Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Bruce W. McClendon FAICP
Director of Planning

May 8, 2007

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

HEARING ON AMENDMENTS TO COUNTY CODE TITLE 22 (PLANNING AND ZONING) RELATING TO NEW CASE PROCESSING PROCEDURES AND CONDITIONS OF USE FOR WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES (ALL SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS) (3 VOTES)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD, AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Consider the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the entire record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Negative Declaration.

2. Approve the recommendation of the Regional Planning Commission as reflected in the attached draft ordinance to establish new case processing procedures and conditions of use for telecommunication facilities, and determine that the proposed amendments are consistent with the Los Angeles County General Plan.

3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare an ordinance to amend Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code as recommended by the Commission and include any changes directed by the Board.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

On August 1, 2006, the Board of Supervisors directed the Regional Planning Commission, County Counsel and the Department of Regional Planning staff to review

the proposed wireless ordinance previously heard by the Board, and to recommend a revised ordinance to the Board for additional hearings.

In directing that the ordinance be returned to your Commission, the Board directed that the ordinance should:

- Comply with all State and Federal requirements.
- Provide a predictable and transparent zoning application process.
- Maximize co-location of facilities where feasible.
- Provide that all appurtenant equipment be screened, located underground or otherwise sited so as to minimize aesthetic impacts on the surrounding neighborhood to the extent feasible.
- Address health concerns to extent allowed by State and Federal law.
- Protect environmental resources potentially affected by the proposed placement of a facility.
- Prepare a draft wireless telecommunications ordinance to be considered at a public hearing before the Regional Planning Commission.

In accordance with the Board's directives, County Counsel drafted a revised ordinance and met with wireless carrier representatives to get their feedback on the draft. The revised ordinance was presented to the Regional Planning Commission during public hearings on September 27, 2006 and November 20, 2006, it was modified as directed by the Commission, and approved on consent on January 24, 2007.

At this time, pending adoption of this draft ordinance, the County continues to require a conditional use permit (CUP) for all wireless telecommunication facilities.

Implementation of Countywide Strategic Plan Goals
The proposed ordinance amendments would contribute to the Countywide Strategic Plan Goals related to service excellence, health and safety. Additionally, the ordinance balances the need for wireless facility services to the public, with protection of unincorporated communities and neighborhoods from the impacts of such facilities.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Implementing this draft ordinance will not have a negative fiscal impact on the County or this Department. An application for a telecommunications facility would be a use subject to a site plan review, director's review, or a conditional use permit. The fees for these permits will offset staff time and costs needed to review and process the applications. Additionally, enforcement fees will be required as part of any conditional use permit approval in order to finance future enforcement of conditions.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

This ordinance is necessary due to the tremendous growth in the number of wireless telecommunications facilities in local unincorporated neighborhoods and the County's lack of concise development standards that can be consistently and fairly applied to these facilities. Additionally, the current requirements for a conditional use permit in all instances appears to be an unnecessary burden for some facilities that are quite small and that do not represent substantial visual or safety concerns to County residents. Accordingly, the proposed draft ordinance would establish concise development standards and case processing procedures that vary with the size of the facility.

Federal and California law impose constraints on the ability of local agencies to use zoning and building laws to regulate wireless telecommunications facilities on private property and in the public right-of-way. The Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 preserved local zoning authority so long as it does not (1) unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services, or (2) prohibit or effect prohibiting the provision of personal wire services, subject to a number of procedural requirements. Since 1996, the Federal courts have clarified the meaning of these provisions in scores of cases, which have, in some instances, further limited local regulation of telecommunications uses. During the same period, the State has also entered the field with legislation that both reinforces and augments the Federal requirements.

Public Hearing Notice
A public hearing is required pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code and Section 65856 of the Government Code. Required notice must be given pursuant to the requirements set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. The County Code procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090, 65856, and 66016 relating to notice of public hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The attached Initial Study concludes that there is no substantial evidence that the adoption of the proposed Zoning Ordinance will have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, in accordance with Section 15070 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Negative Declaration was prepared. A copy of the proposed Negative Declaration has been transmitted to 80 public libraries for public review.

IMPACTS ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The proposed amendment would require requests for wireless telecommunications facilities to be processed with a site plan review, director's review, or a conditional use

permit; these processes are already implemented by the Department of Regional Planning.

CONCLUSION

These proposed ordinance amendments establish the case processing procedures and conditions of use for wireless telecommunications facilities. They address a use that has not been specifically listed in the Zoning Ordinance before. The proposed amendments would provide detailed regulations for permitting telecommunications facilities. The proposed amendments would also comply with State and Federal laws.

If you have any questions regarding these proposed amendments, please call myself or Karen Simmons of my staff at (213) 974-6432. Ms. Simmons can also be reached by email at ksimmons@planning.lacounty.gov.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Bruce W. McClendon, FAICP
Director of Planning

BWM:RDH:RH:KMS

Attachments:

1. Board Motion Directing the Preparation of an Ordinance
2. Project Summary
3. Summaries of Regional Planning Commission Proceedings
4. Resolution of the Regional Planning Commission
5. Ordinance Approved by the Regional Planning Commission
6. Negative Declaration
7. Legal Notice of Hearing
8. List of Persons to be Notified

C: Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Sachi A. Hamai, Executive Officer-
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

At its meeting held August 1, 2006, the Board took the following action:

9

Supervisor Yaroslavsky made the following statement:

"The installation of wireless telecommunications facilities (often known as cellular telephone towers) currently requires a conditional use permit in all zones and within public rights of way. However, there are no uniform standards addressing siting, safety, design or other important criteria. As a result, the process for installing these facilities is not as predictable or transparent as it should be. In 2002, the Board of Supervisors directed County Counsel and the Department of Regional Planning to work with interested parties and return to the Board for consideration of a wireless facilities ordinance to address these concerns. Since that time, representatives of the wireless industry have claimed that Federal and State laws have placed limits on the local government's ability to regulate these facilities, particularly within road rights-of-way.

"Given this situation, the lack of response to the Board's 2002 action should be remedied immediately through development of a comprehensive policy regulating the installation of wireless telecommunication facilities. Such policy should be enacted in ordinance form and should provide that any future substantive changes must be enacted through a process that is open to both members of the public and other interested parties."

(Continued on Page 2)

9 (Continued)

Therefore, on motion of Supervisor Yaroslavsky, seconded by Supervisor Antonovich, unanimously carried, the Acting Director of Planning and County Counsel were instructed to prepare, within 30 days, a draft "wireless telecommunications ordinance" to be considered at a public hearing before the Regional Planning Commission that:

1. Maintains compliance with State and Federal mandates;

2. Provides a predictable and transparent process for both the wireless industry and residents;

3. Maximizes the co-location of facilities wherever possible;

4. Ensures that all equipment is screened, located underground or sited so as to minimize negative aesthetic impacts to the community to the maximum extent allowed by law;

5. Addresses to the maximum extent possible under Federal and State laws, the concerns of residents over the health effects of wireless facilities; and

6. Protects environmental resources from the effects of the installation of these facilities.

09080106_9

Copies distributed:
Each Supervisor
Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Acting Director of Planning
Director of Internal Services

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION:	Proposed amendments to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) establishing new case processing procedures for wireless telecommunication facilities
REQUEST:	Approve the proposed amendments to Title 22
LOCATION:	Countywide
STAFF CONTACT:	Ms. Karen Simmons at (213) 974-6432
RPC MEETING DATES:	September 27, 2006, November 20, 2006
RPC CONSENT DATE:	January 24, 2007
RPC RECOMMENDATION:	Board Hearing and approval of proposed ordinance amendment
MEMBERS VOTING AYE:	Valadez, Helsley, Modugno, Rew, Bellamy
MEMBERS VOTING NAY:	None
MEMBERS ABSENT:	None

KEY ISSUES:

Previously, the County has required a conditional use permit for all wireless telecommunications facilities. This ordinance provides for facilities to be approved through a site plan, director's review or a conditional use permit, depending on the size of the facility.

MAJOR POINTS FOR:

The ordinance would enact standards for the siting, safety, design and other criteria regarding the installation of telecommunication facilities. In addition, the case processing procedures include maintaining compliance with State and Federal mandates, maximizing the co-location of facilities wherever possible, and protecting environmental resources from the effects of wireless facilities.

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST:

Facility providers say some of the regulations imposed by the proposed ordinance are too restrictive; these regulations include: 1) locations on existing churches require a CUP, 2) roof-top mounted facilities in residential zones require a CUP, 3) facilities should be permitted within the public right-of-way without any zoning review, and 4) facilities should not be prohibited in ESHA's (environmentally sensitive habitat areas in the Santa Monica Mountains).

PROCEEDINGS OF REGIONAL PLANNINC COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING OF 9/27/06 ON DRAFT WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES ORDINANCE

Staff presented the revised Draft Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance to the Commission. The ordinance has a strong statement of purpose; stressing comprehensive regulations that do not discriminate among carriers, does not prohibit the provision of wireless services, and balances the need to protect surrounding properties and persons with the need for these important services.

Staff cited written testimony received, and referenced their suggested support and opposition positions for each in the staff report, and listed several new issues raised in written testimony received since the staff report was written. The Commission then opened the public hearing for testimony. Four persons testified regarding the request. One testifier was a consultant for the County's Consumer Affairs Department; the other three testifiers were consultants with telecommunications companies, Cingular, Trillium and T-Mobil.

All of the testifiers were in support of the project, but expressed concerns that included, reviewing the ordinance on a periodic basis to ensure it is still in compliance with State and Federal laws, that larger size facilities should be approved via a site plan, the definition of a legitimate protest to a wireless request, and the screening of such facilities.

Upon Commissioner Valadez's motion, the Commission voted 4-0 to continue the public hearing to November 20, 2006. Her motion also directed staff to organize all of the testimony received by staff and County Counsel to make recommendations on requested changes to the ordinance and to draft a revised ordinance, after apprising the carriers and letting them respond to staff's and County Counsel's recommendations.

PROCEEDINGS OF REGIONAL PLANNINC COMMISSION
WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES
CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING 11/20/06

At the conclusion of the public hearing on September 27, 2006 the Commission directed staff and County Counsel to make recommendations on each of the industry's comments, revise the draft ordinance accordingly, and meet with the industry representatives on the revised draft prior to the continued hearing.

Staff presented the revised draft ordinance to the Commission. Staff provided the Commission with a revised ordinance, staff report, letters and a summary of the industry's comments from a meeting held on November 16, 2006, and a summary of the FCC's radio-frequency electro-magnetic emissions limits.

The Commission then opened the public hearing for testimony. Six people testified regarding the request. One testifier was a representative of the Coalition to Save the Marina; the other five testifiers were consultants with telecommunications companies, Cingular, Verison and T-Mobil.

All of the testifiers were in support of the project, but expressed concerns that included; that wireless facilities should not be allowed in ESHA areas, the co-locating of facilities, there should be no limit on the size of facility that is located underground, that commercial wireless facilities should be allowed on County-owned property, and facilities on existing non-conforming structures.

The Regional Planning Commission voted to close the public hearing and asked staff to prepare the final ordinance and environmental documentation for its approval.

RESOLUTION

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles conducted public hearings on September 29, 2006 and November 20, 2006 on the amendments to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) of the Los Angeles County Code to establish new development standards and case processing procedures for wireless telecommunications facilities;

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. The Federal Telecommunications Act requires that states and local jurisdictions may not prevent the wireless telecommunication industry from providing wireless services to the public.

2. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the California State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and a range of recent court cases have defined the framework within which local jurisdictions may regulate wireless telecommunications facilities.

3. Currently the County Zoning Ordinance requires a conditional use permit zoning application for all proposed wireless telecommunications facilities.

4. That on August 1, 2006, the Board of Supervisors directed the Regional Planning Commission, County Counsel and staff to review the proposed wireless ordinance previously heard by the Board, and to recommend a revised ordinance to the Board for additional hearings in the near future.

5. That the Board of Supervisors has expressed its intent to balance the need for provision of wireless facility services to the public, with protection of unincorporated communities and neighborhoods from the impacts of such facilities.

6. That the proposed ordinance amendments respond to the Board's concerns by establishing new development standards and case processing procedures that would authorize appropriate wireless facilities while limiting their effects on surrounding properties and persons.

7. That the public health and welfare will be further protected by radio frequency emissions limits established for all wireless facilities by the Federal Communications Commission.

8. That the proposed regulation of wireless telecommunications facilities is consistent with all State and Federal laws pertaining to such facilities.

9. That the proposed amendments establishing a County regulatory framework for wireless telecommunication facilities are compatible with, and supportive of, the policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan in that authorized facilities would provide needed services to the residents of unincorporated areas of the County.

10. That an Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning prepared a Negative Declaration for this project. The Commission finds that these proposed amendments to the County Code will not have a significant effect on the environment pursuant to CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the Los Angeles County Environmental Document and Reporting Procedures and Guidelines.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Regional Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the Board hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code to establish new development standards and case processing procedures for wireless telecommunications facilities.

2. That the Board certify the attached Negative Declaration, and find that the proposed amendments to Title 22 will not have a significant effect on the environment;

3. That the Board adopt the revised draft ordinance as recommended by this Commission and amend Title 22 accordingly, and determine that the amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on January 24, 2007.

For Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
Regional Planning Commission
County of Los Angeles

ANALYSIS

This ordinance amends Title 22 - Planning and Zoning of the Los Angeles County Code, establishing standards for the placement of wireless telecommunication facilities.

RAYMOND G. FORTNER, JR.
County Counsel

By
ELAINE M. LEMKE
Principal Deputy County Counsel
Property Division

EML:di

11/07/05 (requested)

8/21/06 (revised)

ORDINANCE NO. _____

An ordinance amending Title 22 - Planning and Zoning of the Los Angeles County Code, establishing standards for the placement of wireless telecommunication facilities.

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 22.08.230 is hereby amended to add the following definition in alphabetical order to read as follows:

22.08.230 W.

. . .

-- "Wireless facility" means any ground-mounted or building-mounted antenna, with any necessary appurtenance, such as an equipment box, used to send or receive radio frequency transmissions for mobile or fixed telephone or data transmission service to provide wireless telecommunication services as may be described in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, or as otherwise authorized by the Federal Communications Commission.

. . .

SECTION 2. Sections 22.20.070, 22.20.170, 22.20.260, 22.20.340, 22.20.410, 22.24.070, 22.24.120.D, 22.28.030.A, 22.28.080.A.2, 22.28.130.A.2, 22.28.180.A.2, 22.28.230. A.2, 22.28.290.A.1, 22.40.190.A.2, 22.40.250.B.1, 22.40.310, 22.40.350.A, 22.40.410.B, and 22.40.670 are hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to the list of permitted uses in all zones:

. . .

-- Wireless facilities identified in subsection B of Section 22.52.1530, subject to the procedures in Section 22.52.1550.

. . .

SECTION 3. Sections 22.20.090, 22.20.190.A, 22.20.280.A, 22.20.360.A, 22.20.430.A, 22.24.090.A, and 22.24.140.A are hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to the list of uses requiring director's review and approval in residential and agricultural zones:

. . .

– Wireless facilities identified in subsection C of Section 22.52.1530, subject to the procedures in Section 22.52.1560.

. . .

SECTION 4. Sections 22.20.100.A, 22.20.200.A, 22.20.290.A, 22.20.370.A, 22.20.440.A, 22.24.100.A, and 22.24.150.A are hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to the list of uses requiring a conditional use permit in residential and agricultural zones:

. . .

-- Wireless facilities, which cannot or do not meet the standards or conditions of this Title 22, subsections A, B, or C of Section 22.52.1530, subject to the procedures specified in Section 22.52.1570.

. . .

SECTION 5. Sections 22.28.050, 22.28.100.A, 22.28.150.A, 22.28.200.A, 22.28.250.A, 22.28.310.A, 22.32.120, 22.32.180, 22.32.230, 22.40.210.A, 22.40.270.A, 22.40.330, 22.40.370, 22.40.420.B, and 22.40.690 are hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to the list of uses requiring director's review and approval in commercial, manufacturing and certain special purpose zones:

. . .

-- Wireless facilities identified in subsection C of Section 22.52.1530, subject to the procedures in Section 22.52.1560.

. . .

SECTION 6. Sections 22.28.060.A, 22.28.110.A, 22.28.160.A, 22.28.210.A, 22.28.260.A, 22.28.320.A, 22.32.130.A, 22.32.190.A.4, 22.32.310, 22.40.220.A, 22.40.280.A, 22.40.340.A, 22.40.380.A, 22.40.430.A, and 22.40.700.A are hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to the list of uses requiring a conditional use permit in commercial, manufacturing and certain special purpose zones:

. . .

-- Wireless facilities, which cannot or do not meet the standards and conditions of this Title 22, subsections A, B, or C of Section 22.52.1530, subject to the procedures specified in Section 22.52.1570.

. . .

SECTION 7. Sections 22.28.060.B, 22.28.110.B, 22.28.160.B, 22.28.210.B., 22.28.260.B, 22.28.320.B, 22.32.070.B, 22.32.130.B, 22.32.190.B, 22.32.300,.B 22.40.380.B

and 22.40.700.B are hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to the list of uses requiring a specified particular permit.

. . .

-- Central Co-Location Wireless Telecommunication Facilities as defined in subsection C of Section 22.52.1520 and consistent with the requirements of Section 22.52.1580.

. . .

SECTION 8. Part 14, Sections 22.52.1500, 22.52.1510, 22.52.1520, 22.52.1530, 22.52.1540, 22.52.1550, 22.52.1560, 22.52.1570 and 22.52.1580 are hereby added to read as follows:

Part 14

WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES

22.52.1500 Purpose and applicability.

22.52.1510 Exemptions and prohibition.

22.52.1520 Definitions.

22.52.1530 Type of permit and review required.

22.52.1540 Development standards and conditions of use.

22.52.1550 Case processing procedures for facilities subject to site plan review.

22.52.1560 Case processing procedures for director's review and approval.

22.52.1570 Case processing procedures for conditional use permits.

22.52.1580 Standards and case processing procedures for central site permits and subsequently installed co-location facilities.

22.52.1500 Purpose and applicability.

A. Purpose. The purpose of this Part 14 is to provide uniform and comprehensive standards for the placement, design, construction and maintenance of wireless telecommunication facilities in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, while not unreasonably discriminating among providers of functionally equivalent services, and not prohibiting or having the effect of prohibiting the provision of personal wireless services. These regulations are intended to encourage the co-location of wireless telecommunication facilities on existing towers, buildings, and other structures. They also are intended to ensure that these facilities are designed and located in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding community and mitigates potential negative visual effects and safety hazards, and results in the installation of smaller, less intrusive or fully disguised facilities and supporting structures wherever feasible, especially in rural areas.

B. Applicability. The provisions of this Part 14 shall not apply to wireless facilities that were lawfully erected prior to the effective date of the ordinance adding this Part 14 to Chapter 22.52, except that upon expiration of a conditional use permit for a wireless facility that was issued prior to the effective date of this ordinance, including any allowable non-discretionary extensions of such permits, said facilities will then be governed by this Part 14.

22.52.1510 Exemptions and prohibition.

A. Exemptions. The following equipment shall not be subject to the provisions of this Part 14.

1. Emergency 911 hardware that meets Federal and State requirements for automatic location identification; and

2. County-owned wireless telecommunication equipment, antennas and support structures.

B. Prohibitions. Wireless facilities shall be prohibited in the following locations:

1. within County-designated environmentally sensitive habitat areas except where wireless facilities can be placed on existing structures that are either (a) entirely within a County right-of-way; or (b) in previously developed areas; and which are approved under the applicable level of review, and

2. for commercial wireless facilities, on County-owned or County-leased property that contain County wireless facilities.

22.52.1520 Definitions. For purposes of this Part 14 of Chapter 22.52, the following definitions shall apply:

A. Building-mounted. The term "building-mounted" means the placement of a wireless facility upon the roof or side of a building, or upon the top or side of a fully enclosed structure such as, but not limited to, a water tank. For purposes of this definition, the term "structure" shall exclude a foundation or platform that is three feet or less above ground or a structure built solely or primarily for the purpose of housing or locating a wireless facility.

B. Camouflage. The term "camouflage" means to disguise a wireless facility by incorporating it into the architectural design of a building or structure or by utilizing design and siting techniques that disguise the wireless facility as a structure or object other than a wireless facility, which is either already present in the area or blends in with the existing environment. Examples of camouflage techniques include, but are not limited to, trees, clock towers, bell steeples, light poles and flag poles. The use of mono-pines shall not be considered

appropriate camouflage unless integrated into the surrounding landscape with the use of live trees, new or existing structures or other design features.

C. The terms "Central Co-Location Wireless Facility" or "Central Co-Location Facility" mean a wireless facility designed and built pursuant to an approved Central Site Permit to allow subsequent co-location of other wireless facilities on, or immediately adjoining to it, and which meets all of the following criteria:

(1) the entire project was fully disclosed, and reviewed by the County and was subject to a discretionary permit issued on or after January 1, 2007;

(2) either an environmental impact report was certified for the project, or a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration was adopted for said facility in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

(3) all mitigation identified as required in either the EIR or mitigated negative declaration were implemented.

D. Co-location. The term "co-location" generally means the placement of portions of two or more wireless facilities on the same building, tower, pole, freestanding sign, or other structure.

E. Ground-mounted. The term "ground-mounted" means the placement of a wireless facility or its antennas upon or under the ground, an/or on a lattice tower, monopole, utility pole or tower, or other structure such as, but not limited to, a freestanding sign, which is erected on or upon the ground, including structures built solely or primarily for the purpose of housing or locating a wireless facility, or upon a foundation or platform that is three feet or less above ground.

F. Large Facility. The term "large facility" means a wireless facility that exceeds the size of a medium facility.

G. Linear system of small facilities. The term "linear system of small facilities" means two or more small wireless facilities, arranged in a linear fashion such that they are interconnected with fiber to a large wireless facility and are typically placed in the public right-of-way.

H. Medium Facility. The term "medium facility" means a wireless facility, where all of the following requirements are satisfied:

1. The panel-type antennas, if any, measure greater than two feet and up to five feet in length, and greater than 12 inches and up to 16 inches in width;

2. The whip-type antennas, if any, measure greater than four feet and up to six feet in length;

3. The microwave-type antennas, if any, collectively measure greater than two feet and up to four feet in diameter; and

4. The appurtenant equipment boxes, if any, collectively measure greater than two feet and up to six feet in height or are greater than six-cubic feet and up to 54-cubic feet in volume, exclusive of any required separate electric meter box or emergency 911 equipment.

I. Screen. The terms "screen" or "screened" mean fully blocking a wireless facility from view at ground level from adjacent properties and the right-of-way. The placement of a stucco wall in front of a wireless facility generally shall not be considered an appropriate

screen unless architecturally integrated into an existing structure as determined under the applicable level of review.

J. Small Facility. The term "small facility" means a wireless facility where all of the following requirements are satisfied:

1. The panel-type antennas, if any, measure less than or equal to two feet in length and one foot in width;

2. The whip-type antennas, if any, measure less than or equal to four feet in length;

3. The facility contains no more than one microwave-type antenna, which measures less than or equal to two feet in diameter; and

4. The appurtenant equipment boxes, if any, collectively measure no more than two feet in height and are no more than six-cubic feet in volume, exclusive of any required separate electric meter box or emergency 911 equipment.

K. Support structure. The term "support structure" as used in this Part 14, means any type of structure or pole on which a wireless facility, or a portion thereof, is mounted.

22.52.1530 Type of permit and review required.

A. Central Co-Location Facility Permit Review. Wireless facilities intended to serve as a Central Co-Location Facility shall obtain a Central Site Permit subject to the procedures specified in Section 22.52.1570 and complying with the standards and conditions of Section 22.52.1540 and subsections A, B and C of Section 22.52.1580.

B. Site Plan Review. The following wireless facilities are permitted in all zones, subject to the applicable standards and conditions of Section 22.52.1540, and subject to the

site plan review procedures specified in Section 22.52.1550, provided such facility is not located on a lot or parcel of land containing an existing, legally-established place of religious worship, day care facility, park, recreational facility primarily utilized by children up through and including age 17, or school through grade 12:

1. Small building-mounted wireless facilities if they comply with the standards and conditions of subsections B.1.a, B.2, B.3.b, B.3.c, B.5, B.6, and B.7 of Section 22.52.1540 and are not located on properties listed on the National Register of Historic Properties or the California Register of Historical Resources.

2. Small ground-mounted wireless facilities located outside of the public rights-of-way if they will not require installation of new support structures, or if any such new support structure replaces an existing support structure, and where they comply with the standards and conditions of subsections B.1.b, B.3.a, B.3.b, B.3.d, B.3.e, B.3.f, B.4, B.5, B.6, and B.7 of Section 22.52.1540.

3. Small or medium ground-mounted wireless facilities located within the public rights-of-way that comply with the standards and conditions of subsections B.1.b, B.3.b, B.3.d, B.3.e, B.6 and B.7 of Section 22.52.1540.

C. Director's Review and Approval. The following wireless facilities require a director's review and approval subject to the applicable standards and conditions of Section 22.52.1540 and the procedures specified in Section 22.52.1560 provided that such facility is not located on a lot or parcel of land containing an existing, legally-established place of religious worship, day care facility, park, recreational facility primarily utilized by children up through and including age 17, or school through grade 12;

1. Small ground-mounted wireless facilities located outside the public rights-of-way that require installation of a new support structure which is not replacing an existing support structure if they comply with the standards and conditions of subsections B.1.b, B.3.a, B.3.b, B.3.d, B.3.e, B.3.f, B.4, B.5, B.6 and B.7 of Section 22.52.1540;

2. Medium or large wireless facilities located outside the public rights-of-way and located in residential or agricultural zones provided that such a facility is co-located with an existing, authorized wireless facility, does not exceed the height thereof, is not located on properties listed on the National Register of Historic Properties or the California Register of Historical Resources and complies with the applicable standards of subsection B of Section 22.52.1540;

3. Medium or large wireless facilities located outside the public rights-of-way and in commercial and industrial zones and in Zones R-R, W, P-R, SR-D, O-S, and IT, if they are not located on properties listed on the National Register of Historic Properties or the California Register of Historical Resources, that are either of the following: (a) located more than 250 feet from any residentially or agriculturally zoned property; or (b) co-located with an existing authorized wireless facility not exceeding the height thereof so long as they comply with applicable standards and conditions specified in subsection B of Section 22.52.1540; and

4. Large ground-mounted wireless facilities located within the public rights-of-way that comply with the standards and conditions of subsections B.1.b, B.3.b, B.3.d, B.3.e, B.3.f, B.6, B.7 and B.8 of Section 22.52.1540,

D. Conditional Use Permit. All wireless facilities that do not qualify for review and approval under subsections A , B or C, above, shall require a Conditional Use Permit subject to the provisions of Section 22.52.1570.

22.52.1540 Development standards and conditions of use.

A. Applicability. All applicable development standards and/or regulations of the zone where the wireless facility is located shall apply unless there is a contrary provision in this Section 22.52.1540 regulating the same matter in which case this Section applies, except that Community Standard District ("CSD") requirements shall supercede the development standards herein.

B. Development standards.

1. Height. A wireless facility shall be measured from the ground to the tip of the highest antenna, or to the top of a tower, utility pole, monopole, sign, or other structure, excluding faux tree branches or palm fronds added for aesthetic purposes, whichever is highest, and shall be subject to the following height restrictions:

a. A building-mounted wireless facility shall not exceed the maximum height allowed in the applicable zone, or 16 feet above the building roof line, whichever is higher, except if the proposed facility is located in a CSD, the height shall not exceed the applicable height limit for the CSD, and except on a legal nonconforming building that exceeds the height limit of the zone or CSD, the height shall not exceed the height of the legal nonconforming building. For purposes of this subdivision, the height of a building roof line shall include existing building parapets; and

b. A ground-mounted wireless facility shall not exceed the maximum height allowed in the applicable zone, or a height of 75 feet above grade in zones where the height limit is established by Section 22.52.050. A replacement support structure may exceed the height of the replaced structure so long as it complies with the height limitations of the applicable zone or CSD.

2. Setback requirements and roof coverage limits. Unless completely screened or architecturally integrated into the building, a building-mounted wireless facility located on a rooftop shall be set back from the roof's edges and parapet walls to the maximum extent possible to minimize its visual impact from public rights-of-way and adjacent properties, while at the same time not materially interfering with antenna reception and/or transmission. Unless screened and not visible from ground level, the total of all building-mounted wireless facilities located on one roof shall not cover more than 10 percent of the total area of the roof.

3. Design.

a. A wireless facility may be mounted upon a flagpole that bears the national, state, and/or local government flags. Flagpole wireless sites that fly the national flag shall comply with United States Code Title 4, Chapter 1 as to flag maintenance and lighting, All other flags, signs, pennants, banners, streamers, balloons, graphic markings, and other attention-getting devices on a wireless facility shall be prohibited, with the exception of public safety devices required by law.

b. The finished surface of the wireless facility shall not be glossy or reflective in nature unless such a finish is necessary to blend into existing design features or

finishes, shall be graffiti-resistant and shall have a color that blends in with the immediately surrounding environment to the satisfaction of the director and/or commission.

c. A building-mounted wireless facility may be required to be integrated into the building's architecture through design, color, and texture and/or fully screened from view in all directions to the extent practicable to the satisfaction of the director and/or commission.

d. Where necessary to minimize visual effects, for ground-mounted wireless facilities, appurtenant equipment boxes shall be screened or camouflaged to the satisfaction of the director and/or commission.

e. Where a wireless facility is located along a scenic highway, in a significant ecological area ("SEA") or within 250 feet of an SEA, all appurtenant equipment boxes, excluding electric meter boxes or pedestals, shall be located underground whenever technically and logistically possible and if less environmentally detrimental than an aboveground installation. If a facility must be located above ground, it shall be fully screened from view with landscaping or other camouflaging techniques to the satisfaction of the director and/or commission. In addition, facilities in such areas shall be located so as to have the least impact on biotic resources.

f. Where reasonably feasible, newly installed monopoles and lattice towers shall be constructed so as to physically and structurally allow co-location of at least one other wireless facility.

g. On co-located facilities, if the electric utility company requires that electric meters be placed on a separate pedestal or in a separate box or otherwise apart from

the other equipment appurtenant to the antenna, then the electric meters for all of the facilities shall be placed on one pedestal or at one location, whenever possible.

4. Security. A ground-mounted wireless facility that is not located within the public rights-of-way shall have all appropriate fencing, gates, and/or locks to secure the facility from access by all persons other than authorized personnel. Any wireless facility located on school grounds, the grounds of a day care facility, or in a park or recreational area, shall, to the greatest extent practicable, be isolated from and not be intrusive on the educational and/or recreational activities at such venue to the satisfaction of the commission.

5. Displacement of required parking prohibited. The placement of a wireless facility in a parking lot or parking structure may not cause a reduction in the amount of required parking spaces to below the number required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52 nor cause deviation from parking development standards or specifications for parking facilities required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52.

6. Maintenance. All wireless facilities shall be maintained in good condition and repair, and shall remain free of graffiti. Any and all graffiti shall be removed by the operator or property owner, or by someone on their behalf, within 48 hours of receiving written notice from the County that graffiti exists on the property. If the graffiti is not removed within 48 hours after receipt of said notice, the County may itself cause the graffiti to be removed, and the permittee or its successor in interest shall be required to pay the County's cost of removal. The property owned or leased for maintaining the wireless facility shall remain free of trash and other debris.

7. Removal. The operator of a wireless facility shall remove such facility within six months after its lawful operation has ceased, and restore the site as nearly as practicable to its original condition. For facilities not located within the public rights-of-way, if the operator or a successor no longer exists, the property owner on which the facility is located shall remove such facility within six months after its lawful operation has ceased, and restore the site as nearly as practicable to its original condition. Failure to remove such facility as provided above shall constitute a public nuisance. If the wireless facility is not so removed within 90 days after receipt by the operator or property owner of notice requiring such removal, the County may itself cause the facility to be removed, and the operator or property owner shall be required to pay the County's costs of removal.

8. Compliance reports. For large facilities, the applicant shall submit on an annual basis, reports to the department to show compliance with the maintenance and removal conditions.

9. For public safety purposes, for facilities located on a lot or parcel of land containing an existing legally-established place of religious worship, day care facility, park, recreational facility primarily utilized by children up through and including age 17, or school through grade 12, the name, address, and telephone number of the service provider shall be displayed on the grounds of the property where the wireless facility is located.

10. In addition to the appropriate permit, all wireless facilities located within or on a public right-of-way shall be required, as a condition of the permit, to obtain an encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works.

11. Upon construction of all authorized facilities, the applicant shall submit written certification that the radio frequency electromagnetic emissions levels comply with FCC limitations for uncontrolled/general human population exposure to such fields.

12. All facilities shall comply with adopted Federal Communications Commission limits for uncontrolled/general population human exposure to such fields when operating at full strength and capacity.

22.52.1550 Case processing procedures for facilities subject to site plan review.

A. Application Requirements. An applicant for a wireless facility subject to site plan review pursuant to the provisions of subsection B of Section 22.52.1530 shall submit the following:

1. A filing fee as required in subsection A of Section 22.60.100;

2. A site plan depicting the proposed exact location, specifications and characteristics of the wireless facility, and other documentation to show that the proposed facility falls within the parameters of subsection B of Section 22.52.1530 and meets the applicable development standards and conditions of Section 22.52.1540;

3. The name and address of the applicant and all persons owning any or all of the property to be used; and

4. For applicants filing under subsections B.1 and B.2 of Section 22.52.1530, evidence that the applicant owns or has the permission of the owner or owners to make such applications.

5. Written certification and adequate emissions documentation that the radio-frequency electromagnetic field's emissions of the proposed wireless facility are expected to

fall within the adopted Federal Communication Commission's limits for uncontrolled/general population human exposure to such fields when operating at full strength and capacity. Where the proposed wireless facility will be co-located with one or more wireless facilities, the certification required by this subsection shall be based on the cumulative emissions of all co-located facilities.

B. Approval or Denial. Applications for wireless facilities seeking site plan review which are submitted in compliance with this section and in conformance with subsection B of Section 22.52.1530 shall be approved by the director. Incomplete applications or those not in compliance with subsection B of Section 22.52.1530 shall be denied.

C. Notice of Decision. The director shall notify the applicant of the action taken by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested. Such notice may also be hand-delivered. The decision shall be final 15 days after receipt by the applicant of the notice of decision.

D. Appeal. An applicant dissatisfied with the decision may appeal to the commission before the decision becomes final. The commission shall affirm, modify, or reverse the original decision. The decision of the commission shall be final.

E. Expiration of Approval. An approved site plan which is not used within one year shall be null and void and of no effect, except that where an application requesting an extension is filed prior to such expiration date, the director may extend such time for a period not to exceed one year.

22.52.1560 Case processing procedures for director's review and approval.

A. Application requirements. In addition to the information required by

subsections A through F of Section 22.56.1680, an applicant for director's review and approval of a wireless facility or a linear system of small facilities, pursuant to subsection C of Section 22.52.1530, shall submit the following:

1. A filing fee as required in subsection A of Section 22.60.100;

2. A site plan depicting the area and dimensions of the site, the proposed exact location, specifications and characteristics of the wireless facility, and other documentation to show that the proposed facility falls within the parameters of subsection C of Section 22.52.1530, and meets the applicable development standards and conditions of Section 22.52.1540;

3. The name and address of the applicant and all persons owning any or all of the property to be used and, if the property is not owned by the applicant, documentation that the applicant has the permission of the owner or owners to make such application;

4. A list of nearby property owners as follows:

a. For individual facilities, a list certified by affidavit or statement under penalty of perjury, of the names and addresses of all persons who are shown on the latest available assessment roll of the County of Los Angeles as owners of the lots on which each wireless facility will be located, and as owning property within 500 feet from the exterior boundaries of such lots if located in an urban land use classification in the adopted general plan or within 1,000 feet of the boundaries of such lots if located in a non-urban land use classification in the adopted general plan, except that if the wireless facility is to be located within a CSD which requires a greater area of notification for director's review applications, then the notice requirements of the CSD shall apply; and

b. For a linear system of small facilities, names and addresses as specified in subsection (a), above, as owning property within 200 feet from the boundary of the lots for which each small facility is proposed.

5. Two sets of mailing labels for the applicable list of owners as determined in subsection 4, above, and a map drawn to a scale specified by the director showing the ownership of the lots referenced in subsection 4, above;

6. Except where the proposed wireless facility will be co-located with one or more existing, authorized wireless facilities:

a. An inventory of existing and approved wireless facilities that reflects a good-faith effort to document all such facilities located within a one-quarter mile radius of the proposed facility, including the location, type, height, and design of each facility; and

b. A statement describing the good-faith efforts on the applicant's part to co-locate the proposed wireless facility on the site of another such facility, including coverage/interference analysis and capacity analysis and any other reasons that co-location is infeasible;

7. For all facilities, written certification and adequate emissions documentation that the radio-frequency electromagnetic fields' emissions of the proposed wireless facility are expected to fall within the adopted Federal Communications Commission's limits for uncontrolled/general population human exposure to such fields when operating at full strength and capacity. Where the proposed wireless facility will be co-located with one or more wireless facilities, the certification required by this subsection shall be based on the cumulative emissions of all co-located facilities.

B. Linear System. Only one application shall be required for a proposed linear system of small facilities.

C. Notice of application. The director shall send notice that an application for a wireless facility has been filed to all property owners shown on the list described in subsection 4, above. The notice shall be sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, describing the project with its proposed location, and informing the recipient that opposition to the project may be submitted by written protest to the director within 15 days after mailing of such notice and informing the recipient that protests must state reasons why the necessary findings for approval cannot be made.

D. Director's approval. The director shall approve an application for a wireless facility when less than two protests to the granting of the application have been received within the specified protest period if the information submitted by the applicant substantiates the following findings:

1. That the proposal meets the applicable development standards specified in Section 22.52.1540 and the principles and standards contained in Section 22.56.1690; and

2. Except where the facility is proposed to be co-located with one or more existing authorized wireless facilities, that the applicant has undertaken and completed a good-faith effort to inventory all wireless facilities within one-quarter mile of the proposed site and to co-locate the proposed facility on the site of an existing, authorized facility.

3. That the applicant has submitted written certification that the radiofrequency electromagnetic fields' emissions from the facility when operating at full

strength and capacity are expected to comply with the FCC limitations for uncontrolled/general human population.

E. Director's denial. The director shall deny the application where two or more protests have been received or where the information submitted by the applicant fails to substantiate the required findings to his satisfaction.

F. Protests. For the purpose of determining whether protests have been received by the director, if written certification of expected emissions show compliance with FCC Guidelines as required herein, a protest based solely on the environmental effects of radio-frequency radiation or electromagnetic emissions from such facilities shall not be counted as a protest received. In addition, a protest that fails to set forth reasons why the necessary findings for director's approval cannot be made shall not be counted as a protest received. Only protests received from property owners or lessees within the noticed area shall constitute a valid protest. If more than one protest is received from the same lot or parcel, said protests shall be counted as one protest.

G. Notice of director's decision. The director shall provide notice of the action taken on the application to the applicant and to any person who filed a written protest accompanied by a return mailing address. Such notice to the applicant shall be by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested or by hand-delivery; and, to those who filed a protest by first-class mail, postage prepaid, or may be hand delivered when appropriate. If the application is denied, such notice shall also inform the applicant that the Zoning Ordinance permits the filing of a subsequent application for a conditional use permit for a wireless facility. If such application is filed within one year after the director's denial, the filing fee for such

application shall be the difference between the fee initially paid and the fee required for a conditional use permit.

H. Finality of Decision. The decision of the director shall be final on the 15th day after receipt by the applicant of the notice of decision.

I. Appeal. Prior to the date when the director's decision becomes final, an applicant or any person who filed a written protest accompanied by a return address may appeal the director's decision to the commission or the commission may call the matter up for review. The commission shall affirm, modify, or reverse the original decision. The decision of the commission shall be final.

J. Expiration of Approval. An approved application for director's review, which is not used within one year, shall be null and void and of no effect, except that where an application requesting an extension is filed prior to such expiration date, the director may extend such time for a period not to exceed one year.

22.52.1570 Case processing procedures for conditional use permits.

A. Applicability. The provisions of Part 1 of Chapter 22.56 shall apply to an application for a conditional use permit for a wireless facility, except as modified by this Part 14.

B. Application Requirements. An applicant for a conditional use permit for a wireless facility shall submit:

1. A filing fee as required in subsection A of Section 22.60.100;

2. The name and address of the applicant and all persons owning any or all of the property to be used and, if the property is not owned by the applicant, documentation

that the applicant has the permission of the owner or owners to make such application;

3. A list of nearby property owners as follows:

a. For individual facilities, a list, certified by affidavit or statement under penalty of perjury of the names and addresses of all persons who are shown on the latest assessment role of the County of Los Angeles as owners of the lot on which the wireless facility will be located, and as owning property within 500 feet of the boundaries of said lot in an urban land use classification in the adopted general plan or within 1,000 feet of the boundaries of said lot in a non-urban land use classification in the adopted general plan; and

b. For a linear system of small facilities, names and addresses such as specified in subsection (a), above, as owning property within 200 feet of the boundaries of the lots for which each small facility is proposed.

4. Two sets of mailing labels for the applicable list of owners as determined in subsection 3, above, and a map drawn to a scale specified by the director showing the ownership of the lots referenced in subsection 3, above;

5. Evidence of the nature, condition, and development of adjacent uses, buildings and structures;

6. A site plan depicting the area and dimensions of the site, the proposed exact location of the wireless facility on the site, proposed landscaping, proposed set backs, and other proposed development features;

7. Evidence of the dimensions and state of improvements of adjoining streets and highway providing access to the site;

8. Documents indicating other permits and approvals obtained for the site in compliance with other applicable ordinances;

9. Maps showing the site and location of property on which the proposed wireless facility will be located and showing:

a. For individual facilities, the location of highways, streets, alleys, and dimensions of lots or parcels within 500 feet with one copy of such a map indicating the use on every lot and parcel; or

b. For a linear system of small facilities, the location of highways, streets, alleys, and dimensions of lots or parcels within 200 feet of each proposed small facility within the system with one copy of such a map indicating the use on every lot and parcel.

10. Information showing the proposed wireless facility is consistent with the applicable general plan;

11. Information showing that the proposed wireless facility complies with the development standards in Section 22.52.1540 and specifying any standard for which the applicant is requesting an exemption; and

12. For all facilities, written certification and adequate emissions documentation that the radio-frequency electromagnetic fields' emissions of the proposed wireless facility are expected to comply with the adopted Federal Communications Commission's limits for uncontrolled/general population human exposure to such fields when operating at full strength and capacity. Where the proposed wireless facility will be co-located with one or more wireless facilities, the verification required by this subsection shall be based on the cumulative emissions of all co-located facilities. Subsequent to any approval and

installation, the permitee shall submit verification that actual emissions from the facility operating at full strength and capacity fall within the FCC Guidelines.

C. Linear System. Only one application shall be required for a proposed linear system of small facilities.

D. Notice of application. The director shall cause notice of an application for a conditional use permit, including the location of the proposed facility, to be mailed by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to all addresses on the list required in subsection B.3, above, and, if the application for a conditional use permit has been filed pursuant to subsections E and G of Section 22.56.1560, to any persons who filed a written protest, accompanied by a return mailing address, to the previous application for a director's review and approval.

E. Posting of notice on property with sensitive uses; Notice of hearing. Where a wireless facility is proposed on a lot or parcel of land containing a legally-established place of religious worship, day care facility, park, recreational facility primarily utilized by children up through and including age 17 or school through grade 12, the applicant shall post notice of the hearing regarding the application on the subject property in accordance with the specifications of subsections A through E of Section 22.60.175, or in such other locations as determined by the director. Posting is not required for other CUP wireless facility applications not located on a sensitive use property. In addition to any posting required, notice of hearings for all CUP applications shall be given pursuant to 22.60.174

F. Burden of Proof. The hearing officer shall approve the application for a conditional use permit where the information submitted by the applicant and/or presented at the public hearing substantiates all of the following findings:

1. That the proposed use will be consistent with the general plan and applicable community plans;

2. That the proposed use complies with the applicable development standards specified in Section 22.52.1540, or where applicable, that the applicant has demonstrated that strict compliance with the development standards specified in Section 22.52.1540 would substantially and unreasonably interfere with the ability of the proposed wireless facility to receive or transmit signals;

3. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed wireless facility;

4. Except where the wireless facility is proposed to be co-located with one or more existing, authorized wireless facilities, that the applicant has undertaken and completed a good-faith effort to inventory all wireless facilities within one-quarter mile of the proposed site and to co-locate the proposed facility on the site of another such facility;

5. For all facilities, that the radio-frequency electromagnetic fields' emissions of the proposed wireless facility are expected to comply with the adopted Federal Communications Commission's limits for uncontrolled/general population human exposure to such fields when operating at full strength and capacity; and

6. Excluding consideration of radio-frequency electromagnetic field emissions that fall within Federal Communications Commission's limits, that the requested use at the location proposed will not:

a. adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area; or

b. be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or

c. jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare;

G. Conditions. Additional conditions may be imposed pursuant to this Part 14 to ensure that the use will be in accordance with the findings required by subsection F.

H. Denial. The hearing officer shall deny the application where the information submitted by the applicant and/or presented at public hearing fails to substantiate such findings to the satisfaction of the hearing officer.

I. Notice of Decision. Procedures and requirements for notification of the action taken shall be those set forth in Section 22.60.190.

J. Appeals. Appeal procedures regarding a conditional use permit for a wireless facility shall conform with the procedures and requirements set forth in Sections 22.60.200 through 22.60.260, inclusive.

22.52.1580 Standards and Case Processing Procedures for Central Site Permits and Subsequently Installed Co-Location Facilities.

A. Location. Central Co-Location Facility sites shall be allowed, space-permitting, in all commercial and manufacturing zones and SR-D and IT zones so long as not located on properties listed on the National Register of Historic Properties or the California Register of Historical Resources.

B. Central Co-Location Facilities shall comply with the standards and conditions of use set forth in Section 22.52.1540.

C. A Central Co-Location Facility shall require a Central Site Permit, complying with the procedures of Section 22.52.1570 and meeting the burden of proof required in subsection F of Section 22.52.1570. To qualify as a Central Co-location Facility, such facilities must have a certified environmental impact report, or an approved mitigated negative declaration or negative declaration. The environmental study for such facilities must consider the impacts not only of the initial facility but of wireless facilities that may be co-located at, or adjoining to, said Central Co-Location Facility in the future.

D. All facilities that comply with the development standards of Section 22.52.1540, with the exception of subsection B.3.f, may be subsequently located at, or adjoining to, a Central Co-Location Facility pursuant to a non-discretionary site plan review so long as they match or blend with the design of the Central Co-Location Facility, including related screening or camouflaging.

E. Applicants for wireless facilities to be located at an established Central Co-Location Facility shall submit the following:

1. A filing fee as required in subsection A of Section 22.60.100;

2. A site plan depicting the proposed exact location, specifications and characteristics of the wireless facility, and other documentation to show that the proposed facility falls within the types of sites reviewed under the environmental study conducted for the Central Co-Location Facility and showing that it meets the applicable development standards and conditions of Section 22.52.1540;

3. Documentation that the applicant owns the Central Co-Location Facility or has the permission of the owner or owners to make such application.

. . .

SECTION 9. Section 22.56.1835 is hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to the list of uses requiring a temporary use permit:

22.56.1835

. . .

Wireless facilities on wheels, for one three-month period on a lot or parcel of land in accordance with the standards and requirements in Section 22.52.1540.

SECTION 10. Subsection A of Section 22.60.100 is hereby amended to add the following in alphabetical order to read as follows:

. . .

— Central Site Permits for Wireless Telecommunication Co-Location Facilities— $5,148.00.

— Conditional Use Permits for Wireless Telecommunication Facilities — $5,148.00 or $4,221 if the permit request is the result of a denial of an initial Director's Review application, except that where a linear system of small facilities is proposed, an additional fee of $100.00 per facility shall be paid for all but one facility.

. . .

— Director's Review for Wireless Telecommunication Facilities — $927.00, except that where a linear system of small facilities is proposed, an additional fee of $100.00 per facility shall be paid for all but one facility where a linear system of small facilities is proposed, an additional fee of $100.00 per facility shall be paid for all but one facility.

. . .

Site Plan Review for Wireless Telecommunication Facilities — $666.00, except that where a linear system of small facilities is proposed, an additional fee of $100.00 per facility shall be paid for all but one facility.

—

SECTION 11. Subsection A of Section 22.60.175 is hereby amended as follows:

. . . A. Size. Dimension of sign(s) shall be two feet in width and three feet in length, except that signs posted for notice of public hearings regarding wireless facilities located in non-urban areas shall be three feet in width by four feet in length.

WIRELESS FACILITY SIZES

PART OF FACILITY	SMALL FACILITY*	MEDIUM FACILITY*	LARGE FACILITY
PANEL ANTENNAS	All of which are less than or equal to 2 feet in length and 1 foot in width.	Any greater than 2 feet and none greater than 5 feet in length; and any greater than 1 foot and none greater than 16 inches in width.	Any greater than 5 feet in length or 16 inches in width.
WHIP ANTENNAS	All of which are less than or equal to 4 feet in length.	Any greater than 4 feet and none greater than 6 feet in length.	Any greater than 6 feet in length.
MICROWAVE ANTENNAS	No more than 1 antenna which is less than or equal to 2 feet in diameter.	All totaling greater than 2 feet and up to 4 feet in diameter.	All totaling greater than 4 feet in diameter.
APPURTENANT RADIO EQUIPMENT BOXES	No more than 2 total feet in height and six total cubic feet in volume.**	All totaling greater than 2 feet and up to 6 feet in height, and greater than 6 cubic feet and up to 54 cubic feet in volume.**	All totaling greater than 6 feet in height or 54 cubic feet in volume.**

*If any element exceeds specifications, the facility will be bumped up to the next size.
**All specified volumes exclusive of emergency 911 equipment and electric meter boxes.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: Draft Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance

1. DESCRIPTION: The proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance (Title 22 of the County Code) would establish new case processing procedures and development standards for wireless telecommunications facilities. The facilities will be differentiated by size and whether or not they are located within or outside of public rights-of-way, and they will be subject to a conditional use permit if they do not meet required development standards, are located on the grounds of a sensitive use, or are located less than 250 feet from residential and agricultural zones and not co-located with another wireless facility.

2. LOCATION: Countywide

3. PROPONENT: County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors.

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:
BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

5. THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012.

PREPARED BY: Leonard Erlanger
Ordinance Studies Section

DATE: 8/2/06

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *Draft Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance*

CASES: *RADV T200600006*

*** * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *N/A* Staff Member: *Leonard Erlanger*

Thomas Guide: *Countywide* USGS Quad: *Countywide*

Location: *Unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County County-wide.*

Description of Project: *Draft ordinance amendment to the County Zoning Ordinance (Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code) that would establish new case processing procedures and development standards for wireless telecommunication facilities, improving visual effects and safety over current procedures and standards. Current procedures require a conditional use permit for all wireless filings; however, no established list of required development standards exists at this time to consistently ensure a lack of potential impacts on surrounding properties and persons, and standards are applied on an inconsistent ad hoc, case by case basis.*

The draft ordinance would distinguish between small, medium and large wireless facilities, between Building-mounted and ground-mounted facilities, and between facilities located within and outside of public Rights-of-way.

The new draft ordinance would allow as a permitted use with a site plan review small wireless facilities located outside the public right-of-way that meet detailed specified development standards, and small and medium facilities located within the public right-of-way that meet detailed specified standards.

It would also allow subject to a director's review and approval certain small facilities located outside the public rights-of-way that do not meet certain development standards, medium and large facilities located outside public rights-of-way in residential and agricultural zones that are co-located and meet detailed specified development standards, medium and large facilities located outside the public rights-of-way in commercial and industrial zones more than 250 feet from residential and agricultural zones or are co-located, that meet detailed specified development standards, and large facilities located within the public rights-of-way subject to detailed development standards.

Additionally, the draft ordinance would require a conditional use permit (CUP) for all facilities that do not meet the detailed specified development standards, or are located on property containing a specified sensitive use (such as schools, parks, playgrounds, etc.), or that are medium or large and are located outside the public rights-of-way in residential and agricultural zones and are not co-located, or are medium or large and are located outside the public right-of-way in commercial and industrial zones 250 feet or less from residential and agricultural zones and are not co-located, or that are building-mounted and are attached to a historical building is listed on the Federal and/or StateRegisters. The related CUP would include a site-specific environmental revie public notice and review, public hearings, and substantial conformance with applicable development standards.

The ordinance also establishes detailed required development standards relating to required height, limits, setbacks, colors, design, integration with existing buildings, camouflaging, under-grounding, landscaping, security, maintenance, removal and periodic compliance reports.

This ordinance amendment will regulate wireless telecommunication facilities Countywide. No site-specific

project is proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

Gross Acres: *All unincorporated properties Countywide.*

Environmental Setting: *Countywide unincorporated areas, including more densely populated south county areas and largely rural north county areas, bisected by the Angeles National Forest.*

Zoning: *Ordinance to apply to wireless telecommunications facilities in all zones, except that where they are more restrictive in related development standards, CSD standards will apply.*

General Plan: *Ordinance will be applicable in all land use designations countywide*

Community/Area wide Plan: *Ordinance to apply countywide.*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
N/A	

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☐ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☒ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ State Fish and Game
- ☐ State Parks
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW: *Land Development Division, Construction Division, and Road Maintenance Division*
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐		
	2. Flood	6	☒	☐		
	3. Fire	7	☒	☐		
	4. Noise	8	☒	☐		
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☒	☐		
	2. Air Quality	10	☒	☐		
	3. Biota	11	☒	☐		
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☒	☐		
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐		
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐		
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☒	☐		
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☒	☐		
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☒	☐		
	3. Education	18	☒	☐		
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☒	☐		
	5. Utilities	20	☒	☐		
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐		
	2. Environmental Study	22	☒	☐		
	3. Land Use	23	☒	☐		
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☒	☐		
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	☒	☐		

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: _____
2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Leonard Erlanger Date: 8-2-06

Approved by: Ron Hoffman Date: 8-2-06

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *Earthquake fault zones exist within Los Angeles County.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *Landslides are known within Los Angeles County.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? *Unstable slopes exist within Los Angeles County.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? *Seismic hazard zones and other liquefaction areas are present in Los Angeles County.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

The draft ordinance will regulate wireless facilities and mitigate the potential impacts of such facilities Countywide on a site/project-specific basis subsequent to its adoption. No site-specific project is being proposed at this time.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *Major drainage courses are present in Los Angeles County.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *Floodways, floodplains and flood hazard zones exist within Los Angeles County.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? *Mudflow areas exist in Los Angeles County.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☒ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The draft ordinance will regulate wireless telecommunication facilities and mitigate the potential impacts of such facilities countywide on a site/project-specific basis subsequent to its adoption No site-specific project is being proposed at this time.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in a high fire hazard area (Fire Zone 4)? *High fire hazard areas exist in Los Angeles County.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? *Water is not available in some areas of Los Angeles County.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? *Dangerous fire hazard conditions existing in Los Angeles County.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Prevention Guide No.46

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

The draft ordinance will regulate wireless telecommunication facilities and mitigate potential impacts of such facilities countywide on a site/project-specific basis subsequent to its adoption. No site-specific project is being proposed at this time.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☐	☒	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *High noise sources exist in Los Angeles County.*
b.		☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
c.		☒	☐	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
d.		☒	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
e.		☒	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Compatible Use

The draft ordinance does not propose any site-specific project at this time.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.		☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
		☐	☐	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.		☒	☐	Could the projects associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?
d.		☒	☐	Could the projects post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?
e.		☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☒ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☒ NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance (DPW)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

The draft ordinance will regulate wireless telecommunication facilities and mitigate the potential impacts of such facilities countywide on a site/project-specific basis subsequent to its adoption No site-specific project is being proposed at this time..

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

The draft ordinance does not propose any site-specific project.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural? *SEA's and ESHA's are designated in Los Angeles County.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site? *Major drainage courses exist within Los Angeles County.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)? *Sensitive habitats are present within Los Angeles County.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *Native trees are present in Los Angeles County.*
f.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *Sensitive species are known in Los Angeles County.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☐ Oak Tree Permit

The draft ordinance will regulate wireless telecommunication facilities and mitigate potential impacts from such facilities countywide on a site/project-specific basis subsequent to its adoption. No site-specific project is proposed at this time.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☐	☒	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *Cultural resources are present in Los Angeles County.*
b.		☐	☒	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? *Paleontological resources are present within Los Angeles County.*
c.		☐	☒	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? *Historic sites exist within Los Angeles County.*
d.		☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.		☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.		☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

The draft ordinance will regulate wireless telecommunication facilities and mitigate potential impacts of such facilities countywide on a site/project-specific basis subsequent to its adoption No site-specific project is being proposed at this time..

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.		☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.		☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

No site-specific project is proposed in connection with this draft ordinance..

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☒	☐	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.		☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.		☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.		☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

No site specific project is proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed? *Scenic corridors are present in Los Angeles County.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? *Trails are located throughout Los Angeles County.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features? *Unique esthetic features are present in Los Angeles County.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)? *Location in, and encroachment into, the public rights-of-way.*

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

The draft ordinance's development standards for wireless facilities relating to scenic impacts will mitigate such impacts related to future site-specific facilities that it regulates. Such draft ordinance conditions include requirements for height limits, camouflaging and under-grounding of ground-mounted facilities, roof-edge setbacks to the extent that viability of signal transmission can be preserved, and use of non-glare materials. No site-specific project is being proposed in connection with this ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☒	☐	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (mid-block or intersections)?
b.		☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.		☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.		☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
e.		☒	☐	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.		☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.		☒	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

The draft ordinance regulates wireless facilities, a use that generates little if any traffic, and the Ordinance requires that such facilities not displace any required parking for other uses. No site-specific project is being proposed in connection with this ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

The wireless facilities regulated by this draft ordinance will generate little or no waste. No site-specific project Is proposed in connection with this ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

The wireless facilities regulated by this draft ordinance will not generate any demand for educational Services, and it will require that such facilities proposed for school sites be sited in a location that is isolated and separated from educational and recreational activities. No site-specific project is proposed in connection With this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

The draft ordinance requires that future wireless facilities be surrounded by appropriate fencing, gates and locks, which will prevent vandalism and need for related police reports. The ordinance will also support Appropriate development of wireless facilities, which along with their 911-equipment, will help provide the location of callers in the event of an emergency. No site-specific project is being proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☐	☒	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *Public water is not available in all areas of Los Angeles County.*
b.		☐	☒	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.		☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.		☒	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
e.		☒	☐	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
c.		☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The draft ordinance will facilitate appropriate review of, and development of, wireless services. No site-specific project is being proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.		☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.		☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.		☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.		☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

No site-specific project is being proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	☒	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	☐	☒	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	☒	☐	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

The draft ordinance regulates small, medium and large wireless facilities that may emit levels of electromagnetic radiation; however, it has been determined that small and medium facilities don't emit significant levels of such radiation, and the ordinance provides that applicants for future large facilities document that the levels of such emissions fall well within related Federal safety guidelines. No specific project is being proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes	No	Maybe	
☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
			Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
☐	☒	☐	Other?
☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community?
☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The draft ordinance will regulate wireless facilities and mitigate potential impacts from such facilities Countywide on a site/project-specific basis subsequent to its adoption. No site-specific project is being Proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	☒	☐	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	☒	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

No site-specific project is being proposed in connection with this draft ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

Yes	No	Maybe	
☐	☒	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
☐	☒	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
☐	☒	☐	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 22 OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CODE (ZONING ORDINANCE)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Regional Planning Commission, County of Los Angeles has recommended certain amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that will establish new development standards and case processing procedures for the construction of wireless telecommunications facilities in the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles.

NOTICE IS ALSO HEREBY GIVEN that a public hearing will be held before the Board of Supervisors, in Room 381, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 at _____ a.m. on _____pursuant to said Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code and Title 7 of the Government Code (the Planning and Zoning Law) for the purpose of hearing testimony relative to the adoption of the following amendments:

1. Amendments to establish new development standards and case processing procedures for the construction of wireless telecommunications facilities.

2. Such other amendments which, in the opinion of the Board of Supervisors, should be considered at this time.

Written comments may be sent to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors at the above address. If you do not understand this notice or need more information, please call Ms. Karen Simmons at (213) 974-6432.

"ADA ACCOMMODATIONS: If you require reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aid and services such as material in alternate format or a sign language interpreter, please contact the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Coordinator at (213) 974-6488 [Voice] or (213) 617-2292 [TDD] with at least three business days notice."

Si no entiende esta noticia o necesita mas informacion, por favor llame este numero: (213) 974-6467.