

From: [Siejen & Pete](#)
To: [Maria Gonzalez](#)
Subject: FORMAL OPPOSITION: Project File PLN2025-00235
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2026 9:24:52 AM
Attachments: [Stevenson - PLN2025-00235.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Maria,

Please see the enclosed letter expressing our opposition to Project File PLN2025-00235.

Thank you,
Siejen Yin & John P. Stevenson
10 Canepa Ct, Emerald Hills, CA 94062

Letter of Opposition

To: County of San Mateo Zoning Hearing Officer

From: Siejen Yin & John P. Stevenson, 10 Canepa Court, Emerald Hills, CA 94062

Date: May 7, 2026

Subject: FORMAL OPPOSITION: Project File PLN2025-00235

Location: Vicinity of 1888 Cordilleras Road, Emerald Hills

Hearing Date: May 7, 2026

To the Zoning Hearing Officer,

Our names are Siejen Yin and John P. Stevenson, and we have resided at 10 Canepa Court, Emerald Hills, CA 94062 for the last 4.5 years. Our home is located within 350 feet of the proposed site.

I am writing to formally request that the County **deny** Project PLN2025-00235. The application fails to meet the mandatory standards set forth in the **San Mateo County Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance (Code Title 8)**. The project should be rejected based on the following six points:

1. Violation of Residential Zoning Protections (Section 8.376.030.II.B)

County Code prohibits new wireless facilities in Residential (R) zones unless a "preponderance of evidence" proves no feasible alternative exists.

- The applicant failed to evaluate non-residential sites within the required 2.5-mile radius.
- The search was arbitrarily limited to Cordilleras Road.
- Commercial corridors, specifically **Edgewood Road**, were excluded without justification, rendering the "Alternatives Analysis" legally insufficient.

2. Violation of Height Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.I.2)

The ordinance limits antenna height in Residential districts to the lesser of 10% or 5 feet above the standard structure limit (28').

- **The Maximum Allowable Height:** 30'9".
- **The Proposal:** 35'11" (exceeding the limit by over 5 feet).
- The applicant has not demonstrated a technical necessity for this height to serve the immediate neighborhood; rather, it appears designed to service transit traffic on Edgewood Road at the expense of our residential zoning integrity.

3. Failure to Meet Mandatory Alternatives Analysis (Section 8.376.030.V.B.16)

An application is deemed incomplete if it does not demonstrate that no feasible sites exist outside of Residential districts. The applicant has provided no evidence that a "Least Intrusive Means"

test was applied. Because non-residential sites were not evaluated, the application should be deemed incomplete.

4. Adverse Visual Impact & Viewshed Obstruction (Section 8.376.030.II.E)

The ordinance mandates siting facilities outside the public viewshed to avoid visual blight.

- Adding 11' to the existing pole creates a significant massing increase to the existing pole.
- "Stealth" paint is an insufficient mitigation for the industrialization of a residential sanctuary.

5. Environmental Risks & Missing Performance Reports (Section 8.376.030.III.H)

The proposed pole is within one foot of a mature, healthy Magnolia tree. The applicant has failed to provide:

- A professional **Arborist Report** to ensure root system protection.
 - A **Grading Permit** evaluation is required.
- Without these, the project poses an unmitigated risk to our community's natural greenery.

6. Procedural Error: Submission of Incorrect & Inaccurate Data(Attachment H)

- The applicant originally submitted an RF report for an entirely different location. Providing incorrect technical data to the public is a violation of due process. Furthermore, while the current report shows radiation levels **3,330% beyond the MPE** at the antenna level, it fails to provide calculations for my home's specific elevation. This lack of precision is a failure to protect the public welfare under **Section 8.376.010.D**.

Conclusion

The applicant is seeking a series of exceptions that would effectively dismantle the protections of the Emerald Hills Residential district. This facility offers no emergency backup power or benefit to local residents, yet imposes significant aesthetic and safety burdens.

I urge the Zoning Hearing Officer to uphold the County Code and **deny** this permit.

Respectfully,

Siejen Yin & John P. Stevenson
10 Canepa Court
Emerald Hills, CA 94062

From: [Janine](#)
To: [Maria Gonzalez](#)
Subject: Re: Subject: VERBAL COMMENT:Formal Opposition to Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Facility – Project File PLN2025-0023
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2026 8:29:57 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Maria,

It's PLN2025-00235

Thanks!

On Thu, May 21, 2026, at 7:53 AM, Maria Gonzalez wrote:

Good morning, Janine!

Kindly let me know what is the Item # and PLN#? PLN2025-00234 or PLN2025-00235?

Thank you,



Maria Gonzalez
Administrative Secretary III

County of San Mateo
Planning & Building Department
455 County Center 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
650-383-0691
www.smcgov.org/planning

From: Janine <janinemj@fastmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2026 6:22 AM
To: Maria Gonzalez <mgonzalez1@smcgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Subject: VERBAL COMMENT:Formal Opposition to Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Facility – Project File PLN2025-0023

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello Tet Maria,

Attached and below are comments to be read verbally, at the May 21, 2026 Zoning Hearing (Project File PLN2025-0023).

Many thanks for your assistance,

Janine Jacobson

Hello,

Our home is located across the street and within 150 feet of the proposed installation. Due to the proposed height, we will have a direct line of sight from our primary living spaces to the new pole-mounted antenna. Additionally, health concerns for residents have been neglected and as the proposal stands, our neighborhood residents will be exposed to excessive radiation levels.

We respectfully request that you **deny approval** of this project.

Written comment was sent with full details shared ; here is a succinct outline of issues for verbal comments:

The application, as submitted, fails to meet the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities (Code of Ordinances Title 8) that states:

Wireless telecommunication facilities shall not be located in areas zoned Residential (R).

1. Violation of Development and Design Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.B)

2. Violation of Height Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.I2)
3. Failure to Provide Alternatives Analysis (Section 8.376.030.V.B.16)
4. Adverse Visual Impact & Viewshed Obstruction (Section 8.376.030.II.E)
5. Public Health, Safety, and Welfare (Section 8.376.010.D)
6. Environmental & Performance Concerns (Section 8.376.030.III.H)

Conclusion

The County has not updated wireless regulations since 2012, but the existing laws remain in effect to protect the character and safety of Emerald Hills.

This application relies on a series of exceptions that violate the core protections of our Residential (R) district.

I urge the Hearing Officer to uphold the San Mateo County Zoning Ordinances and **deny this application.**

Respectfully,

Janine and Grant Jacobson
1911 Cordilleras RD
Emerald Hills, CA

Attachments:

- ZHO 052126 Revised Agenda (003).pdf

Janine

Hello,

Our home is located across the street and within 150 feet of the proposed installation. Due to the proposed height, we will have a direct line of sight from our primary living spaces to the new pole-mounted antenna. Additionally, health concerns for residents have been neglected and as the proposal stands, our neighborhood residents will be exposed to excessive radiation levels.

We respectfully request that you **deny approval** of this project.

Written comment was sent with full details shared ; here is a succinct outline of issues for verbal comments:

The application, as submitted, fails to meet the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities (Code of Ordinances Title 8) that states:

Wireless telecommunication facilities shall not be located in areas zoned Residential (R).

- 1. Violation of Development and Design Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.B)**
- 2. Violation of Height Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.I2)**
- 3. Failure to Provide Alternatives Analysis (Section 8.376.030.V.B.16)**
- 4. Adverse Visual Impact & Viewshed Obstruction (Section 8.376.030.II.E)**
- 5. Public Health, Safety, and Welfare (Section 8.376.010.D)**
- 6. Environmental & Performance Concerns (Section 8.376.030.III.H)**

Conclusion

The County has not updated wireless regulations since 2012, but the existing laws remain in effect to protect the character and safety of Emerald Hills. This application relies on a series of exceptions that violate the core protections of our Residential (R) district.

I urge the Hearing Officer to uphold the San Mateo County Zoning Ordinances and **deny this application.**

Respectfully,

Janine and Grant Jacobson

1911 Cordilleras RD

Emerald Hills, CA

From: [Grant Jacobson](#)
To: [Maria Gonzalez](#)
Subject: Zoning Hearing - Comment on File PLN2025-00235
Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2026 10:30:30 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

To: County of San Mateo Zoning Hearing Officer

From: Grant and Janine Jacobson
1911 Cordilleras Rd
Emerald Hills, CA 94062

Date: May 5, 2026

Subject: Formal Opposition to Proposed Wireless Telecommunication Facility – **Project File PLN2025-00235**

Location: Near 1888 Cordilleras Road, Emerald Hills

Hello,

Our names are Grant and Janine Jacobson, and our family has lived at 1911 Cordilleras Rd since 2004, **22 years**. Our home is located across the street and within 150 feet of the proposed installation. Due to the proposed height, we will have a direct line of sight from our primary living spaces to the new pole-mounted antenna.

I respectfully request that you **deny approval** of this project.

The application, as submitted, fails to meet the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities (Code of Ordinances Title 8) that states:

Wireless telecommunication facilities shall not be located in areas zoned Residential (R).

1. Violation of Development and Design Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.B)

The applicant has failed to comply with this section of the code, which prohibits new wireless facilities in Residential (R) zones unless a preponderance of evidence proves no feasible alternative exists.

Despite the requirement to evaluate all sites within a *2.5-mile radius*, the applicant only submitted alternatives within the same residential zone on Cordilleras Road. ***The application provides no justification for the exclusion of non-residential sites, specifically those along Edgewood Road, which must be assessed to satisfy the ordinance's feasibility standards.***

2. Violation of Height Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.I2)

The ordinance states that in a Residential (R) district, no antenna shall exceed the maximum height for structures by 10% or 5 feet, whichever is less.

- **The Limit:** With a standard residential height limit of 28', the maximum allowable height is 30'9".
- **The Proposal:** This project reaches 35'11"—over 5 feet beyond the limit.
- **Technical Excess:** Under *GO95 standards*, the pole height could be reduced to 28'2" while maintaining safety clearances. The applicant is seeking excessive height not to serve the residents of Cordilleras Road, but to service transit traffic on Edgewood Road at the expense of our neighborhood's zoning integrity.

3. Failure to Provide Alternatives Analysis (Section 8.376.030.V.B.16)

The ordinance requires a **detailed alternatives analysis** demonstrating that no feasible sites exist **outside** of Residential (R) districts.

- The applicant failed this requirement. They only provided options within the residential district on Cordilleras Road.
- No evaluation was provided for non-residential sites, such as Edgewood Road.

The application is incomplete and should be rejected on this basis alone.

4. Adverse Visual Impact & Viewshed Obstruction (Section 8.376.030.II.E)

The ordinance mandates that facilities be sited outside of the public viewshed to avoid visual blight.

- Adding 11' to the existing pole places the antenna in the direct line of sight from our house.
- "Stealth" painting does not mitigate the substantial new massing of the structure, which creates a permanent industrial eyesore in a residential sanctuary and threatens our long-term property values.

5. Public Health, Safety, and Welfare (Section 8.376.010.D)

While the FCC limits local regulation of RF health effects, the County maintains authority over the **safety** and **welfare** of its residents.

- **Incorrect Data:** The applicant originally submitted an RF report for the *wrong location*. Providing incorrect data to the public undermines the entire due process of this hearing.
- **Missing Data:** The submitted report shows radiation levels 3,330% beyond the MPE at the antenna level yet provides no calculations for my home's specific elevation.
- **Lack of Benefit:** This facility offers ***no emergency backup power***, providing zero benefit to residents during power outages while imposing significant risks to a neighborhood filled with young children.

6. Environmental & Performance Concerns (Section 8.376.030.III.H)

There is no grading permit or arborist report included, despite the pole being sited within one foot of a healthy, established magnolia tree. Without a professional evaluation, this project risks destroying mature community greenery.

Conclusion

The County has not updated wireless regulations since 2012, but the existing laws remain in effect to protect the character and safety of Emerald Hills. This application relies on a series of exceptions that violate the core protections of our Residential (R) district.

I urge the Hearing Officer to uphold the San Mateo County Zoning Ordinances and **deny this application.**

Respectfully,

Grant and Janine Jacobson
1911 Cordilleras Rd
Emerald Hills, CA 94062

415-533-9748

<Letter to San Mateo Zoning Hearing Officer.docx>

From: [Allyson Fisch](#)
To: [Maria Gonzalez](#)
Subject: PLN2025-00235 public comment
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2026 4:49:45 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

To the San Mateo County Zoning Officer:

My name is Allyson Fisch. My family and I have lived at 26 Canepa Court in Emerald Hills for 22 years. I am writing to state my strong objection to the installation of AT&T's small cell wireless communications facility at 1888 Cordilleras Road (File Number PLN2025-00235). I was surprised to see this item on the agenda for May 21, 2026. At the hearing earlier in May when I spoke about my concerns, you advised that the issue would be addressed "next month" at the June meeting. This item was added to the agenda for May 21 well within the time limit for public comment, and the neighbors in this area were not notified that it would be discussed again today. This feels like an unethical attempt to pass this item without proper public notification, and the County's willingness to support it is disconcerting. There have been no changes to the proposed plan since I spoke about it earlier this month.

Our small court is directly across the street from the utility pole where the proposed project would be installed, and my home has some elevation above Cordilleras Road. If the new project is installed, it will be fully visible over my neighbors roof. I will be able to see it from my dining room, my kitchen and from my primary bedroom. The latest correspondence from the SM County Planning staff states that "existing trees and roadside vegetation would screen the facility". That is physically impossible as the pole is directly off the edge of Cordilleras Road and there is no vegetation that would hide the pole from the street view or from the houses across the street. In addition, it will be taller than the mature trees around it, making screening again impossible. This is an unacceptable decline in the aesthetics of our neighborhood.

In addition, the application for this project fails to comply with county code prohibiting new wireless facilities in Residential zones unless there is a preponderance of evidence that proves that no feasible alternative exists within a 2.5 mile radius. Planning staff recently responded that, since this pole is within the public right-of-way, there are different height allowances for this telecommunications equipment. While there may be one small sliver of public right-of-way land, the entire neighborhood is zoned as residential. Every pole that the applicant claims they evaluated and rejected was on Cordilleras Road. The applicant made no attempt to prove why there are no sites on Edgewood Road or other non-residential areas that could be used for this project.

I also have health and safety concerns about the project. There is a misconception that this will provide cellular service during a power outage or emergency. However, it does not have a backup battery and it will not work during a power outage. In addition, the initial radiofrequency report that was submitted was actually for the wrong location. However, it states that the installation will exceed the FCC limit for radiofrequency energy levels by 3330%. There are vulnerable people living close to the proposed location including infants and very frail elderly adults just across the street. As I understand it, there will be very alarming signage posted to alert the public to these excessive radiofrequency levels.

And finally, all of these issues culminate into one final point. Studies in real estate literature show that property values decrease when a cellular antenna is installed within a half mile of a property. In areas similar to Emerald Hills in California, this devaluation is likely somewhere between a 15-25%.

More than 90% of home buyers do not wish to look in an area close to a cellular antenna and the time that houses in these areas remain on the market is sometimes doubled and may require reductions in listing prices.

While I understand that the neighborhood would like more reliable cellular service, I do not feel that it is my or my neighbors' responsibility to shoulder the cost of that service when AT&T has not done the legally required legwork to comply with county codes. I should not have to take a hit in my property value, have risks to my health, or lose even an ounce of joy from the beauty around me so that AT&T can increase their profits. I strongly encourage you to reject this telecommunications project in our Residential neighborhood.

Thank you,
Allyson Fisch

From: [Paul Willis](#)
To: [Maria Gonzalez](#); [Bharat Singh](#); [Steve Monowitz](#); [Justin Mates](#); [SMC_SupMueller](#)
Subject: Re: PLN2025-00235
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2026 7:54:06 AM
Attachments: [Formal Opposition PLN2025-00235 1895 Cordilleras Road 05 07 2026.pdf](#)
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Good Morning Maria,

Our group just noticed the hearing was rescheduled today May 21 by looking on the website? We did not receive a new 10-day public notification.

From my understanding of the Brown Act

Under California's Brown Act, a public meeting cannot be legally "continued" or adjourned to a future date if the original session(**May 7**) lacked proper notice. The standard exemption allowing a meeting to be continued within 5 days without a new agenda (Gov. Code § 54954.2(b)(3)) only applies if the initial meeting was legally noticed in the first place.

Because the original notice was defective, any attempt to hold the continued meeting without a fresh notice is invalid and renders future actions voidable. To comply with the law, the agency must treat the upcoming meeting as a new session. Please ensure a full agenda is posted online and in a publicly accessible space at least 72 hours before a regular meeting, or 24 hours before a special meeting.

Also, under the Zoning Hearing files for today, if this item was properly continued from May 7 comments that you previously received from the residents regarding PLN2025-00235 should be posted.

Sincerely,

Paul Willis
1895 Cordilleras Road
Emerald Hills, CA 94062

From: Paul Willis

Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 5:22 PM

To: Maria Gonzalez <mgonzalez1@smcgov.org>; Bharat Singh <bsingh@smcgov.org>

Subject: PLN2025-00235

Maria,

Attached is our formal opposition letter requesting denial of the above subject project located at 1888 Cordilleras Road.

I will be present tomorrow during the public meeting to provide public comment.

Sincerely,

Paul Willis

1895 Cordilleras Road

Emerald Hills, CA 94062

To: County of San Mateo Zoning Hearing Officer

From: Paul Willis, 1895 Cordilleras Road, Emerald Hills, CA 94062

Date: May 7, 2026

Subject: **FORMAL OPPOSITION: Project File PLN2025-00235 (1888 Cordilleras Road)**

To the Zoning Hearing Officer,

Our family of 4 have lived at 1895 Cordilleras Road since 2006. Our home sits at an elevation approximately 70 feet from the proposed site, placing the antenna in the direct line of sight of our kitchen, dining room, and children's bedrooms. I am writing to formally request that the County **DENY Project PLN2025-00235** for failure to comply with **San Mateo County Ordinance Code Chapter 8.376 Wireless Telecommunications Facilities**.

The application must be rejected based on the following **six violations** of Title 8 - County Zoning and Development Regulations.

1. Failure to Prove Siting Necessity (Section 8.376.030.II.B)

Under County Code, new facilities in Residential (R) zones are permitted only if the applicant proves by a "**preponderance of evidence**" that no feasible alternative exists.

- The applicant's "Alternatives Analysis" is legally insufficient. They failed to evaluate non-residential sites within 2.5 miles of this site or along the Edgewood Road commercial corridor.
- By limiting their search ring exclusively to Cordilleras Road, they have failed to meet the "**Least Intrusive Means**" test required by law.

2. Violation of Height Limits (Section 8.376.030.II.I.2)

Section 8.376 strictly limits the height of wireless facilities in residential districts to the lesser of 10% or 5 feet above the maximum building height (28').

- **The Standard:** The maximum allowable height at this site is **30'9"**.
- **The Violation:** The proposal is **35'11"**.
- The applicant has provided no technical proof that a compliant height (under 31') would result in a significant gap in service for the Emerald Hills community.

3. Violation of Visual and Stealth Standards (Section 8.376.030.II.E)

The ordinance mandates that facilities be located to **minimize visual impact** and avoid the public viewshed where possible.

- Adding 11 feet to the existing pole creates significant industrial massing.
- **Technical Error:** The project plans (Attachment D) show redundant spacing. Per **GO95 Section V**, the proposed 3' gap in addition to 6' is unnecessary. GO95 Sec V. C.6 says spacing can be reduced to 4' (or even 2' as these are service drops to the 2 homes), but they have chosen to maximize height at the expense of our neighborhood's visual integrity.

4. Lack of Environmental Protection (Section 8.376.030.III.H)

The Code requires that facilities be installed in a manner that maintains the "natural greenery" of the County.

- The proposed pole is within 2 feet of a mature protected Magnolia tree.
- The applicant has failed to provide an **Arborist Report** or a **Grading Permit** evaluation to protect the root system. Approval without these documents violates the County's commitment to environmental preservation and complete permit requirements.

5. Procedural Errors and Inaccurate Data (Section 8.376.040.V.B)

A "complete application" requires accurate technical data. The applicant has failed this requirement twice:

- **Deceptive Renderings:** The rendering in Attachment E is mathematically flawed. When scaled, the image depicts a pole roughly 5 feet shorter than the actual engineering plan dimension, misleading the public regarding the project's visual impact.
- **MPE Inaccuracy:** The RF report, for the wrong pole, shows radiation levels **3,330% beyond the MPE** (Maximum Permissible Exposure) at the antenna but fails to provide data to adjacent homes. This is a failure to protect public welfare under **Section 8.376.010.D**.

6. Failure to Provide Emergency Infrastructure

While the applicant claims this facility is necessary for coverage, the plans show **no emergency backup power**. In a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" like Emerald Hills, a facility that offers no resiliency during a power shutoff (PSPS) provides no tangible benefit to the residents it purports to serve.

Conclusion

This application seeks to bypass the strict protections of **Chapter 8.376** for the convenience of the carrier. I urge the Zoning Hearing Officer to uphold the County Code and **deny the permit**.

Respectfully,

Paul Willis

CRAN_RSFR_PAPK1_05
NEAR 1888 CORDILLERAS RD
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062

EXISTING

PROPOSED



VIEW FROM CORDILLERAS RD LOOKING NORTHEAST AT SITE