Administrative Services Manager
[Planning and Building Department](#)
3015 H Street | Eureka, CA 95501
Phone: 707-445-7541 | Fax: 707-445-7446
Email: [dmoxon@co.humboldt.ca.us](mailto:dmozon@co.humboldt.ca.us)

From: Brian Millar <brian@landlogistics.com>
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2021 3:45 PM
To: Johnson, Cliff <CJohnson@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Moxon, Delilah <DMoxon@co.humboldt.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: Opposition to PLN-2021-17005 and PLN-2020-16754

Please see the attached email message.
Brian

From: Ramona Fair <msmadrone@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2021 3:26 PM
To: Brian Millar <brian@landlogistics.com>
Subject: Re: Opposition to PLN-2021-17005 and PLN-2020-16754

re: the cell tower/s-

My paragraph in my letter about the concern for domestic animals & wildlife, especially birds, being adversely affected by those towers seems to have disappeared? An environmental analysis should be done. Please include these statements for the record.

Thanks,
Ramona Fair

On Mon, Jun 28, 2021 at 12:04 PM Ramona Fair <msmadrone@gmail.com> wrote:

| I am writing to voice my opposition the the 2 proposed cell towers for the Arcata Bottom,

PLN-2021-17005 and PLN-2020-16754.

The one proposed for Janes x Foster Ave. is an inappropriate location as it's on AE land, close to 2 schools & a church and would be a visual blight on the landscape. *There are NO 'water towers' in this area and it would be in conflict with the landscape. Also, it being Summer, the said schools are out of session and therefore have had no opportunity to weigh in on this matter.

The one proposed for the Sun Valley property is a poor location because it's way too close to neighbors to the west and would be a visible blight from all directions. Cell service out in the Arcata Bottom area/s is fine- if these towers are to serve area/s of South McKinleyville, etc., they should be located closer to that area/s- there are areas near Giuntoli/West End road that are more industrial in use & visuals and that would be a more appropriate location/s.

IF it were to proceed in the Arcata Bottom, it should be One tower with co-location and located on the farside of the old mill buildings, in the NorthEast corner which would be less visible because those buildings are taller and also it's further away from residents on that side.

Thank you,
Ramona Fair