



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

---

## File No. 09-2645

1 message

---

**Sharon Gin** <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Tue, Oct 8, 2013 at 8:28 AM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alexander von Wechmar** <a.vonwechmar@germantvfilms.com>

Date: Mon, Oct 7, 2013 at 4:15 PM

Subject: TOMORROW's Joint PLUM nd PW Committee meeting: File No. 09-2645

To: Jose.Huizar@lacity.org, [Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org](mailto:Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org), Mitchell.Englander@lacity.org, Joe.Buscaino@lacity.org, Curren.Price@lacity.org, Sharon.Gin@lacity.org

Cc: Paul.Habib@lacity.org, Arturo.Chavez@lacity.org, Jennifer.Rivera@lacity.org, John.Lee@lacity.org, Nicole.Bernson@lacity.org, Jenny.Chavez@lacity.org, Curtis.Earnest@lacity.org, Tom LaBonge

<Tom.LaBonge@lacity.org>, Carolyn Ramsay <Carolyn.Ramsay@lacity.org>, Daniel Halden

<Daniel.Halden@lacity.org>, Caroline Schweich <Caroline.Schweich@oakshome.org>, Jonathan Corob

<Jonathan.Corob@oakshome.org>, Gerry Hans <Gerry.Hans@oakshome.org>, Sheryl.Hellard@oakshome.org,

Holly Purcell <Holly.Purcell@oakshome.org>, Kathy Richards <Kathy.Richards@oakshome.org>, John

Saurenman <John.Saurenman@oakshome.org>, Wayne Schlock <Wayne.Schlock@oakshome.org>,

Judy.Wollan@oakshome.org, Bob Young <Bob.Young@oakshome.org>

Dear Councilmember,

The Oaks HOA represents approximately 800 residents of The Oaks neighborhood (in the Los Feliz area of the Hollywood Hills).

For more than seven years we have pushed, along with other community groups, for legislation to regulate the placement of unsightly and potentially harmful cellphone towers in residential neighborhoods, such as ours. We are very pleased that lawmakers have moved forward and are soon to vote on a revised AGF Ordinance which will include regulations for the installation of cellphone towers.

The draft of the new ordinance has our support - except for three provisions which we believe should be reviewed and revised before the ordinance is presented to the City Council for a final vote:

**(1) Notification of AGF Installation** (Subsection VII.D.):

The draft of the new Ordinance calls for a notification of all residents who live along 250 (linear) feet, i.e. up and down a street, from a proposed installation.

We believe this requirement should be expanded to all residents who live within a 250-foot radius around a proposed AGF (cellphone tower).

Reason: People who live on hillsides near a proposed site are as much impacted - sometimes even more so - as residents living along a street where a new cell site is to be erected.

As antennas of cell towers pop up into the eyesight of hillside residents, they have a huge impact on the views

these residents enjoy from their homes and raise concerns about the effects that direct, around-the-clock exposure to radiation from RF signals may have on their health.

**(2) Density Threshold (Subsection IV.I.):**

The new Ordinance should not allow the spacing of cell sites by less than 1,000 feet.

Reason: As cellphone service providers compete for the best sites for their antennas, residents who live at or near "strategic locations" often find themselves surrounded by cellphone towers of competing carriers.

In our neighborhood, for example, the cell sites of three different companies have been erected only 300 feet apart from each other. As a result, nearby residents are burdened by a triple doses of negative impacts, including a decrease in value of their properties. Despite living so close to these cell sites, these residents - for technical reasons - do not even enjoy improved cellphone reception as their neighbors do who live further away from the site.

In fairness to those who live close to those "prime sites", the new Ordinance should define a density threshold for AGFs that does not allow the clustering of cellphone towers at "strategic locations" along residential streets.

**(3) Applicability to Existing AGF Installations (Subsection IX.A.):**

The draft of the new Ordinance contains a provision for upgrades or repairs of existing AGFs (i.e. AGFs that have been installed prior to the adoption of the new Ordinance), but the draft does not include any regulations for upgrades or repairs of future AGFs (approved and installed after the adoption of the new Ordinance.)

The lack of a provision for upgrades of future AGFs would allow service providers to obtain approval for a low-key installation, only to upgrade it then at a later time without having to go through another approval process. Closing this loophole would be important for the new Ordinance to work as intended.

We hope you share our concerns regarding these issues and will ask the City Attorney for a review of the provisions that apply to them.

Thank you,

Alexander von Wechmar  
THE OAKS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION  
Phone (323) 467-9004  
Alexander.von.Wechmar@oakshome.org

—  
Sharon Gin  
City of Los Angeles  
Office of the City Clerk  
213.978.1074  
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

---

## Fwd: Council File 09-2645

1 message

---

**Sharon Gin** <sharon.gin@lacity.org>  
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Tue, Oct 8, 2013 at 8:28 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nahtahna Cabanes** <cabanes2@gmail.com>  
Date: Tue, Oct 8, 2013 at 6:30 AM  
Subject: Council File 09-2645  
To: sharon.gin@lacity.org  
Cc: Jonathan Brand <jonathan.brand@lacity.org>, tanner.blackman@lacity.org

Good morning Sharon,

I am writing as a representative of my Sherman Oaks neighborhood. We are requesting addenda to the current drafted ordinance regarding the installation of the cell towers in the public-right-of-way.

We support the position of the Pacific Palisades Community Council in their call for expanded notification, certification compliance, and the expanded appeals process.

In addition, we would like to request that the drafted ordinance include language relating to permit duration limits. Current law regarding cell tower installations does not require permit duration limits. As a result, telecommunication companies are given unrestricted authority as to the operation of such installations once a permit has been issued.

We are asking that, consistent with San Francisco law, existing and future cell towers be required to obtain a Personal Wireless Service Facility Site Permit.

This is a recommendation initially made by the City Attorney (I have included an experts from his report at the end of this email). Permit duration limits would allow local government to periodically review compliance of cell tower operations so that the rights and safety of the citizens are protected.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Nahtahna Cabanes

Sherman Oaks Community Quad

From the City Attorney's 2011:



**TOMORROW's Joint PLUM nd PW Committee meeting: File No. 09-2645**

1 message

**alexander.von.wechmar@oakshome.org**

Mon, Oct 7, 2013 at 7:11 PM

<alexander.von.wechmar@oakshome.org>

Reply-To: alexander.von.wechmar@oakshome.org

To: Mitchell.Englander@lacity.org, John.Lee@lacity.org, Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org, Patrice.Lattimore@lacity.org

--- Original Message ---

**From:** Alexander von Wechmar

**To:** Jose.Huizar@lacity.org ; Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org ; Mitchell.Englander@lacity.org ;

Joe.Buscaino@lacity.org ; Curren.Price@lacity.org ; Sharon.Gin@lacity.org

**Cc:** Paul.Habib@lacity.org ; Arturo.Chavez@lacity.org ; Jennifer.Rivera@lacity.org ; John.Lee@lacity.org ;

Nicole.Bernson@lacity.org ; Jenny.Chavez@lacity.org ; Curtis.Earnest@lacity.org ; Tom LaBonge ; Carolyn

Ramsay ; Daniel Halden ; Caroline Schweich ; Jonathan Corob ; Gerry Hans ; Sheryl.Hellard@oakshome.org ;

Holly Purcell ; Kathy Richards ; John Saurenman ; Wayne Schlock ; Judy.Wollan@oakshome.org ; Bob Young

**Sent:** Monday, October 07, 2013 4:15 PM

**Subject:** TOMORROW's Joint PLUM nd PW Committee meeting: File No. 09-2645

Dear Councilmember,

The Oaks HOA represents approximately 800 residents of The Oaks neighborhood (in the Los Feliz area of the Hollywood Hills).

For more than seven years we have pushed, along with other community groups, for legislation to regulate the placement of unsightly and potentially harmful cellphone towers in residential neighborhoods, such as ours. We are very pleased that lawmakers have moved forward and are soon to vote on a revised AGF Ordinance which will include regulations for the installation of cellphone towers.

The draft of the new ordinance has our support - except for three provisions which we believe should be reviewed and revised before the ordinance is presented to the City Council for a final vote:

**(1) Notification of AGF Installation (Subsection VII.D.):**

The draft of the new Ordinance calls for a notification of all residents who live along 250 (linear) feet, i.e. up and down a street, from a proposed installation.

We believe this requirement should be expanded to all residents who live within a 250-foot radius around a proposed AGF (cellphone tower).

Reason: People who live on hillsides near a proposed site are as much impacted - sometimes even more so - as residents living along a street where a new cell site is to be erected.

As antennas of cell towers pop up into the eyesight of hillside residents, they have a huge impact on the views these residents enjoy from their homes and raise concerns about the effects that direct, around-the-clock exposure to radiation from RF signals may have on their health.

**(2) Density Threshold (Subsection IV.I.):**

The new Ordinance should not allow the spacing of cell sites by less than 1,000 feet.

Reason: As cellphone service providers compete for the best sites for their antennas, residents who live at or near "strategic locations" often find themselves surrounded by cellphone towers of competing carriers.

In our neighborhood, for example, the cell sites of three different companies have been erected only 300 feet apart from each other. As a result, nearby residents are burdened by a triple doses of negative impacts, including a decrease in value of their properties. Despite living so close to these cell sites, these residents - for technical reasons - do not even enjoy improved cellphone reception as their neighbors do who live further away from the site.

In fairness to those who live close to those "prime sites", the new Ordinance should define a density threshold for AGFs that does not allow the clustering of cellphone towers at "strategic locations" along residential streets.

**(3) Applicability to Existing AGF Installations (Subsection IX.A.):**

The draft of the new Ordinance contains a provision for upgrades or repairs of existing AGFs (i.e. AGFs that have been installed prior to the adoption of the new Ordinance), but the draft does not include any regulations for upgrades or repairs of future AGFs (approved and installed after the adoption of the new Ordinance.)

The lack of a provision for upgrades of future AGFs would allow service providers to obtain approval for a low-key installation, only to upgrade it then at a later time without having to go through another approval process. Closing this loophole would be important for the new Ordinance to work as intended.

We hope you share our concerns regarding these issues and will ask the City Attorney for a review of the provisions that apply to them.

Thank you,

Alexander von Wechmar  
THE OAKS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION  
Phone (323) 467-9004  
Alexander.von.Wechmar@oakshome.org