

Iraheta, Alba

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 10:18 AM
To: Official Records - City Clerk
Subject: FW: Remarks for November 14th Appeal Hearing
Attachments: Appeal of Wi fi Antenna at Grand and CA _11-14-11.pdf

From: Gretchen Brickson [jgbrickson@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 6:29 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Cc: Madison, Steve; Suzuki, Takako; Christopher Sutton; ostenson.brandt@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Remarks for November 14th Appeal Hearing

Mark,

Attached is an electronic copy of my remarks for tomorrow's Appeal hearing. Please distribute to the City Council members for the hearing.

Let me know if you have any questions. I will be tied up in the late afternoon, but if you need to reach me please call my cell phone at (818) 454-4892.

It has been a pleasure working with you.

Regards,

Gretchen

**Appeal of Decision to Approve T-Mobile Permit to
Install Wireless Antenna at California and Grand
Appellant Remarks
November 14, 2011**

Mayor Boggard, Vice Mayor McAustin and members of the council, thank you for the opportunity to speak. As you know, I am Gretchen Brickson, the appellant in this case. Again I want to thank Dan Rix, Richard Yee, Mark Jomsky and Steve Madison's office for their time and attention to this matter. The appeal process thoroughly met my request for community participation and I hope will serve as a model for future wireless telecommunication decisions.

Proposed Antenna Violates Pasadena Municipal Code

However, I am disappointed that the Department of Public Works and T-Mobile have been unable to identify an *alternative location* that would protect pedestrian safety, preserve the historic nature of Grand Avenue and bring resources to the City. I am also concerned that the proposed installation violates the Pasadena Municipal Code in two ways:

1. The 25 foot height standard in Pasadena Municipal Code, Section 12.22.120 B. is not met.

Pasadena Municipal Code (PMC), Section 12.22.120 B. states, "*No wireless telecommunications facility may be located on a pole that is less than 25 feet in height*" and is intended to ensure that cell tower arrays are located ABOVE the highest roof line of adjacent residences. This supports aesthetics, safety, and effectiveness of signal transmission. However, the "25 foot" rule fails to take into account instances such as this where the street's elevation is below adjoining residences.

The topography at Grand and California is unusual. The pole proposed for the antenna is located within a depression between nearby higher residential properties. This means that the antenna would be below the highest roof lines—resulting in reduced signal effectiveness and placing the antenna improperly within the direct line of sight of the adjoining residential properties on South Grand.

For example, the property at 558 South Grand starts with an eight foot high concrete wall, and the yard slopes upward to the east. The residence's pool is placed halfway up the slope and the house is above that. The antenna would be directly adjacent to the yard and pool. The residence at 555 South Grand is many feet higher, and the placement of the wireless antenna at the proposed site would place it at or below the first floor.

Appeal of Decision to Install Wireless Antenna at California and Grand

The residents and owners of these properties have raised this issue during the hearings and community meetings, and the applicant has not responded adequately.

2. The antenna placement is not on a side frontage as required by PMC, Section 12.22.110 F.

PMC Code, Section 12.22.110 F. requires that any placement of an antenna near a corner in a residential area must be on the side frontage and not on the primary frontage of a residence. The unusual design of the residences at 555 and 558 South Grand mean that the proposed location is not on the side frontage. In fact, the front steps of both homes have sole access from South Grand Avenue.

Alternative Locations are Available

An alternative antenna location at Orange Grove and California Boulevards—proposed by telecommunications consultant, Jonathan Kramer—is less intrusive and preferable. The Orange Grove and California intersection does not pose the topographical challenges of the Grand and California location. Since several concrete light standards and traffic signal poles already exist at the intersection, the visual impact would also be less than an antenna placed at Grand and California.

An antenna at Orange Grove and California could be paired with a second antenna at La Loma Road and Arroyo Boulevard. A concrete light pole is currently in place at the southwest corner of La Loma and Arroyo. The City could enhance the height of this pole or replace the pole with a taller concrete or steel pole. There are no residences on the west side of Arroyo because the land to the west is within the Lower Arroyo Seco open space area. The residences on the east side of Arroyo are at the same elevation as the ground on the west side. The topography within one block of this site is either level, slightly inclined or lower. This site will provide substantially larger coverage than the site at Grand and California without the negative impact on residents.

In summary, the proposed antenna should be: 1) placed at an alternative site where the bottom of the antenna is above the highest roof lines of adjacent residences; and 2) located only on a side frontage of a residence. For this reason I ask you to uphold the appeal and instruct the applicant to continue to work with the City of Pasadena to develop an alternative location for the antenna. Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Iraheta, Alba

To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: RE: Cell Phone antenna @ California & Grand

From: Rix, Dan
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 10:58 AM
To: Yee, Richard; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: FW: Cell Phone antenna @ California & Grand

fyi

From: chuck grosenbaugh [mailto:cgrosenbaugh@sunrisemortgage.com]
Sent: 2011-11-14 09:31
To: Rix, Dan
Subject: FW: Cell Phone antenna @ California & Grand

This is a copy of the email that I send to each of the members of the city council.

Once again this issue is being brought up for discussion. It is unfortunate that I will not be able to attend the council meeting tonight but I want to register my strong support for the new antenna. For those of us that live in the Arroyo it is imperative that the cellular providers give us quality service which this antenna will provide. Our cell phones are just marginally useful because of the lack of a quality signal. We have even attempted to use a signal booster to improve the service which has marginally helped. I also find it frustrating that one or two individuals have the power to over-ride the vast majority of residents that have wanted this antenna. When the city staff and city consultant both approve the antenna it is wrong to have these two individuals using misleading and questionable objections to delay approval.

Both Mimi and I strongly recommend you approve this antenna and stop the delaying tactics that are being employed.

Charles & Mimi Grosenbaugh
657 W. California Blvd.

Iraheta, Alba

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 10:12 AM
To: Official Records - City Clerk
Subject: FW: Please APPROVE The California and Grand T-Mobile Antenna Without Further Ado

From: Yee, Richard
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 8:43 AM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Cc: Flores, Silvia; Rix, Dan
Subject: FW: Please APPROVE The California and Grand T-Mobile Antenna Without Further Ado

Mark,

I am forwarding another comment for the record.

Rich

From: timeresrch [mailto:timeresrch@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 13, 2011 10:50 PM
To: Holden, Chris; Bogaard, Bill; De La Cuba, Vannia; district1; Fuller, Margo; Sullivan, Noreen; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Rix, Dan; Yee, Richard; Wu, Yannie
Subject: Please APPROVE The California and Grand T-Mobile Antenna Without Further Ado

Eminent domain allows cities to buy private property for the greater public good. Here we have the exact opposite situation: A hysterical resident is attempting to stop improvements meant for the greater public good, and on property that does not belong to her. Why residents were ever invited to hold forth on improvements to city property is beyond me. This is a very minor improvement to city property, and local residents should have no say in the matter. Gretchen Brickson has wasted far too much time for too many people at this point, and it should stop now.

With 4G technology becoming the new connectivity standard, it's now possible for customers to discontinue paying inflated landline rates for Internet connectivity. This is the new standard, and it should be READILY available in Pasadena of all places.

Please do NOT allow Pasadena to be further disadvantaged by misguided luddites bearing Powerpoint presentations who claim that cell phone signals destroy trees, kill birds, cause the sea level to rise and will send us back to the Dark Ages.

Please inform Ms. Brickson that this is about progress, and about Pasadena providing--as is expected of it--the full competitive range of connectivity options to its residents. After all, if the city would never place a roadblock on Orange Grove just to accommodate an irritated resident, then why would it block a strategic on-ramp to the Internet?

Mr. Williams
South Orange Grove

Iraheta, Alba

Subject: FW: Cellular installation at California and Grand

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 1:41 PM
To: Official Records - City Clerk
Subject: FW: Cellular installation at California and Grand

From: Paul Little [Paul@pasadena-chamber.org]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 12:50 PM
To: City_Council
Cc: Jomsky, Mark; Beck, Michael
Subject: Cellular installation at California and Grand

Good afternoon.

The Pasadena Chamber of Commerce supports a comprehensive and viable communication system for all of Pasadena. As you are aware, that often means installation of cellular antennae in our city. The City Council enacted guidelines and regulations for the installation of such antennae with the hope of mitigating the issues surrounding cellular towers in residential areas. In fact, the City Council specifically announced a preference for pole top installations when these regulations were enacted a short few years ago.

The installation proposed by T-Mobile at California and Grand Avenue clearly fits within the parameters and will have no noticeable visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood. In fact, T-Mobile will upgrade the light pole that will house the 72inch antenna. In addition, cellular service for T-Mobile customers in the area will be substantially improved.

The Pasadena Chamber of Commerce urges you to support the installation of the cellular antenna at California and Grand in Pasadena.

If it is of any interest, T-Mobile is not presently a member of the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce. Our interest in the decision is only to support a viable and effective mobile phone and data network in Pasadena.

Thank you,

Paul

Paul Little
Paul Little
President and Chief Executive Officer
Pasadena Chamber of Commerce
844 East Greet Street, Suite 208
Pasadena, California 91101
Tel: 626.795.3355
Fax: 626.795.5603

ExchangeDefender Message Security: [Check Authenticity](#)

11/14/2011

Item 12

Flores, Silvia

From: Yee, Richard
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 4:24 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Cc: Flores, Silvia; Rix, Dan
Subject: FW: Support for a T-mobile antenna at S. Grand Avenue and West California Blvd

Mark,

Another comment received.

Rich

From: Barbara Ellis [mailto:babs.ellis@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Holden, Chris; Bogaard, Bill; district1; Fuller, Margo; Sullivan, Noreen; De La Cuba, Vannia; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry
Cc: Rix, Dan; Yee, Richard; Wu, Yannie
Subject: Support for a T-mobile antenna at S. Grand Avenue and West California Blvd

Dear Council Member,

Please support the installation of a small cell phone antenna for T-Mobile at the corner of West California Boulevard and Grand.

We live near there, at 636 West California Boulevard, and have very poor cell phone reception. My husband is an astronomy professor at Caltech, and I work there as well. We are both increasingly reliant on our cell phones when at home, and **URGE YOU TO APPROVE THIS SMALL, SAFE and INCONSPICUOUS ANTENNA AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.**

I wrote to you several months ago about this issue, but the discussion was delayed interminably while efforts were made to appease the objectors, who will be present again at today's meeting. They never give up. We need better reception in our area, and none of the objections put up by this vociferous anti-cell-phone group are credible. It is now 265 days since the City first approved the antenna and then, as a result of the objectors, withdrew their approval and made T-Mobile and City staff undertake a lot more work. Please do the right thing today and ignore the erroneous "facts" you will be presented with.

I have talked to many residents in the California Boulevard, California Terrace, and Arroyo Boulevard area who are desperate for better cell phone service -many are running businesses from home and have had to put up their own boosters, which do not work well. I have also heard from tradesmen and contractors that our area is very hard for them to work in as they cannot communicate by cell phone, their only means of communication during the day.

Not having good cell phone reception is bad for business, bad for parents communicating with their children when they are away from home, bad for our safety during house telephone outages (all too frequent), and a bad reflection on the City of Pasadena, which prides itself in being the home of Caltech and JPL, and wants to have a thriving science and technology innovation corridor. We hope you will approve the installation today.

Professor Richard Ellis FRS, CBE.
Barbara Ellis