3304 Carpenter Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20020
July 26, 2001

Board of Zoning and Adjustment (BZA)
Case No. 16753
Cell Tower Penn Branch Center
441 4th Street N.W., Suite 210 South
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Board Members:

The purpose of this letter is register serious objections to the proposed exception to Section 212.2 of the D.C. Zoning Regulations to permit the installation of a 125 to 150 feet high monopole antenna on the premises of the Penn Branch Shopping Center (Specifically Lot 840, Square 5539, Zoning District R-1-B). My comments are as follows:

- We are advised that most, if not all, the 34 churches within the local ANC(7B) boundaries are already equipped with monopole antennas. We understand that twenty of the churches have at least two antennas, while twelve have four apiece. This means that there are more than 75 monopole antennas in our geographic residential area. Why is there a need for more? If there is a burning need for more why not put them in the 20 churches that have only two monopoles each? Why not the inside the shopping center?

- My cellular phone reception is very good in the Penn-Branch area. I rarely drop a call. Also, many residents of the area do not need to use cell phones to make calls because they call from their homes via hard wire. So the proposed monopole would fill no overriding requirement to meet the needs of the residents in the area. Again, if

BZA
Case No. 16753
Exhibit No. 27

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16753
EXHIBIT NO.27

there is a additional need why not add antennas to those churches that might be willing host them. What about other structures ? What about schools serving as antenna hosts or could that adversely impact teacher/student health?

◇ In connection with the last point, the matter of high levels of Radio Frequency -Microwave Radiation emitted by the antennas must be addressed. Certainly, those living in close proximity to the monopoles should be informed by competent District of Columbia government medical and scientific authorities what physical risks are attendant to this system.

◇ SBA Properties, Inc., the proposed contractor, in its FACT SHEET about the installation indicated that proposed location was selected after researching " ...every commercial location in the community...". This was done "...to determine if it could meet requisite technical and radio frequency requirements to eliminate the drop zones, i.e., areas where cell phone calls cannot be dependably made or received." Who in this community of property owners has expressed this concern? They go on to state that after detailed environmental and technical analyses "...engineers determined that the Penn-Branch Shopping Center provides the best site location **to meet the community's service needs and poses no environmental risk. "** (bold type added). Who made this determination as to what I or the community needs? Against what environmental standards was the determination made? What input have the service suppliers had in this process?

◇ SBA Properties, Inc. in the FACT SHEET states that where monopoles are located in Virginia property values have increased. Are these locations comparable to this area in current housing values? Why should this fine residential area be required to accept an

ugly pole towering over the residences and in effect being an negative, yet identifying landmark of the area. If it were to installed, one could direct strangers to Penn-Branch by telling them to guide on the ugly monopole antenna towering over the area.

This proposed exception to the zoning regulations should dismissed as unjustified since there is no technical need for this device in the Penn-Branch area; there are unknowns about the physical impacts of the operating system; questions exist about engineering and environmental aspects of the proposed system; and since the 125 to 150 feet high monopole antenna is ugly property values,including mine, will be adversely affected.

There is one basic question: Why should the residential property owners be forced to accept such an unwanted, ugly, unseeming device to accomodate commercial interests?

Very truly yours,

Richard J. Green