From: Tind Shepper Ryen <tsryen@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 9:40 PM

**To:** Preservation < Preservation@alexandriava.gov>

**Cc:** mark.s.mahar@gmail.com; Jessica Palmer Ryen <avarael@gmail.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL]BAR #2020-00063

Dear Board of Architectural Review and Board Staff:

We are writing to express our opposition to Docket #10, BAR #2020-00063 to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations (5G small cell facility) at 421 N Fayette as currently structured.

We are the owners of 417 N. Fayette St. Our house has several windows and two decks directly facing the utility pole slated for replacement in the application. While we understand and support the need for 5G cellular equipment for commercial and public safety benefits, we have significant concerns regarding the site selection and errors in the Board's staff recommendation concerning this application.

First, publicly available documents provide no information on site selection or the consideration of alternatives. There appear to be numerous other options in close proximity that would have reduced impacts on residents and the right-of-way, including taller commercial properties outside of the Parker-Gray historic district or the adjacent utility poles at the corner of Fayette and Oronoco that have a larger space to accommodate further construction. More generally, the city (and Board where applicable) should work closely with providers to ensure that site selection for a 5G network meets technical, aesthetic, and social needs. We are concerned that utilities' interest in choosing the cheapest siting option are overwhelming resident and city interests.

Second, in recommending approval for this certificate, Board staff appear to have overlooked several key points. The review fails to disclose that the total increase in pole height from last year would be over the 10 foot limit that requires a special use permit. As part of the Fayette Streetscape project, taller poles were just installed within the past year. The proposed replacement would add another 8 feet to the new pole height. Also, since poles come in standard 10' increments, an even greater increase is possible should they not be buried sufficiently, a challenge given the limited space available in the current site proposal. Further, the review states that no tree or tree roots will be affected. Had staff visited the site instead of using outdated photos of the area, they would know that as part of the Streetscape project, the city paid for and planted a tree near the current pole. As the current pole, a residential water line, and the new tree are all within approximately 8-10 feet, it is difficult to see how a replacement pole could be installed as proposed without killing or maiming the new tree or moving water lines.

Finally, we also note that Board staff have not responded to our emailed request on March 6th asking for further information on the "Small Cell Policy" described in agenda versions for the March 18th meeting as either up for discussion, or alternately, for amendment.

Regards, Tind Shepper and Jessica Ryen