

**From:** [Sarah Rathbone](#)  
**To:** [PER Meetings](#)  
**Cc:** [Jason Frantz](#)  
**Subject:** Design Review Board on 8/11/26 - Goleta AT&T Wireless Facility  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 29, 2026 9:43:20 AM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

**To:** Goleta Planning Commission  
**Re:** Proposed AT&T Cell Tower Near San Napoli Drive

Dear Members of the Goleta Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed AT&T cell tower in its currently proposed location near the homes on and around San Napoli Drive.

I understand the importance of reliable wireless service and recognize that cell towers are an essential part of modern infrastructure. My concern is not with the need for improved communication services, but rather with placing this facility in such close proximity to an established residential neighborhood when other locations may be available.

The proposed site raises several concerns:

- **Neighborhood compatibility.** A cell tower of this size is not consistent with the character of our residential community. Its visual presence would permanently alter the neighborhood and negatively affect the enjoyment of nearby homes.
- **Property values.** While individual market impacts can vary, the perception of living immediately adjacent to a large telecommunications facility may make nearby homes less desirable to prospective buyers. For many families, their home is their largest financial investment, and this proposal has the potential to diminish that investment.
- **Proximity to homes.** Even if the facility complies with all applicable regulations, I question whether it is appropriate to place this type of infrastructure so close to residences. I respectfully ask the Commission to carefully evaluate whether the project can be relocated to a site farther from homes while still meeting AT&T's coverage objectives.

- **Prudent planning.** Good planning seeks to balance infrastructure needs with the quality of life of existing residents. When reasonable alternative locations exist, those that minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods should be given preference.

I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. Deny the project at its currently proposed location, or
2. Require AT&T to conduct a thorough evaluation of alternative sites that are farther from homes and have fewer impacts on surrounding residents.

I also encourage the Commission to visit the neighborhood from the perspective of the affected homes and streets before making a decision. Standing in the neighborhood provides a much clearer understanding of the visual and community impacts than site plans alone.

I appreciate the difficult task of balancing community needs with infrastructure improvements. I respectfully ask that you protect the character of our neighborhood and require that this facility be placed in a location that minimizes impacts on nearby residents.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Sarah Rathbone

**From:** [Cara Goldsworthy](#)  
**To:** [Travis Lee](#); [PER Meetings](#)  
**Cc:** [Josh Goldsworthy](#)  
**Subject:** Request for Planning Commission Review of Code Compliance - AT&T Tower  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 4, 2026 8:55:12 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

My name is Cara Goldsworthy, and I am submitting this comment jointly with my husband, Josh Goldsworthy. Our family lives at 7614 Pine Tree Place, approximately 0.4 miles from the proposed AT&T tower at 290 Ellwood Canyon Road (Project Nos. 26-001-CUP and 26-0006-DRB).

My husband and I grew up in this neighborhood, and now our children do too. We care deeply about preserving the character of our community and ensuring that new development complies with the City's adopted codes.

We respectfully ask the City to evaluate and address all applicable code requirements before, or at the August 11 public hearing. **The proposed 50-foot tower exceeds the 35-foot agricultural height limit. If AT&T is claiming a coverage gap, has it demonstrated that gap with objective data, and have lower-profile or alternative locations on the property been fully evaluated?** Because **Cathedral Oaks is a designated scenic corridor, we also ask that visual impacts and alternative sites be carefully considered.**

Finally, Goleta is not a "water tower town." If this project is approved, we encourage the City to require a concealment design that better reflects the character of our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cara and Josh Goldsworthy

**From:** [Zachary Ingram](#)  
**To:** [PER Meetings](#)  
**Cc:** [Travis Lee](#)  
**Subject:** AT&T Wireless Facility 26-0001-CUP and 26-0006-DRB  
**Date:** Friday, August 7, 2026 1:14:10 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, I am concerned about the AT&T tower proposed just yards from Cathedral Oaks Road, a Scenic Corridor, seated on historic land that the city has already felt worth protecting once before in 2021 and 2022. Thank you for this work!

Before anything is approved, please ask for evidence that AT&T has done complete due diligence and that this location genuinely has the least impact. A disguised 35' tower so close to Cathedral Oaks is already out of character for Goleta, and AT&T is apparently demanding 50 feet... Thankfully we are not without options.

- Please ask AT&T prove this is an actual coverage gap, not just a capacity gap; legally very different. I'd like to see the coverage study: drive-test data, dropped-call locations, etc. so we can verify the claim ourselves rather than take their word for it. I'd be happy to participate in the verification study if that is helpful.
- If only a small area is identified as having a "coverage gap", do not let AT&T use it as an excuse to build out bigger infrastructure. This can be addressed with smaller, safer (non-fire hazard) localized tower(s).
- I've lived in this neighborhood my whole life and can attest to other carriers having better coverage than AT&T. Co-location should be a viable option.
- Have other property owners been contacted? Can we see evidence of this? There are plenty of better hills in the area further from Cathedral Oaks.

Thank you for your time and continued hard work in upholding our wonderful small town look and feel! It is truly an important job during a time where much of our town is under development. You are greatly appreciated.

Please contact me if you have any questions or have answers to these questions. Again, I am an engineer by profession, and willing to help in any capacity if volunteers are needed.