

**From:** [Duggan, Scarlet](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: PA25-0072 Public Hearing December 4, 2025  
**Date:** Monday, December 1, 2025 10:51:06 AM

---

Hi Young Family,

We have received your email below. Please note that your email will be provided to the Zoning Administrator as it relates to the public hearing of PA25-0072.

Thank you,

*Scarlet Duggan, Land Use Manager*  
OC Public Works | Development Services  
601 N. Ross Street, Santa Ana, CA 92701 | (714) 667-1606



---

**From:** K. Young [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 30, 2025 9:45 PM  
**To:** Duggan, Scarlet <[scarlet.duggan@ocpw.ocgov.com](mailto:scarlet.duggan@ocpw.ocgov.com)>  
**Subject:** PA25-0072 Public Hearing December 4, 2025

**Attention:** This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

November 30, 2025

Zoning Commission / Planning Department

[scarlet.duggan@ocpw.ocgov.com](mailto:scarlet.duggan@ocpw.ocgov.com)

OC Development Services Planning

601 N. Ross Street, Santa Ana, CA 9270

Re: PA25-0072 Public Hearing December 4, 2025 at 1:30 PM

Orange County Center, 425 W. Santa Ana Boulevard, Santa Ana, CA

To Express Opposition to proposed Verizon Wireless and AT&T communications facilities at Pelican Hill Golf Course

Dear Members of the Zoning Commission:

We have lived at [REDACTED] for 32 years. Now, **100 feet** from our home, cell towers are proposed to be built which would expose us to strong microwave and 5G radiation, 24 hours a day. We firmly **oppose** the placement of cell towers near our home and near our neighborhood playground.

In October 2025, the International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF) [<https://icbe-emf.org/>], published a review of the the evidence about risks of exposure to non-ionizing radiation. This review provides an expert perspective summarizing evidence from a series of systematic reviews and meta-analyses commissioned by the World Health Organization to study cancer, electromagnetic hypersensitivity, cognitive impairment, birth outcomes, male fertility, oxidative stress, and heat-related effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields [RF-EMF] [Melnick RL et al. International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF). The WHO-commissioned systematic reviews on health effects of radiofrequency radiation provide no assurance of safety. *Environ Health*. 2025 Oct 2;24(1):70. doi: 10.1186/s12940-025-01220-4. PMID: 41034851; PMCID: PMC12490090]. The review concludes that "report of harmful effects (e.g., cancer, reproductive toxicity, etc.) at doses below the adverse health effect threshold claimed by ICNIRP demonstrates that current exposure limits to RF-EMF, which were established by applying arbitrary uncertainty factors to their putative adverse threshold dose, lack scientific credibility." While this does not prove that radiofrequency exposure damages human health, it does demonstrate: (1) that the risks of chronic radio-frequency are not completely understood; (2) that essential research in universities around the world continues and is gaining increasing attention; and (3) that radiofrequency exposures below current regulatory limits may carry significant risk.

Given that the public health implications of microwave and 5G transmission networks remain incompletely understood, ethical public planning demands that transmission towers be sited so as to minimize the exposure of the public. This means minimizing the radio-frequency intensity to which members of the public are exposed, the number of people exposed, and the fraction of time during which those people are exposed.

And these **health issues** become more concerning at higher frequencies. The proposed towers would be transmitting at the highest radio frequencies that are widely used in terrestrial telecommunications: those of 5G and microwaves. For this reason, it is essential that the proposed antennae be located as far as possible from residential homes and neighborhoods where people spend most of their lives.

Golf courses have a very low average occupancy per square foot - much lower than in residential neighborhoods. Workers and golfers are on the course a much smaller fraction of time than residents are in their homes. Risk depends on intensity, frequency, time, and number of people exposed. The currently-proposed site, which minimizes the exposure of a small number of golfers and workers by maximizing the exposure of nearby residents is certainly unethical.

Because there are real concerns about the safety and visual impacts of such transmission towers, placing them near residential homes decreases the **property value** of those homes. We hope that the Zoning and Planning Commission will ensure that a proposed new use of one property, for the benefit of the owner of that property, does not unfairly impact the owners and residents of adjacent and nearby properties. Since the transmission towers will directly benefit the owners of the golf course far more than the neighborhood, fairness demands that the transmission towers be sited as far back as possible from homes and playgrounds.

In addition, there are **traffic dangers** to children playing catch, hopscotch, tag, etc. in the park and the adjacent driveway, which cell phone maintenance trucks will need to use on a regular basis. Far beyond a nuisance, this is a threat to our grandchildren and all children in the

neighborhood.

Since our neighborhood is in the **highest fire risk zone**, we have hardened our home against wildfires. However, Cameo Highlands has only one entrance and exit. If a fire were to break out among the batteries, fuel tanks, or generators on the site, firefighters would be using the same roads to access the fire as residents would be using to evacuate the neighborhood. If a wildfire were to break out elsewhere and approach the concentrated fuel on the site, the same problem would arise. If the towers were built on the golf course maintenance yard, which is easily accessible from the PCH, the entire community would be safer.

The proposed cell towers placement should be **denied** and the companies should be encouraged to select a site much further away from homes and children's playgrounds. The impact on our views, health, our well-being and our property values is very large. It would be easy to place these towers on the golf course in a much more suitable location.

Katharine S. Young

Robert R. Young, M.D. [REDACTED]

Nicholas Young, B.S.Ch.E.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.