

**Wireless Telecommunication Facilities (WTF) Governance by California Cities –
Discretionary Permits in the Public Right-of-Way (Residential Districts)¹**

1. Large and/or nearby cities with discretionary permitting requirements:

- San Francisco (SF; Muni. Code §25.1500)
- Richmond (R; Muni. Code §15.04.890)
- Oakland (O; Muni. Code §17.128)
- San Diego (SD; Muni. Code §141.0420)
- Malibu (M; Muni. Code §§17.46, 17.08.040)
- Pasadena (P; Muni. Code §12.22)
- Norwalk (N; Muni. Code §§17.04.240, 17.02.295)
- Inglewood (I; Muni. Code §10-230)
- Santa Monica (SM; Muni. Code §7.06 -- new poles, over-height poles)

2. Common key provisions:

- Notice of installation and/or hearing to nearby/affected property owners/occupants (300 ft./500 ft.)
- Public comments and/or hearing prior to permit issuance²
- Design, installation and/or development standards (e.g., height, scale, color, finish, camouflage, antenna placement/number, landscaping, setbacks, ID and/or accessory equipment requirements)
- Visual/aesthetic impact and public welfare/safety considerations
- No exemption for utility pole installations
- Conditions may be imposed by reviewing authority
- Appeals by any interested/aggrieved persons
- Procedures for permit revocation/termination and/or facility removal

3. Other provisions of note:

- Expanded notice (e.g., posting on-site; notice to community groups/others requesting notice; 1000 ft. notice in rural areas) (SF, R, O, SD, N, M)
- Tiered location preferences/residential siting discouraged (e.g., commercial districts preferred over residential districts, distance prohibitions) (R, O, M, SM)
- Tiered support structure preferences (e.g., co-location, existing poles, streetlights) (SF, O, P, N, SM)³
- Concentration limits (O, P, M, I, SM)
- Noise, acoustical, wind/load consideration/analysis (SF, R, N)
- Additional specific siting requirements: prohibition against installations in areas with no overhead utilities (SF) and within 500 ft. of schools, playgrounds or parks (M); height limitations for installations on existing poles (P, M, SM); pole height (O) or 100 ft. (R) set-back requirements; attachment to utility poles permitted only if surplus space available (I)
- Justification/prohibition analysis and/or hearing (coverage gap, alternative site feasibility, hardship, least intrusive means and/or needs tests) (R, SD, M, P, N, I, SM)
- RF emissions analysis and/or certification of compliance with FCC requirements (all except SD)
- Mapping of existing WTF and/or projection of anticipated future needs (N, I)
- Showing of CPUC issuance of Certificate of Public Convenience & Necessity (public utility status of applicant) (N, SM)
- Permit duration limits and/or periodic review/monitoring (SF, R, P, N, I, SM)

4. Temporary moratorium/hold on applications during drafting process: R, O, P, N, I, SM

5. Legal challenges to listed ordinances: None (as of 4/28/11)

¹Includes cities with specific and/or extensive WTF regulations (does not include counties); sources: communications with city officials/city attorneys/text of ordinances.

²In practice, Norwalk subjects installations other than co-locations to public hearing/discretionary review (staff, Norwalk Planning Division/NMC §17.02.295(E)).

³In practice, Pasadena prefers the use of streetlights over other poles (Pasadena City Attorney/PMC §12.22.110-120).