

From: [Alexis Jenkins](#)
To: [Board Of Supervisors](#)
Cc: [COB Staff](#); [Justin Cummings](#); [Trina Barton](#); [Andy Schiffrin](#); [Sandy Brown](#); [Jamie Sehorn](#); [Manu Koenig](#); [Felipe Hernandez](#); [Ramon Gomez](#); [Maria Orozco](#); [Rae Spencer-Hill](#); [Fifth District](#); [Monica Martinez](#); [Megan Renfrew](#); [Jesseka Rodriguez](#); [Kimberly De Serpa](#); [Maureen McCarty](#); [Regina Kelbert](#)
Subject: Agenda item #10-6/10/25-Board of Supervisors regular Meeting re: tower Summit Drive
Date: Monday, June 9, 2025 11:49:05 AM

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

From: Alexis Jenkins <ajglitter@comcast.net>
Date: June 7, 2025 at 1:55:35 PM PDT
To: BoardOfSupervisors@santacruzcountycalifornia.gov
Subject: Tower request for 186 Summit Drive

To Board of Supervisors:

I live on 219 Summit Drive, Santa Cruz and I can see 186 Summit Drive from my deck. I am opposed to building a new and taller cell tower disguised as a tree. The 186 Summit Drive property owners agreed, decades ago, to keep the height of any equipment on their property below 70 feet. It is in the county records. My husband and I signed off on the neighborhood request. Why was this not explained (or was it ignored) to the CTI, the new owners?

In addition to this previous agreement, here are my reasons for opposition:

1. I have learned that the huge tower planned is not an effective solution for the cell service that people desire as it is outdated as far as the technology for this type of terrain.
2. Summit Drive is RR and has small parcels. The manner in which homes are set up means that the tower will be smack dab in the middle of both the upper and lower parts of Summit Drive impacting many homes in negative ways including lowering property values, noise, and visual unattractiveness. We would get a close up view of the tower disguised as a fake tree.

The lot size of 186 does not appear large enough to protect nearby homes or the road if the tower falls in an earthquake or other weather event. We need road access for first responders. What comes with our high elevation is more extreme weather including high winds.

This tower would require multiple noisy generators that legally need to be turned on and tested regularly. The reason I say multiple generators is that CTI plans to rent space to others and every other

will need a generator. This information came from a meeting with CTI.

3. I believe that CTI bought this property a number of years ago hoping to profit both from cell service providers (AT&T) and from rental fees from those renting tower space. Since their purchase of 186 Summit, times and technology have changed. Their hopes to provide a large swath of cell service is not realistic and many more Bonny Doon neighbors can get cell service provided by updated technology that doesn't negatively impact a neighborhood that is still trying to recover from the CZU fire.

4. An additional point of concern is that the owners have neglected property upkeep and do not contribute to road maintenance. We are concerned about another fire in addition to the aesthetics.

Thanks you for considering my concerns. Please do not approve of this tower.

Sincerely,

Alexis Jenkins