



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead



Richard J. Bruckner
Director

January 11, 2016

TO: Stephanie Pincetti, Chair
Doug Smith, Vice Chair
David W. Louie, Commissioner
Curt Pedersen, Commissioner
Pat Modugno, Commissioner

FROM: Michele Bush *MRB*
Zoning Permits East Section

Project No. R2014-02389-(4) – Conditional Use Permit No. 201400111
RPC Meeting: January 20, 2016

The above-mentioned item is a request to authorize the construction and maintenance of a 50-foot-high unmanned monoecalyptus wireless telecommunications facility.

Please find enclosed a letter of opposition from the Rowland Heights Community Coordinating Council. The letter was received subsequent to hearing package submittal to the Regional Planning Commission.

If you need further information, please contact Michele Bush at (213) 974-6435 or mbush@planning.lacounty.gov. Department office hours are Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The Department is closed on Fridays.

MM:MRB

Enclosure



ROWLAND HEIGHTS COMMUNITY COORDINATING COUNCIL

"IMPROVING OUR COMMUNITY"

WWW.ROWLAND-HEIGHTS.ORG

P.O. Box 8171
Rowland Heights
California 91748

Email:
rhccc4RH@gmail.com

President
Ted Ebenkamp

First Vice President
Programs
Deborah Enos

Second Vice President
Membership
Roland Sanchez

Third Vice President
Community
Improvement
Henry Woo

Recording Secretary
DeAnn Joyce

Corresponding Secretary
David Koo

Treasurer
Carla Sanchez

Historian
Charles Liu

Past President
Kingdon Chew

January 9, 2016

Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission
320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90012
Email: zoningldcc@planning.lacounty.gov

Re: Project No. R2014-02389-(4) CUP 201400111

Dear Commissioners:

Stephanie Pincetl, Chair
Doug Smith, Vice Chair
David W. Louie
Curt Pedersen
Pat Modugno

Project No. R2014-02389 is a request to authorize the construction and maintenance of a 50-foot high unmanned mono-eucalyptus wireless communications facility (Wireless Facility) at 2356 Fullerton Road, Rowland Heights.

Rowland Heights Community Coordinating Council (RHCCC) joins with a large number of residents, 67 of whom signed an earlier petition against this project, in continuing to oppose the construction of the Wireless facility at this address and respectfully requests L.A. County to continue to stand with the community and deny this request as proposed.

Having had the opportunity to view the December 9th Planning hearing video on this project we were pleased to see that our community's concerns regarding the Verizon Wireless tower were thoughtfully acknowledged by the Commission. And that your Board took proactive and positive action in support of the Community to uncover why the more suitable County Park locations were dismissed by the applicant despite both being viable.

We also thank you for continuing this item until January 20th and requiring the applicant to provide supporting documentation of their *new claims* that there are reasons beyond cost as to why they did not choose either of the two County Park locations. It should be noted that at no time did the applicant indicate to us, in all our prior communications, that there was any other reason beyond cost for not choosing one of the County park sites. This is troubling, given our experiences with their lack of transparency to date, that this is now being presented as the case.

Therefore, RHCCC respectfully requests having any supporting documents the applicant provides regarding these new claims be forwarded to RHCCC in a timely enough manner to allow us an opportunity to review and respond, if necessary, prior to the January 20th hearing date.

And while we were pleased by the Commission's questions of the applicant and support of the community's concerns, we were very disappointed by the *applicant's disingenuous remarks in claiming to want to work with RHCCC and the Community* but having been turned away this past Fall. For the record, our two previous meetings over the summer with the applicant's representative was, to be perfectly blunt, a waste of time. It was clear, both times, that the applicant's *only motivation* to meet with us was to present the project in order *to check a box that they had met with RHCCC* and then get on to the public hearing so their project would be approved.

There was no intention shown by them to work with us to find a mutually beneficial solution.

In both meetings, while the applicant listened to our concerns, and answered questions, most of our suggestions and concerns were simply swept aside or responded to in a condescending manner. At the end of both meetings, the message received was clear — they felt that they did not have to do anything more or different than they already had done in their design or their application in order to get approval.

Specifically, at the August meeting Michelle and I, representing the community and RHCCC respectively, presented a variety of alternatives to the applicant. Including asking them to relook at the two park locations, the cemetery, to co-locating, and even updating their out-dated equipment or under-grounding the system. The return response was that they had found a fairly viable site and already had an agreement in place with the gas station and nothing was going to change their mind because they had no requirement to relook at the other locations. Simply put, they were not going to pay more for the County Park site when they could get the gas station cheaper. And since tree camouflage was acceptable to County there was no reason to do anything more or differently. Essentially that was the end of conversation.

Given the lack of the applicant's past willingness to find a solution, it is our opinion, had RHCCC's agendas not already been full, and another presentation had taken place, the result would have been the same as before.

From the community's perspective, the real problem with finding a compromise on this matter has been the applicants' aversion to expending any more capital than they absolutely have to. They clearly view our community as a place that they do not have to value or invest in more than they minimally have to. We pray that you prove them wrong and rule in favor of protecting the long term potential of our community's character over the short-term profit considerations of the applicant and Verizon Wireless.

The community desires the tower be located in the least intrusive location, which is NOT at the gas station location on Fullerton Road. It was heartening to see that several Commissioners appeared to agree by their comments that the proposed fake tree did not appear to blend in well with the surrounding landscape

and that the gas station was not the only viable location. Additionally, we agree that the community would be better served if revenues from the facility were to go to our County park and be reinvested in our community than enrich a private entity and devalue the Community.

We strongly support that the best way to blend the tower into the landscape and to meet the needs of the community is to place the tower elsewhere. Carolyn Rosa County Park appears to be the most desirable site to both blend the tower into the landscape and to close the identified service gap meeting the intended purpose of the application. Additionally, the lease revenue generated by the facility could be utilized by County parks to help fill the unmet recreational needs of this area of Rowland Heights.

RHCCC and the community continues to ask for your support and strongly urges your votes in favor of our Community Plan, our Community Standards, and in taking a positive step toward restoring our Community's character by denying this project as proposed.

Thank you in advance for your Board's thoughtful and thorough consideration of this item and your support for the betterment of Rowland Heights.

Sincerely,
Debbie Enos
First VP, RHCCC

Michelle Nicolaus
Resident, RHCCC Community Member and Representative

cc: Michele Bush, Principal Regional Planning Assistant