

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

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

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

From: [Elisabeth Brubaker](#)
To: [Planning](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sarah Locklin](#); [Stephen Izant](#); [Michael Flaherty](#); [Peter Hoffman](#); [Greg McNally](#); [Kate Hirsh](#)
Subject: Re: Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 Proposed Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility 725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:20:11 PM
Attachments: [Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 .pdf](#)

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

Date: March 16, 2026

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
725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following comments requesting that the Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04, which proposes the installation of a Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the building located at 725 5th Street be denied.

While reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to modern communities, the proposed installation raises significant concerns regarding compliance with the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, land use compatibility, and the adequacy of the site selection analysis provided in the application materials.

Based on review of the agenda packet and applicable municipal code provisions, the following issues warrant careful consideration by the Planning Commission before any approval of this project.

Compatibility With Surrounding Residential Uses

The staff report acknowledges that residential properties are located immediately to the south and west of the proposed facility. The proposed installation consists of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound including nine panel antennas, six radios, and multiple equipment cabinets contained within a 588.5 square foot enclosure.

Although the equipment is proposed to be screened, the overall scale and mass of the

rooftop installation raises legitimate compatibility concerns given the extremely close proximity to nearby homes and families. There is less than seven feet between the building and the adjacent residential structure.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050 governing Conditional Use Permits requires the Planning Commission to determine that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements and that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with surrounding land uses.

Specifically:

Section 17.56.050(C) requires a finding that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements.

Section 17.56.050(D) requires a finding that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity.

In addition, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(6) states that preference shall be given to wireless facilities not located adjacent to residential uses. In this case the proposed facility is directly adjacent to residential homes and within extremely close proximity to existing residential structures.

Given the scale of the installation and its location immediately adjacent to residential properties, it is unclear whether the required findings of compatibility and lack of detriment can reasonably be made.

Height and Visual Impact

The project proposes a rooftop telecommunications enclosure measuring approximately 588.5 square feet and approximately 5 feet 6 inches in height above the parapet, resulting in a total building height of approximately 35 feet.

This height represents the maximum height permitted within the SPA 7 zoning district.

While the installation may technically remain within the numerical height limit, the addition of a large rooftop telecommunications compound significantly alters the visual massing and profile of the building.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.46.210 requires rooftop equipment to be located and designed to reduce visual impacts from surrounding properties and public streets.

In addition, Section 17.40.170(B)(3) requires wireless facilities to utilize non reflective materials and architectural treatments that blend with surrounding structures.

Section 17.40.170(D)(1) and (2) require the City to evaluate whether the facility is architecturally integrated into a concealing structure and whether the facility is effectively screened or camouflaged by existing or proposed structures.

The Planning Commission should carefully evaluate whether a rooftop telecommunications compound of this scale located immediately adjacent to residential homes appropriately minimizes visual impacts and maintains compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

There is also a discrepancy within the applicant's submitted materials regarding the height calculations. The packet indicates the building height is approximately 30 feet while the proposed enclosure height is approximately 5 feet 6 inches. These figures suggest the possibility that the total structure height could exceed the 35 foot height limit applicable to the SPA 7 zone.

At a minimum, the City should independently verify the building height, parapet height, and total enclosure height before making any finding that the project complies with the applicable height limitations.

Adequacy of Alternative Site Analysis

Federal telecommunications law requires wireless providers to demonstrate both the existence of a significant gap in service and that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing that gap.

The agenda packet indicates that Verizon submitted a Gap Identification and Coverage Solution Report asserting that the subject site represents the most feasible location and that no other suitable structures were available.

However, the packet does not appear to include a detailed comparative analysis of alternative sites or locations that were evaluated and rejected.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider the availability of suitable alternative locations when reviewing wireless telecommunications facilities.

Without a meaningful evaluation of alternative commercial sites, publicly owned structures, co location opportunities, or distributed small cell deployments, it is difficult to conclude that the proposed rooftop installation represents the least intrusive solution available.

Reliance on Applicant Provided Technical Studies

The technical analyses included in the application, including radio frequency compliance evaluations and coverage gap analyses, appear to have been prepared by consultants retained by the applicant. There is a discrepancy found on the elevation measurements used from the adjacent home. It is important to note that the adjacent home is on a hill and therefore an elevation measurement must be taken from the average grade. The applicant did not comply with Hermosa Beach Municipal Code 17.04.040.

The agenda packet does not indicate that the City conducted or commissioned an independent technical review of these studies.

Given the scale of the installation and its proximity to residential homes, independent technical evaluation may be appropriate to ensure that the Planning Commission has sufficient evidence to support the findings required under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050 and 17.40.170.

Long Term Site Suitability

The conditions of approval included in the draft resolution acknowledge that future development on adjacent properties could require modification or removal of the wireless facility in order to maintain compliance with applicable radio frequency exposure regulations.

Condition 9 specifically states that the permit does not grant Verizon any right to hinder future lawful development of adjacent properties and that if site conditions change due to lawful development on adjacent property, Verizon may need to modify or remove its wireless facility or obtain adjacent property owner consent to mitigation measures.

This is a critical point.

The City is being asked to determine that the site is physically suitable and compatible while simultaneously acknowledging that future lawful development on adjacent property could force modification or elimination of the facility.

This issue is particularly significant because the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum 35 foot height limit for the SPA 7 zone. The project is not being proposed with a meaningful margin for future flexibility.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050(E) requires that the site be physically suitable for the type of use proposed. If the facility may require modification or removal as surrounding properties develop, it raises legitimate questions regarding the long term suitability of this location.

This issue is especially relevant as I am the resident at 683 5th Street and am currently working with my architect and structural engineer to prepare plans for a second story

addition. I intend to submit the application to the City as soon as the architectural and structural plans are completed and expect to submit the application no later than March 31, 2026.

If the City reviews my recent permits at this location, it will find that substantial structural improvements have already been completed to support future vertical construction, including underpins, shear walls, and steel beams.

CEQA Exemption Concerns

The staff report recommends that the project be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act under the Class 3 exemption for small structures.

However the project involves construction of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound measuring approximately 588.5 square feet containing multiple antennas radios and supporting equipment and located immediately adjacent to residential homes.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 states that categorical exemptions do not apply where unusual circumstances exist or where the project may result in a significant environmental impact due to its location scale or surrounding conditions.

Given the size of the facility its immediate proximity to residential properties and the potential visual land use and compatibility impacts associated with a large rooftop telecommunications compound the applicability of the categorical exemption warrants closer review.

Where unusual circumstances exist or where the project may create a reasonable possibility of significant environmental impact CEQA requires that the categorical exemption not be used and that appropriate environmental review be conducted.

Furthermore, the applicant failed to provide any reports on the noise decibel readings that will be created by the mechanical cooling systems.

Community Concerns

In addition to these planning and code considerations, a community petition regarding this proposal has already gathered significant support from Hermosa Beach residents, with the majority of signatures coming from within the local ZIP code.

While petitions do not determine land use decisions, they demonstrate that many residents believe the project warrants additional scrutiny given its immediate proximity to residential homes.

Conclusion

Reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to the community. However, the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code requires that such infrastructure be carefully located and designed to ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and to minimize unnecessary impacts. The municipal code clearly establishes a hierarchy of preferred siting criteria for wireless facilities, including avoiding adjacency to residential properties. The applicant has proposed a large macro installation directly next to homes without demonstrating that less intrusive alternatives were fully evaluated.

Given the size of the proposed rooftop compound, its close proximity to residential homes, the fact that the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum allowable height, and the acknowledgment that future development on adjacent properties may require modification or removal of the facility, the Planning Commission should carefully evaluate whether the required Conditional Use Permit findings under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050, 17.40.170, and 17.46.210 can be satisfied.

At a minimum, additional analysis of alternative locations and independent review of the applicant's technical submissions would help ensure that the Commission's decision is supported by substantial evidence and consistent with both municipal code requirements and federal telecommunications laws.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Brubaker

██████ - ██████████

Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [Robby Brubaker](#)
To: [Planning](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sarah Locklin](#); [Stephen Izant](#); [Michael Flaherty](#); [Peter Hoffman](#); [Greg McNally](#); [Kate Hirsh](#)
Subject: Public Comment Submission – CUP25-04 Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 3:21:00 PM
Attachments: [Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 .pdf](#)

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

Dear Planning Commission and Community Development Staff,

Please find attached my formal written comments regarding Conditional Use Permit **CUP25-04** for the proposed Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility at **725 5th Street**.

I respectfully request that this letter be included in the official record for the Planning Commission's review and consideration prior to the hearing.

The attached document outlines several concerns related to municipal code compliance, compatibility with surrounding residential properties, the adequacy of the alternative site analysis, and the long-term suitability of this location for the proposed installation.

Thank you for confirming receipt of this submission and for including it in the meeting record.

Sincerely,
Robert Brubaker

[REDACTED]
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Date: March 16, 2026

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
725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to respectfully request that the Planning Commission carefully review and deny the proposed Conditional Use Permit, CUP25 04, for the installation of a Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street.

While reliable wireless infrastructure is important for modern communities, the proposed installation raises several significant concerns related to the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, land use compatibility, and the adequacy of the site selection analysis provided in the application materials.

Based on a review of the agenda packet and applicable municipal code provisions, the following issues warrant careful consideration.

1. Compatibility with Surrounding Residential Uses

The staff report acknowledges that residential properties are located immediately to the south and west of the proposed facility. The proposed installation consists of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound including nine panel antennas, six radios, and multiple equipment cabinets contained within a 588.5 square foot enclosure.

Although the equipment is proposed to be screened, the overall scale and mass of the rooftop installation raises legitimate compatibility concerns given the close proximity to nearby homes and families. There is less than 7 feet between the building and the adjacent home.

Under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050 governing Conditional Use Permits, the Planning Commission must determine that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements and that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the use are compatible with surrounding land uses. More specifically, Section 17.56.050(C) requires a finding that the use will not be adverse to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the community, nor detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements, and Section 17.56.050(D) requires a finding that the design, location, size, and operating

characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with the existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity.

In addition, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(6) states that preference shall be given to sites not located adjacent to residential uses. The staff report also acknowledges that the site is within 200 feet of residential use and that the screened structure is only 10 feet from the west property line. Given the size of the proposed installation and its location directly adjacent to residential uses, it is unclear whether these required findings can reasonably be made.

2. Height and Visual Impact Considerations

The proposed telecommunications facility would extend the building height to the maximum allowable height of approximately 35 feet in the applicable zone. The packet states that the screening structure measures 5 feet 6 inches in height from the parapet wall, totals 588.5 square feet, and results in a building height of 35 feet. It also states that the top of the proposed enclosure is at 35 feet, which is the maximum height permitted in SPA 7.

While the installation may technically remain within the permitted height limit, the addition of a large rooftop compound containing multiple antennas and equipment structures substantially alters the visual massing of the building.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.46.210 requires rooftop equipment to be located and designed to reduce visual impacts from surrounding properties and public streets. Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(B)(3) further requires that the facility exterior be comprised of non reflective materials and be painted or camouflaged to blend with surrounding materials and colors. Section 17.40.170(D)(1) and (2) require the City to consider the extent to which the facility is architecturally integrated into a concealing structure and the extent to which it is actually screened or camouflaged by existing or proposed structures.

The Commission should carefully evaluate whether the size and visibility of this rooftop compound is appropriate in a location immediately adjacent to residential properties to the east and south of the project that will lose their existing ocean views.

Lastly, there is a discrepancy listed in the data provided by the applicant showing the height of the building is 30 feet and the height of the proposed cell tower is 5 feet 6 inches. This would exceed the height limit restricted by SPA 7 zoning height limits. At a minimum, the City should independently verify the roof height, parapet height, and full enclosure height before making any finding that the proposal complies with the SPA 7 height limit. The fact that the proposed enclosure is already at the maximum 35 foot limit is particularly important because the applicant's own approval conditions acknowledge that future development on adjacent properties could require modification or removal of the facility to remain compliant. Therefore, when the adjacent property is developed it will not meet FCC compliance requirements and the structure is already at its height limit.

3. Adequacy of Alternative Site Analysis

Federal telecommunications law requires that applicants demonstrate both the existence of a significant gap in wireless service and that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing that gap.

The agenda packet indicates that Verizon submitted a Gap Identification and Coverage Solution Report asserting that the subject site represents the most feasible location and that no other suitable structures were available. However, the packet does not appear to include a detailed comparative analysis of alternative sites or locations that were evaluated and rejected. The staff report states only that Verizon asserts the site was the most feasible location analyzed and that no other towers or suitable tall structures are available in the targeted search area.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider the availability of suitable alternative locations. A statement from the applicant that no other sites are available does not constitute a comprehensive alternative site analysis. In the absence of a clear analysis demonstrating why alternative commercial locations, publicly owned structures, co location opportunities, or distributed small cell deployments could not address the claimed coverage gap, it is difficult to conclude that this rooftop installation represents the least intrusive solution available.

4. Reliance on Applicant Provided Technical Studies

The technical analyses included in the application, including the radio frequency compliance evaluation and coverage gap analysis, appear to have been prepared by consultants retained by the applicant. It does not appear that the City has conducted or commissioned independent technical review to verify these conclusions.

Given the scale of the proposed installation and its proximity to residential homes, additional independent evaluation may be appropriate to ensure that the Planning Commission has sufficient evidence to support the findings required under the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, including Section 17.56.050 and the wireless facility standards under Section 17.40.170.

One very important detail to examine is the applicant's measurement of the adjacent homes. These homes are on a hill and according to Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, elevation measurements should be taken from average grade. The applicant failed to provide correct data showing the elevation of the RF zone from average grade and also did not provide any data from the adjacent home if the structure were to build a second story at the 30 foot compliant height limit with a rooftop deck where people can stand 5 to 6 feet over the roof line.

5. Long Term Site Suitability

The conditions of approval included in the draft resolution acknowledge that future development on adjacent properties could require modification or removal of the wireless facility in order to maintain compliance with applicable radio frequency exposure regulations. Specifically, Condition 9 states that the permit does not grant Verizon any right to make adjacent properties inaccessible to the public or to hinder future lawful development of adjacent properties as a mitigation measure, and it further states that if site conditions change in the future due to lawful

development on adjacent property, Verizon may need to modify or remove its wireless facility, or obtain adjacent property owner consent to mitigation measures on the adjacent property, in order to maintain compliance with laws applicable to human exposure to RF emissions.

This is a critical point. The City is simultaneously being asked to find that this site is physically suitable and compatible, while the applicant's own conditions acknowledge that lawful future development on adjacent property may force modification or elimination of the facility. That issue is even more significant here because the enclosure is already proposed at the absolute 35 foot height limit for SPA 7. The project is not being proposed with a meaningful margin for future flexibility. Instead, it is being proposed at its maximum height in a location immediately adjacent to residential properties, while the approval itself acknowledges that future neighboring development may create compliance conflicts.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050(E) requires that the site be physically suitable for the type of use being proposed, including access, utilities, and the absence of physical constraints. If the installation may create future conflicts with adjacent development, it raises legitimate questions about whether this location is appropriate for telecommunications infrastructure of this scale.

This condition indicates that the facility's compliance assumptions depend on the current configuration of surrounding properties and may change if neighboring sites are redeveloped in the future. This raises additional questions regarding the long term suitability of this location for a telecommunications installation of this scale.

This is especially important as I am the resident at 683 5th Street and am currently working with my architect and structural engineer to provide me the plans so I can submit them to the city within the next few weeks so I can start the construction on my second story. I have already submitted a building permit application to the City in order to initiate this process, however the City responded that the application could not be accepted because additional architectural and structural documents were required before a permit number could be opened. This confirms that the City is already aware that development of the second story is being actively pursued.

I would like it to be recorded that the intent to build this second story has already been formally communicated to the City through the permit application process. The proposed second story represents Phase 2 of improvements to my home. Phase 1 of this project involved substantial structural work that was previously approved by the City and completed specifically to prepare the existing structure for a future vertical addition. These improvements included structural reinforcement such as underpins, shear walls, and steel beams designed to support the additional load of a second story.

I will be submitting a complete permit application including architectural and structural plans as soon as they become available, which is expected no later than March 31st 2026.

If you take a moment to review my recent permits at this location, you can find the structural construction that was completed on my home to ensure the current structure already has the

structural integrity for my build up. All of this data should be taken into consideration when confirming the details of this proposed telecommunications project.

6. Community Concerns

In addition to these planning and code considerations, a community petition regarding this proposal has already gathered significant support from Hermosa Beach residents, with the majority of signatures coming from within the local ZIP code. While public petitions do not determine land use decisions, they do demonstrate that many residents believe the project warrants additional scrutiny given its location within a residential adjacent area.

7. Additional Municipal Code Concerns Regarding Site Selection and Design

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(5) states that preference shall be given to publicly owned structures, co location, and shared sites. The current record does not demonstrate that those preferred siting options were meaningfully pursued.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(7) provides that whenever possible, wireless communication facilities should be located on existing buildings, existing poles, or other existing support structures. However, use of an existing building does not by itself resolve the separate requirements regarding compatibility, scale, screening, and residential adjacency.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(3) requires consideration of the total size of the proposed facility, particularly in relation to surrounding and supporting structures. A rooftop telecommunications enclosure of nearly 600 square feet on a building of roughly 2,000 square feet represents a substantial structural addition that may materially affect the building's massing and rooftop profile in relation to nearby residential properties.

Conclusion

Reliable telecommunications infrastructure is essential, and residents recognize the importance of strong wireless service throughout the community. However, the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code requires that such infrastructure be carefully located and designed to ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and to minimize unnecessary impacts.

Given the size of the proposed rooftop compound, its close proximity to residential homes, the fact that the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum 35 foot height limit, and the applicant's own acknowledgment that future lawful development on adjacent properties may require the facility to be modified or removed, the Commission should carefully evaluate whether the required Conditional Use Permit findings can be satisfied under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050, 17.40.170, and 17.46.210.

At a minimum, additional analysis of alternative locations, independent review of the applicant's technical submissions, and independent verification of the building and enclosure height measurements would help ensure that the Commission's decision is supported by substantial

evidence and consistent with both municipal code requirements and federal telecommunications law.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these important issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Brubaker

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Robert Brubaker.

Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [jennifer d](#)
To: [Planning](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sarah Locklin](#); [Stephen Izant](#); [Michael Flaherty](#); [Peter Hoffman](#); [Greg McNally](#); [Kate Hirsh](#)
Subject: Comment for 7.a. March 17, 2026 Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 Proposed Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility 725 5th Street
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 4:13:13 PM
Attachments: [Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 \[1\].pdf](#)

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

Date: March 16, 2026

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
725 5th Street

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I submit my comments below in opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04, an installation of a Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the building located at 725 5th Street.

While reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to modern communities, this proposal raises serious concerns regarding the adequacy of the project record, compatibility with surrounding residential properties, and compliance with applicable standards under the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, TCA and CEQA. Based on the current record, the findings necessary to approve this Conditional Use Permit do not appear to be supported by substantial evidence.

Most notably, the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D) and CEQA should be carefully considered.

Hermosa Beach Muni Code §17.40.170(D) has not been followed because:

1. Alternate sites were not considered or evaluated. §17.40.170(D)(4) and (5)
2. Alternate sites are available (industrial) and Verizon has refused to disclose their own alternative existing sites for co-location. 17.40.170(D)(4)
3. Preference given to public facilities is not met. 17.40.170(D)(5)
4. This site is residential and is not preferred. 17.40.170(D)(6)
5. The building is not a preferred type of facility 17.40.170(D)(5)

Lack of Meaningful Alternative Site Analysis

In addition, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider the availability of suitable alternative locations when reviewing wireless telecommunications facilities. Without independent verification of the alleged coverage gap or independent technical

The agenda packet states that Verizon evaluated alternative sites, yet it does not provide a detailed list, map, or comparison of locations that were analyzed and rejected. Instead, the staff report states only that Verizon's report asserts the project site was the most feasible location analyzed and that no other towers or suitable tall structures are available.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider alternate sites that are available. A statement from the applicant that other sites are unavailable does not constitute a comprehensive alternative site analysis. The record does not appear to show whether the applicant meaningfully evaluated other commercial buildings within the coverage area, publicly owned structures, co location opportunities, existing wireless facilities, utility structures, distributed antenna systems, or smaller installations.

Moreover, Verizon simply refused to provide their current locations (See Attachment 7 letter Dated Nov 2024) for analysis of co-location sites.

Without a meaningful evaluation of alternatives, the Planning Commission cannot reasonably determine whether the proposed site satisfies the site selection criteria required by §17.40.170(D)(4) or whether it represents the least intrusive available location.

Proximity to Residential Properties

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(6) states that preference shall be given to sites not located adjacent to residential uses. Yet the proposed site is immediately adjacent to residential properties. The staff report primarily addresses visibility from 5th Street but does not meaningfully analyze compatibility with adjacent residential properties located within a very short distance of the proposed installation. The report admits residential uses are located immediately adjacent to the subject property and that the proposed telecommunications equipment enclosure will be located approximately **ten feet from the west property line, a residential address.**

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050(C) also requires that a Conditional Use Permit may only be approved if the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements. Given the extremely close proximity of the proposed telecommunications facility to neighboring residences, the Commission should carefully evaluate whether this required finding can reasonably be made.

Preference for Co Location and Publicly Owned Structures

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(5) states that preference shall be given to facilities located on publicly owned structures, co location, and shared sites. The staff report acknowledges that the building is privately owned and that the applicant is not proposing to co locate or share the site, relying instead on a letter stating only that Verizon does not oppose co location if feasible.

The record does not demonstrate that the applicant meaningfully pursued the preferred siting options identified in the municipal code. The report's statement that co location would be acceptable if feasible is not the same as evidence that publicly owned structures, shared sites, or existing infrastructure were actively investigated and found unsuitable.

Improper Reliance on CEQA Categorical Exemption

The staff report recommends that the project be categorically exempt from environmental review

under the California Environmental Quality Act as a Class 3 exemption for small structures. However, the project involves a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound and associated infrastructure.

Under CEQA Guidelines §15300.2, categorical exemptions may not apply where **unusual circumstances** exist or where the project may result in significant impacts due to its location or scale. Given the size of the facility and its proximity to residential homes, further evaluation may be warranted to determine whether the proposed exemption is appropriate.

The City proposes to approve the project using a **CEQA categorical exemption**. However, CEQA prohibits categorical exemptions when **unusual circumstances may create significant environmental effects**.

The project includes several unusual circumstances:

- a large telecommunications compound (588.5 sq ft)
- tower height approximately 35+ feet
- extreme proximity to residences (10 feet)
- placement in a mixed-use residential coastal neighborhood
- visual impact concerns

Under **Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley**, these circumstances require **environmental review rather than categorical exemption**. There has been a disregard of the unusual circumstances that create significant environmental effects.

Evidence currently exists and it is a crucial point in the decision making for Commission and City. There is substantial evidence to support a fair argument that significant impacts may occur based on the following unusual circumstances:

1. the size of the large telecommunications compound;
2. the height does not comply with the code;
3. the extreme proximity to residences;
4. the placement in a mixed use residential neighborhood which is against the city's own mandated guidelines; and
5. the visual impact has not been considered.

In the *Ocean View Estates* case, the court stated, "The documents were in existence prior to the District's decision to issue the MND. They provide substantial evidence to support a fair argument that significant impacts of contamination or dam failure may occur. But the MND does not discuss or even identify the impacts." *Ocean View Estates Homeowners Assn. v. Montecito Water District* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 396. Similarly there has been a clear failure to discuss or identify required evidence.

TCA Considerations

Hermosa Beach need not be concerned with Verizon's potential assertion that it is violating the TCA (Telecommunications Act) if Hermosa shows that the coverage gap is not significant (here, only about 5-8 blocks) and that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing that gap.

Failure to Demonstrate a Verified Coverage Gap

The staff report relies heavily on Verizon's Gap Identification and Coverage Solution Report to justify the need for the proposed facility. However, that report appears to have been prepared solely by consultants retained by the applicant, and the agenda packet does not appear to include any independent engineering verification of the claimed coverage gap. Examples of missing data:

propagation maps showing existing and predicted signal strength, drive test data measuring real-world signal performance, dropped-call data or network reliability metrics, and coverage modeling reports prepared by radiofrequency engineers, and comparisons of signal strength before and after installation of the proposed facility.

Questionable Determination of Least Intrusive Means

The report states that no other towers or suitable tall structures are available in the targeted search area and that the majority of the claimed gap would be covered from this location, but those statements appear to come entirely from the applicant's own materials.

The project proposes a significant telecommunications installation consisting of nine panel antennas, six radios, surge equipment, and three equipment cabinets within a new 588.5 square foot rooftop screened structure.

This configuration resembles a macro wireless facility rather than a minor rooftop installation. Under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050(D), the Planning Commission must determine that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity.

Without a detailed comparison of alternative sites and technologies, including smaller scale or distributed solutions, the Commission lacks substantial evidence to determine whether this proposal is in fact the least intrusive option.

The alternative site evaluation and Code § 17.40.170 (D) requirements, discussed supra, are also applicable in this analysis.

Use of an Existing Building Does Not Resolve Compatibility Concerns

The staff report notes that the facility would be located on an existing building, thereby avoiding the need to install a new support structure.

While placement on an existing structure can reduce impacts in some circumstances, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(7) does not eliminate the need to comply with the code's separate requirements regarding screening, visual compatibility, alternative site evaluation, and residential adjacency. The fact that the facility is proposed on an existing building does not by itself establish that the project is compatible with surrounding uses or that the selected site is appropriate.

Other Considerations Fall Short

Size and Visual Impact of the Facility

The proposed installation includes a rooftop enclosure, multiple antennas, and associated telecommunications equipment that will bring the structure to the maximum allowable height of approximately 35 feet.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.46.210 requires rooftop equipment to be located and designed to reduce visual impacts from surrounding properties and public streets. In addition, §17.40.170(B) (3) requires wireless facilities to utilize non reflective materials and architectural treatments that blend with surrounding structures.

Although the applicant proposes screening, the Planning Commission must still evaluate whether a rooftop telecommunications compound of this scale adequately minimizes visual impacts and remains compatible with adjacent residential properties that will be losing their existing views and

also confirm that the height restrictions are being upheld.

Future Compliance Issues Acknowledged

The conditions of approval included in the draft resolution note that future development on nearby properties could require modification of the facility in order to maintain compliance with RF exposure standards. This acknowledgment suggests that the long term compatibility of the site may depend on surrounding development conditions.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050(E) requires that the Planning Commission determine that the site is physically suitable for the proposed use. If the installation may create future conflicts with adjacent development, it raises legitimate questions about whether this location is appropriate for telecommunications infrastructure of this scale.

Lack of Analysis of Modern Small Cell Alternatives

Modern wireless networks increasingly rely on distributed small cell systems, microcells, and pole mounted nodes that reduce the need for large rooftop telecommunications compounds. The agenda packet does not appear to include any analysis of whether a distributed small cell network could address the alleged coverage gap with less impact on surrounding properties.

Because §17.40.170(D) is intended to minimize visual and land use impacts through appropriate siting and design, the absence of analysis regarding smaller scale alternatives further limits the Commission's ability to determine whether the proposed facility represents the least intrusive solution.

Architectural Integration and Visual Compatibility

The staff report concludes that the project would be architecturally integrated because the proposed screening structure would match the existing architectural features and building materials.

However, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(1) requires consideration of the extent to which the proposed facility truly blends into the surrounding environment or is architecturally integrated into a concealing structure, taking into consideration alternate sites that are available.

Here, the proposal includes nine antennas, multiple radios and related equipment, three equipment cabinets, and a new 588.5 square foot rooftop enclosure. Even if finished with similar materials, a structure of this size materially alters the rooftop profile and building massing. The current record does not appear to contain substantial evidence establishing that this large rooftop compound is truly integrated with the surrounding environment rather than merely concealed within a large new enclosure.

Screening and Camouflage

The staff report states that the antennas would be screened by a non reflective structure on top of the existing roof and that support equipment would be located behind the parapet wall and within the proposed enclosure.

However, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(2) requires the City to consider the extent to which the facility is actually screened or camouflaged by existing or proposed buildings or structures. Screening does not eliminate visual impact where the screened enclosure itself becomes the dominant visible element. A newly constructed rooftop telecommunications enclosure is not the same as preexisting architectural screening.

Size of the Facility Relative to the Building and Surroundings

The staff report concludes that the facility is not out of scale because its footprint is approximately 588.5 square feet on a building that is estimated to be no more than approximately 2,000 square feet in size and approximately 29.5 feet in height, with the overall structure reaching the 35 foot height limit of the SPA 7 zone. The SPA 7 zoning requires that the City conduct an independent measurement of the height and footprint of the enclosure because this project appears to be extremely close to exceeding the height restrictions required to meet municipal code.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(3) requires consideration of the total size of the proposed facility, particularly in relation to surrounding and supporting structures. When the rooftop enclosure itself represents a very large portion of the total building footprint, the relative scale of the installation becomes significantly more pronounced. A rooftop telecommunications enclosure of nearly 600 square feet on a building of roughly 2,000 square feet represents a substantial structural addition that may materially affect the building's massing and rooftop profile in relation to nearby residential properties.

Conclusion

Although the staff report concludes that the project satisfies the screening and site selection criteria of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D), the record does not appear to contain substantial evidence demonstrating that alternative sites were meaningfully evaluated, that preference was actually given to public or co location sites, that preference was given to sites not adjacent to residential uses, that the facility is truly integrated with the surrounding environment, or that the rooftop enclosure will not create significant visual impacts on nearby residences.

For these reasons, the current record does not appear to demonstrate that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing a verified coverage gap, nor does it clearly demonstrate compliance with the Conditional Use Permit findings required under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050.

The TCA and CEQA must be carefully considered in this case. A request for full CEQA environmental review and analysis of alternative sites is completed before approval.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission continue this item and require a more comprehensive analysis of alternative locations, preferred siting options, and less intrusive technologies before approving the Conditional Use Permit.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Duffy
Adjacent Property Owner
Hermosa Beach Resident

Date: March 16, 2026

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
725 5th Street

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I submit my comments below in opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04, an installation of a Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the building located at 725 5th Street.

While reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to modern communities, this proposal raises serious concerns regarding the adequacy of the project record, compatibility with surrounding residential properties, and compliance with applicable standards under the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, TCA and CEQA. Based on the current record, the findings necessary to approve this Conditional Use Permit do not appear to be supported by substantial evidence.

Most notably, the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D) and CEQA should be carefully considered.

Hermosa Beach Muni Code §17.40.170(D) has not been followed because:

1. Alternate sites were not considered or evaluated §17.40.170(D)(4) and (5)
2. Alternate sites are available (industrial) and Verizon has refused to disclose their own alternative existing sites for co-location. 17.40.170(D)(4)
3. Preference given to public facilities is not met. 17.40.170(D)(5)
4. This site is residential and is not preferred. 17.40.170(D)(6)
5. The building is not a preferred type of facility 17.40.170(D)(5)

Lack of Meaningful Alternative Site Analysis

In addition, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider the availability of suitable alternative locations when reviewing wireless telecommunications facilities.

The agenda packet states that Verizon evaluated alternative sites, yet it does not provide a detailed list, map, or comparison of locations that were analyzed and rejected. Instead, the staff report states only that Verizon's report asserts the project site was the most feasible location analyzed and that no other towers or suitable tall structures are available.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider alternate sites that are available. A statement from the applicant that other sites are unavailable does not constitute a comprehensive alternative site analysis. The record does not appear to show whether the applicant meaningfully evaluated other commercial buildings within the coverage area, publicly owned structures, co location opportunities, existing wireless facilities, utility structures, distributed antenna systems, or smaller installations.

Moreover, Verizon simply refused to provide their current locations (See Attachment 7 letter Dated Nov 2024) for analysis of co-location sites.

Without a meaningful evaluation of alternatives, the Planning Commission cannot reasonably determine whether the proposed site satisfies the site selection criteria required by §17.40.170(D)(4) or whether it represents the least intrusive available location.

Proximity to Residential Properties

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(6) states that preference shall be given to sites not located adjacent to residential uses. Yet the proposed site is immediately adjacent to residential properties. The staff report primarily addresses visibility from 5th Street but does not meaningfully analyze compatibility with adjacent residential properties located within a very short distance of the proposed installation. The report admits residential uses are located immediately adjacent to the subject property and that the proposed telecommunications equipment enclosure will be located approximately **ten feet from the west property line, a residential address.**

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050(C) also requires that a Conditional Use Permit may only be approved if the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements. Given the extremely close proximity of the proposed telecommunications facility to neighboring residences, the Commission should carefully evaluate whether this required finding can reasonably be made.

Preference for Co Location and Publicly Owned Structures

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(5) states that preference shall be given to facilities located on publicly owned structures, co location, and shared sites. The staff report acknowledges that the building is privately owned and that the applicant is not proposing to co locate or share the site, relying instead on a letter stating only that Verizon does not oppose co location if feasible.

The record does not demonstrate that the applicant meaningfully pursued the preferred siting options identified in the municipal code. The report's statement that co location would be acceptable if feasible is not the same as evidence that publicly owned structures, shared sites, or existing infrastructure were actively investigated and found unsuitable.

Improper Reliance on CEQA Categorical Exemption

The staff report recommends that the project be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act as a Class 3 exemption for small structures. However, the project involves a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound and associated infrastructure.

Under CEQA Guidelines §15300.2, categorical exemptions may not apply where **unusual circumstances** exist or where the project may result in significant impacts due to its location or scale. Given the size of the facility and its proximity to residential homes, further evaluation may be warranted to determine whether the proposed exemption is appropriate.

The City proposes to approve the project using a **CEQA categorical exemption**.

However, CEQA prohibits categorical exemptions when **unusual circumstances may create significant environmental effects**.

The project includes several unusual circumstances:

- a **large telecommunications compound (588.5 sq ft)**
- **tower height approximately 35+ feet**
- **extreme proximity to residences (10 feet)**
- placement in a **mixed-use residential coastal neighborhood**
- **visual impact concerns**

Under **Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley**, these circumstances require **environmental review rather than categorical exemption**. There has been a disregard of the unusual circumstances that create significant environmental effects.

Evidence currently exists and it is a crucial point in the decision making for Commission and City. There is substantial evidence to support a fair argument that significant impacts may occur based on the following unusual circumstances:

1. the size of the large telecommunications compound;
2. the height does not comply with the code;
3. the extreme proximity to residences;
4. the placement in a mixed use residential neighborhood which is against the city's own mandated guidelines; and
5. the visual impact has not been considered.

In the *Ocean View Estates* case, the court stated, "The documents were in existence prior to the District's decision to issue the MND. They provide substantial evidence to support a fair argument that significant impacts of contamination or dam failure may occur. But the MND does not discuss or even identify the impacts." *Ocean View Estates Homeowners Assn. v. Montecito Water District* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 396. Similarly there has been a clear failure to discuss or identify required evidence.

TCA Considerations

Hermosa Beach need not be concerned with Verizon's potential assertion that it is violating the TCA (Telecommunications Act) if Hermosa shows that the coverage gap is not significant (here, only about 5-8 blocks) and that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing that gap.

Failure to Demonstrate a Verified Coverage Gap

The staff report relies heavily on Verizon's Gap Identification and Coverage Solution Report to justify the need for the proposed facility. However, that report appears to have been prepared solely by consultants retained by the applicant, and the agenda packet does not appear to include any independent engineering verification of the claimed coverage gap. Examples of missing data: propagation maps showing existing and predicted signal strength, drive test data measuring real-world signal performance, dropped-call data or network reliability metrics, and coverage modeling reports prepared by radiofrequency engineers, and comparisons of signal strength before and after installation of the proposed facility.

Questionable Determination of Least Intrusive Means

The report states that no other towers or suitable tall structures are available in the targeted search area and that the majority of the claimed gap would be covered from this location, but those statements appear to come entirely from the applicant's own materials.

The project proposes a significant telecommunications installation consisting of nine panel antennas, six radios, surge equipment, and three equipment cabinets within a new 588.5 square foot rooftop screened structure.

This configuration resembles a macro wireless facility rather than a minor rooftop installation. Under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050(D), the Planning Commission must determine that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity.

Without a detailed comparison of alternative sites and technologies, including smaller scale or distributed solutions, the Commission lacks substantial evidence to determine whether this proposal is in fact the least intrusive option.

The alternative site evaluation and Code § 17.40.170 (D) requirements, discussed supra, are also applicable in this analysis.

Use of an Existing Building Does Not Resolve Compatibility Concerns

The staff report notes that the facility would be located on an existing building, thereby avoiding the need to install a new support structure.

While placement on an existing structure can reduce impacts in some circumstances, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(7) does not eliminate the need to comply with the code's separate requirements regarding screening, visual compatibility, alternative site evaluation, and residential adjacency. The fact that the facility is proposed on an existing building does not by itself establish that the project is compatible with surrounding uses or that the selected site is appropriate.

Other Considerations Fall Short

Size and Visual Impact of the Facility

The proposed installation includes a rooftop enclosure, multiple antennas, and associated telecommunications equipment that will bring the structure to the maximum allowable height of approximately 35 feet.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.46.210 requires rooftop equipment to be located and designed to reduce visual impacts from surrounding properties and public streets. In addition, §17.40.170(B)(3) requires wireless facilities to utilize non reflective materials and architectural treatments that blend with surrounding structures.

Although the applicant proposes screening, the Planning Commission must still evaluate whether a rooftop telecommunications compound of this scale adequately minimizes visual impacts and remains compatible with adjacent residential properties that will be losing their existing views and also confirm that the height restrictions are being upheld.

Future Compliance Issues Acknowledged

The conditions of approval included in the draft resolution note that future development on nearby properties could require modification of the facility in order to maintain compliance with RF exposure standards. This acknowledgment suggests that the long term compatibility of the site may depend on surrounding development conditions.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050(E) requires that the Planning Commission determine that the site is physically suitable for the proposed use. If the installation may create future conflicts with adjacent development, it raises legitimate questions about whether this location is appropriate for telecommunications infrastructure of this scale.

Lack of Analysis of Modern Small Cell Alternatives

Modern wireless networks increasingly rely on distributed small cell systems, microcells, and pole mounted nodes that reduce the need for large rooftop telecommunications compounds. The agenda packet does not appear to include any analysis of whether a distributed small cell network could address the alleged coverage gap with less impact on surrounding properties.

Because §17.40.170(D) is intended to minimize visual and land use impacts through appropriate siting and design, the absence of analysis regarding smaller scale alternatives further limits the Commission's ability to determine whether the proposed facility represents the least intrusive solution.

Architectural Integration and Visual Compatibility

The staff report concludes that the project would be architecturally integrated because the proposed screening structure would match the existing architectural features and building materials.

However, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(1) requires consideration of the extent to which the proposed facility truly blends into the surrounding environment or is architecturally integrated into a concealing structure, taking into consideration alternate sites that are available.

Here, the proposal includes nine antennas, multiple radios and related equipment, three equipment cabinets, and a new 588.5 square foot rooftop enclosure. Even if finished with similar materials, a structure of this size materially alters the rooftop profile and building massing. The current record does not appear to contain substantial evidence establishing that this large rooftop compound is truly integrated with the surrounding environment rather than merely concealed within a large new enclosure.

Screening and Camouflage

The staff report states that the antennas would be screened by a non reflective structure on top of the existing roof and that support equipment would be located behind the parapet wall and within the proposed enclosure.

However, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(2) requires the City to consider the extent to which the facility is actually screened or camouflaged by existing or proposed buildings or structures. Screening does not eliminate visual impact where the screened enclosure itself becomes the dominant visible element. A newly constructed rooftop telecommunications enclosure is not the same as preexisting architectural screening.

Size of the Facility Relative to the Building and Surroundings

The staff report concludes that the facility is not out of scale because its footprint is approximately 588.5 square feet on a building that is estimated to be no more than approximately 2,000 square feet in size and approximately 29.5 feet in height, with the overall structure reaching the 35 foot height limit of the SPA 7 zone. The SPA 7 zoning requires that the City conduct an independent measurement of the height and footprint of the enclosure because this project appears to be extremely close to exceeding the height restrictions required to meet municipal code.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D)(3) requires consideration of the total size of the proposed facility, particularly in relation to surrounding and supporting structures. When the rooftop enclosure itself represents a very large portion of the total building footprint, the relative scale of the installation becomes significantly more pronounced. A rooftop telecommunications enclosure of nearly 600 square feet on a building of roughly 2,000 square feet represents a substantial structural addition that may materially affect the building's massing and rooftop profile in relation to nearby residential properties.

Conclusion

Although the staff report concludes that the project satisfies the screening and site selection criteria of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.40.170(D), the record does not appear to contain substantial evidence demonstrating that alternative sites were meaningfully evaluated, that preference was actually given to public or co location sites, that preference was given to sites not adjacent to residential uses, that

the facility is truly integrated with the surrounding environment, or that the rooftop enclosure will not create significant visual impacts on nearby residences.

For these reasons, the current record does not appear to demonstrate that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing a verified coverage gap, nor does it clearly demonstrate compliance with the Conditional Use Permit findings required under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code §17.56.050.

The TCA and CEQA must be carefully considered in this case. A request for full CEQA environmental review and analysis of alternative sites is completed before approval.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission continue this item and require a more comprehensive analysis of alternative locations, preferred siting options, and less intrusive technologies before approving the Conditional Use Permit.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Duffy
Adjacent Property Owner
Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [Elisabeth Brubaker](#)
To: [Planning](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sarah Locklin](#); [Stephen Izant](#); [Michael Flaherty](#); [Peter Hoffman](#); [Greg McNally](#); [Kate Hirsh](#)
Subject: Comment for March 17th Hearing Re: Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 Proposed Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility 725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 8:48:45 PM
Attachments: [Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 .pdf](#)

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

Date: March 16, 2026

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
725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following comments requesting that the Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04, which proposes the installation of a Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the building located at 725 5th Street be denied.

While reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to modern communities, the proposed installation raises significant concerns regarding compliance with the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, land use compatibility, and the adequacy of the site selection analysis provided in the application materials.

Based on review of the agenda packet and applicable municipal code provisions, the following issues warrant careful consideration by the Planning Commission before any approval of this project.

Compatibility With Surrounding Residential Uses

The staff report acknowledges that residential properties are located immediately to the south and west of the proposed facility. The proposed installation consists of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound including nine panel antennas, six radios, and multiple equipment cabinets contained within a 588.5 square foot enclosure.

Although the equipment is proposed to be screened, the overall scale and mass of the

rooftop installation raises legitimate compatibility concerns given the extremely close proximity to nearby homes and families. There is less than seven feet between the building and the adjacent residential structure.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050 governing Conditional Use Permits requires the Planning Commission to determine that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements and that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with surrounding land uses.

Specifically:

Section 17.56.050(C) requires a finding that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements.

Section 17.56.050(D) requires a finding that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity.

In addition, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(6) states that preference shall be given to wireless facilities not located adjacent to residential uses. In this case the proposed facility is directly adjacent to residential homes and within extremely close proximity to existing residential structures.

Given the scale of the installation and its location immediately adjacent to residential properties, it is unclear whether the required findings of compatibility and lack of detriment can reasonably be made.

Height and Visual Impact

The project proposes a rooftop telecommunications enclosure measuring approximately 588.5 square feet and approximately 5 feet 6 inches in height above the parapet, resulting in a total building height of approximately 35 feet.

This height represents the maximum height permitted within the SPA 7 zoning district.

While the installation may technically remain within the numerical height limit, the addition of a large rooftop telecommunications compound significantly alters the visual massing and profile of the building.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.46.210 requires rooftop equipment to be located and designed to reduce visual impacts from surrounding properties and public streets.

In addition, Section 17.40.170(B)(3) requires wireless facilities to utilize non reflective materials and architectural treatments that blend with surrounding structures.

Section 17.40.170(D)(1) and (2) require the City to evaluate whether the facility is architecturally integrated into a concealing structure and whether the facility is effectively screened or camouflaged by existing or proposed structures.

The Planning Commission should carefully evaluate whether a rooftop telecommunications compound of this scale located immediately adjacent to residential homes appropriately minimizes visual impacts and maintains compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

There is also a discrepancy within the applicant's submitted materials regarding the height calculations. The packet indicates the building height is approximately 30 feet while the proposed enclosure height is approximately 5 feet 6 inches. These figures suggest the possibility that the total structure height could exceed the 35 foot height limit applicable to the SPA 7 zone.

At a minimum, the City should independently verify the building height, parapet height, and total enclosure height before making any finding that the project complies with the applicable height limitations.

Adequacy of Alternative Site Analysis

Federal telecommunications law requires wireless providers to demonstrate both the existence of a significant gap in service and that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing that gap.

The agenda packet indicates that Verizon submitted a Gap Identification and Coverage Solution Report asserting that the subject site represents the most feasible location and that no other suitable structures were available.

However, the packet does not appear to include a detailed comparative analysis of alternative sites or locations that were evaluated and rejected.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider the availability of suitable alternative locations when reviewing wireless telecommunications facilities.

Without a meaningful evaluation of alternative commercial sites, publicly owned structures, co location opportunities, or distributed small cell deployments, it is difficult to conclude that the proposed rooftop installation represents the least intrusive solution available.

Reliance on Applicant Provided Technical Studies

The technical analyses included in the application, including radio frequency compliance evaluations and coverage gap analyses, appear to have been prepared by consultants retained by the applicant. There is a discrepancy found on the elevation measurements used from the adjacent home. It is important to note that the adjacent home is on a hill and therefore an elevation measurement must be taken from the average grade. The applicant did not comply with Hermosa Beach Municipal Code 17.04.040.

The agenda packet does not indicate that the City conducted or commissioned an independent technical review of these studies.

Given the scale of the installation and its proximity to residential homes, independent technical evaluation may be appropriate to ensure that the Planning Commission has sufficient evidence to support the findings required under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050 and 17.40.170.

Long Term Site Suitability

The conditions of approval included in the draft resolution acknowledge that future development on adjacent properties could require modification or removal of the wireless facility in order to maintain compliance with applicable radio frequency exposure regulations.

Condition 9 specifically states that the permit does not grant Verizon any right to hinder future lawful development of adjacent properties and that if site conditions change due to lawful development on adjacent property, Verizon may need to modify or remove its wireless facility or obtain adjacent property owner consent to mitigation measures.

This is a critical point.

The City is being asked to determine that the site is physically suitable and compatible while simultaneously acknowledging that future lawful development on adjacent property could force modification or elimination of the facility.

This issue is particularly significant because the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum 35 foot height limit for the SPA 7 zone. The project is not being proposed with a meaningful margin for future flexibility.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050(E) requires that the site be physically suitable for the type of use proposed. If the facility may require modification or removal as surrounding properties develop, it raises legitimate questions regarding the long term suitability of this location.

This issue is especially relevant as I am the resident at 683 5th Street and am currently working with my architect and structural engineer to prepare plans for a second story

addition. I intend to submit the application to the City as soon as the architectural and structural plans are completed and expect to submit the application no later than March 31, 2026.

If the City reviews my recent permits at this location, it will find that substantial structural improvements have already been completed to support future vertical construction, including underpins, shear walls, and steel beams.

CEQA Exemption Concerns

The staff report recommends that the project be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act under the Class 3 exemption for small structures.

However the project involves construction of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound measuring approximately 588.5 square feet containing multiple antennas radios and supporting equipment and located immediately adjacent to residential homes.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 states that categorical exemptions do not apply where unusual circumstances exist or where the project may result in a significant environmental impact due to its location scale or surrounding conditions.

Given the size of the facility its immediate proximity to residential properties and the potential visual land use and compatibility impacts associated with a large rooftop telecommunications compound the applicability of the categorical exemption warrants closer review.

Where unusual circumstances exist or where the project may create a reasonable possibility of significant environmental impact CEQA requires that the categorical exemption not be used and that appropriate environmental review be conducted.

Furthermore, the applicant failed to provide any reports on the noise decibel readings that will be created by the mechanical cooling systems.

Community Concerns

In addition to these planning and code considerations, a community petition regarding this proposal has already gathered significant support from Hermosa Beach residents, with the majority of signatures coming from within the local ZIP code.

While petitions do not determine land use decisions, they demonstrate that many residents believe the project warrants additional scrutiny given its immediate proximity to residential homes.

Conclusion

Reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to the community. However, the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code requires that such infrastructure be carefully located and designed to ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and to minimize unnecessary impacts. The municipal code clearly establishes a hierarchy of preferred siting criteria for wireless facilities, including avoiding adjacency to residential properties. The applicant has proposed a large macro installation directly next to homes without demonstrating that less intrusive alternatives were fully evaluated.

Given the size of the proposed rooftop compound, its close proximity to residential homes, the fact that the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum allowable height, and the acknowledgment that future development on adjacent properties may require modification or removal of the facility, the Planning Commission should carefully evaluate whether the required Conditional Use Permit findings under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050, 17.40.170, and 17.46.210 can be satisfied.

At a minimum, additional analysis of alternative locations and independent review of the applicant's technical submissions would help ensure that the Commission's decision is supported by substantial evidence and consistent with both municipal code requirements and federal telecommunications laws.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Brubaker


Hermosa Beach Resident

Date: March 16, 2026

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
725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully submit the following comments requesting that the Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04, which proposes the installation of a Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of the building located at 725 5th Street be denied.

While reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to modern communities, the proposed installation raises significant concerns regarding compliance with the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, land use compatibility, and the adequacy of the site selection analysis provided in the application materials.

Based on review of the agenda packet and applicable municipal code provisions, the following issues warrant careful consideration by the Planning Commission before any approval of this project.

Compatibility With Surrounding Residential Uses

The staff report acknowledges that residential properties are located immediately to the south and west of the proposed facility. The proposed installation consists of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound including nine panel antennas, six radios, and multiple equipment cabinets contained within a 588.5 square foot enclosure.

Although the equipment is proposed to be screened, the overall scale and mass of the rooftop installation raises legitimate compatibility concerns given the extremely close proximity to nearby homes and families. There is less than seven feet between the building and the adjacent residential structure.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050 governing Conditional Use Permits requires the Planning Commission to determine that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements and that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with surrounding land uses.

Specifically:

Section 17.56.050(C) requires a finding that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements.

Section 17.56.050(D) requires a finding that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity.

In addition, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(6) states that preference shall be given to wireless facilities not located adjacent to residential uses. In this case the proposed facility is directly adjacent to residential homes and within extremely close proximity to existing residential structures.

Given the scale of the installation and its location immediately adjacent to residential properties, it is unclear whether the required findings of compatibility and lack of detriment can reasonably be made.

Height and Visual Impact

The project proposes a rooftop telecommunications enclosure measuring approximately 588.5 square feet and approximately 5 feet 6 inches in height above the parapet, resulting in a total building height of approximately 35 feet.

This height represents the maximum height permitted within the SPA 7 zoning district.

While the installation may technically remain within the numerical height limit, the addition of a large rooftop telecommunications compound significantly alters the visual massing and profile of the building.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.46.210 requires rooftop equipment to be located and designed to reduce visual impacts from surrounding properties and public streets.

In addition, Section 17.40.170(B)(3) requires wireless facilities to utilize non reflective materials and architectural treatments that blend with surrounding structures.

Section 17.40.170(D)(1) and (2) require the City to evaluate whether the facility is architecturally integrated into a concealing structure and whether the facility is effectively screened or camouflaged by existing or proposed structures.

The Planning Commission should carefully evaluate whether a rooftop telecommunications compound of this scale located immediately adjacent to residential homes appropriately minimizes visual impacts and maintains compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

There is also a discrepancy within the applicant's submitted materials regarding the height calculations. The packet indicates the building height is approximately 30 feet while the

proposed enclosure height is approximately 5 feet 6 inches. These figures suggest the possibility that the total structure height could exceed the 35 foot height limit applicable to the SPA 7 zone.

At a minimum, the City should independently verify the building height, parapet height, and total enclosure height before making any finding that the project complies with the applicable height limitations.

Adequacy of Alternative Site Analysis

Federal telecommunications law requires wireless providers to demonstrate both the existence of a significant gap in service and that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing that gap.

The agenda packet indicates that Verizon submitted a Gap Identification and Coverage Solution Report asserting that the subject site represents the most feasible location and that no other suitable structures were available.

However, the packet does not appear to include a detailed comparative analysis of alternative sites or locations that were evaluated and rejected.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider the availability of suitable alternative locations when reviewing wireless telecommunications facilities.

Without a meaningful evaluation of alternative commercial sites, publicly owned structures, co location opportunities, or distributed small cell deployments, it is difficult to conclude that the proposed rooftop installation represents the least intrusive solution available.

Reliance on Applicant Provided Technical Studies

The technical analyses included in the application, including radio frequency compliance evaluations and coverage gap analyses, appear to have been prepared by consultants retained by the applicant. There is a discrepancy found on the elevation measurements used from the adjacent home. It is important to note that the adjacent home is on a hill and therefore an elevation measurement must be taken from the average grade. The applicant did not comply with Hermosa Beach Municipal Code 17.04.040.

The agenda packet does not indicate that the City conducted or commissioned an independent technical review of these studies.

Given the scale of the installation and its proximity to residential homes, independent technical evaluation may be appropriate to ensure that the Planning Commission has sufficient evidence to support the findings required under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050 and 17.40.170.

Long Term Site Suitability

The conditions of approval included in the draft resolution acknowledge that future development on adjacent properties could require modification or removal of the wireless facility in order to maintain compliance with applicable radio frequency exposure regulations.

Condition 9 specifically states that the permit does not grant Verizon any right to hinder future lawful development of adjacent properties and that if site conditions change due to lawful development on adjacent property, Verizon may need to modify or remove its wireless facility or obtain adjacent property owner consent to mitigation measures.

This is a critical point.

The City is being asked to determine that the site is physically suitable and compatible while simultaneously acknowledging that future lawful development on adjacent property could force modification or elimination of the facility.

This issue is particularly significant because the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum 35 foot height limit for the SPA 7 zone. The project is not being proposed with a meaningful margin for future flexibility.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050(E) requires that the site be physically suitable for the type of use proposed. If the facility may require modification or removal as surrounding properties develop, it raises legitimate questions regarding the long term suitability of this location.

This issue is especially relevant as I am the resident at 683 5th Street and am currently working with my architect and structural engineer to prepare plans for a second story addition. I intend to submit the application to the City as soon as the architectural and structural plans are completed and expect to submit the application no later than March 31, 2026.

If the City reviews my recent permits at this location, it will find that substantial structural improvements have already been completed to support future vertical construction, including underpins, shear walls, and steel beams.

CEQA Exemption Concerns

The staff report recommends that the project be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act under the Class 3 exemption for small structures.

However the project involves construction of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound measuring approximately 588.5 square feet containing multiple antennas radios and supporting equipment and located immediately adjacent to residential homes.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 states that categorical exemptions do not apply where unusual circumstances exist or where the project may result in a significant environmental impact due to its location scale or surrounding conditions.

Given the size of the facility its immediate proximity to residential properties and the potential visual land use and compatibility impacts associated with a large rooftop telecommunications compound the applicability of the categorical exemption warrants closer review.

Where unusual circumstances exist or where the project may create a reasonable possibility of significant environmental impact CEQA requires that the categorical exemption not be used and that appropriate environmental review be conducted.

Furthermore, the applicant failed to provide any reports on the noise decibel readings that will be created by the mechanical cooling systems.

Community Concerns

In addition to these planning and code considerations, a community petition regarding this proposal has already gathered significant support from Hermosa Beach residents, with the majority of signatures coming from within the local ZIP code.

While petitions do not determine land use decisions, they demonstrate that many residents believe the project warrants additional scrutiny given its immediate proximity to residential homes.

Conclusion

Reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important to the community. However, the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code requires that such infrastructure be carefully located and designed to ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and to minimize unnecessary impacts. The municipal code clearly establishes a hierarchy of preferred siting criteria for wireless facilities, including avoiding adjacency to residential properties. The applicant has proposed a large macro installation directly next to homes without demonstrating that less intrusive alternatives were fully evaluated.

Given the size of the proposed rooftop compound, its close proximity to residential homes, the fact that the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum allowable height, and the acknowledgment that future development on adjacent properties may require modification or removal of the facility, the Planning Commission should carefully evaluate whether the required Conditional Use Permit findings under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050, 17.40.170, and 17.46.210 can be satisfied.

At a minimum, additional analysis of alternative locations and independent review of the applicant's technical submissions would help ensure that the Commission's decision is supported by substantial evidence and consistent with both municipal code requirements and federal telecommunications laws.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Brubaker



Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [Robby Brubaker](#)
To: [Planning](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sarah Locklin](#); [Stephen Izant](#); [Michael Flaherty](#); [Peter Hoffman](#); [Greg McNally](#); [Kate Hirsh](#)
Subject: Comment for March 17th Hearing Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 Proposed Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility 725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 7:08:27 AM
Attachments: [Opposition to Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 .pdf](#)

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

Dear Planning Commission and Community Development Staff,

Please find attached my formal written comments regarding Conditional Use Permit **CUP25-04** for the proposed Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility at **725 5th Street**.

I respectfully request that this letter be included in the official record for the Planning Commission's review and consideration prior to the hearing.

The attached document outlines several concerns related to municipal code compliance, compatibility with surrounding residential properties, the adequacy of the alternative site analysis, and the long-term suitability of this location for the proposed installation.

Thank you for confirming receipt of this submission and for including it in the meeting record.

Sincerely,
Robert Brubaker

[REDACTED]

Date: March 16, 2026

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
725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to respectfully request that the Planning Commission carefully review and deny the proposed Conditional Use Permit, CUP25 04, for the installation of a Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street.

While reliable wireless infrastructure is important for modern communities, the proposed installation raises several significant concerns related to the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, land use compatibility, and the adequacy of the site selection analysis provided in the application materials.

Based on a review of the agenda packet and applicable municipal code provisions, the following issues warrant careful consideration.

1. Compatibility with Surrounding Residential Uses

The staff report acknowledges that residential properties are located immediately to the south and west of the proposed facility. The proposed installation consists of a substantial rooftop telecommunications compound including nine panel antennas, six radios, and multiple equipment cabinets contained within a 588.5 square foot enclosure.

Although the equipment is proposed to be screened, the overall scale and mass of the rooftop installation raises legitimate compatibility concerns given the close proximity to nearby homes and families. There is less than 7 feet between the building and the adjacent home.

Under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050 governing Conditional Use Permits, the Planning Commission must determine that the proposed use will not be detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements and that the design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the use are compatible with surrounding land uses. More specifically, Section 17.56.050(C) requires a finding that the use will not be adverse to the public health, safety, or general welfare of the community, nor detrimental to surrounding properties or improvements, and Section 17.56.050(D) requires a finding that the design, location, size, and operating

characteristics of the proposed activity are compatible with the existing and reasonably foreseeable future land uses in the vicinity.

In addition, Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(6) states that preference shall be given to sites not located adjacent to residential uses. The staff report also acknowledges that the site is within 200 feet of residential use and that the screened structure is only 10 feet from the west property line. Given the size of the proposed installation and its location directly adjacent to residential uses, it is unclear whether these required findings can reasonably be made.

2. Height and Visual Impact Considerations

The proposed telecommunications facility would extend the building height to the maximum allowable height of approximately 35 feet in the applicable zone. The packet states that the screening structure measures 5 feet 6 inches in height from the parapet wall, totals 588.5 square feet, and results in a building height of 35 feet. It also states that the top of the proposed enclosure is at 35 feet, which is the maximum height permitted in SPA 7.

While the installation may technically remain within the permitted height limit, the addition of a large rooftop compound containing multiple antennas and equipment structures substantially alters the visual massing of the building.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.46.210 requires rooftop equipment to be located and designed to reduce visual impacts from surrounding properties and public streets. Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(B)(3) further requires that the facility exterior be comprised of non reflective materials and be painted or camouflaged to blend with surrounding materials and colors. Section 17.40.170(D)(1) and (2) require the City to consider the extent to which the facility is architecturally integrated into a concealing structure and the extent to which it is actually screened or camouflaged by existing or proposed structures.

The Commission should carefully evaluate whether the size and visibility of this rooftop compound is appropriate in a location immediately adjacent to residential properties to the east and south of the project that will lose their existing ocean views.

Lastly, there is a discrepancy listed in the data provided by the applicant showing the height of the building is 30 feet and the height of the proposed cell tower is 5 feet 6 inches. This would exceed the height limit restricted by SPA 7 zoning height limits. At a minimum, the City should independently verify the roof height, parapet height, and full enclosure height before making any finding that the proposal complies with the SPA 7 height limit. The fact that the proposed enclosure is already at the maximum 35 foot limit is particularly important because the applicant's own approval conditions acknowledge that future development on adjacent properties could require modification or removal of the facility to remain compliant. Therefore, when the adjacent property is developed it will not meet FCC compliance requirements and the structure is already at its height limit.

3. Adequacy of Alternative Site Analysis

Federal telecommunications law requires that applicants demonstrate both the existence of a significant gap in wireless service and that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing that gap.

The agenda packet indicates that Verizon submitted a Gap Identification and Coverage Solution Report asserting that the subject site represents the most feasible location and that no other suitable structures were available. However, the packet does not appear to include a detailed comparative analysis of alternative sites or locations that were evaluated and rejected. The staff report states only that Verizon asserts the site was the most feasible location analyzed and that no other towers or suitable tall structures are available in the targeted search area.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(4) requires the City to consider the availability of suitable alternative locations. A statement from the applicant that no other sites are available does not constitute a comprehensive alternative site analysis. In the absence of a clear analysis demonstrating why alternative commercial locations, publicly owned structures, co location opportunities, or distributed small cell deployments could not address the claimed coverage gap, it is difficult to conclude that this rooftop installation represents the least intrusive solution available.

4. Reliance on Applicant Provided Technical Studies

The technical analyses included in the application, including the radio frequency compliance evaluation and coverage gap analysis, appear to have been prepared by consultants retained by the applicant. It does not appear that the City has conducted or commissioned independent technical review to verify these conclusions.

Given the scale of the proposed installation and its proximity to residential homes, additional independent evaluation may be appropriate to ensure that the Planning Commission has sufficient evidence to support the findings required under the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, including Section 17.56.050 and the wireless facility standards under Section 17.40.170.

One very important detail to examine is the applicant's measurement of the adjacent homes. These homes are on a hill and according to Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, elevation measurements should be taken from average grade. The applicant failed to provide correct data showing the elevation of the RF zone from average grade and also did not provide any data from the adjacent home if the structure were to build a second story at the 30 foot compliant height limit with a rooftop deck where people can stand 5 to 6 feet over the roof line.

5. Long Term Site Suitability

The conditions of approval included in the draft resolution acknowledge that future development on adjacent properties could require modification or removal of the wireless facility in order to maintain compliance with applicable radio frequency exposure regulations. Specifically, Condition 9 states that the permit does not grant Verizon any right to make adjacent properties inaccessible to the public or to hinder future lawful development of adjacent properties as a mitigation measure, and it further states that if site conditions change in the future due to lawful

development on adjacent property, Verizon may need to modify or remove its wireless facility, or obtain adjacent property owner consent to mitigation measures on the adjacent property, in order to maintain compliance with laws applicable to human exposure to RF emissions.

This is a critical point. The City is simultaneously being asked to find that this site is physically suitable and compatible, while the applicant's own conditions acknowledge that lawful future development on adjacent property may force modification or elimination of the facility. That issue is even more significant here because the enclosure is already proposed at the absolute 35 foot height limit for SPA 7. The project is not being proposed with a meaningful margin for future flexibility. Instead, it is being proposed at its maximum height in a location immediately adjacent to residential properties, while the approval itself acknowledges that future neighboring development may create compliance conflicts.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.56.050(E) requires that the site be physically suitable for the type of use being proposed, including access, utilities, and the absence of physical constraints. If the installation may create future conflicts with adjacent development, it raises legitimate questions about whether this location is appropriate for telecommunications infrastructure of this scale.

This condition indicates that the facility's compliance assumptions depend on the current configuration of surrounding properties and may change if neighboring sites are redeveloped in the future. This raises additional questions regarding the long term suitability of this location for a telecommunications installation of this scale.

This is especially important as I am the resident at 683 5th Street and am currently working with my architect and structural engineer to provide me the plans so I can submit them to the city within the next few weeks so I can start the construction on my second story. I have already submitted a building permit application to the City in order to initiate this process, however the City responded that the application could not be accepted because additional architectural and structural documents were required before a permit number could be opened. This confirms that the City is already aware that development of the second story is being actively pursued.

I would like it to be recorded that the intent to build this second story has already been formally communicated to the City through the permit application process. The proposed second story represents Phase 2 of improvements to my home. Phase 1 of this project involved substantial structural work that was previously approved by the City and completed specifically to prepare the existing structure for a future vertical addition. These improvements included structural reinforcement such as underpins, shear walls, and steel beams designed to support the additional load of a second story.

I will be submitting a complete permit application including architectural and structural plans as soon as they become available, which is expected no later than March 31st 2026.

If you take a moment to review my recent permits at this location, you can find the structural construction that was completed on my home to ensure the current structure already has the

structural integrity for my build up. All of this data should be taken into consideration when confirming the details of this proposed telecommunications project.

6. Community Concerns

In addition to these planning and code considerations, a community petition regarding this proposal has already gathered significant support from Hermosa Beach residents, with the majority of signatures coming from within the local ZIP code. While public petitions do not determine land use decisions, they do demonstrate that many residents believe the project warrants additional scrutiny given its location within a residential adjacent area.

7. Additional Municipal Code Concerns Regarding Site Selection and Design

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(5) states that preference shall be given to publicly owned structures, co location, and shared sites. The current record does not demonstrate that those preferred siting options were meaningfully pursued.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(7) provides that whenever possible, wireless communication facilities should be located on existing buildings, existing poles, or other existing support structures. However, use of an existing building does not by itself resolve the separate requirements regarding compatibility, scale, screening, and residential adjacency.

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170(D)(3) requires consideration of the total size of the proposed facility, particularly in relation to surrounding and supporting structures. A rooftop telecommunications enclosure of nearly 600 square feet on a building of roughly 2,000 square feet represents a substantial structural addition that may materially affect the building's massing and rooftop profile in relation to nearby residential properties.

Conclusion

Reliable telecommunications infrastructure is essential, and residents recognize the importance of strong wireless service throughout the community. However, the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code requires that such infrastructure be carefully located and designed to ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and to minimize unnecessary impacts.

Given the size of the proposed rooftop compound, its close proximity to residential homes, the fact that the enclosure is already proposed at the maximum 35 foot height limit, and the applicant's own acknowledgment that future lawful development on adjacent properties may require the facility to be modified or removed, the Commission should carefully evaluate whether the required Conditional Use Permit findings can be satisfied under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Sections 17.56.050, 17.40.170, and 17.46.210.

At a minimum, additional analysis of alternative locations, independent review of the applicant's technical submissions, and independent verification of the building and enclosure height measurements would help ensure that the Commission's decision is supported by substantial

evidence and consistent with both municipal code requirements and federal telecommunications law.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these important issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Brubaker

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [Mike Nickle](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: 725 5th St Telecommunications facility opposition
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 9:20:12 AM

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

Hello,

I am completely opposed to a 588 sq foot wireless telecommunications facility on the roof of 725 5th Street in Hermosa Beach as I live at 833 5th Street. We spend quite a bit of money to live in Hermosa Beach and do not want to have our ocean view obstructed by an unnecessary structure. I have Verizon wireless and do not experience any coverage issues in Hermosa, except inside the local Pavilions grocery store.

Other locations to consider include:

- **Frontier / Verizon central office located at 1st and PCH - this would be ideal, since it is already owned by Frontier/Verizon**
- Hermosa Beach city maintenance yard that is one block north on 6th and Valley Ave that appears to be a graveyard for old street signs
- Pavilions location on Pier Ave as cell service is very poor there
- Vacant Big Lots property on Aviation Blvd

I will be attending the public hearing on Tuesday, March 17.

Thank you,
Mike Nickle

From: [Jennifer Duffy](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: Opposition to CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 2:53:24 PM

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

Dear Hermosa Beach Planning Commission and City Officials,

I am writing on behalf of concerned residents and myself, a Hermosa Beach resident living very adjacent to the subject property. I write to respectfully oppose Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes installation of an approximately 588.5-square-foot rooftop Verizon wireless telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street.

While reliable telecommunications service is important, this proposal raises several significant concerns:

- **CEQA Review:** The project is proposed as categorically exempt under CEQA. However, due to its size, visibility, and extremely close proximity (less than seven feet) to neighboring residences, it may qualify as an “unusual circumstance” requiring further environmental review.
- **Land-Use Compatibility:** The facility would introduce substantial rooftop equipment and structures in a mixed-use area with nearby residences, potentially conflicting with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.
- **Visual and Neighborhood Impacts:** Rooftop telecommunications compounds can significantly alter skyline views and building massing, which is particularly important in a coastal community like Hermosa Beach.
- **Potential Property Value Effects:** Visible telecommunications infrastructure near homes can affect buyer perception and neighborhood desirability.

- Alternative Sites: Before approving such a facility in close proximity to homes, the applicant should demonstrate that less intrusive alternatives—such as co-location on existing infrastructure or placement in commercial areas—have been fully evaluated.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny CUP25-04 as currently proposed or require additional environmental review and evaluation of alternative locations.

Hermosa Beach residents value the visual character, livability, and residential quality of our community, and infrastructure projects should be designed in a manner that protects those qualities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jennifer

Close proximity neighbor to 725 5th St

Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [Jennifer Duffy](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: March 17, 2026 Meeting: Opposition to CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street
Date: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 2:55:43 PM

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

Dear Hermosa Beach Planning Commission and City Officials,

I am writing on behalf of concerned residents and myself, a Hermosa Beach resident living very adjacent to the subject property. I write to respectfully oppose Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes installation of an approximately 588.5-square-foot rooftop Verizon wireless telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street.

While reliable telecommunications service is important, this proposal raises several significant concerns:

- **CEQA Review:** The project is proposed as categorically exempt under CEQA. However, due to its size, visibility, and extremely close proximity (less than seven feet) to neighboring residences, it may qualify as an “unusual circumstance” requiring further environmental review.
- **Land-Use Compatibility:** The facility would introduce substantial rooftop equipment and structures in a mixed-use area with nearby residences, potentially conflicting with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.
- **Visual and Neighborhood Impacts:** Rooftop telecommunications compounds can significantly alter skyline views and building massing, which is particularly important in a coastal community like Hermosa Beach.
- **Potential Property Value Effects:** Visible telecommunications infrastructure near homes can affect buyer perception and neighborhood desirability.
- **Alternative Sites:** Before approving such a facility in close proximity

to homes, the applicant should demonstrate that less intrusive alternatives—such as co-location on existing infrastructure or placement in commercial areas—have been fully evaluated.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny CUP25-04 as currently proposed or require additional environmental review and evaluation of alternative locations.

Hermosa Beach residents value the visual character, livability, and residential quality of our community, and infrastructure projects should be designed in a manner that protects those qualities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jennifer

Close proximity neighbor to 725 5th St

Hermosa Beach Resident

From: [Randy Cox](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: eComment, Agenda Item, March 17, 2026, proposed wireless installation
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 9:30:19 PM

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

March 16, 2026

Community Development Dept.
Planning Div. Attn: DT

eComment from Randall Cox, Hermosa Beach resident
Agenda Item, March 17, 2026
Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate Verizon telecommunications facility
at 725 5th St, Hermosa Beach

I am a Hermosa Beach resident living near the intersection of Ocean View Ave and 5th St. I am one block east of PCH, and the proposed Verizon telecommunications facility on the roof of 725 5th St is one block to the west of PCH. I have a direct and unobstructed line-of-sight from my residence to that roof.

I am opposed to installing this wireless facility, not even as much for the possibility of impairing my view, but for the health and safety of myself and neighboring community. For some time, I have been aware of the potential health risks from such large wireless equipment emitting radiation and a constant or repeating signal.

It is a coincidence that just over a week ago, I received an email from Children's Health Defense about a recent Swedish scientific study of people living near newly-installed 5G towers. I think it will be beneficial to share this short email below. Several key points are made, and there is a link to "EMF Hazards, Safeguard Our Future" Summit, which may or not work for you. There is a wealth of information available, and I encourage the Planning Division and concerned residents to look into this further, before approving or moving forward with this project.

- Randal Cox
Hermosa Beach

(scroll down below for related email)

Shocking: What happened 50 meters from a 5G tower

From: Childrens Health Defense <team@childrenshealthdefense.org>
To:
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2026 at 11:06:26 AM PST
Subject: Shocking: What happened 50 meters from a 5G tower

Shocking: What happened 50 meters from a 5G tower

CHD Logo with Registered Mark



EMF Hazards Summit - Safeguard Our Future



A team of Swedish scientists recently published something disturbing...

As you'll discover during **EMF Hazards: Safeguard Our Future**, they documented eight case studies of people living near newly-installed 5G towers. The

results? **Within days of activation, residents living within 150 feet developed unexplained symptoms. Headaches. Sleep issues. Fatigue. Even nosebleeds.**

Once these people moved away? The symptoms vanished.

But here's the truly alarming part: The radiation levels measured near these towers were still "within safety limits" according to government guidelines.

Let that sink in: People got sick from radiation levels that our regulatory agencies claim are "perfectly safe."

These findings are SHOCKING, and yet not a single mainstream news outlet has reported on it. Meanwhile, 5G towers are being installed in neighborhoods across the world. Every. Single. Day.

During EMF Hazards: Safeguard Our Future, journalist Mona Nilsson will reveal:

- **Why current "safety" limits are up to 100,000 times too high**
- The astronomical radiation levels measured near these towers
- **Why some people (and even pets) got sick while others didn't**
- What this means for your family's safety
- **Simple steps to protect yourself if you live near a tower**

Mona and 17 other world-renowned scientists and doctors have broken their silence.

Our friend Nick Pineault, aka "The EMF Guy," has decided to make their groundbreaking insights available for no charge — but only for a limited time.

====> [**No-Cost Access For 48 Hours: EMF Hazards: Safeguard Our Future**](#)

You deserve to know about these findings.

Listen to the EMF Hazards Summit to learn the facts and get practical solutions to protect yourself, and future generations.

WATCH NOW

Thank you,

The Children's Health Defense Team

P.S. No fear or tech-shaming. Just simple, practical solutions to help you use

technology safely and protect your loved ones. But remember: **this free access** disappears just 48 hours after you sign up.

You Make It Possible

Children's Health Defense depends on generous donations from our community. Large or small, every donation gets us closer to achieving our goals.

[Donate Now](#)

Children's Health Defense® is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. Our mission is ending childhood health epidemics by eliminating toxic exposure. We will restore and protect the health of children by eliminating environmental exposures, holding responsible parties accountable, and establishing safeguards to prevent future harm of children's health. Protecting Children. Exposing Harms. Seeking Justice.

ChildrensHealthDefense.org | [Contact Us](#) | [Work for CHD](#)

[FIND US ON SOCIAL MEDIA](#)

852 Franklin Ave Suite 511 | Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417 US

From: [Elisabeth Brubaker](#)
To: [Planning](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Sarah Locklin](#); [Stephen Izant](#); [Michael Flaherty](#); [Peter Hoffman](#); [Greg McNally](#); [Kate Hirsh](#)
Subject: Comment for March 17th Hearing Re: Conditional Use Permit CUP25 04 Proposed Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility 725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:56:30 PM

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

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

Please find the community petition regarding this proposal that has already gathered significant support from Hermosa Beach residents, with the majority of signatures coming from within the local ZIP code (112).

While petitions do not determine land use decisions, they demonstrate that many residents believe the project warrants additional scrutiny given its immediate proximity to residential homes. We ask that this petition and the 205 signatures be added to the record.

Respectfully,

Liz Brubaker

Hermosa Beach Resident

Linked Here:

<https://c.org/2msYZnZbns>

**PETITION TO OPPOSE
Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04
Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Facility
725 5th Street – Hermosa Beach**

To the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission and City Officials:

We, the undersigned residents and community members, respectfully petition the City of Hermosa Beach to deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04, which proposes installation of an approximately 588.5 square foot rooftop Verizon wireless telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street.

While reliable telecommunications infrastructure is important, the proposed project raises serious concerns regarding CEQA compliance, zoning compatibility, visual impacts, and compliance with the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code.

Families, including one with small children, are living just 7 feet away from the proposed cell tower installation. The Planning Commission may approve this project unless residents make their concerns known.

We are asking our community to stand together. Hermosa Beach residents support one another and value the safety and livability of our neighborhoods.

Please sign this petition to help prevent the installation of a large telecommunications tower immediately adjacent to homes where young children live.

KEY CONCERNS

1. Failure to Meet Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Guidelines

Four of the seven guidelines in Municipal Code Subsection 17.40.170(D) appear not to be satisfied.

Concerns include:

- Alternate sites were not adequately evaluated
- Alternate sites may exist in industrial areas, but Verizon has declined to fully disclose them
- Preference guidelines for facility placement are not satisfied
- The building is not a preferred facility type

2. RF Modeling Relies on Assumed Building Elevations

The RF compliance report relies entirely on predictive modeling based on

assumed elevations of nearby buildings and site inputs.

Because RF exposure predictions depend on the vertical distance between antennas and surrounding structures, inaccurate elevation assumptions could alter predicted exposure contours and rooftop safety zones.

Before approving the project, the City should confirm that:

- RF modeling used surveyed roof elevations
- The model accurately reflects the geometry of surrounding buildings

At present, the roof heights of surrounding properties are not accurately recorded or depicted in relation to the antenna height.

3. Failure to Demonstrate a Significant Gap in Service or the Least Intrusive Means

Federal law does not require cities to approve every proposed wireless facility.

Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. §332(c)(7)), local governments retain authority to regulate wireless facility placement through zoning and land use decisions.

Courts within the Ninth Circuit require wireless providers to demonstrate:

- A significant gap in wireless service, and
- That the proposed facility is the least intrusive means of closing that gap

Relevant cases include:

- MetroPCS Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco
- T-Mobile USA Inc. v. City of Anacortes

The burden of proof rests on the applicant and typically requires technical evidence such as:

- Radiofrequency propagation maps
- Drive test data showing real world signal performance

- Dropped call or reliability data
- Engineering analysis demonstrating how the facility resolves the gap

Courts distinguish between true coverage gaps and projects that merely improve service quality or capacity.

In this case, the applicant has not demonstrated that:

- A significant service gap exists in the area, or
- A tower located 7 feet from homes represents the least intrusive means of addressing the gap

Without such evidence, the City may deny the application based on zoning compatibility, neighborhood impacts, and local planning standards.

4. Improper Reliance on a CEQA Categorical Exemption

The City proposes to approve the project using a CEQA categorical exemption.

However, CEQA prohibits categorical exemptions when unusual circumstances may create significant environmental effects.

This project includes several unusual circumstances:

- A large telecommunications compound (588.5 square feet)
- Tower height of approximately 35 feet or more
- Extreme proximity to residences (7 feet)
- Location within a mixed use residential coastal neighborhood

Under *Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley*, such circumstances may require full environmental review rather than a categorical exemption.

5. Land Use Compatibility Concerns

The proposed facility is located within a mixed use residential neighborhood with homes immediately adjacent to the site.

The project introduces:

- **Antennas**
- **Rooftop equipment enclosures**
- **Mechanical infrastructure**
- **Screening structures**
- **Additional building mass**

This type of infrastructure is typically located in commercial or industrial corridors, not immediately adjacent to residential homes.

Given the scale of the installation and its proximity to nearby residences, the project appears incompatible with surrounding residential land uses.

6. Visual Impacts and Neighborhood Character

Telecommunications towers and rooftop compounds can significantly affect:

- **Skyline views**
- **Neighborhood character**
- **Building massing**

These impacts are particularly important in coastal communities, where preservation of visual character is a central planning objective.

7. Property Value and Marketability Concerns

Visible telecommunications infrastructure located directly next to homes can affect buyer perception and property marketability.

While property value impacts alone may not determine approval, they are relevant when evaluating compatibility with surrounding land uses under Conditional Use Permit findings.

8. Violation of Zoning Height Limits

Hermosa Beach zoning generally limits building height to approximately 30 feet in residential zones.

The proposed facility includes antenna structures approximately 10 feet above the roofline, resulting in an effective structure height exceeding typical zoning limits.

9. Failure to Meet Municipal Code Limits on Antenna Height Variances
Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.46.210 allows antennas to exceed height limits only when:

- The surface area exceeding the height limit does not exceed 12 square feet, and
- The device does not exceed 15 feet above the building height limit

The proposed telecommunications compound is approximately 588.5 square feet, far exceeding the 12 square foot variance allowance.

10. Failure to Evaluate Less Intrusive Alternatives

Before approving a telecommunications facility immediately adjacent to homes, the applicant should demonstrate that less intrusive alternatives were evaluated, including:

- Co- location on existing telecommunications infrastructure
- Placement within commercial zones
- Placement within nearby industrial areas

Approval without evaluating feasible alternatives could expose the permit to legal challenge.

11. Precautionary Planning

Although federal law limits denial based solely on RF emissions, the extreme proximity of the proposed installation (7 feet from residences) highlights the importance of prudent siting decisions to protect residential quality of life.

CONCLUSION

Before approving a large rooftop telecommunications facility immediately adjacent to residential homes, the City should require the applicant to demonstrate, with competent technical evidence, that:

- A significant gap in wireless service exists, and**
- The proposed installation represents the least intrusive means of closing that gap**
- A full CEQA environmental review and analysis of alternative sites is completed prior to approval**

Without this evidence, approval of the proposed facility would be inconsistent with federal telecommunications law and the land use authority preserved to local governments.

REQUEST

For the reasons stated above, we respectfully request that the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission:

- Deny Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04 as currently proposed**

Or require the following before any approval:

- Full CEQA environmental review and analysis of alternative sites**
- A complete two prong analysis demonstrating a significant gap and least intrusive means**
- Compliance with municipal code height limits**
- A residential compatibility evaluation**
- Re evaluation of Municipal Code Subsection 17.40.170(D) guidelines**
- Formal review of the concerns presented in this petition**

Hermosa Beach residents value the livability, visual character, and residential quality of our coastal community, and telecommunications infrastructure should be deployed in a manner consistent with those values.

Respectfully submitted,

Residents of

Hermosa Beach, California

LEGAL AUTHORITY SUPPORTING OPPOSITION

**Proposed Verizon Wireless Facility – 725 5th Street
Conditional Use Permit CUP25-04**

This document outlines the legal authority supporting opposition to the proposed Verizon wireless telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street in Hermosa Beach.

1. Failure to Demonstrate a Significant Gap in Service and Failure to Demonstrate the Least Intrusive Means

Two Part Legal Test

The Ninth Circuit requires wireless providers to demonstrate two things before a facility may be approved:

A significant gap in wireless service exists

The proposed facility is the least intrusive means of closing that gap

This legal standard comes from:

- **MetroPCS Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco (9th Cir. 2005)**
- **T-Mobile USA Inc. v. City of Anacortes (9th Cir. 2009)**

In this CUP case the proposal involves:

- **A cell tower 7 feet from homes**

- A 588 square foot rooftop compound
- A 40 foot total height structure
- Location in a mixed use residential neighborhood
- Possible commercial and industrial alternatives nearby

These facts strongly support the conclusion that less intrusive alternatives likely exist.

Examples courts expect wireless providers to evaluate include:

- Co location on existing towers
- Mounting antennas on commercial buildings
- Placement in industrial areas
- Use of smaller distributed antennas
- Multiple micro cells instead of a tower

The applicant has not demonstrated that a significant gap in wireless service exists or that the proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of addressing such a gap.

Under Ninth Circuit precedent, telecommunications providers must demonstrate both the existence of a significant coverage gap and that the proposed site is the least intrusive means of closing that gap.

The record does not demonstrate that less intrusive alternatives such as:

- Co location on existing facilities
- Placement in commercial or industrial areas
- Use of distributed antenna systems

have been fully evaluated.

Burden of Proof Lies With the Applicant

The burden of proof rests on the telecommunications provider, not the City or the public.

Technical Evidence Typically Required to Demonstrate a Significant Gap

Courts expect wireless providers to submit technical evidence demonstrating the existence of a significant gap in service.

Typical evidence includes:

- Propagation maps showing existing and predicted signal strength
- Drive test data measuring real world signal performance
- Dropped call data or network reliability metrics
- Coverage modeling reports prepared by radiofrequency engineers
- Comparisons of signal strength before and after installation

Courts have rejected wireless facility approvals when this evidence is incomplete or insufficient.

In MetroPCS v. City and County of San Francisco, the Ninth Circuit emphasized that generalized claims of improved service are not enough. Providers must present specific technical evidence demonstrating a true coverage gap.

Application to the Proposed Facility at 725 5th Street

Before such a facility can be approved so close to residential homes, federal telecommunications law requires the applicant to demonstrate:

A significant gap in wireless service exists, and

The proposed facility represents the least intrusive means of closing that gap.

It remains unclear whether the applicant has provided sufficient technical evidence demonstrating:

- The existence of a significant coverage gap in the surrounding area
- That co location on existing infrastructure has been fully evaluated
- That placement in nearby commercial or industrial areas is infeasible
- That smaller distributed antenna systems could address the alleged service needs

Without such evidence, approval of the proposed facility would be inconsistent with Ninth Circuit legal standards.

Compatibility With Local Land Use Authority

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 expressly preserves local authority to regulate the placement and appearance of wireless facilities.

Courts consistently affirm that local governments may deny wireless facilities based on legitimate land use concerns when the applicant fails to satisfy the two part legal test.

See:

- Sprint PCS Assets LLC v. City of Palos Verdes Estates (9th Cir. 2009)**

If the applicant cannot demonstrate both a significant service gap and the least intrusive means, the City may lawfully deny the application based on:

- Zoning compatibility**
- Aesthetic impacts**
- Neighborhood character**

2. CEQA Prohibits Use of a Categorical Exemption When Unusual Circumstances Exist

The City proposes to rely on a categorical exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(c) prohibits categorical exemptions when:

“Unusual circumstances create a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment.”

The California Supreme Court held in:

- Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley (2015)**

that when substantial evidence shows unusual circumstances may cause environmental impacts, a categorical exemption cannot be used and environmental review is required.

The proposed project includes several unusual circumstances:

- **A 588.5 square foot telecommunications compound**
- **Placement 7 feet from residential dwellings**
- **A tower approximately 40 feet above ground level**
- **Location in a mixed use residential coastal neighborhood**

These factors create a reasonable possibility of significant visual and land use impacts, requiring CEQA review.

3. Aesthetic and Visual Impacts Are Recognized Environmental Effects
CEQA specifically recognizes aesthetic impacts as environmental impacts.

CEQA requires analysis of impacts on:

- **Scenic vistas**
- **Visual character**
- **Neighborhood aesthetics**

See:

- **CEQA Guidelines Section 15125**
- **CEQA Appendix G**

California courts have repeatedly held that visual impacts alone can trigger CEQA review.

See:

- **Pocket Protectors v. City of Sacramento (2004)**
- **Ocean View Estates Homeowners Assn. v. Montecito Water District (2004)**

A 40 foot telecommunications tower in a coastal residential neighborhood presents exactly the type of visual impact CEQA requires agencies to analyze.

4. Local Governments Retain Authority Over Wireless Facility Location and

Aesthetics

Federal law preserves local zoning authority over wireless facilities.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. Section 332(c)(7)) states that local governments retain authority over:

- **Placement**
- **Construction**
- **Zoning compatibility**
- **Aesthetic impacts**

Courts consistently uphold local denials based on visual and neighborhood compatibility concerns.

Example:

- **Sprint PCS Assets v. City of Palos Verdes Estates (9th Cir. 2009)**

Thus, the City retains discretion to deny facilities that conflict with neighborhood character.

5. Local Zoning Height Limits Must Be Enforced

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code generally limits building height to approximately 30 feet in residential and mixed use zones.

If the proposed wireless facility extends 10 feet above the roofline, the structure would effectively exceed the permitted height limits.

Courts consistently uphold enforcement of local zoning standards against telecommunications providers.

See:

- **MetroPCS v. City and County of San Francisco (9th Cir. 2005)**

Local governments may enforce:

- **Height limits**

- Zoning compatibility
- Development standards

when reviewing wireless facility permits.

6. Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Limits Height Variances for Antenna Equipment

Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.46.210 allows limited exceptions for antennas.

Height increases above zoning limits are allowed only when:

- The surface area exceeding the height limit does not exceed 12 square feet, and
- The device does not exceed 15 feet above the building height limit

The proposed telecommunications compound is approximately 588.5 square feet, vastly exceeding the 12 square foot allowance.

Therefore the proposed installation does not qualify for the antenna height variance allowed under the code.

7. Accessory Equipment Must Comply With Zoning Development Standards Under Hermosa Beach Municipal Code Section 17.40.170, wireless communications equipment must:

- Be located within a building, enclosure, or underground vault
- Comply with development standards of the zoning district

Wireless equipment cannot bypass:

- Height limits
- Development standards
- Compatibility requirements

The proposed rooftop telecommunications compound appears inconsistent with these standards.

8. Cities May Require Evaluation of Less Intrusive Alternatives

Courts allow cities to require telecommunications providers to demonstrate that less intrusive alternatives are not feasible.

See:

- **T-Mobile USA v. City of Anacortes (9th Cir. 2009)**

Cities may require evaluation of:

- **Co location on existing towers**
- **Placement in commercial or industrial zones**
- **Alternative designs**

If feasible alternatives exist, denial of the proposed site is lawful.

9. Coastal Communities Have Additional Visual Protection Obligations

Hermosa Beach lies within the California Coastal Zone.

The California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code Section 30251) requires development to:

- **Protect coastal visual resources**
- **Preserve scenic character**
- **Minimize visual impacts**

A highly visible telecommunications tower in a residential coastal neighborhood raises legitimate Coastal Act concerns.