

November 21, 2017

Manhattan Beach City Council
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Dear City Council –

On behalf of the 2nd and Morningside Community, we would like to appeal your decision to allow AT&T to install a cell phone antenna at this location. This appeal is based on the following factors:

1) AT&T's Misrepresentation of the Aesthetic Design

AT&T proposed a flat panel antenna on the telephone pole, and this was the photo example that was sent to our neighborhood. However, as you know, they are now planning to install a large arm off of the pole to hold the antenna. We feel this was a bait and switch on their part. The City Council acknowledged in your meeting that this design is “particularly onerous” and questioned whether it falls within the city’s aesthetic guidelines. Pursuant to Sections 13.02.090 and 13.02.030 of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code, we believe it violates the aesthetics and general welfare standards of our community. We would therefore like to request that the City Council uphold these standards and not allow AT&T to compromise the aesthetic appeal of our neighborhood, which will directly impact our property values.

2) Distance to Homes

Mason M, who lives at 333 2nd Street, measured the distance from his home to the telephone pole at 8.5 ft. As you know, the standard for installation is 10 ft. While AT&T may claim that the actual antenna is 10 ft when measured on the diagonal, we feel that this does not fall within the guidelines.

3) Misrepresentation of our Community to the City Council.

Representatives of 2nd Street gave Assistant Planner Jason Masters two letters (attached) and met with him in person to discuss our concerns. We were very clear that these concerns included more than just the sidewalk box. His advice to us was to wait until the

City Council had approved the antenna, and then file an appeal for \$500. When the City Council asked him if anyone had expressed opposition to the 2nd Street antenna, he answered no, not since the box was removed. This is completely false and misleading. We therefore feel our objections were not properly conveyed in the meeting, which could have made a difference in the one vote we needed.

4) Misleading Coverage Assessment

While AT&T lists our neighborhood as a “white zone” with no coverage, our neighbors who are subscribers feel they are getting satisfactory coverage. Per Federal Law, there is a lack of credible evidence to support the “significant coverage gap” alleged by AT&T using only the 1900 MHz bandwidth propagation map and showing a goal of cell signal strength that is 20 dB higher than required (per Verizon vs. Fairfax County 2005). AT&T conveniently omitted the 700 and 2100 MHz ranges, which help fill in the gap in coverage. This gap is not sufficient in a Federal court of law to demonstrate a “significant gap” and we would like to see a higher standard applied to our neighborhood.

Our residents elected a City Council that we expect to be a voice for our community. The City Council should put the people and property of Manhattan Beach first, certainly before wireless providers such as AT&T. This particular antenna covers only a few blocks and the people of our neighborhood do not want it there. Steve and Richard, we appreciate your support in the meeting. Amy, Nancy and David, we sincerely hope we can sway your opinion to act in the best interest of our little community.

Best regards from your 2nd Street neighbors:

(Signed by neighborhood)

Martha Alvarez

From: Martha Alvarez
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 6:00 PM
To: Martha Alvarez
Subject: FW: Re: Manhattan Beach City Council Recap/Highlights - Re AT&T

From: fisher6188@aol.com [<mailto:fisher6188@aol.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2017 8:45 PM
To: List - City Council <CityCouncil@citymb.info>
Cc: Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>; Kendra Davis <kdavis@citymb.info>
Subject: Fwd: Re: Manhattan Beach City Council Recap/Highlights - Re AT&T

Hello,

Please see the email chain below. This makes absolutely no sense to me to have two installations within two blocks. Will we soon have one on each corner?

Lyn Fisher

From: fisher6188@Aol.com
To: jmasters@citymb.info
Cc: kdavis@citymb.info
Sent: 11/28/2017 8:35:02 PM Pacific Standard Time
Subject: Re: Manhattan Beach City Council Recap/Highlights - Re AT&T

Jason,

Thank you for the info. It still does not make sense to me that we have to have two installations within two blocks.

I think the Council has to man/woman up. There should be other blocks that can share this burden. I wonder if any of these proposed sites are near the Council Members' homes?

Also, on NextDoor.com, there were some people lauding this plan. Why not put these installations closer to their homes so they will have the service they crave.

I am forwarding this message chain to the MB City Council.

Lyn Fisher

On Nov 28, 2017, at 5:31 PM, Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info> wrote:

Lyn,

The providers decide which locations they would like to propose to meet their coverage objectives. They generally provide some alternatives, and City Staff works with them to try to identify the preferred locations. This isn't easy for them or for City Staff, as the City is mostly built-out, and locations are difficult to find which meet both City/Government regulations and the providers coverage objectives.

In this case, the City Council directed staff to prepare a Resolution approving it at that location. If we were directed to prepare a Resolution denying it, than AT&T would have the ability to propose a new site at a different location.

I hope that makes sense, please let me know if you have any further questions.

Take care,

Jason

From: fisher6188@aol.com [<mailto:fisher6188@aol.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2017 1:54 PM

To: Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>

Cc: Kendra Davis <kdavis@citymb.info>

Subject: Re: RE: RE: RE: Manhattan Beach City Council Recap/Highlights - Re AT&T

Thank you. So why does it have to be on 28th? Why not share the fun with some of the other nearby streets?

In a message dated 11/28/2017 1:51:38 PM Pacific Standard Time,
jmasters@citymb.info writes:

Lyn,

Looking at the existing and proposed coverage maps, it appears that the existing site on Grandview does not reach Highland or other areas which the location at Alma and 28th aims to achieve. So in order to achieve their coverage objectives, they are proposing this additional site. I hope that makes sense. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Jason

From: fisher6188@aol.com [<mailto:fisher6188@aol.com>]

Sent: Saturday, November 25, 2017 12:14 PM

To: Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>

Cc: Kendra Davis <kdavis@citymb.info>

Subject: Fwd: RE: RE: Manhattan Beach City Council Recap/Highlights - Re AT&T

Hello Jason Masters,

I am forwarding this to you as suggested below. Please let me know why we are getting two of these within just a few short blocks.

Thank you,

Lyn Fisher

473 28th St.

From: kdavis@citymb.info

To: fisher6188@aol.com

Sent: 11/20/2017 9:26:11 AM Pacific Standard Time

Subject: RE: RE: Manhattan Beach City Council
Recap/Highlights

Good morning,

If that is the case, then AT&T would have to elaborate on why nearby locations were proposed.

You are welcome to reach out to [Jason Masters](#) in our Community Development Dept. who deals directly with these applications for additional information. His number is (310) 802-5515.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can do for you.

Thanks,

Kendra Davis

From: fisher6188@aol.com [<mailto:fisher6188@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2017 9:22 AM
To: Kendra Davis <kdavis@citymb.info>
Subject: Re: RE: Manhattan Beach City Council Recap/Highlights

They do belong to AT&T - they are here often servicing them.

In a message dated 11/20/2017 8:47:03 AM Pacific Standard Time, kdavis@citymb.info writes:

Good morning,

Thank you for your response to our recap of the City Council meeting regarding proposed telecommunications permits from AT&T. While the City can't really speak to the why of the locations that were proposed by AT&T (though there is some context within their [application](#)), I have attached two maps that were provided to help illustrate the impact of these applications on current coverage.

It may also be helpful to note that the tower and boxes that you mentioned below may not belong to AT&T but another service provider.

Hope that is helpful!

Thanks,

Kendra Davis

From: fisher6188@aol.com [<mailto:fisher6188@aol.com>]

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 4:44 PM

To: Kendra Davis <kdavis@citymb.info>

Subject: Re: Manhattan Beach City Council Recap/Highlights

Why is 28th getting all the poles (Alma and 28th conditionally approved). We already have a tower and boxes on Grandview between 28th and 27th. This is only about two blocks away from the current ones.

In a message dated 11/17/2017 4:28:52 PM Pacific Standard Time, CityOfManhattanBeach@enotify.visioninternet.com writes:

City Council Recap/Highlights

Date: 11/17/2017 4:26 PM

Thank you for your interest in Manhattan Beach City Council meetings.

As a service to those who are unable to attend the City Council meetings but would like to know what

decisions were reached by the City Council, we have created this informational item that provides a brief recap and identifies "highlights" from the meeting. We will send these out after each regularly scheduled City Council meeting.

[Click here to download this recap](#) or continue reading below.

November 17, 2017 City Council Meeting **Recap/Highlights**

Below are the major highlights of the November 17, 2017 Council Meeting.

1. City Council Meeting

- Conducted a [Public Hearing to consider 15 proposed telecommunications permits for AT&T Telecom sites](#), four of which are in the appealable area of the Coastal Zone. City Council directed staff to draft resolutions as follows:

1. Ocean Dr / 18th St – denial;
2. Manhattan Ave / 5th Pl – denial;
3. Manhattan Ave / 35th & 36th St – conditionally approved;
4. Manhattan Ave / 29th St – conditionally approved;
5. Morningside Dr / 2nd St – conditionally approved;
6. Alma Ave / 28th St & 28th Pl – conditionally approved;
7. Highland Ave / 19th St & 19th Pl – denial;
8. Marine Ave / Bayview Dr – denial;
9. Manhattan Ave / 11th St – denial;
10. Highland Ave / 32nd Pl & 33rd St – conditionally approved;
11. Bayview Dr / 26th St – conditionally approved;
12. 2nd St / N. Ardmore Ave – denial;
13. Ingleside Dr / 5th Pl – conditionally approved;
14. Church St / 13th St & 14th St – denial;
15. N. Valley Dr / Pacific Ave – conditionally approved.

Please note that the proposed node at N. Valley Drive and 9th Place was previously denied by staff, no appeal was filed. Staff will present draft resolutions for City Council consideration at the December 5, 2017 City Council meeting.

For more information on the November 17, 2017 City Council meeting, please see the [City website](#). A full video recording of the meeting can be found [here](#) within 24 hours of the meeting.

[Change your eNotification preference.](#)

[Unsubscribe from all City of Manhattan Beach eNotifications.](#)

Kendra Davis
Management Analyst

P: (310) 802-5063

E: kdavis@citymb.info

Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app [Reach Manhattan Beach](#)
Download the mobile app now

Kendra Davis
Management Analyst

P: (310) 802-5063

E: kdavis@citymb.info



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app [Reach Manhattan Beach](#)
Download the mobile app now



Jason Masters
Assistant Planner

P: (310) 802-5515

E: jmasters@citymb.info



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app [Reach Manhattan Beach](#)
Download the mobile app now



Jason Masters
Assistant Planner

P: (310) 802-5515

E: jmasters@citymb.info



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app [Reach Manhattan Beach](#)
Download the mobile app now



Jason Masters
Assistant Planner

P: (310) 802-5515

E: jmasters@citymb.info



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app [Reach Manhattan Beach](#)