

From: Jessica Mills [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2026 7:41 PM
To: Planning <Planning@hermosabeach.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Verizon Wireless Facility Application – 725 5th Street, Hermosa Beach

You 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 to formally oppose the proposed Verizon Wireless telecommunications facility at 725 5th Street. While I recognize the need for reliable wireless infrastructure, this application raises serious unresolved questions regarding structural integrity, public health, and neighborhood safety.

1. ABSENCE OF STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

No independent structural analysis has been submitted. Any rooftop installation of this scale — antenna arrays, equipment cabinets, cable conduits, and mounting hardware — adds significant dead load and wind-induced dynamic loads to the structure. The Commission should require a full structural engineering design stamped by a licensed California structural engineer confirming the building can safely bear these loads.

2. SEISMIC / EARTHQUAKE COMPLIANCE

The age and construction history of 725 5th Street are unclear. The building may predate modern seismic codes, and retrofitting it to accommodate this equipment could trigger a mandatory seismic upgrade. The Commission should require verification through the City's Building & Safety Division of the building's permit history and any outstanding retrofit orders.

3. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — ASBESTOS, LEAD PAINT, AND OTHER TOXINS

Any construction or retrofit work risks disturbing asbestos, lead paint, and other toxins common in older buildings. This is not hypothetical — our neighborhood has many families with small children who could be exposed to airborne fibers and dust. A Hazardous Materials Survey, Abatement Plan, air quality monitoring, and neighbor notification must be required before any work begins.

Before this application is approved, I urge the Commission to require: a structural engineering report; verification of seismic compliance and permit history through Building & Safety; and a Hazardous Materials Survey and Abatement Plan with air quality monitoring and neighbor notification.

The safety of this neighborhood — including the many children who live and play nearby — must take precedence. I respectfully ask the Commission to table this matter until all concerns have been fully addressed.

Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

Sincerely,

Jessica Mills
[REDACTED]

From: R Rocchio [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 3:42 PM
To: citiclerk@hermosabeach.gov; Planning Commission <Planningcommission@hermosabeach.gov>
Subject: Technical Public Comment Opposing CUP25-04 – Verizon Wireless Facility at 725 5th Street

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 site 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 structure
- Antennas and associated mechanical infrastructure
- Increased visual bulk on rooftops that were not designed to accommodate such installation

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,

Rose Rocchio

[Redacted signature block]

--

Rose Rocchio