

**LAND USE COMMITTEE  
OF THE ALTADENA TOWN COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

**November 7, 2006 7:00 P.M.**

**Altadena Community Center, 730 E Altadena Dr, Altadena, CA**

A regular meeting of the Land Use Committee of the Altadena Town Council was held at the abovementioned date and time in the Community Room of the Altadena Community Center, 730 East Altadena Drive, Altadena CA.

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Chair Lucy Hino.

**GENERAL MATTERS**

**1. Roll Call**

The following Members, constituting a quorum, were present: Ron Carter, Anthony Cheng, Susan Goldman, Mark Goldschmidt, Steve Haussler, George Lewis, Gino Sund, Cynthia Tilleman, and Bobby Thompson.

The following Committee members were absent: Dennis Bridwell, C Jake, Steve Lamb, Walter Olszewski, Tecumseh Shackelford, and Sandra Thomas.

**2. Agenda Approval**

Motion to approve the agenda as posted was made by Member Haussler, seconded by Member Carter, and approved unanimously.

**3. Minutes Approval**

Motion to approve the October 3, 2006 minutes with corrections as announced was made by Member Thompson, seconded by Member Sund, and approved unanimously.

**4. Organizational Matters**

A. Regional Planning County hearing date for the Altadena Golf Course project was announced.

**5. Public Comment** – none.

**PUBLIC HEARING: PERMITS, VARIANCES & CHANGES**

**6. 1796 N Sierra Bonita Ave (CT4613) – Goldman**

Applicant: Peter Jackson, Vickie Novell

PM066769 filed 04/13/2006 R2 Nooshin Paidar (Subdivisions)

Oak Tree Permit filed 07/31/2006

Subdivision of 1 lot into 3 units. 6 encroachments.

Member Goldman explained that she spoke with the applicant and examined the site. 1 SFR will be demolished and 3 SFR will be built. All of the oak tree activity will be encroachments, not removal. Uses on both sides are residential rentals. There appears to be plenty of space for the proposed structures. The applicant has been very responsive to making modifications based on County Staff feedback.

The County Public Hearing will be on December 9. The applicant's engineering consultant is EGL.

The property is on the east side of Sierra Bonita. The lot is roughly 200' deep by 90' wide for a total of 17,640 sf. The current structure is 1,800 sf, which will be removed. The new proposal calls for 3 SFR in a classic Spanish style each 1,500-1,600sf. The applicant also owns the 7 Spanish bungalows next door. The new proposal is designed to fit the 3 SFR in between the existing oak trees and have a driveway down the middle. These new structures will be two story houses. This project would improve the look of the neighborhood since it is currently in poor condition. There is only 1 neighbor diagonally across that well maintains her property. These 3 SFR will be fee simple ownership.

Member Goldman stated that all of the neighbors are rentals. Having 2 story houses would stand out but it would improve the neighborhood.

Each house will have its own 2-car garage. There will be 2 common guest parking spaces for the three houses.

The zoning of the site and all surrounding parcels is R-2.

Given the above, and on motion made by Member Goldman, seconded by Member Lewis, and approved 8-0-1, it was

RESOLVED that the Committee recommend that the Altadena Town Council issue a letter to the County Regional Planning Department to recommend APPROVAL of PM066769 for the subdivision of 1796 N Sierra Bonita Ave into 3 lots and the corresponding oak tree permit applications as presented to the Committee.

**7. Multiple site: MetroPCS wireless facilities (CT4601/4602/4612) – Cheng/Sund**

Applicant: Patrick Ryan, NextG Networks

CUPs 2006-02929 thru -02936 & -02881; Karen Simmons

Co-location of 8 wireless facilities on existing utility poles in the public right-of-way.

Member Cheng gave a brief summary of the project. He stated he drove the sites and felt there was no significant aesthetic impact of these antennae given their co-location on existing utility poles and small size of the equipment as shown in the photo-simulation.

Applicant Patrick Ryan explained that NextG Networks is a public utility that does not serve wireless users directly – it is a carrier’s carrier to provide infrastructure to wireless companies who then serve customers.

All of the deployments are in the right-of-way with no new towers. NextG actually does not build new towers – its model is to attach new equipment on existing poles. The antenna is omnidirectional that attaches to the pole. The affiliated equipment is also on the pole.

Member Haussler inquired whether this is the same technology for WiFi. The applicant explained it is not, but more similar to standard wireless antennae.

Member Sund asked how this is different from traditional wireless mono-poles. The applicant explained that standard mono-poles are macrosite installations with much higher power. The NextG antenna is much less in terms of power but much more frequently placed along public right-of-ways. The emission level is equivalent to roughly 5 cell phones strapped to the pole. Several of these smaller “nodes” would be required to meet the same needs as a macrosite.

Member Goldman how do these smaller nodes compare in power and aesthetics to the standard traditional poles. The applicant explained that there are a lot of companies deploying infrastructure out there. However, NextG is not putting up new poles – they are using existing utility poles on a shared basis. There are strict guidelines on how much equipment can be attached to poles so that is a limiting factor on future co-location.

He also explained a traditional pole puts out 50-60W of power but the NextG nodes puts out 5-6W of power.

Member Tilleman asked about the aesthetics of the antenna. Mr. Ryan explained these omnidirectional antennae are 24” long by 2.5” wide and the box itself is only 40 lbs on the pole.

Member Sund stated he canvassed the neighbors in his census tract and received no real opposition to the project.

Given the above, and on motion made by Member Sund, seconded by Member Tilleman, and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED that the Committee recommend that the Altadena Town Council issue a letter to the County Regional Planning Department to recommend APPROVAL of CUPs 2006-02929 thru -02936 & -02881 for the co-location of 8 wireless facilities on existing public right-of-way utility poles as presented to the Committee.

**8. 1456 Mendocino St (CT4612) – Lewis**

Applicant: Altadena Golf Course

R2006-02000 filed 06/29/2006 Karen Simmons

Continue golf course and ABC license.

Member Lewis stated he spoke to all of the neighbors regarding the project. Most of the neighbors do not care about the project. One neighbor asked on an unrelated matter that gardening services at the golf course start at 7am or later; if so, then that neighbor would have no problems with the subject project. So, in summary, there has only been 1 possible point of opposition.

The applicant explained that this is a full liquor license continuation. There has been a liquor license in place for the normal 10 year CUP period.

Member Sund stated that the Golf Course also borders his CT. He disclosed he is a regular patron of the golf course. He stated that the Golf Course is a benefit to the neighborhood and the restaurant serves the local community besides golfers.

Given the above, and on motion made by Member Lewis, seconded by Member Thompson, and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED that the Committee recommend that the Altadena Town Council issue a letter to the County Regional Planning Department to recommend APPROVAL of CUP R2006-02000 for the continuation of the Altadena Golf Course and its associated ABC license.

**9. R-2 & R-3 Standards Amendment (Altadena-wide)**

County Planners: Thuy Hua, Mitch Glaser, Regional Planning

Seeking feedback on implementing the recent East Washington amended standards regarding R-2 and R-3 zoning across all of Altadena.

Mitch Glaser explained that the County Planning Commission authorized a zoning study of the R-2 and R-3 zones in Altadena based on the original letter from the Town Council to Regional Planning regarding the changes to the East Washington design standard

amendments. County Staff would like to get feedback from the Committee on how and what changes should or could be made to the Altadena CSD. Ms. Thuy Hua is the lead planner on this project. Four representatives from the County appeared before the Committee and explained they also drove the various streets that may be affected by the changes.

There are roughly 300 R-3 parcels in Altadena. Most of the parcels are located around 3 areas: the East Washington area, the southern end of Lake Ave in Altadena, and the corner of Fair Oaks and Woodbury; the remaining parcels are sprinkled in a few other areas. 62% of the lots affected are 3 or more units. 17% have 1-2 units with possibility for future redevelopment into multi-family.

The Chair asked whether this is complicated by limiting changes to those parcels that abut R-1 properties. Planner Hua stated this does not really make a difference since most of the R-3 properties abut R-1 zones.

The process of making the amendment is similar to passing a CSD. Residents would have to put this into a proposal, present it to the Town Council, have the Town Council adopt the proposal, then present it to County Staff. Staff would write it up and subsequently present it to the Planning Commission for approval.

Member Haussler inquired whether our proposed changes would change the density requirements by zone, but the planners confirm this does not. The proposed changes are more on building size, mass, and location. He noted that there are quite a few differences between the East Pasadena East San Gabriel CSD and what we have now. In particular, R-2 standards are left open. He inquired whether the County can include R-2 parcels into this zoning study since it was commissioned only on R-3.

ATC Councilman XXX stated that a recent structure went up in an R-2 zone that does not fit in the neighborhood so would like to see this applied to R-2 zones.

Another question was raised by the Chair whether this study should be expanded to all R-3 and R-2 parcels, not just those that abut R-1 zones.

A member of the public raised the issue that if this study was expanded to include R-2 zones, that perhaps these changes could be phased so that the original issue of protecting R-1 lots that abut R-3 parcels in case of near-term monstrous projects that may be in the pipeline.

The timing of the County is that a new set of standards could be brought back to the Town Council and Committee in the Spring. ATC Chairman Balder raised the issue that

enough community feedback needs to be done either before or simultaneously with the drafting of the new standards.

Given the above, and on motion made by Member Haussler, seconded by Member Sund, and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED that the Committee recommend that the Altadena Town Council request the County Regional Planning Commission to expand the commissioned zoning study of R-3 zones in Altadena to also include all R-2 zoned parcels and their associated design standards.

Planner Hua also inquired what specific design standards should be explored. Several members stated that it is the massing, building envelope and number of stories of both R-2 and R-3 zoned lots that are most important to the community.

## **REPORTS**

### **10. 2000 N Lake Ave (CT4612) – Cheng/Lewis** Gas station (aka Altadena Car Wash proposal)

The property user is now seeking to install actual gas pumps at this site. This is in conformance with its prior use.

No further business being brought before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned to the scheduled regular meeting on Tuesday, December 5, 2006, at 7:00 P.M. at the Community Room of the Altadena Community Center.

Respectfully submitted,  
Member Anthony Cheng  
Communications & Recording Secretary