

**From:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Subject:** PRJ18-003 Comment  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 3:32:35 PM

---

Wes Daniels  
1625 Sonoma Ave.

Has issue with height of the steeple. I reviewed the project review process with him and identified points at which he could anticipate receiving communication from the City. He noted that his mailing address is incorrect on his property record. He will change his mailing address so that he receives notifications.

**Andrew Trippel | City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)



**From:** [Jason Farnham](#)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Cc:** [Gerie Johnson](#); [Osburn, Gabe](#)  
**Subject:** Re: RE: I oppose the Verizon antenna at 1620 Sonoma Ave  
**Date:** Friday, March 16, 2018 8:47:35 AM

---

Good morning Andrew. Thank you for your message. I would also like this situation to be elevated to a **public hearing**. I believe I am supposed to contact the Zoning Administrator for this request. Would that be Andy Gustavson? If not, can you point me to the person to whom I should make this request?  
Thank you

Cheers,  
Jason

**jasonfarnham** | music

upside down piano | beethoven on steroids | 21st century victor borge

[Listen to Jason on PANDORA RADIO](#)

[Concert Footage Video](#)

[www.jasonfarnham.com](http://www.jasonfarnham.com)

[jfarnham2@yahoo.com](mailto:jfarnham2@yahoo.com)

323-868-4895

On Thursday, March 8, 2018, 7:53:07 PM PST, Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

Hi Jason,

Thanks for your email and for sharing your concerns with us. I've recorded your email in the project file and it will be incorporated into our review process when formal review of the project applications begins. I've included Ms. Gerie Johnson, project applicant, on this response so that she is aware of your concerns as well. Please feel free to contact me via email or phone should you have any questions.

Best Regards,

Andrew

**Andrew Trippel | City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)



---

**From:** Jason Farnham [mailto:jfarnham2@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 08, 2018 5:02 PM  
**To:** Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>  
**Cc:** gosburn@srcity.org  
**Subject:** I oppose the Verizon antenna at 1620 Sonoma Ave

Dear Mr. Trippel:

I attended the city zoning neighborhood meeting last night regarding the construction of the Verizon antenna to be mounted at the church at 1620 Sonoma Ave. I am a homeowner and live in the neighborhood (716 Brasher Ct). I have 3 young children- ages 7, 5, and 2. The fact that this antenna is going to be built at the church in my neighborhood makes me very uncomfortable, as I live in the vicinity and either walk or drive past that church every day to take my son to preschool. I'm afraid of the amount of RF frequencies it will be emitting- 12,000 watts ERP- I feel that as a culture we still do not have a complete understanding of long-term RF effects on humans, including the use of smartphones. For this reason, I still use a flip phone, and while I know it's still not perfect, I know that smartphones emit much higher levels of RF.

This is not a "minor" telecommunications facility by any means. At the meeting last night, it was determined that **the reason this structure is classified as a "Minor" Telecommunications Facility is simply because it is not freestanding, but rather attached to a building. I urge you to consider the sneaky way Verizon is trying to bypass this being classified as a "Major" Telecommunications Facility by simply attaching it to a church.** I would like to turn the question on Verizon- would they want this tower constructed in their neighborhood where their children play? I would say not.

In addition, the construction of this tower will most certainly diminish the value of my home and the homes of others who live near it.

I do not understand why this cannot be built in a commercial area, or at least somewhere farther away from homes, and not in a residential district. I realize the church is not considered a residential parcel, but there are nothing but houses surrounding the church. These homes have families with children, including my own, who will be negatively affected by its presence.

Please reconsider approving the application for Verizon at this location, and any location where homes are located for that matter.

Cheers,

Jason

j a s o n f a r n h a m | m u s i c

upside down piano | beethoven on steroids | 21st century victor borge

[Listen to Jason on PANDORA RADIO](#)

[Concert Footage Video](#)

[www.jasonfarnham.com](http://www.jasonfarnham.com)

[jfarnham2@yahoo.com](mailto:jfarnham2@yahoo.com)

323-868-4895

**From:** [Gustavson, Andy](#)  
**To:** [Jason Farnham](#)  
**Cc:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Verizon tower project elevation request to Public Hearing  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 20, 2018 11:42:13 AM

---

Mr. Farnham,

Your email requesting a Zoning Administrator public hearing regarding the proposed Verizon antenna/tower located at 1620 Sonoma Avenue has been received and accepted. No other steps are required by you. The project planner, Andrew Trippel, will inform the applicant and schedule a public hearing at the next available date. The meeting date will be noticed by mail and site posting.

Thank you,

**Andy Gustavson | Senior Planner**

Planning and Economic Development  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-3236 | Fax (707) 543-3269  
[AGustavson@srcity.org](mailto:AGustavson@srcity.org)



---

**From:** Jason Farnham [mailto:jfarnham2@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 20, 2018 11:31 AM  
**To:** Gustavson, Andy <AGustavson@srcity.org>  
**Cc:** Trippel, Andrew <atrippel@srcity.org>; Osburn, Gabe <GOsburn@srcity.org>; Combs, Julie <jcombs@srcity.org>; Tibbetts, Jack <hjtibbetts@srcity.org>  
**Subject:** Verizon tower project elevation request to Public Hearing

Dear Mr. Gustavson:

My name is Jason Farnham and I am a homeowner living at 716 Brasher Ct, Santa Rosa, CA 95405. I attended a city zoning neighborhood meeting a few weeks ago regarding the construction of a Verizon antenna/tower to be mounted in my neighborhood at the church located at **1620 Sonoma Ave. I am requesting to elevate this project's Zoning Administrator Public Meeting to a Zoning Administrator Public Hearing.** Please let me know what appropriate steps I need to take in order to do this.

I have 3 young children- ages 7, 5, and 2. The fact that this antenna is going to be built at the church in my neighborhood makes me very uncomfortable, as I live in the vicinity and either walk or drive past that church every day to take my son to preschool. I'm afraid of the amount of RF frequencies it will be emitting- 12,000 watts ERP- I feel that as a culture we still do not have a complete understanding of long-term RF effects on humans, including the use of smartphones. For this reason, I still use a flip phone, and while I know it's still not perfect, I know that smartphones emit much higher levels of RF.

This is not a "minor" telecommunications facility by any means. At the neighborhood meeting I attended, it was revealed to us that **the reason this structure is classified as a Minor Telecommunications Facility is simply because it is not freestanding, but rather attached to a building. I urge you to consider the sneaky way Verizon is trying to bypass this being classified as a Major**

**Telecommunications Facility by simply attaching it to a church.** I would like to turn the question on Verizon- would they want this tower constructed in their neighborhood where their children play? I would say not.

In addition, the construction of this tower will most certainly diminish the value of my home and the homes of others who live near it.

I do not understand why this cannot be built in a commercial area, or at least somewhere farther away from homes, and not in a residential district. I realize the church is not considered a residential parcel, but there are nothing but houses surrounding the church. These homes have families with children, including my own, who will be negatively affected by its presence.

Thank you for reading and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,  
Jason Farnham

**j a s o n f a r n h a m** | m u s i c

upside down piano | beethoven on steroids | 21st century victor borge

[Listen to Jason on PANDORA RADIO](#)

[Concert Footage Video](#)

[www.jasonfarnham.com](http://www.jasonfarnham.com)

[jfarnham2@yahoo.com](mailto:jfarnham2@yahoo.com)

323-868-4895

**From:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**To:** ["John Harley"](#)  
**Cc:** [Nutt, Jason](#); [GJohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:GJohnson@completewireless.net); [kirsti.harley@gmail.com](mailto:kirsti.harley@gmail.com); [James, Elene](#)  
**Subject:** RE: 611 Hoen Ave and Cell tower  
**Date:** Monday, April 23, 2018 1:05:00 PM

---

Hi John,

Thanks for your email. Please allow me some time to research your question with other departments and respond. I hope to be back in touch by the week's end.

Best Regards,

Andrew

Andrew Trippel | City Planner  
Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)

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

From: John Harley [<mailto:johnharley123@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 12:34 PM  
To: Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>  
Cc: Nutt, Jason <[jnutt@srcity.org](mailto:jnutt@srcity.org)>; [GJohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:GJohnson@completewireless.net); [kirsti.harley@gmail.com](mailto:kirsti.harley@gmail.com); James, Elene <[EJames@srcity.org](mailto:EJames@srcity.org)>  
Subject: 611 Hoen Ave and Cell tower

Good afternoon Andrew,

I'm writing this email and copying all I can think to copy to see what kind of answer we can get. As you know from our pervious email exchanges my wife, Kirsti, and I live at 611 Hoen Ave. We purchased the house back in November and we're more then excited to move in. However, we were not as excited about the proposed cell phone tower being built at the church directly across the street from us. I'm sure it's still in project planning and approval stages but I wanted to reach out to everyone here and see if it's possible to get help from the city to plant some curb side trees in our front sidewalk space. This would at least minimize the hit of such a big change to the street. We currently have one dead tree in this space but would love to remove that and plant two to four young, city approved, trees. According to the Santa Rosa City website the city offers no funds to help home owners with projects like this, however it sounds like they used too. I'm wondering between all copied here if we could be provided some financial help getting this tree removed and these sidewalk spaces planted in preparation of this Cell Tower.

Thank you for your time.

John Harley

**From:** [kirsti.harley@gmail.com](mailto:kirsti.harley@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Cc:** [John Harley](#)  
**Subject:** Verizon Cell tower - Sonoma Ave  
**Date:** Thursday, May 17, 2018 8:34:15 AM

---

Hello Mr. Trippel,

I just wanted to check in and see what the status of the Verizon project located at the Community Baptist Church is.

We have not seen any notices for design review. Can you please advise as to when the next meeting is?

Also, when is construction planned to start? We would like to know how long the construction period will take. And what hours they will be working.

Thank you,  
Kirsti Harley  
801-898-6880

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [John Harley](#)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Cc:** [kirsti.harley@gmail.com](mailto:kirsti.harley@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Re: Verizon Cell tower - Sonoma Ave  
**Date:** Thursday, May 17, 2018 10:26:00 AM

---

Hi Andrew,

Thanks for the information. It does help. We would very much like to know everything going on and planned to go on with this Cell Tower project as possible. Please try to keep us in the loop as best as you can. Our biggest fear would be somehow surprised by the structure and construction. After the initial meeting went a little out of hand (not to anyone from the city's fault) we just want to make sure we're well informed.

On a side note: Whom would we need to speak to about getting a crossing signal for a crosswalk on Sonoma ave at the Sonoma Ave and Hoen Ave intersection? There's easily a crash there every two weeks or so.

Thanks,  
John

> On May 17, 2018, at 9:16 AM, Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

>

> Good morning,

>

> Thanks for your email. The applicant is addressing requests for additional information. Project review will commence when the requests are completed. I anticipate sending a Notice of Application within the next two weeks. This notice will indicate that project review is beginning. Project review and review/decision by the review authority will take 3-4 months. Any subsequent construction would require a building permit, which has additional review requirements that typically take 4-6 weeks. The building permit applicant would make decisions about the construction start and completion dates; however, the City does regulate daily hours of construction through the building permit that would be approved and issued.

>

> Does this help?

>

> Andrew

>

> Andrew Trippel | City Planner

> Planning & Economic Development |100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404

> Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: [kirsti.harley@gmail.com](mailto:kirsti.harley@gmail.com) [<mailto:kirsti.harley@gmail.com>]

> Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 8:34 AM

> To: Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>

> Cc: John Harley <[johnharley123@gmail.com](mailto:johnharley123@gmail.com)>

> Subject: Verizon Cell tower - Sonoma Ave

>

> Hello Mr. Trippel,

>

> I just wanted to check in and see what the status of the Verizon project located at the Community Baptist Church is.

>

> We have not seen any notices for design review. Can you please advise as to when the next meeting is?

>

> Also, when is construction planned to start? We would like to know how long the construction period will take.  
And what hours they will be working.

>

> Thank you,

> Kirsti Harley

> 801-898-6880

>

> Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Cailyn McCauley](#)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#); [Gerie Johnson](#)  
**Cc:** [stopverizon@gmail.com](mailto:stopverizon@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** 1620 Sonoma Ave Verizon Tower  
**Date:** Saturday, May 26, 2018 12:58:22 PM

---

We just received our notification of the application.

We oppose this project.

1-Design is imposing and obstructs our view

2-Installation of a major commercial enterprise on a religious property in a residential neighborhood reduces the family-friendly atmosphere

3-As 30 year residents and neighbors of Community Baptist Church we do not approve expansion of the church design to be almost twice the height of the existing roofline which we feel is an encroachment by a commercial enterprise on religious property

4-We do not want to be subject to the extreme radio waves which may emanate from this project.

5-We specifically purchased our home to be free of major utility stations.

We formally register our opposition.

Cailyn McCauley and Joel Quigley  
555 Alderbrook Drive  
Santa Rosa CA 95405

**From:** [Erin Morris](#)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Subject:** Re: PRJ18-003 - Proposed 62 Foot Steeple at 1620 Sonoma Avenue  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 29, 2018 7:58:17 AM

---

Andrew,

So helpful. Thanks!

Erin

On Tue, May 29, 2018 at 7:56 AM, Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

Hi Erin,

I hope all is well with you. The applicant has not submitted revised plans. The application was deemed incomplete upon submission because it was determined that a Neighborhood Meeting would be required and a creek cross-section was required; therefore, the Notice of Application was not distributed until those items were received. Those items have been received. The applicant is currently responding to a request for a Historic Resource Evaluation. Upon receipt of the evaluation, the application will be deemed complete.

The applicant has also been advised that the Director is elevating Minor Design Review to the Design Review Board for review/approval. The applicant has been advised of this decision; however, it has not yet submitted the additional fees required for Design Review Board project review. We have also strongly recommended Concept Design Review for this project.

Does this help?

Have a great week,

Andrew

**Andrew Trippel | City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | [100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3](#) | [Santa Rosa, CA 95404](#)

Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)



**From:** Erin Morris [mailto:[erin.morris1@gmail.com](mailto:erin.morris1@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 28, 2018 4:52 PM  
**To:** Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: PRJ18-003 - Proposed 62 Foot Steeple at [1620 Sonoma Avenue](#)

Hello again Andrew,

I just received another notice for the project. Did the applicant submit revised plans? If so, can you send me a pdf of the plans? My main interest is in the elevations. Hoping that the design has improved because I would love better Verizon coverage in our neighborhood.

Thanks!

Erin

On Thu, Mar 8, 2018 at 7:58 PM Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

Hi Erin,

Thanks for your email and for sharing your concerns with us. I've recorded your email in the project file and it will be incorporated into our review process when formal review of the project applications begins. I've included Ms. Gerie Johnson, project applicant, on this response so that she is aware of your concerns as well. Please feel free to contact me via email or phone should you have any questions.

Best Regards,

Andrew

**Andrew Trippel | City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | [100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404](#)

Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)



**From:** Erin Morris [mailto:[erin.morris1@gmail.com](mailto:erin.morris1@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2018 8:35 AM

**To:** Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>

**Cc:** [gjohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:gjohnson@completewireless.net)

**Subject:** PRJ18-003 - Proposed 62 Foot Steeple at [1620 Sonoma Avenue](#)

Dear Andrew,

Thank you for sharing the plans for the proposed telecommunications facility at [1620 Sonoma Avenue](#). My family and I reside on Bobelaine Drive and are supportive of new Verizon facilities that will improve cell phone service in our home and area. However, we do not support the proposed design for a few key reasons:

1) The existing Community Baptist Church structure is a handsome, well proportioned building likely constructed in the late 1950s or early 1960s. According to Verizon's plans, the highest point of the church is 23 feet. This height, and the overall design of the building, fits in well with the surrounding neighborhood which is comprised primarily of single story homes constructed in the 1940s and 1950s. The proposal to construct a steeple to a height of 62 feet (almost triple the height of the existing building!) is out of scale and proportion with both the church and the surrounding neighborhood.

2) The church structure is greater than 50 years old and may be historically significant both in its mid-century modern design and in its association with important Santa Rosans most notably the late Reverend James Coffee. Reverend Coffee was and is very important to local history. According to the California Office of Historic Preservation, a building may be found to be a significant historical resource at the local, state, or national level, under one or more of the following four criteria:

a) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or

b) It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or

c) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method or construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or

d) It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

3) There are alternative, nonresidential sites that may be more suitable for the proposed facility. Did Verizon provide an alternative sites analysis? I am wondering if they considered [2260 Sonoma Avenue](#) (City-owned water facility with an existing flag pole located near the southwest corner of Farmers Lane and Sonoma Avenue; zoned Commercial Office), Montgomery Village (which has tall elements, including a flag pole, toward the center of the development above Penzey's Spices; zoned General Commercial) or [1221 Farmers Lane](#) (office building; zoned Planned Development) ? All of these sites provide a potential opportunity to accomplish improved telecommunications facilities on non-residentially zoned sites.

If the project moves forward, we would prefer an alternative site or an alternative design that is more complementary to the church and surrounding neighborhood. For this site, we would rather see a slim monopole or other structure that does not affect the primary church building. Due to the site's size and configuration, it seems possible to place the facility in a location that would provide a generous setback from adjacent residences on Bobelaine and Hoen Avenue.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Erin Morris

[600 Bobelaine Drive](#)

[707/495-9145](#)

**From:** [matthew mendonsa](#)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Subject:** Community Baptist Church-Steeple #PRJ18-003  
**Date:** Thursday, May 31, 2018 10:31:17 AM  
**Attachments:** [Verizon Sims.png](#)

---

Mr. Trippel-

Hello and thank you for the letter regarding the proposed communication tower. My wife and I own our home at 556 Alderbrook on the corner of Sonoma Ave and Alderbrook Dr., directly across from the church property.

Please see attached photograph view from our dining room as well as Verizon's photo simulations of proposed tower.

I wanted to express my concern and opposition to the proposed tower steeple structure for the above project in its present format. I'm less concerned about radiation issue raised by others, and more concerned about the visual impact to our view and how that might affect any future resale value of our home. If the tower project goes forward, the church gets a profit center but the homeowners directly impacted visually get zero compensation.

Setting aside the ethical issues of a non-taxed faith-based entity getting paid for a third-party commercial use and then slapping a cross on it- I feel that this communications tower is too large and not in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. I have been a little disappointed that the church, who has historically been a good neighbor, has not seen fit to interface with the community on this, sending no representatives from the church to the City meetings held to discuss this and leaving Verizon reps to do the talking.

I also believe that the designer has taken the easier and less expensive permitting/construction route and attached the structure to the existing building rather than exploring other options such as a free-standing structure- setback from the main structure and road view or lowering the proposed height. I'll be honest, If this was a 35' structure or set back from the road, I'd be less inclined to take issue.

I hope that this application can be denied in its present design configuration- pending exploration of other options more friendly to surrounding home owners. I'm not entirely convinced that, because it may cost Verizon more to do so, that it's not the right thing to do.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments and concerns.

Cordially,

Matthew Mendonsa



**From:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**To:** ["Jason Farnham"](#)  
**Cc:** [Osburn, Gabe](#); [Tibbetts, Jack](#); [Combs, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Oppose antenna at 1620 Sonoma Ave  
**Date:** Monday, June 04, 2018 8:29:00 AM

---

Hi Jason,

Thank you for your email. I have added your email comments to the project file, and they will be included in project review. The project file is available for public review if you wish to review the application and associated submittal information.

Best Regards,

Andrew

**Andrew Trippel | City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)



---

**From:** Jason Farnham [<mailto:jfarnham2@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 03, 2018 8:41 PM  
**To:** Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>  
**Cc:** Osburn, Gabe <[GOsburn@srcity.org](mailto:GOsburn@srcity.org)>; Tibbetts, Jack <[hjtibbetts@srcity.org](mailto:hjtibbetts@srcity.org)>; Combs, Julie <[jcombs@srcity.org](mailto:jcombs@srcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Oppose antenna at 1620 Sonoma Ave

Dear Mr. Trippel:

I received the Notice of Application in the mail for the telecommunications facility project at 1620 Sonoma Ave. I am a homeowner and live in the neighborhood (716 Brasher Ct). I have 3 young children- ages 7, 5, and 2. The fact that this antenna is going to be built at the church in my neighborhood makes me very uncomfortable, as I live in the vicinity and either walk or drive past that church every day to take my son to preschool. I'm afraid of the amount of RF frequencies it will be emitting- 12,000 watts ERP- I feel that as a culture we still do not have a complete understanding of long-term RF effects on humans, including the use of smartphones. For this reason, I still use a flip phone, and while I know it's still not perfect, I know that smartphones emit much higher levels of RF.

This is not a "minor" telecommunications facility by any means. This fact cannot be overstated: **The reason this structure is classified as a "Minor" Telecommunications Facility is simply because it is not freestanding, but rather attached to a building. I urge you to consider the sneaky way Verizon is trying to bypass this being classified as a "Major" Telecommunications Facility by simply attaching it to a church.** I would like to turn the question on Verizon- would they want this tower constructed in their neighborhood where their children play? I would say not.

In addition, the construction of this tower will most certainly diminish the value of my home and the homes of others who live near it.

I do not understand why this cannot be built in a commercial area, or at least somewhere farther away from homes, and not in a residential district. I realize the church is not considered a residential parcel, but there are nothing but houses surrounding the church. These homes have families with children, including my own, who will be negatively affected by its presence.

Please reconsider approving the application for Verizon at this location, and any location where homes are located for that matter.

Cheers,  
Jason

j a s o n f a r n h a m | m u s i c

upside down piano | beethoven on steroids | 21st century victor borge

[Listen to Jason on PANDORA RADIO](#)

[Concert Footage Video](#)

[www.jasonfarnham.com](http://www.jasonfarnham.com)

[jfarnham2@yahoo.com](mailto:jfarnham2@yahoo.com)

323-868-4895

**From:** [Cailyn McCauley](#)  
**To:** [Gerie Johnson](#)  
**Cc:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Cell Phone Tower Protest 1620 Sonoma Ave  
**Date:** Friday, June 08, 2018 6:27:52 PM

---

Hi Gerie,

Thanks.

As a loyal Verizon customer since 1991, even before Verizon existed, we can verify that coverage at this location is outstanding.

We have never experienced service interruptions or loss at our neighborhood.

As we reported directly to the Verizon Investigative team on the ground during the October wildfires, our service worked the entire time. When we got our calls connected on conference between family members, we were able to navigate the streets in 3 different vehicles through Santa Rosa, to Rohnert Park to Petaluma.

This was while Verizon's customers on the hills of Bennett Valley and in Rincon Valley lost their services.

We firmly oppose this project across the street from our home where we have lived, as Verizon customers, for 26 years.

We firmly oppose the desecration of a religious, Historic, Heritage site for this project.

Cailyn McCauley & Joel Quigley  
555 Alderbrook Drive  
Santa Rosa ca 95405

On Jun 8, 2018, at 5:13 PM, Gerie Johnson <[GJohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:GJohnson@completewireless.net)> wrote:

Dear Ms. McCauley,

Thank you for your email. I confirm that over 20 site were considered for this project.

Also, when considering possible sites – the proposed location must be able to meet certain requirements, including but not limited to coverage objectives (must be able to cover the area lacking coverage or capacity).

Best regards,

***Gerie Johnson, Planning Specialist***  
***Complete Wireless Consulting, Inc.***

(916) 709-2057  
(916) 313-3730 fax  
[GJohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:GJohnson@completewireless.net)  
2009 V Street  
Sacramento, CA 95818

---

**From:** Cailyn McCauley <[cailynq@me.com](mailto:cailynq@me.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 8, 2018 4:51 PM  
**To:** Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>  
**Cc:** Gerie Johnson <[GJohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:GJohnson@completewireless.net)>  
**Subject:** Re: Cell Phone Tower Health News

Thank you Andrew.

I have not heard from Gerie and do not know if 4th street has been considered.

The historical nature of Community Baptist church is a valuable heritage for Sonoma County. It's imperative to protect this site for future generations.

Thank you

Cailyn McCauley

On Jun 8, 2018, at 2:35 PM, Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your email. I've added it to public comments in the project folder and will include your comments in project review. Please note that we do review the application as presented; in other words, we would not suggest alternate locations for the project as part of our review and recommendation. The applicant is required to submit an Alternative site or location analysis [Zoning Code [Section 20-44.060 \(E\)](#)] that "identifies reasonable, technically feasible, alternative locations and/or facilities which would provide comparable service" [[Section 20-44.060 \(G\)\(1\)](#)]. This information, as well as required NIER exposure information/RF emissions study, is available in the project file, which can be reviewed in Room 3, City Hall. A Historic Resource Evaluation of the church structure has been requested from the applicant and is currently being prepared.

Best Regards,

Andrew

**Andrew Trippel | City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)

<image002.jpg>

---

**From:** Cailyn McCauley [<mailto:cailynq@me.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 06, 2018 7:06 AM  
**To:** Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>  
**Cc:** Gerie Johnson <[GJohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:GJohnson@completewireless.net)>  
**Subject:** Re: Cell Phone Tower Health News

Hello Andrew,

The cell phone tower would be better located at the 4th Street Safeway/CVS lot. It would fit right behind the gas station, where they have empty space and just tore down old storage buildings.

Permanent residents do not live nearby, only transient population from The Flamingo and The Inn at Hilltops restaurant. This exposure is limited and aesthetically it would match the Flamingo Tower.

The tower could be easily installed at that space without damaging family neighborhood cosmetic and lifestyle atmosphere.

Installing a 3 story cell tower disguised as a church steeple is not in keeping with our neighborhood aesthetic.

We have lived in our home 26 years. We were here first. This tower would be a blight to our view and lower our property values.

We participated heavily in the traffic flow and studies for Sonoma Avenue and our neighborhood. We advocated for the switch down to two lanes to slow traffic speeds and return to a neighborhood atmosphere while better servicing the traffic flow to side streets by the thousands of vehicles who travel Sonoma Avenue on a daily basis.

The NIER exposure information is simply a requirement to post the information. It is not a guarantee of health safety. The government is now releasing its results and actively modifying their recommendations based on male rats cancer results.

We believe this project is in violation of numerous acts, including Section 322(c)(7) by altering a historic property.

We were not informed of the project until most recently and we highly oppose it.

What are our next steps to relocate this tower to 4th street?

As a reminder, we have been Verizon customers since before Verizon existed. We are loyal to the brand, however, we ask that the brand recognize our opinions as those of highly valued customers.

Thank you,  
Cailyn McCauley

On May 30, 2018, at 7:28 PM, Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

We are required to prioritize all projects based upon the type of application, date the application was received, and other factors including direction from management. I respond to all emails in the order in which they are received based upon my current project schedule. My goal is to respond to all emails within 24 hours of receipt, excepting weekends and holidays; however, sometimes other projects do require attention due to project deadlines. When this happens, I respond to emails received as soon as possible.

Thank you for your email and the link you've provided. The City of Santa Rosa Zoning Code, [Section 20-44.060 \(E\)](#) requires that all applications for commercial telecommunications facilities include NIER exposure information. This information was included in the Statement of Hammett & Edison, Inc. Consulting Engineers submitted with the application on January 16, 2018. This document, as well as other application documents, is available for review in Room 3, City Hall, located at 100 Santa Rosa Avenue.

Best Regards,

Andrew

**Andrew Trippel | City Planner**

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Ave Rm  
3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-3223 | Fax (707) 543-3269 |

[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)

<image003.jpg>

---

**From:** Cailyn McCauley [<mailto:cailynq@me.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 29, 2018 11:04 PM  
**To:** Trippel, Andrew <[atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)>; Gerie Johnson  
<[GJohnson@completewireless.net](mailto:GJohnson@completewireless.net)>  
**Subject:** Cell Phone Tower Health News

Hello,  
You have not responded to our emails.

Here is an article about the possible health scares;

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-5784487/The-roll-5G-wireless-service-massive-health-experiment-public-health-expert-warns-a.html>

This is another valid reason we do not want to see the cell tower built at 1620 Sonoma Avenue.

Cailyn McCauley & Joel Quigley  
555 Alderbrook Dr  
Santa Rosa

**From:** [wrcode@sonic.net](mailto:wrcode@sonic.net)  
**To:** [Trippel, Andrew](#)  
**Subject:** Community Baptist Church steeple (1620 Sonoma Ave)  
**Date:** Monday, June 11, 2018 12:22:28 PM  
**Attachments:** [Ltr re Community Baptist steeple.pdf](#)

---

Please see attached letter.

**Wes Daniels Construction/Code Consulting**  
**2344-A Franklin Ave**  
**Santa Rosa, CA 95404-2225**  
**707-576-1077**  
wrcode@sonic.net



---

## **WES DANIELS CONSTRUCTION CODE CONSULTING**

2344 FRANKLIN AVENUE, UNIT A • SANTA ROSA • CA • 95404-2225

Tel: (707) 576-1077 • E-Mail: [wdcode@sonic.net](mailto:wdcode@sonic.net)

CONCORD SANTA ROSA GUALALA

---

June 11, 2018

Andrew Trippel  
Planning & Economic Development Department.  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room #1  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

*Sent via e-mail to: [atrippel@srcity.org](mailto:atrippel@srcity.org)*

Re: Community Baptist Church steeple

Dear Mr. Trippel:

I am the owner of 1625 Sonoma Avenue across the street from the church. First of all, the proposed 5-story enclosed antenna tower is no more steeple than a fake tree antenna is an ag preserve. It does not deserve any relaxation of neighborhood standards.

This construction would be a black eye on this low rise neighborhood. This predominantly residential neighborhood already has a microwave tower in Doyle Park next door. John Sawyer states that the science of microwave radiation is unsettled. If true, it seems really imprudent to concentrate antennas in a small residential area. Why not put the new tower in the City complex where the scale is more appropriate and the revenue would accrue to the City, or in the proposed City/County complex.

This proposal seems to be a substitute for low power distribution on wood poles which have little visual impact and much less microwave energy.

Finally, I understand that the next gen will include a materially different frequency range. Will this project pose a new threat in the next couple of years?

Very truly yours,



Wes Daniels