

From: [Jeannette Horibe](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Opposing cell antennas on 725 5th St
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 7:26:11 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

I am opposed to having the cell antennas on 725 5th St.. Although I don't live close to 5th St, we have neighbors who are have little ones or who are elderly and are worried about their health and how it will affect their quality of life.

Please think of them before putting something that could affect them.

Jeannette Horibe
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Alex Sola](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Concern Regarding Proposed Cell Antennas at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 8:06:11 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission,

I am writing as a concerned resident regarding the proposal to install multiple cellular antennas at 725 5th Street. While I understand the importance of reliable telecommunications infrastructure, I would like to express concern about the potential long-term health implications and community impacts associated with placing numerous antennas in close proximity to residential areas.

Cell towers emit radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation (RF-EMF), and while this form of radiation is classified as non-ionizing, ongoing scientific discussion continues regarding the potential biological effects of chronic exposure. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), part of the World Health Organization, has classified RF electromagnetic fields as “possibly carcinogenic to humans” (Group 2B), based on limited evidence of an association with certain cancers.

In addition, some peer-reviewed studies examining populations living close to cellular base stations have reported higher rates of symptoms such as sleep disturbances, headaches, fatigue, difficulty concentrating, and other neurological complaints. Although research findings vary and more long-term data is needed, the presence of these reported associations raises legitimate questions about cumulative exposure in residential environments.

Given that this proposal appears to involve multiple antennas located on a single structure in a neighborhood where people live, work, and raise families, I believe it is reasonable for residents to ask that the City apply a precautionary approach when evaluating this project.

Specifically, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

- Carefully evaluate the cumulative RF exposure associated with multiple antennas at a single location
- Consider the proximity of the installation to surrounding residences
- Explore whether alternative locations farther from residential areas are available
- Ensure that independent assessments and transparent information are provided to the community regarding projected exposure levels

Hermosa Beach is a unique residential coastal community, and decisions that affect neighborhood environments should be made with thoughtful consideration of long-term impacts on residents’ well-being.

Thank you for your time and for considering the concerns of community members as you review this proposal.

Sincerely,

Alex Sola
Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [Kat Forbes](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Technical Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:32:32 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following technical comments in opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes the installation and operation of an unmanned 588.5-square-foot wireless telecommunications facility (Verizon Wireless) on the roof of the existing building located at 725 5th Street.

While telecommunications infrastructure is an important public utility, the proposed siting raises significant concerns related to land use compatibility, visual impacts, neighborhood character, and potential economic effects on surrounding residential properties. These concerns warrant careful review before approving the requested Conditional Use Permit.

1. Land Use Compatibility and Zoning Considerations

Conditional Use Permits are intended to ensure that uses with potentially significant impacts are only approved when they are compatible with surrounding land uses and will not adversely affect the public welfare. The proposed facility is located within Specific Plan Area 7, an area characterized by mixed-use development that includes residential uses in close proximity.

Wireless telecommunications facilities placed on rooftops in residential or mixed-use neighborhoods often introduce:

- Large equipment enclosures and screening structures
- Antennas and associated mechanical infrastructure
- Increased visual bulk on rooftops that were not designed to accommodate such installations

Planning best practices recommend prioritizing telecommunications facilities in commercial, industrial, or infrastructure corridors where impacts on residents are minimized. Approving a facility in close proximity to residential units should require clear evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been thoroughly evaluated and are infeasible.

2. Visual Impact and Community Character

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of aesthetic impacts where projects may substantially degrade the visual character of a neighborhood.

Even when screened, rooftop telecommunications installations can:

- Alter building massing and skyline profiles
- Introduce mechanical structures inconsistent with surrounding architecture
- Become visible from nearby residential windows, streets, and public viewpoints

Hermosa Beach's planning framework emphasizes preservation of neighborhood character

and coastal visual quality. A rooftop telecommunications compound approaching 600 square feet represents a substantial rooftop structure that could conflict with these objectives.

3. Economic and Property Value Considerations

Peer-reviewed and market studies have documented that proximity to telecommunications towers and antenna facilities can influence buyer perception and property marketability.

Examples include:

- The Sandy Bond Study (2013), which found that residential properties located near cell towers experienced measurable decreases in buyer interest and market value.
- A National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy review, which documented multiple cases where real estate professionals reported marketing challenges for homes near telecommunications infrastructure.

Although impacts vary by site and visibility, the perception of risk alone can influence residential property values and buyer behavior. Given the high property values and residential density in Hermosa Beach, even small percentage impacts represent significant economic consequences for homeowners.

4. Health and Precautionary Planning Considerations

Federal regulations limit local governments' ability to deny telecommunications facilities solely on the basis of RF emissions if they comply with FCC exposure limits. However, planning bodies may still consider community welfare, prudent siting, and precautionary principles when evaluating land use compatibility.

Several international and public health organizations, including the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), have classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as "possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B)". While research is ongoing, this designation supports the use of a precautionary approach, particularly in residential areas.

Prudent planning policies in many municipalities therefore encourage:

- Maximizing distance between antennas and residential living spaces
- Locating facilities on existing infrastructure (utility corridors, industrial zones, etc.)
- Avoiding unnecessary concentration of telecommunications equipment near homes

5. Evaluation of Alternative Sites

A key question in evaluating CUP applications is whether the applicant has demonstrated that less impactful alternative locations are unavailable or technically infeasible. The Planning Commission should request detailed documentation addressing:

- Alternative commercial or non-residential locations within the coverage area
- Potential co-location on existing telecommunications structures
- Use of smaller distributed antenna systems (DAS) or other lower-impact technologies

Without clear evidence that reasonable alternatives were fully explored, approval of this rooftop facility may be premature.

Conclusion

Based on the concerns outlined above regarding land use compatibility, visual impacts, potential property value effects, and prudent siting practices, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. Deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 as currently proposed, or
2. Require the applicant to conduct a comprehensive alternatives analysis and visual impact assessment prior to reconsideration.

Hermosa Beach residents place great value on the character, aesthetics, and livability of their neighborhoods. Telecommunications infrastructure should be planned in a way that protects these qualities while still meeting service needs.

Thank you for your consideration and for including this letter in the public record for the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission hearing.

Sincerely
Kathleen B Jucar



From: [Trey F](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [Planning](#)
Subject: March 17, 2026 Planning Commission – Agenda Item CUP25-04 – Public Comment Opposing Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:47:42 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

To: Hermosa Beach Planning Commission
Community Development Department
City of Hermosa Beach
1315 Valley Drive
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Re: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 – Proposed Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility at 725 5th Street

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed installation of the Verizon wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the building at 725 5th Street.

I live one street away from the proposed site and my residence is on the second floor, placing me in relatively close proximity and likely line-of-sight to the antennas. Because of this proximity, I have significant concerns regarding potential health, safety, and neighborhood impacts.

First, there remains ongoing scientific debate about the long-term health effects of chronic exposure to radiofrequency (RF) radiation emitted by cellular infrastructure, particularly with the increasing deployment of newer technologies such as 5G. While federal exposure guidelines exist, many researchers and public health advocates have raised concerns that current limits were developed decades ago and primarily address short-term thermal exposure rather than long-term cumulative biological effects.

A number of peer-reviewed studies and international reviews have suggested possible associations between long-term RF exposure and biological impacts including sleep disruption, oxidative stress, and neurological effects. Organizations such as the World Health Organization's cancer research arm have classified RF electromagnetic fields as a "possible carcinogen." Given that the science is still evolving, many communities have chosen to apply a precautionary approach when placing transmitters close to homes.

Second, the proposed installation appears to be located in the immediate vicinity of residential buildings. Residents living nearby—including those on upper floors such as myself—may experience higher direct exposure compared with ground-level passersby. Installing this type of facility so close to homes raises reasonable concerns about continuous exposure over many years.

Third, the facility may negatively affect neighborhood character and property values. Rooftop telecommunications infrastructure can introduce visual clutter and industrial equipment into otherwise residential areas. Many homeowners are understandably concerned that living near visible cell infrastructure could reduce desirability for future buyers or renters.

Finally, I would encourage the Commission to carefully evaluate whether alternative locations exist that would create greater distance from residential dwellings while still meeting wireless coverage needs. Locating such infrastructure in commercial zones, on taller non-residential structures, or in less densely populated areas would significantly reduce the potential impact on nearby residents.

Wireless connectivity is important, but it should be balanced with community health, neighborhood character, and

the concerns of the residents who live closest to these facilities.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 for the proposed telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street or require the applicant to pursue a location that is farther from surrounding residences.

Thank you for considering the concerns of nearby residents.

Sincerely,

James Flick
Resident, Hermosa Beach

From: [Sharon Paul](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: 10 Foot Cell Antenna
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 10:13:05 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am very concerned for my neighbors on 5th street. Their anxiety is high and understandably so regarding a possible cell tower on their block. We do not have clear evidence that the electromagnetic exposure does not pose any risks or dangers to those living near this antenna. This is extremely concerning. Thank you for giving this matter serious consideration.

From: [Kelly Kress Castro](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Proposed 725 5th Street Cell Tower
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 11:20:44 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I write in opposition to the proposed cell tower at this address, in part, because of its proximity to residential properties where infants and children reside.

Any purported complaints about “spotty reception” in that area pale in comparison to the very real and sometimes irreversible physical damage experienced by those forced to live, work and attend school next to these towers.

Effects from RF that are documented in scientific research include increased cancer risk, cellular stress, headaches, sleep issues, genetic damage, changes to the reproductive system, memory deficits, and impacts to the nervous system.

Research has found that the cumulative dose from cell tower RF can result in significant exposure over time. Young children do not use cell phones, yet they are involuntarily exposed. Cell tower radiation exposures are nonstop day and night.

Short-term exposure to these fields in experimental studies has not always shown immediate negative effects, but this does not rule out cumulative damage from these fields, so larger studies over longer periods are needed to help understand who is at risk. There have never been and can never ethically be studies conducted on infants and children, so it is hard to scientifically document cellular damage or to establish a cause for cancer or neurological damage to a pediatric population.

Think of the many things we have endured as humans despite being told by the industries profiting from them that they are safe?

Cigarettes, asbestos, leaded gasoline, lead paint, Thalidomide for morning sickness, and trans fats were once considered safe or beneficial before being linked to cancer, birth defects, and heart disease, respectively. Cell tower radiation will undoubtedly be added to that list of human tragedies.

In 2011, wireless radio frequency radiation was classified as a Class 2B possible carcinogen by the World Health Organization’s International Agency for Research on Cancer. Between then and now, the published peer-reviewed scientific evidence has significantly increased.

- Falcioni, 2018 published in *Environmental Research* exposed rats to RF comparable to cell tower RF levels and found increased cancers. Now, many scientists are of the opinion that the weight of current peer-reviewed evidence supports the conclusion that radiofrequency radiation should be regarded as a human **carcinogen** (Hardell and Carlberg 2017, Peleg et al, 2018, Miller et al 2018).
- Zothansiana 2017 published in *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* found changes

in blood considered biomarkers predictive of cancer in people living closer to cell arrays.

- Rodrigues 2021 published in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health found higher exposure to cell arrays linked to higher mortality from all cancer and specifically lung and breast cancer.
- Meo 2018 published in American Journal of Men's Health linked higher cell tower exposures to delayed fine and gross motor skills, spatial working memory, and attention in school adolescents
- Yakymenko 2011 published in Exp Oncology found increased of cancer incidence.
- Meo 2015 published in Environmental Research and Public Health found higher exposures linked to higher risk of type 2 diabetes.
- López 2021 published in Environmental Research linked higher exposures to more severe headaches and decreased sleep
- Levitt 2010 published in Environmental Reviews analyzed 100 studies and found ~80% showed biological effects near towers. (PDF)
- Yakymenko 2015 published in Electromagnetic Biology Medicine reviewed 100 studies and showed oxidative effects of low-intensity RF radiation.
- Buchner 2011 published in Umwelt-Medizin-Gesellschaft and detailed in Oncology Letters followed people in a German town after a cell tower was erected and found stress hormones adrenaline and noradrenaline significantly increased over the first 6 months after the antenna activation and decreased dopamine and PEA levels after 18 months.
- Dode 2011 published in Science of the Total Environment 10 year study on cell phone antennas by the local Municipal Health Department and several universities in Brazil found a clearly elevated relative risk of cancer mortality at residential distances of 500 meters or less from cell phone towers.
- Khurana 2011 published in International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health reviewed epidemiological studies and found in 80% of the studies, people living <500 m from base stations had an increased adverse neuro-behavioral symptoms and cancer.
- Two published case reports document illness that developed after 5G antennas were installed. In "The Microwave Syndrome after Installation of 5G Emphasizes the Need for Protection from Radiofrequency Radiation" (Hardell and Nilsson 2023), a man and woman developed microwave syndrome symptoms (e.g., neurological symptoms, tinnitus, fatigue, insomnia, emotional distress, skin disorders, and blood pressure variability) after a 5G base station was installed on the roof above their apartment.
- Similarly, in "Development of the Microwave Syndrome in Two Men Shortly after Installation of 5G on the Roof above their Office" two men developed symptoms after 5G antennas were activated on the roof of their workplace. The symptoms disappeared in both men within a couple of weeks (case 1) or immediately (case 2) after leaving the office.

Surveys of people living near cell tower antennas in France, Spain, Iraq, India, Germany, Egypt, Poland have found significantly higher reports of health issues including sleep issues, fatigue and headaches (See Santini et al. 2003, López 2021, Alazawi 2011, Pachuau and Pachuau 2016, Eger et al. 2004, Abdel-Rassoul et al. 2007, Bortkiewicz et al., 2004).

"There is a large and growing body of evidence that human exposure to RFR from cellular phone base stations causes negative health effects (Siddoo-Atwal, 2018; Singh et al., 2018; Faisal, et al., 2018), including both i) neuropsychiatric complaints such as headache,

concentration difficulties, memory changes, dizziness, tremors, depressive symptoms, fatigue, and sleep disturbance (Navarro et al., 2003; Hutter et al., 2006; Abdel-Rassoul et al., 2007); and ii) increased incidence of cancer and living in proximity to a cell-phone transmitter station (Wolf and Wolf, 2004; Havas, 2017).”

Fortunately, many school districts are finally taking action to protect children and many cities are also enacting sensible protections.

Here is a sampling of school boards nationwide that no longer allow cell towers or cell tower antennas on or near schools:

- Los Angeles CA School District: Resolutions opposing cell towers on school property and a “cautionary level” for radiofrequency radiation 10,000 times lower than FCC limits.
- Palo Alto CA Unified School District: Resolution No. 2018-19.19 supports the City 1,500 setback and opposes cell tower “on or in close proximity to schools to ensure individuals, especially children, are protected from the potential negative effects associated with radiation exposure”
- West Linn-Wilsonville Oregon School Board prohibits cell towers on school property.
- Vancouver School Board: Resolution prohibiting cell antennas within 1,000 feet of school property.
- Montgomery County: Maryland Schools policy does not allow cell towers on elementary schools.
- Prince George’s County: Maryland School Board decided not to renew a cell tower construction master leasing agreement that had allowed over 60 schools to be marketed as cell tower sites.
- Portland Oregon Schools: ended new leases for cell towers.
- Temecula Valley Unified School District trustees passed a ban on new cell phone towers on school property and barring the district from renewing existing tower leases.

In addition, Many Cities and Towns Have Laws To Restrict Cell Tower Antennas near Homes (and Schools). This is just a small sampling of American cities with such restrictions. **The proposed 725 5th Street antennas would be far closer to the family immediately next door with two small children.**

- Encinitas, CA – No antennas within 500 feet from residential dwelling unit, No antennas within 500 feet of daycare facility or school
- Shelburne, MA – no wireless antennas within 3,000 feet of schools and within 1,500 feet of homes and no new wireless antennas in residential zones.
- Copeck , NY – no wireless facility may be within 1,500 feet from homes, schools, churches, or other buildings containing dwelling units.
- Sallisaw, OK – no commercial wireless telecommunications towers within 1,500 of homes.
- Calabasas, CA – no “Tier 2” wireless telecommunications facilities within 1,000 feet of homes and schools.
- Bedford, NH – No wireless antennas within 750 feet from nearest residentially-zoned property.
- Scarsdale, NY – No wireless facilities within 500 feet from homes, schools, parks, and houses of worship.

- Davis, CA – no freestanding wireless facilities within 500 feet of residential zone and schools.
- Westlake Village, CA – no facilities within 500 feet of homes.
- Randolph, MA – no wireless antennas within 500 feet of homes and businesses.
- Petaluma, CA – no “small cell” antennas within 500 feet of homes.
- Suisin City, CA – no “small cell” antennas within 500 feet of homes.
- Contra Costa County, CA – no new high-visibility facilities or towers within 300 feet of residential zones.
- North Hempstead NY– No installations within 350 feet of a school.

Sadly, some communities only find out the very real risks *after* the fact.

Read this news report from CBS News about Ripon, California where the Sprint cell towers were installed, but later removed without litigation as a precautionary measure after cases of cancer in children came to light.

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/cell-tower-shut-down-some-california-parents-link-to-several-cases-of-childhood-cancer/>

In short, our community’s health and wellbeing should be the absolute priority where the science is not entirely settled.

Thank you for your time reviewing this information and considering my concerns about the proposed antennas.

Kelly Kress
HB Resident

From: [Sharon Paul](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Re: 10- Cell Antennas
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 12:05:52 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

This is a correction to the first email I sent.

On Mon, Mar 9, 2026 at 10:12 PM Sharon Paul <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I am very concerned for my neighbors on 5th street. Their anxiety is high and understandably so regarding possible electromagnetic cell antennas on their block. We do not have clear evidence that the electromagnetic exposure does not pose any risks or dangers to those living near this antenna. This is extremely concerning. Thank you for giving this manner serious consideration.

From: [Emilia Fallas](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Formal Opposition/Concern - Cell towers on 725 5th Street
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 7:48:46 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission,

My name is Emilia Fallas and I am a resident at [REDACTED] in Hermosa Beach. I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the proposed installation of 10 cell towers at 725 5th Street.

While I understand the importance of reliable telecommunications infrastructure, the density and proximity of this specific proposal raise significant concerns for my family and my neighbors. I would like to request that the Commission addresses the following points before moving forward with approval:

- **Cumulative Impact:** While a single tower must meet FCC guidelines, I am concerned about the cumulative radiofrequency (RF) exposure from ten towers concentrated in one small area. Has an independent study been conducted on the total output for this specific site?
- **Proximity to Residences:** These towers are located next to residential homes. I request clarification on the minimum setback distances being enforced and whether alternative, less intrusive locations were considered.
- **Property Values and Aesthetics:** A high concentration of industrial equipment can significantly impact the character and property values of a residential zone. I ask that the commission require a visual impact assessment and consider stealth/camouflaged designs if the project proceeds.
- **Public Safety and Monitoring:** If approved, what measures will the city take to ensure these towers remain in compliance with safety standards over time?

I urge the Commission to postpone approval until these concerns are addressed and residents can receive transparent answers regarding the long-term health and environmental impacts of such a dense installation.

Thank you for your time and for protecting the interests of our community.

Sincerely,

Emilia Fallas

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Barbra](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 (March 17 meeting) – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 10:58:14 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following comments **in opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04**, which proposes the installation and operation of an unmanned 588.5-square-foot wireless telecommunications facility (Verizon Wireless) on the roof of the existing building located at 725 5th Street.

While telecommunications infrastructure is an important public utility, the proposed siting raises significant concerns related to land use compatibility, visual impacts, neighborhood character, and potential economic effects on surrounding residential properties. These concerns warrant careful review before approving the requested Conditional Use Permit.

1. Land Use Compatibility and Zoning Considerations Conditional Use Permits are intended to ensure that uses with potentially significant impacts are only approved when they are compatible with surrounding land uses and will not adversely affect the public welfare. The proposed facility is located within Specific Plan Area 7, an area characterized by mixed-use development that includes residential uses in close proximity.

Wireless telecommunications facilities placed on rooftops in residential or mixed-use neighborhoods often introduce:

- Large equipment enclosures and screening structures
- Antennas and associated mechanical infrastructure
- Increased visual bulk on rooftops that were not designed to accommodate such installations Planning best practices recommend prioritizing telecommunications facilities in commercial, industrial, or infrastructure corridors where impacts on residents are minimized. Approving a facility in close proximity to residential units should require clear evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been thoroughly evaluated and are infeasible.

2. Visual Impact and Community Character The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of aesthetic impacts where projects may substantially degrade the visual character of a neighborhood. Even when screened, rooftop telecommunications installations can:

- Alter building massing and skyline profiles

- Introduce mechanical structures inconsistent with surrounding architecture
- Become visible from nearby residential windows, streets, and public viewpoints

Hermosa Beach's planning framework emphasizes preservation of neighborhood character and coastal visual quality. A rooftop telecommunications compound approaching 600 square feet represents a substantial rooftop structure that could conflict with these objectives.

3. Economic and Property Value Considerations

Peer-reviewed and market studies have documented that proximity to telecommunications towers and antenna facilities can influence buyer perception and property marketability.

Examples include:

- The Sandy Bond Study (2013), which found that residential properties located near cell towers experienced measurable decreases in buyer interest and market value.
- A National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy review, which documented multiple cases where real estate professionals reported marketing challenges for homes near telecommunications infrastructure.

Although impacts vary by site and visibility, the perception of risk alone can influence residential property values and buyer behavior. Given the high property values and residential density in Hermosa Beach, even small percentage impacts represent significant economic consequences for homeowners.

4. Health and Precautionary Planning Considerations

Federal regulations limit local governments' ability to deny telecommunications facilities solely on the basis of RF emissions if they comply with FCC exposure limits. However, planning bodies may still consider community welfare and precautionary principles when evaluating land use compatibility.

Several international and public health organizations, including the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), have classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as "possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B)". While research is ongoing, this designation supports the use of a precautionary approach, particularly in residential areas.

Prudent planning policies in many municipalities therefore encourage:

- Maximizing distance between antennas and residential living spaces
- Locating facilities on existing infrastructure (utility corridors, industrial zones, etc.)
- Avoiding unnecessary concentration of telecommunications equipment near homes

5. Evaluation of Alternative Sites

A key question in evaluating CUP applications is whether the applicant has demonstrated that less impactful alternative locations are unavailable or technically infeasible. The Planning Commission should request detailed documentation addressing:

- Alternative commercial or non-residential locations within the coverage area
- Potential co-location on existing telecommunications structures
- Use of smaller distributed antenna systems (DAS) or other lower-impact technologies.

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

Without clear evidence that reasonable alternatives were fully explored, approval of this rooftop facility may be premature.

Conclusion:

Based on the concerns outlined above regarding land use compatibility, visual impacts, potential property value effects, and prudent siting practices, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. Deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 as currently proposed, or
2. Require the applicant to conduct a comprehensive alternatives analysis and visual impact assessment prior to reconsideration.

Hermosa Beach residents place great value on the character, aesthetics, and livability of their neighborhoods. Telecommunications infrastructure should be planned in a way that protects these qualities while still meeting service needs.

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

Thank you for your consideration and for including this letter in the public record for the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission hearing.

Sincerely,
Barbra Benes



From: [Robby Brubaker](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Liz Brubaker](#)
Subject: Public Comment and Request for Clarification – CUP25-04 – 725 Fifth Street
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 12:33:05 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP25-04) for the construction and operation of a 588.5-square-foot unmanned wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the existing building at 725 5th Street within Specific Plan Area 7.

While I understand the importance of improving wireless infrastructure in our community, I would like the Commission to carefully consider several aspects of this proposal before approving the permit.

First, how closely this is being considered next to my home at 683 5th Street. As a family of 4, with my youngest 15 months old and my oldest 3 years old, this is incredibly concerning. After speaking with the planning department today, I found many questions left unanswered, which I would like to address here for further clarity.

First, I have the visual and neighborhood compatibility of a rooftop telecommunications facility in SPA-7 that should be evaluated closely. The area contains a mix of residential and commercial uses, and rooftop equipment can significantly impact the character and aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood if not carefully designed and screened.

I encourage the Commission to consider whether alternative locations or design modifications could reduce the installation's visual footprint. Facilities of this size may affect nearby residents and businesses, particularly if they are visible from the street or surrounding properties.

Finally, I would appreciate additional transparency regarding the determination that the project qualifies for a Class 3 CEQA exemption. Given the scale of the facility and its location in a developed, active area, it would be helpful for the community to better understand the basis for this exemption and whether any cumulative impacts were evaluated.

I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to review this proposal carefully and ensure that any approval includes appropriate design standards, screening requirements, and community considerations. Thank you for your time and for your service to our community.

Sincerely,
Robert Brubaker

[REDACTED]

From: [Matthew Conrad](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Technical Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:07:12 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following technical comments in opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes the installation and operation of an unmanned 588.5-square-foot wireless telecommunications facility (Verizon Wireless) on the roof of the existing building located at 725 5th Street.

While telecommunications infrastructure is an important public utility, the proposed siting raises significant concerns related to land use compatibility, visual impacts, neighborhood character, and potential economic effects on surrounding residential properties. These concerns warrant careful review before approving the requested Conditional Use Permit.

1. Land Use Compatibility and Zoning Considerations

Conditional Use Permits are intended to ensure that uses with potentially significant impacts are only approved when they are compatible with surrounding land uses and will not adversely affect the public welfare. The proposed facility is located within Specific Plan Area 7, an area characterized by mixed-use development that includes residential uses in close proximity.

Wireless telecommunications facilities placed on rooftops in residential or mixed-use neighborhoods often introduce:

- Large equipment enclosures and screening structures
- Antennas and associated mechanical infrastructure
- Increased visual bulk on rooftops that were not designed to accommodate such installations

Planning best practices recommend prioritizing telecommunications facilities in commercial, industrial, or infrastructure corridors where impacts on residents are minimized. Approving a facility in close proximity to residential units should require clear evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been thoroughly evaluated and are infeasible.

2. Visual Impact and Community Character

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of aesthetic impacts where projects may substantially degrade the visual character of a neighborhood.

Even when screened, rooftop telecommunications installations can:

- Alter building massing and skyline profiles
- Introduce mechanical structures inconsistent with surrounding architecture
- Become visible from nearby residential windows, streets, and public viewpoints

Hermosa Beach's planning framework emphasizes preservation of neighborhood character

and coastal visual quality. A rooftop telecommunications compound approaching 600 square feet represents a substantial rooftop structure that could conflict with these objectives.

3. Economic and Property Value Considerations

Peer-reviewed and market studies have documented that proximity to telecommunications towers and antenna facilities can influence buyer perception and property marketability.

Examples include:

- The Sandy Bond Study (2013), which found that residential properties located near cell towers experienced measurable decreases in buyer interest and market value.
- A National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy review, which documented multiple cases where real estate professionals reported marketing challenges for homes near telecommunications infrastructure.

Although impacts vary by site and visibility, the perception of risk alone can influence residential property values and buyer behavior. Given the high property values and residential density in Hermosa Beach, even small percentage impacts represent significant economic consequences for homeowners.

4. Health and Precautionary Planning Considerations

Federal regulations limit local governments' ability to deny telecommunications facilities solely on the basis of RF emissions if they comply with FCC exposure limits. However, planning bodies may still consider community welfare, prudent siting, and precautionary principles when evaluating land use compatibility.

Several international and public health organizations, including the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), have classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as "possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B)". While research is ongoing, this designation supports the use of a precautionary approach, particularly in residential areas.

Prudent planning policies in many municipalities therefore encourage:

- Maximizing distance between antennas and residential living spaces
- Locating facilities on existing infrastructure (utility corridors, industrial zones, etc.)
- Avoiding unnecessary concentration of telecommunications equipment near homes

5. Evaluation of Alternative Sites

A key question in evaluating CUP applications is whether the applicant has demonstrated that less impactful alternative locations are unavailable or technically infeasible. The Planning Commission should request detailed documentation addressing:

- Alternative commercial or non-residential locations within the coverage area
- Potential co-location on existing telecommunications structures
- Use of smaller distributed antenna systems (DAS) or other lower-impact technologies

Without clear evidence that reasonable alternatives were fully explored, approval of this rooftop facility may be premature.

Conclusion

Based on the concerns outlined above regarding land use compatibility, visual impacts, potential property value effects, and prudent siting practices, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. Deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 as currently proposed, or
2. Require the applicant to conduct a comprehensive alternatives analysis and visual impact assessment prior to reconsideration.

Hermosa Beach residents place great value on the character, aesthetics, and livability of their neighborhoods. Telecommunications infrastructure should be planned in a way that protects these qualities while still meeting service needs.

Thank you for your consideration and for including this letter in the public record for the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission hearing.

Sincerely,

Matthew Conrad



From: [Lynn Cheng](#)
To: [Planning](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Technical Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:21:23 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following technical comments in opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes the installation and operation of an unmanned 588.5-square-foot wireless telecommunications facility (Verizon Wireless) on the roof of the existing building located at 725 5th Street.

While telecommunications infrastructure is an important public utility, the proposed siting raises significant concerns related to land use compatibility, visual impacts, neighborhood character, and potential economic effects on surrounding residential properties. These concerns warrant careful review before approving the requested Conditional Use Permit.

1. Land Use Compatibility and Zoning Considerations

Conditional Use Permits are intended to ensure that uses with potentially significant impacts are only approved when they are compatible with surrounding land uses and will not adversely affect the public welfare. The proposed facility is located within Specific Plan Area 7, an area characterized by mixed-use development that includes residential uses in close proximity.

Wireless telecommunications facilities placed on rooftops in residential or mixed-use neighborhoods often introduce:

- Large equipment enclosures and screening structures
- Antennas and associated mechanical infrastructure
- Increased visual bulk on rooftops that were not designed to accommodate such installations

Planning best practices recommend prioritizing telecommunications facilities in commercial, industrial, or infrastructure corridors where impacts on residents are minimized. Approving a facility in close proximity to residential units should require clear evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been thoroughly evaluated and are infeasible.

2. Visual Impact and Community Character

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of aesthetic impacts where projects may substantially degrade the visual character of a neighborhood.

Even when screened, rooftop telecommunications installations can:

- Alter building massing and skyline profiles
- Introduce mechanical structures inconsistent with surrounding architecture
- Become visible from nearby residential windows, streets, and public viewpoints

Hermosa Beach's planning framework emphasizes preservation of neighborhood character and coastal visual quality. A rooftop telecommunications compound approaching 600 square

feet represents a substantial rooftop structure that could conflict with these objectives.

3. Economic and Property Value Considerations

Peer-reviewed and market studies have documented that proximity to telecommunications towers and antenna facilities can influence buyer perception and property marketability.

Examples include:

- The Sandy Bond Study (2013), which found that residential properties located near cell towers experienced measurable decreases in buyer interest and market value.
- A National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy review, which documented multiple cases where real estate professionals reported marketing challenges for homes near telecommunications infrastructure.

Although impacts vary by site and visibility, the perception of risk alone can influence residential property values and buyer behavior. Given the high property values and residential density in Hermosa Beach, even small percentage impacts represent significant economic consequences for homeowners.

4. Health and Precautionary Planning Considerations

Federal regulations limit local governments' ability to deny telecommunications facilities solely on the basis of RF emissions if they comply with FCC exposure limits. However, planning bodies may still consider community welfare, prudent siting, and precautionary principles when evaluating land use compatibility.

Several international and public health organizations, including the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), have classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as "possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B)". While research is ongoing, this designation supports the use of a precautionary approach, particularly in residential areas.

Prudent planning policies in many municipalities therefore encourage:

- Maximizing distance between antennas and residential living spaces
- Locating facilities on existing infrastructure (utility corridors, industrial zones, etc.)
- Avoiding unnecessary concentration of telecommunications equipment near homes

5. Evaluation of Alternative Sites

A key question in evaluating CUP applications is whether the applicant has demonstrated that less impactful alternative locations are unavailable or technically infeasible. The Planning Commission should request detailed documentation addressing:

- Alternative commercial or non-residential locations within the coverage area
- Potential co-location on existing telecommunications structures
- Use of smaller distributed antenna systems (DAS) or other lower-impact technologies

Without clear evidence that reasonable alternatives were fully explored, approval of this

rooftop facility may be premature.

Conclusion

Based on the concerns outlined above regarding land use compatibility, visual impacts, potential property value effects, and prudent siting practices, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. Deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 as currently proposed, or
2. Require the applicant to conduct a comprehensive alternatives analysis and visual impact assessment prior to reconsideration.

Hermosa Beach residents place great value on the character, aesthetics, and livability of their neighborhoods. Telecommunications infrastructure should be planned in a way that protects these qualities while still meeting service needs.

Thank you for your consideration and for including this letter in the public record for the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission hearing.

Sincerely,

Lynn Chow



From: [Stephanie Conrad](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:28:43 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commission Members,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes the construction and operation of an unmanned 588.5-square-foot wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the existing building at 725 5th Street.

While I understand the importance of telecommunications infrastructure, I believe this proposed location raises several serious concerns for nearby residents and the surrounding community.

1. Potential Health Concerns

Many residents remain concerned about long-term exposure to radiofrequency (RF) emissions associated with wireless telecommunications equipment. Although regulatory standards exist, ongoing scientific debate and uncertainty about cumulative exposure—particularly in residential neighborhoods—justify a precautionary approach. Locating this facility in close proximity to homes and daily living environments raises legitimate community health concerns that should not be dismissed.

2. Visual and Neighborhood Aesthetic Impact

Hermosa Beach is known for its coastal charm, neighborhood character, and carefully maintained visual environment. Rooftop telecommunications equipment can introduce bulky structures, antennas, and screening that alter the appearance of buildings and the surrounding skyline. This installation risks negatively affecting the visual harmony of the neighborhood and detracting from the character residents value.

3. Property Value Impacts

Numerous homeowners are concerned that the presence of a wireless telecommunications facility so close to residential properties could negatively influence buyer perception and ultimately reduce property values. For many families, their home represents their largest financial investment. The city should carefully weigh whether the potential economic impacts to residents are justified by this siting decision.

4. Availability of Alternative Locations

Before approving this permit, the City should require a thorough evaluation of alternative locations that would minimize impacts to residential neighborhoods. Facilities of this nature are more appropriate in commercial zones, industrial areas, or locations farther from homes where visual, health, and economic concerns would be significantly reduced.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny CUP25-04 as currently proposed or require Verizon to pursue alternative siting options that better protect residents and preserve the character of the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration of community concerns. I ask that this letter be entered into the official public record for the Planning Commission hearing.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Conrad



From: [Trey F](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [Planning](#)
Subject: March 17, 2026 Planning Commission – Agenda Item CUP25-04 – Public Comment Opposing Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:47:43 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

To: Hermosa Beach Planning Commission
Community Development Department
City of Hermosa Beach
1315 Valley Drive
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Re: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 – Proposed Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility at 725 5th Street

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed installation of the Verizon wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the building at 725 5th Street.

I live one street away from the proposed site and my residence is on the second floor, placing me in relatively close proximity and likely line-of-sight to the antennas. Because of this proximity, I have significant concerns regarding potential health, safety, and neighborhood impacts.

First, there remains ongoing scientific debate about the long-term health effects of chronic exposure to radiofrequency (RF) radiation emitted by cellular infrastructure, particularly with the increasing deployment of newer technologies such as 5G. While federal exposure guidelines exist, many researchers and public health advocates have raised concerns that current limits were developed decades ago and primarily address short-term thermal exposure rather than long-term cumulative biological effects.

A number of peer-reviewed studies and international reviews have suggested possible associations between long-term RF exposure and biological impacts including sleep disruption, oxidative stress, and neurological effects. Organizations such as the World Health Organization's cancer research arm have classified RF electromagnetic fields as a "possible carcinogen." Given that the science is still evolving, many communities have chosen to apply a precautionary approach when placing transmitters close to homes.

Second, the proposed installation appears to be located in the immediate vicinity of residential buildings. Residents living nearby—including those on upper floors such as myself—may experience higher direct exposure compared with ground-level passersby. Installing this type of facility so close to homes raises reasonable concerns about continuous exposure over many years.

Third, the facility may negatively affect neighborhood character and property values. Rooftop telecommunications infrastructure can introduce visual clutter and industrial equipment into otherwise residential areas. Many homeowners are understandably concerned that living near visible cell infrastructure could reduce desirability for future buyers or renters.

Finally, I would encourage the Commission to carefully evaluate whether alternative locations exist that would create greater distance from residential dwellings while still meeting wireless coverage needs. Locating such infrastructure in commercial zones, on taller non-residential structures, or in less densely populated areas would significantly reduce the potential impact on nearby residents.

Wireless connectivity is important, but it should be balanced with community health, neighborhood character, and

the concerns of the residents who live closest to these facilities.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 for the proposed telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street or require the applicant to pursue a location that is farther from surrounding residences.

Thank you for considering the concerns of nearby residents.

Sincerely,

James Flick
Resident, Hermosa Beach

March 9, 2026

To: planning@hermosabeach.gov

Please no cell tower at 725 5th Street. I live at [REDACTED]. Please do not approve a cell tower at 725 5th Street. I live at [REDACTED], a very densely populated residential area where many families live in close proximity to one another. Installing a cell tower in the middle of our neighborhood would directly impact the people who live here every day.

This area is made up of homes and families, many of whom live practically on top of one another due to the density of the neighborhood. A structure like this does not belong in the center of our residential community. Please consider placing this type of infrastructure in a more appropriate commercial or less densely populated location.

Thank you for taking the concerns of local residents into account.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jennifer Krause

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Adam Heiman](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Technical Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 10:23:26 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Technical Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following technical comments in opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes the installation and operation of an unmanned 588.5-square-foot wireless telecommunications facility (Verizon Wireless) on the roof of the existing building located at 725 5th Street.

While telecommunications infrastructure is an important public utility, the proposed siting raises significant concerns related to land use compatibility, visual impacts, neighborhood character, and potential economic effects on surrounding residential properties. These concerns warrant careful review before approving the requested Conditional Use Permit.

1. Land Use Compatibility and Zoning Considerations

Conditional Use Permits are intended to ensure that uses with potentially significant impacts are only approved when they are compatible with surrounding land uses and will not adversely affect the public welfare. The proposed facility is located within Specific Plan Area 7, an area characterized by mixed-use development that includes residential uses in close proximity.

Wireless telecommunications facilities placed on rooftops in residential or mixed-use neighborhoods often introduce:

- Large equipment enclosures and screening structures
- Antennas and associated mechanical infrastructure
- Increased visual bulk on rooftops that were not designed to accommodate such installations

Planning best practices recommend prioritizing telecommunications facilities in commercial, industrial, or infrastructure corridors where impacts on residents are minimized. Approving a facility in close proximity to residential units should require clear evidence that less intrusive alternatives have been thoroughly evaluated and are infeasible.

2. Visual Impact and Community Character

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of aesthetic impacts where projects may substantially degrade the visual character of a neighborhood.

Even when screened, rooftop telecommunications installations can:

- Alter building massing and skyline profiles
- Introduce mechanical structures inconsistent with surrounding architecture
- Become visible from nearby residential windows, streets, and public viewpoints

Hermosa Beach's planning framework emphasizes preservation of neighborhood character and coastal visual quality. A rooftop telecommunications compound approaching 600 square feet represents a substantial rooftop structure that could conflict with these objectives.

3. Economic and Property Value Considerations

Peer-reviewed and market studies have documented that proximity to telecommunications towers and antenna facilities can influence buyer perception and property marketability.

Examples include:

- The Sandy Bond Study (2013), which found that residential properties located near cell towers experienced measurable decreases in buyer interest and market value.
- A National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy review, which documented multiple cases where real estate professionals reported marketing challenges for homes near telecommunications infrastructure.

Although impacts vary by site and visibility, the perception of risk alone can influence residential property values and buyer behavior. Given the high property values and residential density in Hermosa Beach, even small percentage impacts represent significant economic consequences for homeowners.

4. Health and Precautionary Planning Considerations

Federal regulations limit local governments' ability to deny telecommunications facilities solely on the basis of RF emissions if they comply with FCC exposure limits. However, planning bodies may still consider community welfare, prudent siting, and precautionary principles when evaluating land use compatibility.

Several international and public health organizations, including the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), have classified radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as "possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B)". While research is ongoing, this designation supports the use of a precautionary approach, particularly in residential areas.

Prudent planning policies in many municipalities therefore encourage:

- Maximizing distance between antennas and residential living spaces
- Locating facilities on existing infrastructure (utility corridors, industrial zones, etc.)
- Avoiding unnecessary concentration of telecommunications equipment near homes

5. Evaluation of Alternative Sites

A key question in evaluating CUP applications is whether the applicant has demonstrated that less impactful alternative locations are unavailable or technically infeasible. The Planning Commission should request detailed documentation addressing:

- Alternative commercial or non-residential locations within the coverage area
- Potential co-location on existing telecommunications structures
- Use of smaller distributed antenna systems (DAS) or other lower-impact technologies

Without clear evidence that reasonable alternatives were fully explored, approval of this rooftop facility may be premature.

Conclusion

Based on the concerns outlined above regarding land use compatibility, visual impacts, potential property value effects, and prudent siting practices, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. Deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 as currently proposed, or
2. Require the applicant to conduct a comprehensive alternatives analysis and visual impact assessment prior to reconsideration.

Hermosa Beach residents place great value on the character, aesthetics, and livability of their neighborhoods. Telecommunications infrastructure should be planned in a way that protects these qualities while still meeting service needs.

Thank you for your consideration and for including this letter in the public record for the March 17, 2026 Planning Commission hearing.

Sincerely,

Adam Heiman
Hermosa Resident

From: [Georgia Tesla](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Cc: [Enrique Vassallo](#)
Subject: Proposed cell towers on 5th Street
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 12:30:06 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

My husband and I live on the same block as the proposed cell towers at 725 5th Street. Potential health risks caused by living near these antennas include emission of electromagnetic radiation, increased cancer risk, headaches, sleep issues, genetic damage, changes to reproductive system, memory deficits and impacts on the nervous system. There are also
Increased fire risks.

Better alternatives exist such as the mall where Pavillions is located which has greater concentration of business rather than residences.

There will be obstruction of views and eye sore resulting in reduced property value. Please find an alternative location for the towers. We strongly oppose the towers.

Georgia Tesla and Enrique Vassallo

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPhone