glendale california
City of Glendale
Community Development
Planning & Neighborhood Services

633 E. Broadway, Room 103
Glendale, CA 91206-4311
Tel 818.548.2140 Tel 818.548.2115
Fax 818.240.0392 ci.glendale.ca.us

July 20, 2016

Jerry Ambrose
Eukon Groups for AT&T Mobility
3905 State Street, #7-188
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

RE: 4700 DUNSMORE AVENUE
WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY - CASE NO. PWTF 1523946

Dear Mr. Ambrose:

The Planning Commission of the City of Glendale, at its meeting held on June 15, 2016, conducted a public hearing on a Wireless Telecommunication Facility Permit (Case No. PWTF 1523946), for a proposed Wireless Telecommunication Facility Permit to install and operate a new unmanned wireless telecommunication facility with a 60-foot high antenna support structure disguised as a pine tree ("monopine") and ancillary pre-fabricated equipment building located at **4700 Dunsmore Avenue**, in the "SR" - (Special Recreation) Zone, described as Lot 5, Block "B", Glendale Valley View Tract, in the City of Glendale, County of Los Angeles.

After thorough consideration of the statements contained in the application, the plans submitted therewith, the report by the Community Development Department staff thereon, and the statements made at the public hearing with respect to this application, the Planning Commission **DENIED** the case and **CONTINUED** it to July 20, 2016, for staff to make the findings for denial. The Planning Commission, at its meeting held on July 20, 2016, adopted the findings for denial.

CODE REQUIRES

The Planning Commission shall review a Class 6 wireless telecommunication facility in the "SR" - (Special Recreation) Zone.

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting to install and operate an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility with antennas and equipment at the southeast corner of Dunsmore Park. The proposed facility would consist of a 60-foot high support structure disguised as a pine tree with 12, 8-foot antennas, split within three sectors, four antennas per sector; 24 RRUs, and an 11-foot by 21-foot ancillary equipment /generator building within an approximate 600 square foot leased/fenced premise.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION
Categorical exemption – Existing Facility Class 1: Alteration or negligible expansion of an existing use.

A motion adopted by the Planning Commission is attached.

Should you have any questions regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to contact the case planner, Kathy Duarte, at (818) 937-8163 or kduarte@glendaleca.gov.

Sincerely,
Philip Lanzafame
Director of Community Development

Kathy Duarte
Planner

KD:sm

CC: City Clerk (K.Cruz); Police Dept. (Lt.S.Bickle/Z.Avila); City Attorney's Dept. (G. van Muyden/Y.Neukian); Fire Prevention Engineering Section-(J.Halpert); Dir. Of Public Works (R.Golanian); Traffic & Transportation Section (W. Ko/S. Vartanian); General Manager for Glendale Water and Power (S.Zurn); Glendale Water & Power--Water Section (G. Tom/S. Boghosian); Glendale Water & Power--Electric Section (V. Avedian/B. Ortiz); Parks, Recreation and Community Services Dept. (T. Aleksanian/Coco Panossian); Neighborhood Services Division (J.Brownell); Integrated Waste Management Admin. (D. Hartwell); Maintenance Services Section Admin. (D. Hardgrove); Street and Field Services Admin.; Environmental Management (M. Oillataguerra); Arnold Gordon –Wireless System Supervisor; all who spoke at the hearing and sent emails; and case planner –Kathy Duarte

MOTION

Moved by Planning Commissioner Astorian, seconded by Planning Commissioner Shahbazian, that upon review and consideration of all materials and exhibits of current record relative to Wireless Telecommunication Facility Case No. PWTF 1523946, located at **4700 Dunsmore Avenue**, and after having conducted a hearing on said matter, that the Planning Commission hereby **DENIES** said Wireless Telecommunication Facility Case No. PWTF 1523946 in accord with the findings set forth below:

Pursuant to Section 30.48.040 of the Glendale Municipal Code, a Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Permits may be granted by the reviewing authority only if all of the following findings are made:

(1) ***Required Finding 1: To the maximum extent reasonably feasible, the proposed wireless telecommunications facility has been designed to achieve compatibility with the community.***

This finding cannot be met. The proposed wireless telecommunications facility has not been designed to achieve compatibility with the community.

The proposed 60 foot tall mono pine antenna and equipment has not been designed on the site to achieve community compatibility because it is located in a heavily used area of the park and would impede recreational uses, take away open space, and possibly impact protected trees. The proposed monopine is located adjacent to the southeast corner of the baseball field on a flat area, noted by the community as the flattest area in the park outside the baseball field. The flat area is part of a main walking and running loop for the park and is at the top of a hill that is used for "sliding" (sliding down the hill on cardboard boxes). This corner area is where families picnic and people sit to watch baseball games or their children at various summer camps. Taking away these resources would be incompatible with Policy 2 of the Open Space and Conservation Element to "provide a variety of outdoor recreational opportunities to all residents." There are existing Sycamore trees, the roots of which may be impacted by the construction. These trees are protected by the City of Glendale.

Additionally, the wireless telecommunications facility is out of context and incompatible with the existing single family residential neighborhood and schools within the vicinity and is in conflict with North Glendale's Vision statement, as noted in the North Glendale Community Plan as follows:

"We value and embrace a rural suburban lifestyle which allows us to live and work close to nature, offers unique and varied neighborhood-based shopping

opportunities, quality schools, a variety of recreational opportunities and recognizes our connection to the mountains, neighboring communities, and our history. We seek to protect open space, advocate sustainable development, preserve and enhance neighborhood character, provide transportation options and balance land uses."

(2) ***Required Finding 2: Alternative configurations will not increase community compatibility or are not reasonably feasible.***

This finding cannot be met. It cannot be said that there are not available alternative configurations within this site that may increase community compatibility and may be feasible. Other configurations should be explored that would not take away outdoor recreational opportunities and not effect protected trees, as noted above.

(3) ***Required Finding 3: Alternative locations on the site will not increase community compatibility or are not reasonably feasible.***

This finding cannot be met. It cannot be said that alternative locations within this site will not increase community compatibility. An alternative location in the park may not lead to a loss in outdoor recreational opportunities and may not effect protected trees, as noted above..

As noted in the Alternative Site Analysis, the applicant was unable to obtain permission to locate the wireless telecommunication facility at the surrounding schools (Valley View Elementary School and Clark Magnet High School), as well as the Crescenta Valley Water District water tank on Cloud Avenue. The Cloud Water Tank was pursued by AT&T as the "primary" candidate location, but due to opposition from the Crescenta Valley Town Council, neighbors, and the Boards of Supervisors, the applicant withdrew their conditional use permit application. Nevertheless, there was no evidence in the record that alternative locations on the site (another location at the park) were explored that would increase community compatibility. Since this option is not infeasible and seems reasonably feasible, it should be explored.

(4) ***Required Finding 4: The location of the wireless telecommunications facility on alternative sites will not increase community compatibility or is not reasonably feasible.***

This finding can be met. An alternative site location may increase community compatibility. However, the applicant stated that alternative site locations were investigated before selecting the proposed site (to fill a gap in coverage within the network of other providers), but were not viable. The applicant noted in the Alternative Site Analysis, all of the

alternative sites are either on smaller properties in residential zones, technically infeasible, and/or have property owners that are not interested in leasing space to AT&T. The seven sites investigated included: Crescenta Valley Water District water tank at Cloud Avenue, Valley View Elementary School, Clark Magnet High School, Crescenta Valley Water District water tank on Markridge Road, Pinnacle Village Church, St. James Catholic Church, and Center for Spiritual Living. Comments from the City's Wireless Administrator for Information Services, Tom Arnold, stated that the proposed site is necessary to fill a significant gap in coverage consistent with the ordinance for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Permits.

(5) ***Required Finding 5: The facility is necessary to close a significant gap in coverage.***

This finding can be met. The purpose of the proposed installation is to close a significant gap in coverage within the residential area generally between Dunsmore and Pennsylvania Avenues north of the Foothill Boulevard commercial areas. This area includes portions of the City of Glendale and unincorporated La Crescenta. The applicant identified on the RF propagation maps that this area has unreliable coverage for AT&T customers, noting that there is limited service in some of the surrounding area, but the strength of the signal is inadequate to meet customer demand. Comments from the City's Wireless Administrator for Information Services, Gordon Arnold, stated that the proposed site is necessary to fill a significant gap in coverage consistent with the ordinance for Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Permits.

(6) ***Required Finding 6: The applicant has submitted a statement of its willingness to allow other carriers to co-locate on the proposed wireless telecommunications facility wherever technically and economically feasible and where co-location would not harm community compatibility.***

This finding can be met. The applicant submitted a statement of its willingness to allow other carriers to co-locate on the proposed wireless telecommunications facility, whenever technically and economically feasible and where co-location would not harm community compatibility.

(7) ***Required Finding 7: Noise generated by equipment will not be unnecessary, excessive, annoying nor be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.***

This finding can be met. The applicant has stated that there will not be any noise generated on a daily basis. However, if there is a power outage,

the emergency backup generator may operate temporarily in order to guarantee that service (including emergency 911 services) is able to continue. Additionally, the generator is contained within noise-suppressing housing, limiting the noise audible to the surrounding neighborhood.

(8) Required Finding 8: The facility complies with all of the requirements of state and federal laws, regulations and orders.

This finding can be met. The applicant stated that the proposed facility will meet all of the requirements of state and federal laws, regulations and orders.