



Los Angeles County  
Department of Regional Planning

*Planning for the Challenges Ahead*



Richard J. Bruckner  
Director

January 14, 2016

**TO:** Susie Tae  
Hearing Officer

**FROM:** Steve Mar   
Regional Planning Assistant  
Zoning Permits East

**SUBJECT:** **Additional Materials**  
**Project Number R2015-02771-(4)**  
**Conditional Use Permit No. 201500112**  
**HO Meeting: January 19, 2016**  
**Agenda Item: 6**

An additional comment letter for the abovementioned item has been submitted for your review.

If you need further information, please contact Steve Mar at (213) 974-6435 or smar@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:SM

January 14, 2016

Hearing Officer  
Los Angeles County  
Department of Regional Planning  
320 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Project Number R2015-02771-(4), Conditional Use Permit No. 201500112

Dear Hearing Officer,

A conditional use permit should not be granted to the above referenced project for the following reasons:

1. This project is essentially the same as the earlier project proposed on the neighboring tower to the west but without the imposition of landscaping requirements that would mitigate the view of the structure from the general public. Moving the project over to the neighboring tower by sixty feet would also simply move sight of the project to the other side of the SCE right of way. The new project site remains open to view by the general public, simply from the opposite side.

If the hearing officer's intention in granting the earlier conditional use permit was to protect the general public from viewing the project site, moving it over to the westerly neighboring tower does not accomplish that intent.

This new proposed project site appears not to have been physically viewed for compliance with the conditions set forth by the earlier CUP grant, or, if it has, there has been an error in judgement.

2. The necessity for a diesel fueled back-up generator at this site has not been clearly established. It is long established and well known that diesel exhaust is a serious health hazard. There should be no need for a review of all that here. A reasonable person must then wonder at the wisdom of installing such a facility in the midst of a residential area. If no other company finds it necessary to install such a facility, why does Verizon Wireless find the need to do so?

A federal or state regulatory requirement for a diesel fueled back-up power generating facility at this particular site has not been clearly established. No regulatory citations have been requested or offered.

In the interests of the health and well being of the general public and, in particular, the health and well being of the neighboring residents, whose health will in all likelihood be adversely affected by the ill effects of diesel engine exhaust being emitted into their homes and backyards, a diesel fueled power back-up facility should not be granted until citations have been provided and viable alternatives have been examined.

3. An alternative site is the next proximate SCE high voltage transmission tower located south of the tower in question, just south of Colima Road and readily accessible from Colima Road. It is at a higher elevation from the proposed site and probably better situated to provide a broader coverage area.

It, too, is located in a residential area but with less dense zoning, fewer homes and a smaller population that would be adversely impacted by diesel engine exhaust because of the larger buffer areas between the facility and the dwellings.

4. In addition, if area coverage is the principle interest of the applicant, according to its own coverage maps, it seems that the higher elevation more southerly SCE transmission tower could provide that coverage.

The selection of this most southerly Colima Road site rather than the currently proposed Clementina site is more appropriate to Verizon Wireless' stated goals and purposes and would adversely impact far fewer citizens.

In the interests of a transparent public policy, whatever obstacles exist that may bar the selection of this obviously better location should be clearly presented and examined before a decision granting the conditional use permit is made at the currently proposed site.

I most respectfully submit that the unresolved issues presented here be addressed and resolved before a decision that takes into account all of the above factors and considers the best interests of the community whose interests and health would be most directly impacted.

Yours truly,

Al Daniels  
[rinka963@hotmail.com](mailto:rinka963@hotmail.com)  
626 512-2424