

Sandra Yang

From: S. Wadhwani <sumanth.wadhwani@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 7:05 AM
To: Sandra Yang
Subject: Fwd: Renegade LLC residential cell phone tower

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "S. Wadhwani" <sumanth.wadhwani@gmail.com>
Date: Oct 2, 2017 6:50 AM
Subject: Renegade LLC residential cell phone tower
To: <yolandac@ci.corona.ca.us>, <sandrayang@coronaca.gov>
Cc: <DHaley@ci.corona.ca.us>, <Kirk.Bennett@ci.corona.ca.us>, <kspiegel@ci.corona.ca.us>

Thank you for your time and attention.

Two weeks ago Corona citizens residing within a certain radius of a proposed cellphone tower facility were sent communication regarding informational meetings on the topic. The proposed location of this cellphone tower is on private property on the westerly side of Skyline Drive between Chase Drive and Foothill Parkway, just north of 3298 Skyline Drive.

Citizens from the neighborhood have attended the informational meeting and have left with the understanding that Renegade Towers, LLC will be proceeding with their plans to pursue the Cell Tower facility at this location.

The citizens have raised concerns over the close proximity of the tower to the homes and surrounding community and the long term impact on residential exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields. The citizens have also voiced concerns over the height and elevation of the cell tower which puts it in direct horizontal line of sight and exposure with the adjacent homes and living areas posing a health risk to the citizens and their children.

The citizens have sufficient information to believe that the presence of the cell tower within the residential community poses a significant health and safety risk. We do not wish to experience the short or long term effects of RF Electromagnetic Fields, as research reviewed has pointed to an elevated risk of cancer related illnesses in humans.

We request that the planning commission seek other alternatives to the location of this cell tower to a commercial or utility site, including the option to use of small cell sites along the unpopulated stretch of the Foothill extension. The citizen's request that there be a thorough review of the environmental and health impact of the location of this and any future cell tower when permits are requested for residential, work or school areas where there is extended human exposure. We also request that there be a hearing and presentation of the findings related to how the planning commission will be addressing relocation of this specific tower.

We do not see a community benefit from the presence of this cell tower as current technology allows for the use of cellphones within our household if needed. We urge you to take into account our request for relocation, to reduce the exposure and impact to our residential tract and zone in question and to mitigate any future risks.

This community will be petitioning its residents to write and call the city personnel and planning commission to voice their concerns against this residential cell tower.

With hope you will take our request and concerns seriously and help us reach a meaningful alternative.

Sincerely,

Sandra Yang

From: Joanne Coletta
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 4:48 PM
To: Sandra Yang; Terri Manuel
Subject: FW: Proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Fyi.

From: Sylvia Edwards
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 4:35 PM
To: Darrell Talbert <Darrell.Talbert@CoronaCA.gov>; Joanne Coletta <Joanne.Coletta@CoronaCA.gov>
Subject: FW: Proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Message sent to the full City Council.

From: Michael Shay [<mailto:mvshay@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 3:58 PM
To: Dick Haley <Dick.Haley@CoronaCA.gov>
Subject: Proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Dear Mayor Dick Haley,

We would like to first thank you for having the vendor for the proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive present to the community prior to submitting their application.

As the vendor may have already communicated to you, we, along with several other residents affected by this proposed cell phone tower, are against this plan. This cell phone tower came as a complete surprise as Section B4 of the General Plan created 8/7/2014 shows the lot in question as having been zoned for low density residential development. We don't understand how a cell phone tower qualifies as low density residential development.

We purchased our property on Amethyst Street in 2010 specifically because it is far away from power lines, it has an unobstructed view from the backyard, and it should appreciate in value. We then invested substantially in this property with the expectation that the General Plan would not be changed to allow commercial operations in the middle of a residential area. Now we are being confronted with a giant structure that will obstruct our view, threaten the health of our family, and lower our home's resale value, for a service that our community doesn't need or want. We and our neighbors have Wi-Fi and use it to connect to our cell phones while at home. Who is this cell phone tower really meant to serve? Maybe the people commuting on Foothill? Is convenience to commuters, many of whom do not live in Corona, more important than the health and property values of your voting constituents?

I ask that you deny the application for a cell phone tower near 3298 Skyline Drive.

Respectfully,

Michael and Violeta Shay
3384 Amethyst Street

Corona, CA 92882

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Sandra Yang

From: Michael Shay <mvshay@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2017 9:48 PM
To: Sandra Yang
Subject: Proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Dear Sandra Yang,

We would like to first thank you for having the vendor for the proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive present to the community prior to submitting their application.

As the vendor may have already communicated to you, we, along with several other residents affected by this proposed cell phone tower, are against this plan. This cell phone tower came as a complete surprise as Section B4 of the General Plan created 8/7/2014 shows the lot in question as having been zoned for low density residential development. We don't understand how a cell phone tower qualifies as low density residential development.

We purchased our property on Amethyst Street in 2010 specifically because it is far away from power lines, it has an unobstructed view from the backyard, and it should appreciate in value. We then invested substantially in this property with the expectation that the General Plan would not be changed to allow commercial operations in the middle of a residential area. Now we are being confronted with a giant structure that will obstruct our view, threaten the health of our family, and lower our home's resale value, for a service that our community doesn't need or want. We and our neighbors have Wi-Fi and use it to connect to our cell phones while at home. Who is this cell phone tower really meant to serve? Maybe the people commuting on Foothill? Is convenience to commuters, many of whom do not live in Corona, more important than the health and property values of your voting constituents?

We ask that you deny the application for a cell phone tower near 3298 Skyline Drive.

Respectfully,

Michael and Violeta Shay
3384 Amethyst Street
Corona, CA 92882

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Sandra Yang

From: ian.atkins@verizon.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2017 1:37 PM
To: Dick Haley; Yolanda Carrillo; Sandra Yang; Karen Spiegel; Kirk Bennett
Subject: Renegade Towers - Skyline Dr. Corona CA 92882

Ms. Carrillo

RE: Renegade Towers - Skyline Dr. Corona CA 92882

I'd like to bring to your attention reasonable concerns that should support the denial of the building permit requested by Renegade Towers LLC for a cell phone tower proposed on Skyline Dr., Corona CA 92882.

1. Erecting a 70' tower would ruin the character of this great Corona neighborhood; let's keep Skyline Dr. aesthetically intact with its scenic views for hundreds of yearly walkers, hikers and bikers as they enter Cleveland National Forest.
2. The FCC has ruled that, in order for a person to be endangered by cell phone RF, they would have to remain at the height of the antenna. Since the homes on Amethyst St., Amethyst Cir., Onyx Cir. and Elysia St. are built at a 50' elevation from Skyline Dr., the homeowners will be in direct line-of-sight of the antenna and at risk of RF transmission. This has the potential of a class action against the city.
3. The close proximity of the tower to homes and neighborhoods would be an intrusion into the privacy of the residents. Workers performing routine maintenance would have direct visibility into homes. This maintenance brings work crews, trucks with lifts, radios, lights and noise that will affect many neighbors.
4. Reduction in property values is not good for home owners, nor the City of Corona.
5. In 2005, the residents of Douglas Way, Corona brought forth similar causes for concern that ultimately lead to that cell tower project being cancelled.

The neighborhood greatly appreciates your support and guidance for the City Council to suspend this project indefinitely.

Ian Atkins
714-624-1369

Sandra Yang

From: M. Khan <mdkhan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2017 9:45 AM
To: Sandra Yang
Subject: Fw: Opposition to Renegade Proposed Cell Tower in Corona

Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to inform you that Renegade Tower LLC is planning to install a Cell Tower at Skyline and Chase street. I am the resident of 3482 Amethyst Circle and I fully oppose to the installation of the Cell Tower in my neighborhood. I am very concerned with the idea of having a Cell Tower in my neighborhood as it poses serious health and environmental risks.

Few years back my mother was diagnosed with Bradycardia and she was implanted with cardiac assisting device called Pacemaker. The Pacemaker was implanted to regulate the beating of her heart and she was told to avoid being close to devices such as cell phones, microwaves, scanners and other mechanical and electrical equipment that generate radio frequencies.

According to the Boston Scientific and Guidant Corporation, two major manufacturers of ICDs and pacemakers, electrical and radio communication devices causes harmful interference with ICD's and Pacemakers. They have stated that Electrical and Radio communication devices are potentially hazardous for those people who have an implanted ICD or Pacemakers. Therefore, I am very worried about the exposure of electromagnetic fields from the planned cell tower installation close to my house by Renegade Company. The magnetic fields and strongly emitting radio

frequencies from Cell tower may inactivate and or make the Pacemaker to operate improperly.

Not only the proposed Cell tower poses threat to the health of my family but it also poses great threat to the beautiful environment we enjoy. Below is a link to the letter issued by the United States Department of Interior that addresses the damage causes by Cell Towers to the environment.

https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/us_doi_comments.pdf

I sincerely request and hope that the City of Corona cares about its residents and look into the best interest of its residents.

I look forward to receiving a hopeful response.

Regards,

Mohammad Khan
3482 Amethyst Circle
Corona, CA 92882
C. [310.849.2151](tel:310.849.2151)
H. [951.272.6181](tel:951.272.6181)

Sandra Yang

From: Sandra Yang
Sent: Friday, October 6, 2017 8:22 AM
To: mvshay@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: Proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Mr. and Mrs. Shay:

We have received your email. Regarding the General Plan and zoning, the Corona Municipal Code currently allows wireless telecommunications facilities to be established in any zone in the city as long as the developer goes through the city's entitlement process and obtains approval of a conditional use permit which is subject to the review of the city's Planning Commission. He has yet to submit an application at this point. You will have an opportunity to voice your concerns further as he formally goes through the process.

Sincerely,

Sandra Yang
Associate Planner
CITY OF CORONA
Community Development Dept. - Planning Division
Phone: (951)736-2262
Direct: (951)279-3553
Email: Sandra.Yang@CoronaCA.gov
Website: www.CoronaCA.gov



From: Michael Shay [<mailto:mvshay@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2017 9:48 PM
To: Sandra Yang <Sandra.Yang@CoronaCA.gov>
Subject: Proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Dear Sandra Yang,

We would like to first thank you for having the vendor for the proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive present to the community prior to submitting their application.

As the vendor may have already communicated to you, we, along with several other residents affected by this proposed cell phone tower, are against this plan. This cell phone tower came as a complete surprise as Section B4 of the General Plan created 8/7/2014 shows the lot in question as having been zoned for low density residential development. We don't understand how a cell phone tower qualifies as low density residential development.

We purchased our property on Amethyst Street in 2010 specifically because it is far away from power lines, it has an unobstructed view from the backyard, and it should appreciate in value. We then invested substantially in this property with the expectation that the General Plan would not be changed to allow commercial operations in the middle of a residential area. Now we are being confronted with a giant structure that will obstruct our view, threaten the health of our family, and

lower our home's resale value, for a service that our community doesn't need or want. We and our neighbors have Wi-Fi and use it to connect to our cell phones while at home. Who is this cell phone tower really meant to serve? Maybe the people commuting on Foothill? Is convenience to commuters, many of whom do not live in Corona, more important than the health and property values of your voting constituents?

We ask that you deny the application for a cell phone tower near 3298 Skyline Drive.

Respectfully,

Michael and Violeta Shay
3384 Amethyst Street
Corona, CA 92882

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Sandra Yang

From: S. Wadhwani <sumanth.wadhwani@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 17, 2018 8:33 AM
To: sandrayang@coronaca.gov; Sandra Yang
Cc: Jason Scott; Jim Steiner; Yolanda Carrillo; Jacque Casillas; Wes Speake
Subject: Renegade Towers cell-site: Skyline project

Respected mayor, vice mayor, City Council and Senior planner;

Advanced wishes for a Merry Christmas and happy New Year.

In Fall of 2017 the residents nearby Skyline Drive attended and voice their opposition to the cell site opposed by Renegade Towers LLC. The residents attended the infrastructure meeting in November 2017 where we were shown a tremendous amount of support and it was stated that the planning Personnel did not support this project.

The residents received another letter after Thanksgiving this year for another community meeting with Renegade Towers. My understanding is that the process is not fully completed and the project still stands a chance of moving forward.

I would like to continue voicing opposition to this project for the following reasons:

Out of character for the surrounding community: the 70 + foot cell site facility will stand out as an eyesore in an area surrounded by homes and very well Essie hiking destination with natural Scenic views.

Implicit cost two surrounding homes &

Disproportionate benefit to those outside of the community: the site comes at a cost to those homes directly in its path of view. We the residents have expressed that we do not personally benefit from increased cell phone coverage in the area due to sufficient cell coverage within our homes. The benefit is to other's not within the residential area and to the owner of the property in question.

A lack of proposed alternate locations

Availability of less intrusive 5 G technology: there are potentially several other locations alongside the Foothill extension that can be explored for strategic placement that is less intrusive to the community and that will Foster a positive image of the city of Corona planning and concern for communities.

The currently proposed project location does not demonstrate Proper community planning and placement around existing community and safeguarding nearby Community interests.

I enjoy living in this city specifically around Skyline Trail because it is blessed with beautiful Scenic views. I also strongly believe that there are other options to the placement of the cell site that can be beneficial but yet respectful to the nearby community and its residents.

I strongly urge the city council and planning department to consider alternatives within reasonable capability for proper placement around and to safeguard already existing Community and community interest.

The future will require a lot of proactive planning around existing community to avoid haphazard out of character placement and a planning of communities around technology infrastructure needs rather than the reverse.

Sincerely,
Sumanth Wadhwani
3461 Amethyst Circle
Corona

Sandra Yang

From: Michael Shay <mshay001@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2018 9:42 PM
To: sandrayang@coronaca.gov; Sandra Yang
Cc: Jason Scott; Jim Steiner; Yolanda Carrillo; Wes Speake
Subject: Opposition to Renegade Tower's application for a conditional use permit for a cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Dear Sandra Yang,

We would like to first thank you for having the developer of the proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive present to the community again.

We, along with other residents in the affected area, are against the solution proposed by Renegade Towers to build a cell phone tower on Skyline Drive. The solution proposed by Renegade Towers provides little benefit and comes at a great cost to those living in the Emerald Crest neighborhood. Furthermore, we believe there are better solutions available to meet the needs of the City of Corona.

Renegade Towers has suggested that their solution will serve the community by providing coverage to First Responders. However, the proposed cell phone tower won't solve the problem of poor cell phone service along Foothill Parkway between Skyline Drive and Paseo Grande: at the meeting with Renegade on November 29, 2018, the representative from Renegade stated that the surrounding hills will absorb much of the signal produced by the proposed cell phone tower.

This means:

a.) Because the tower will be located in a low-elevation, valley-like location, any additional coverage provided to First Responders and hikers will be very limited:

-First Responders, commuters, and hikers on Foothill Pkwy. between W. Chase Dr. and Paseo Grande will continue to have poor cell phone service.

-Hikers in Hagador Canyon south of Burrero Way will continue to have poor cell phone service.

-Hikers in the mountains of that area of the Cleveland National Forest will continue to have poor cell phone service.

b.) Additional cell phone towers will still have to be built along Foothill Parkway to provide coverage between W. Chase Dr. and Paseo Grande.

-At the meeting with the developer on November 29, 2018, the developer stated that more towers would have to be built along Foothill Parkway.

c.) The large, unsightly cell phone towers will conflict with the City's goal of promoting Skyline Trail as a destination for visitors:

-At the City Council meeting on May 3, 2017, members of the City Council verbally stated a goal of promoting the Skyline Trail as a destination for visitors (this goal was the justification for the City's approval of parking spaces and parking lots along Foothill Parkway).

--These additional towers will conflict with that goal since they will obstruct the natural beauty of the area; hikers and other outdoor enthusiasts trying to enjoy nature will instead be confronted with massive cell phone towers.

d.) The proposed cell phone tower does not match Corona's image as an innovative, technologically-advanced city:

-Not only are large cell phone towers an eyesore, they are also a technology that is becoming outdated. There is a strong trend away from large cell phone towers. For example, Anaheim, San Francisco, and other cities are deploying

other solutions such as Small Cells (also known as "micro cells", duffel-bag sized mini-towers that can be installed on street lights and traffic signals).

There are better options available such as:

a.) Installing Small Cells along Foothill Parkway. This option would meet the needs of First Responders, not have a significant impact to the resident's health, views, or property values, and leave the hills undisturbed. Micro Cells are a proven technology that have the added benefit of generating revenue for the City since these small cells would be installed on top of traffic signals and streetlights.

b.) There are hilltop lots available along Foothill Parkway. For example, the owner of Quality Growers (a plant nursery on Foothill) has sent us an email stating that he is interested in speaking with cell phone tower developers about leasing some of his space for a cell phone tower. A hilltop cell phone tower would provide a wider range of coverage, thereby reducing the number of towers needed along Foothill. A hilltop cell phone tower have the added benefit of not negatively impacting residents' health, views, or property values, since there are no homes near the hilltops.

The official Minutes from the November 1, 2017, Infrastructure Meeting stated that the proposed cell phone tower is out-of-character with the surrounding area. Section B4 of the General Plan created on August 7, 2014 shows the lot in question as having been zoned for low density residential development. When we purchased our home on Amethyst Street in 2010, we took into consideration that the lot in question was vacant and while something residential could be built on the lot in the future, there would not be any commercial development. We specifically looked for a completely residential area, with an unobstructed view of mountains and hills from the backyard.

Thinking that there was no reason that the area's zoning would be changed to allow commercial operations in the middle of our neighborhood, we invested substantially in our home. For example, we spent \$60,000 on a 700 square foot balcony. We consider the presence of this cell phone tower such a risk to our family that it will force us to sell our home.

We would also like to add that the cell phone tower would not be placed here for our benefit. We have lived on Amethyst Street since 2010 and have been able to make and receive cell phone calls from our home. We have also had First Responders and various vendors make and receive calls from our home. This causes us to wonder, Who is this cell phone tower really meant to serve? The commuters that will get maybe an additional small fraction of a mile of coverage on Foothill or Chase? The hikers that will only have coverage prior to getting into the mountains? Again, the benefits are minimal while it comes with a great financial and health risk to us.

With this in mind, we ask that you deny the application by Renegade Towers for a conditional use permit for a cell phone tower near 3298 Skyline Drive.

Respectfully,

Michael and Violeta Shay
3384 Amethyst Street
Corona, CA 92882

Sandra Yang

From: Joanne Coletta
Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2018 7:48 AM
To: Sandra Yang
Subject: FW: Renegade Towers cell-site: Skyline project

fyi

From: S. Wadhwani <sumanth.wadhwani@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Yolanda Carrillo <Yolanda.Carrillo@CoronaCA.gov>; Joanne Coletta <Joanne.Coletta@CoronaCA.gov>; sandrayang@coronaca.gov; sandrayang@ci.corona.ca.us
Subject: Fwd: Renegade Towers cell-site: Skyline project

Kindly file this copy instead due to corrected typos

Thanks again.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: S. Wadhwani <sumanth.wadhwani@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 17, 2018, 8:32 AM
Subject: Renegade Towers cell-site: Skyline project
To: <sandrayang@coronaca.gov>, <sandra.yang@ci.corona.ca.us>
Cc: <Jason.Scott@coronaca.gov>, <Jim.Steiner@coronaca.gov>, <Yolanda.Carrillo@coronaca.gov>, <Jacque.Casillas@coronaca.gov>, <Wes.Speake@coronaca.gov>

Respected mayor, vice mayor, City Council and Senior planner;

Advanced wishes for a Merry Christmas and happy New Year.

In Fall of 2017 the residents nearby Skyline Drive attended and voiced their opposition to the cell site proposed by Renegade Towers LLC. The residents attended the infrastructure meeting in November 2017 where we were shown a tremendous amount of support and it was stated that the planning Personnel did not support this project.

The residents received another letter after Thanksgiving this year for another community meeting with Renegade Towers. My understanding is that the process is not fully completed and the project still stands a chance of moving forward.

I would like to continue voicing opposition to this project for the following reasons:

Out of character for the surrounding community: the 70 + foot cell site facility will stand out as an eyesore in an area surrounded by homes and very well known as a hiking destination with natural Scenic views.

Implicit cost to surrounding homes &

Disproportionate benefit to those outside of the community: the site comes at a cost to those homes directly in its path of view. We the residents have expressed that we do not personally benefit from increased cell phone coverage in the area due to sufficient cell coverage within our homes. The benefit is to other's not within the residential area and to the owner of the property in question.

A lack of proposed alternate locations

Availability of less intrusive 5 G technology: there are potentially several other locations alongside the Foothill extension that can be explored for strategic placement that is less intrusive to the community and that will foster a positive image of the city of Corona planning and concern for communities.

The currently proposed project location does not demonstrate proper community planning and placement around existing community and safeguarding nearby Community interests.

I enjoy living in this city specifically around Skyline Trail because it is blessed with beautiful Scenic views. I also strongly believe that there are other options to the placement of the cell site that can be beneficial but yet respectful to the nearby community and its residents.

I strongly urge the city council and planning department to consider alternatives within reasonable capability for proper placement around and to safeguard already existing Community and community interest.

The future will require a lot of proactive planning around existing community to avoid haphazard out of character placement and a planning of communities around technology infrastructure needs rather than the reverse.

Sincerely,
Sumanth Wadhwani
3461 Amethyst Circle
Corona

Sandra Yang

From: Michael Shay <mshay001@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2018 9:42 PM
To: sandrayang@coronaca.gov; Sandra Yang
Cc: Jason Scott; Jim Steiner; Yolanda Carrillo; Wes Speake
Subject: Opposition to Renegade Tower's application for a conditional use permit for a cell phone tower on Skyline Drive

Dear Sandra Yang,

We would like to first thank you for having the developer of the proposed cell phone tower on Skyline Drive present to the community again.

We, along with other residents in the affected area, are against the solution proposed by Renegade Towers to build a cell phone tower on Skyline Drive. The solution proposed by Renegade Towers provides little benefit and comes at a great cost to those living in the Emerald Crest neighborhood. Furthermore, we believe there are better solutions available to meet the needs of the City of Corona.

Renegade Towers has suggested that their solution will serve the community by providing coverage to First Responders. However, the proposed cell phone tower won't solve the problem of poor cell phone service along Foothill Parkway between Skyline Drive and Paseo Grande: at the meeting with Renegade on November 29, 2018, the representative from Renegade stated that the surrounding hills will absorb much of the signal produced by the proposed cell phone tower.

This means:

a.) Because the tower will be located in a low-elevation, valley-like location, any additional coverage provided to First Responders and hikers will be very limited:

-First Responders, commuters, and hikers on Foothill Pkwy. between W. Chase Dr. and Paseo Grande will continue to have poor cell phone service.

-Hikers in Hagador Canyon south of Burrero Way will continue to have poor cell phone service.

-Hikers in the mountains of that area of the Cleveland National Forest will continue to have poor cell phone service.

b.) Additional cell phone towers will still have to be built along Foothill Parkway to provide coverage between W. Chase Dr. and Paseo Grande.

-At the meeting with the developer on November 29, 2018, the developer stated that more towers would have to be built along Foothill Parkway.

c.) The large, unsightly cell phone towers will conflict with the City's goal of promoting Skyline Trail as a destination for visitors:

-At the City Council meeting on May 3, 2017, members of the City Council verbally stated a goal of promoting the Skyline Trail as a destination for visitors (this goal was the justification for the City's approval of parking spaces and parking lots along Foothill Parkway).

--These additional towers will conflict with that goal since they will obstruct the natural beauty of the area; hikers and other outdoor enthusiasts trying to enjoy nature will instead be confronted with massive cell phone towers.

d.) The proposed cell phone tower does not match Corona's image as an innovative, technologically-advanced city:

-Not only are large cell phone towers an eyesore, they are also a technology that is becoming outdated. There is a strong trend away from large cell phone towers. For example, Anaheim, San Francisco, and other cities are deploying

other solutions such as Small Cells (also known as "micro cells", duffel-bag sized mini-towers that can be installed on street lights and traffic signals).

There are better options available such as:

a.) Installing Small Cells along Foothill Parkway. This option would meet the needs of First Responders, not have a significant impact to the resident's health, views, or property values, and leave the hills undisturbed. Micro Cells are a proven technology that have the added benefit of generating revenue for the City since these small cells would be installed on top of traffic signals and streetlights.

b.) There are hilltop lots available along Foothill Parkway. For example, the owner of Quality Growers (a plant nursery on Foothill) has sent us an email stating that he is interested in speaking with cell phone tower developers about leasing some of his space for a cell phone tower. A hilltop cell phone tower would provide a wider range of coverage, thereby reducing the number of towers needed along Foothill. A hilltop cell phone tower have the added benefit of not negatively impacting residents' health, views, or property values, since there are no homes near the hilltops.

The official Minutes from the November 1, 2017, Infrastructure Meeting stated that the proposed cell phone tower is out-of-character with the surrounding area. Section B4 of the General Plan created on August 7, 2014 shows the lot in question as having been zoned for low density residential development. When we purchased our home on Amethyst Street in 2010, we took into consideration that the lot in question was vacant and while something residential could be built on the lot in the future, there would not be any commercial development. We specifically looked for a completely residential area, with an unobstructed view of mountains and hills from the backyard.

Thinking that there was no reason that the area's zoning would be changed to allow commercial operations in the middle of our neighborhood, we invested substantially in our home. For example, we spent \$60,000 on a 700 square foot balcony. We consider the presence of this cell phone tower such a risk to our family that it will force us to sell our home.

We would also like to add that the cell phone tower would not be placed here for our benefit. We have lived on Amethyst Street since 2010 and have been able to make and receive cell phone calls from our home. We have also had First Responders and various vendors make and receive calls from our home. This causes us to wonder, Who is this cell phone tower really meant to serve? The commuters that will get maybe an additional small fraction of a mile of coverage on Foothill or Chase? The hikers that will only have coverage prior to getting into the mountains? Again, the benefits are minimal while it comes with a great financial and health risk to us.

With this in mind, we ask that you deny the application by Renegade Towers for a conditional use permit for a cell phone tower near 3298 Skyline Drive.

Respectfully,

Michael and Violeta Shay
3384 Amethyst Street
Corona, CA 92882

Sandra Yang

From: Michael Shay <mshay001@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 2, 2019 10:12 PM
To: Jason Scott; Jim Steiner; Wes Speake
Cc: Sandra Yang; e2atkins@gmail.com; sumanth.wadhwani@gmail.com
Subject: Infrastructure Committee mtg on 1/9: Signed Petitions against proposed cell phone tower for Skyline Drive
Attachments: skyline_cell_petition_2018.pdf

Dear Honorable Mayor Scott, Mr. Speake, and Vice Mayor Steiner,

Attached you will find a copy of the petition we dropped-off at the Community Development Department at City Hall on 12/28/2018 and 01/02/2019. The petition we dropped-off included 16 pages of signatures which we can provide (if they haven't already been provided to you). These petitions were signed to voice opposition to the proposed cell phone tower for Skyline Drive that will be discussed in the January 9th Infrastructure Meeting. The petitions have been signed by many residents of Amethyst Street and the surrounding area. In the petition, we have explained our reasons for opposing the cell phone tower and we have provided suggested alternatives that, we believe, would better serve the community without the negative impact that the current proposal poses to our neighborhood.

We would also like to communicate that the alternatives we have proposed are not just speculative. We have contacted the owner of Quality Growers and he has stated that he would be interested in leasing part of his land for the cell phone tower. We also have a contact at Crown Castle that has stated that a small cell solution (duffel-bag-sized "mini" cell phone towers) along Foothill is a viable option and would be willing to develop such a plan if this proposed cell phone tower does not move forward. If you are interested in either alternative, we can provide you and your staff with that support.

Thank you in advance for listening to the concerns of your constituents.

Regards,

Michael and Violeta Shay
(on behalf of the concerned residents of Amethyst St and surrounding area)