

MINUTES: of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, August 8, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: James Macdonald, Chairman
Thomas Osborne, Vice Chairman
Paul Foster, Commissioner
John James, Commissioner
Gary Miller, Commissioner
Eric Shamp, Commissioner

ABSENT: Ruth Cook, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Michael Reiter, Assistant City Attorney
David Jump, Associate Planner
Joshua Altopp, Assistant Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - 3 MINUTES

Chairman Macdonald called the meeting to order. All Commissioners were present except Commissioners Cook and Miller.

Chairman Macdonald pulled Consent Calendar item II A. at the request of the applicant so that there could be discussion and a vote on item II B as a consent item.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

- B. Planning Commission review of application for the person to person transfer of an off-sale beer and wine license for Ford Street 76 located at 1075 Parkford Drive, Redlands, CA.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote to approve the Off-Sale Beer and Wine Alcoholic Beverage License person to person transfer for Ford Street 76 to SBCW Consulting, Inc., and no conditions are recommended as there are no problems associated with this site.

- A. **GMID, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

Final Landscape Plan for **COMMISSION REVIEW & APPROVAL No. 749**, Building Two

Project Planner Joshua Altopp stated that final landscaping plans were submitted with several alterations that were made relative to the size of the shrubs and types of trees that were different from those used for building one. The shrubs varied in size and Crepe Myrtles were proposed rather than the required 36" box Coral Gum trees. Mr. Altopp stated that the applicant was available to give an overview of their proposed alterations.

Glen Follett, GMID Architects, stated that there was difficulty in obtaining 36" box Coral Gum trees. Chairman Macdonald asked the applicant what was the proposed alternate tree. Mr. Follett proposed the Canary Island Pine tree.

Chairman Macdonald asked for feedback from staff. Director Jeff Shaw asked Mr. Follett if they were able to locate 24" box Coral Gum trees. Mr. Follett responded no.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the Canary Island Pine would be adequate. Mr. Shaw commented that the Canary Island Pine is a large tree with a good canopy that would give a nice, green appearance.

Commissioner Shamp asked what characteristics of the Canary Island Pine led the applicant to choose this particular species for the location. Scott Pritchett, Casa Verde Landscaping, stated that the Canary Island Pine was a tree that could be planted relatively close to the building and was chosen for its taller, slender appearance. Commissioner Shamp commented that the tree was a nice choice.

Mr. Altopp asked for direction relative to the size of the proposed trees.

Mr. Pritchett stated that 36" Canary Island Pine would be larger than the pre-existing Coral Gum when planted and would grow larger. He commented that a smaller 24" box would be advantageous in order to train the tree properly.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Final Landscape Plan for Commissioner Review and Approval No. 749, Building 2, subject to the conditions of approval:

1. The applicant shall change all shrub size from the proposed 1 gallon to a minimum of 5 gallon.
2. The applicant shall change the eight trees proposed for the north elevation of building two to be **24" box Canary Island Pine.**
3. The applicant shall install mulch in all planters throughout the project site including around the base of the buildings, landscaped planters in the parking area, and landscaped planters around the property perimeter.

The motion includes the amendment as shown in Condition of Approval number two (2).

Commissioner Miller arrived at 2:11 p.m.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. **HANNIBAL PETROSSI, APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. Planning Commission to consider **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 811** an Industrial development consisting of four single story buildings comprising a total of 71,872 square feet on a 4.75 acre site located on east side of Nevada Street approximately 700 feet south of Redlands Boulevard within the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan Industrial/Commercial District (EV/IC).

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner David Jump stated that the project was continued from the June 28, 2006 meeting to allow time to address issues relative to site layout, building architecture and landscaping. Mr. Jump showed a revised PowerPoint presentation and provided drawings of the proposed project site. Based on the enhanced architecture, landscaping and site layout, staff recommends approval of the proposed project subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked about parking requirements for auto repair operations. Mr. Jaquess stated that staff monitors the assumptions of the original project relative to the parking requirements when there is a business license review.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak.

Hannibal Petrossi, applicant, thanked the Planning Staff and Commissioner Miller for their help and advice relative to the redesign of the project and was available for questions.

Chairman Macdonald commended the applicant for the changes made and for fulfilling the requests of the commission on the development.

Commissioner Miller commented on the surface shown behind the signage and asked if it was a shadow line or if it was an indication of some kind of texture. Mr. Petrossi stated that it was a shadow line.

Commissioner Miller asked staffs position relative to the proposed box sign as opposed to channel letter signs. Mr. Jump stated that the under canopy signs would not be allowed and would have to be building mounted with channel letters. It would not be a typical sign seen on a building in a C-4 district.

Mr. Petrossi commented that there is no room on the fascia of the building and would prefer the signs in under the canopy in front of each store. Mr. Jaquess commented that the sign code does not allow for a sign that hangs down from a canopy and that the applicant would need to either revise the proposal or submit a proposal to amend the sign code.

Commissioner Miller commended the applicant for the changes made and addressed his concern relative to viewing the delivery side of the units in the back. Commissioner Miller made a suggestion in introducing a grid underneath the canopy that would allow the mounting of the signs to the building. Mr. Petrossi had concerns relative to tenant changes that would result in repetitive drilling into the concrete panels.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the applicant was installing impervious paving. Mr. Petrossi stated that they were going to use porous concrete. Commissioner Shamp appreciated seeing the use of this type of product and asked if there was a plan in place relative to the maintenance. Mr. Petrossi commented that the porous concrete is a fairly new material and that they will have a maintenance system for it.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval 811 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval 811 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of California Street//Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 811 subject to the following findings and attached Conditions of Approval:

1. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the industrial park use because it complies with all property development standards for the EV/IC zoning district;
2. The site properly relates to Nevada Street which will be designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because both streets will be constructed to city prescribed standards to their ultimate half widths through compliance with project conditions of approval;
3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 811 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare;
4. The use is desirable for the overall development of the community because the proposed project conforms with both the General Plan Designation and Municipal Code requirements.

B. STARBRIDGE COMMUNICATIONS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 854** to allow the installation of a wireless telecommunications facility approximately 70 feet in height to be disguised as a clock tower and become an entry monument feature within a City owned orange grove located immediately east of California Street and immediately south of the eastbound on-ramp for the Interstate 10 Freeway in the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan General Commercial District (EV/CG).

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Jump stated that the applicant is requesting an extension of time to revise the photo simulations and the architecture for the proposed clock tower. Staff is recommending a continuance to the September 12, 2006 meeting.

Chairman Macdonald asked if anyone in the audience was wishing to speak. Seeing no comments forthcoming, the public hearing was closed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Conditional Use Permit No. 854 to the September 12, 2006 meeting.

C. **HEEMSTRA SIGNS, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

Planning Commission to consider **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 280, REVISION NO. 1**, for a revision to Uniform Sign Program No. 25 for the Citrus Grove Business Park located at 310 - 390 Alabama Street in the I-C District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Project Planner Altopp stated that the project was continued several times with the commission requesting a redesign to provide a monument sign. The applicant is proposing a revision to the sign program for the Citrus Grove Business Park since there was no previous provision for a free-standing sign. Mr. Altopp gave an overview of the proposed sign. Staff recommends approval for the revision to the sign program subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked why the applicant identified the change to the sign program as a pedestal sign. Mr. Altopp stated that it was an error and clarified that it should be identified as a monument sign.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant or anyone in the audience would like to speak. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman Macdonald continued the discussion.

Commissioner Shamp had a question relative to the green line on the sign and asked if it was a reveal or a painted line. Mr. Altopp stated that it was his understanding that it was a painted line.

Tim Heemstra, representing the applicant, stated that the line could be dimensional, painted or a reveal item.

Commissioner Shamp stated that he recalled that there are existing reveals on the building and that mimicking those would be appropriate.

Director Jeff Shaw commented that this hearing is for the approval of the sign program and that the details of a specific sign would come back to the commission for their approval.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Heemstra to consider a frame that would match the architecture of the building and provided him with an example.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission find that no environmental review is required. The project qualifies as a categorical exemption from environmental review per Section 15311(a) of the CEQA guidelines.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Sign Review No. 280 Revision 1 to amend the sign program subject to the Conditions of Approval:

Conditions of Approval

1. This approval is for a Revision to the Sign Program establishing the sign criteria for the Citrus Grove Business Park. Any changes to this Sign Program would require an amendment to the Sign Program subject to Planning Commission approval;
2. In no case shall any sign extend into the City right-of-way;
3. All signs shall conform with the provisions of Chapter 15.36 of the Redlands Municipal Code;
4. The applicant will be required to apply for a Commission Sign Review for the free standing monument sign.

Commissioner Miller recused himself at 2:40 p.m. due to a conflict of interest.

D. YOCUM-BALDWIN DEVELOPMENT, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. Consideration of **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 817** for construction of one (1) building with 29,660 square feet and 3,726 square feet at mezzanine level for twelve (12) manufacturing/warehouse/office units on 2.1 acres, located on the east side of New York Street between Colton Avenue and Brockton Avenue in the C-M, Commercial Industrial District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief overview of the proposed project. He clarified that the mezzanine was removed. Mr. Altopp stated that the applicant has added elements to the west elevation that were not included in the staff report and will address the changes to the commission during the public hearing. Staff recommends approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner James had questions relative to the easements and referred to Condition of Approval number thirty-nine (39) being in place before the project is approved. Mr. Altopp stated that staff will need to see proof that the easements have been recorded prior to the issuance of building permits.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant would like to show the changes being discussed.

Mark Stanson, representing Yocum-Baldwin Development, and Gary Stegmann, architect for the project, addressed the commission. Mr. Stanson commented that both the properties are closing escrow today and that the easements are in the process of being recorded.

Mr. Stegmann commented on the exterior elevations on the west elevation and the color schemes. Mr. Stegmann passed around an example of the relief to the commission for review.

Commissioner Osborne asked about the proposed glass. Mr. Stanson stated it would be gray glass.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the glazing on the upper level of the west elevation is true clear story lighting. Mr. Stegmann stated that it would be true clear story lighting. Mr. Shamp remarked on the single glazing and asked if there was consideration in using dual glazing to lighten up the tint. Mr. Stanson stated that there was a cost issue relative to using dual glazing.

Commissioner James commented on the parking, stating that any tenant moving in would add more office space as tenant improvements. He stated that the parking spaces that are part of the easements are important to the project and would like the easement added as part of the conditions of approval. Mr. Stanson stated that staff advised that it would not be necessary since they met the required parking standards.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there were other means of identifying the need of additional parking if additional space is going to be constructed. Mr. Jaquess stated that staff ensures that parking standards meet the requirements of the building permit.

Chairperson Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Chairperson Macdonald commented that the color scheme was a big improvement and asked for a consensus from the commission. Commissioner James commented that he liked the color scheme and the redesign of the architecture with Commissioners Foster and Shamp concurring.

Mr. Jaquess stated that condition of approval number twenty-nine (29) could be modified slightly, relative to staff reviewing the building plans for compliance with the elevation that was presented to the Planning Commission today.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and moved on 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review & Approval No. 817 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review & Approval No. 817 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review & Approval No. 817 subject to the following findings and attached Conditions of Approval:

1. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the commercial industrial office building use because it complies with all property development standards of C-M, Commercial Industrial District;

2. The site properly relates to New York Street which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because this street will be constructed to city prescribed standards to its ultimate half widths through compliance with project conditions of approval;
3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 817 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare;
4. The use is desirable for the overall development of the community because the proposed project conforms with the General Plan Designation, Municipal Code requirements, and the development standards of the C-M, Commercial Industrial District.

This includes the modification to Community Development Condition of Approval No. 29 as follows:

- 29. The applicant shall make changes to the architecture for the west building elevation as presented to the Planning Commission at the hearing with the changes to be confirmed by staff prior to the issuance of building permits.**

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. **ENTERPRISE RENT-A-CAR, APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 888** for the construction of a 8,961 square foot regional office, storage yard, and vehicle wash area on multiple parcels totaling 3.69 gross acres located on the north side of Park Avenue in between Nevada Street and New Jersey Street in the EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief presentation of the proposed project. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Shamp asked how the storm water was being handled from the car storage area. Mr. Altopp stated that according to the WQMP, he believes they are doing some bio-swale treatment throughout the project.

Commissioner Shamp asked for clarification relative to the applicant being exempt from planting trees within the parking area and the purpose of parking trees in relation to that decision. Mr. Jaquess stated that the parking trees are a convenience for the public from a shade and heat standpoint as well as an aesthetic value. Staff considers this a "storage" area and not a parking lot.

Commissioner Shamp stated that he would like to see the tree requirement remain since trees mitigate heat island effect.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant would like to provide more input on the project.

Jim Rosenlieb, architect for the project, commented on the parking, stating that they had an option of treating the back as a parking lot, which would require more landscaping, or going through a Conditional Use Permit and treating it as storage where landscaping is not required. Mr. Rosenlieb stated that they provided for a ten (10) foot perimeter which was in excess of the required 7-1/2 feet.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the parking area was asphalt or concrete. Mr. Rosenlieb responded that the parking area is asphalt.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Shamp stated that he was troubled by the car storage area and the amount of paving that is asphalt but understands that the applicant has followed the code. Commissioner Shamp commented that this is something that needs to be considered in the future with some way of recommending to applicants that they take care to either lighten or shade non-pervious surfaces.

Commissioner Miller commented that the architecture of the building needs enhancement, especially on the street façade.

Commissioner Osborne concurred with Commissioner Miller, adding that it looked like a pre-fab, modular building, and that it is very bland. Commissioner James concurred, stating that it looked like a temporary building.

Chairperson Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rosenlieb stated that the elevation was designed around a footprint that Enterprise uses and commented that he could redo the plan to omit the door to the west elevation and replace it with a window.

Commissioner Miller stated that he realizes that this is a prototype building for Enterprise Rent-A-Car but looks at this as an office building that is part of the collection of office buildings in Redlands. He commented that the building needs more glazing or at least the appearance of glazing so that it has an appearance of an office building. Commissioner Miller also suggested more treatment around the windows, either with an overhang or a relief to the surface.

Mr. Rosenlieb stated that there is a limited budget relative to the project and that they put twenty (20) percent into the landscaping. Mr. Rosenlieb asked for consideration in the conservative design of the building and that they are providing something better than the adjacent tilt-up building.

Commissioner Miller stated that the structure has a temporary building appearance and suggested moving away from the modular quality it seems to have now.

Commissioner Shamp referred to the front elevations, stating that there could be some coordination between the window opening and the reveals.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Chairman Macdonald commented that the building is very boring. Treatment with brick or rock work along the front or wainscoting, some relief on front, treatment on the corners, maybe a change in color.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Michael Blackwell, member of the audience, commented that the elevations are lacking landscaping which would help enhance the building.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Chairman Macdonald asked if this project should be continued for another rendering. Mr. Shaw concurred with Chairman Macdonald, stating that it would be best to continue the project to the next meeting.

Commissioner Miller suggested that the applicant take some direction from the Nissan dealership that was recently completed, since it is a simple building with simple shapes.

Commissioner Foster agreed that the applicant made a lot of effort relative to the landscaping. He has no problem supporting the project but does feel that the color is depressing and should be addressed.

Commissioner Shamp concurred but stated that we should be careful that we do not use landscaping to conceal a design that is less than desirable.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Conditional Use Permit No. 888 to the September 12, 2006 meeting.

Commissioner Foster left the meeting at 3:33 p.m.

B. ALAN E. RONSKA, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 312** amending Section 15.36.340 of the Redlands Municipal Code pertaining to allowable signs in the M-2, General Industrial District.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated that the applicant has requested another continuance to the September 12, 2006 meeting.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 5-0 vote (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission continue Ordinance Text Amendment No. 312 to the meeting of September 12, 2006.

Commissioner Foster returned to the meeting at 3:37 p.m.

C. CINGULAR WIRELESS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 872** for the installation of a new 81-foot tall cellular telecommunications mono-pole and the addition of a 230 square foot equipment shelter within an 1,000 square foot lease area at an existing Municipal Utilities Department reservoir site located on the east side of Dearborn Street, approximately 200 feet south of Independence Avenue in the O, Open Land District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner David Jump gave a brief presentation of the proposed cellular telecommunications mono-pine. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner James asked about the different standards of pine trees and wanted to ensure that the mono-pine shown in the exhibit is the one that would be used.

Mr. Jump referred to the mono-pine that is located behind the Smart and Final building and how that mono-pine was able to achieve a more, dense look.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to speak on the project.

Michael Blackwell, representing the applicant, stated that he was available to address any questions relative to the project. Mr. Blackwell addressed Commissioner James concern relative to the quality of the mono-pine, stating that inserting a condition of approval requiring that the proposed mono-pine be similar to what is reflected in the project plans and photo simulations.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 872 subject to the following findings, submitted plans, and attached conditions of approval:

1. The use applied for at this location is conditionally permitted in the O, Open Space District under the provisions of Chapter 18.178.090 and 18.192.020 of the Municipal Code, which allows the placement of public utility structures and service facilities to be permitted in any zone when such uses are determined by the City to be essential or desirable for the public health, safety, and welfare subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit;
2. The proposed establishment of the wireless facility at this location is necessary and desirable for the development of the community, is in harmony with the various elements or objectives of the General Plan, and is not detrimental to existing uses or to uses specifically permitted in the zone;
3. The project site is sufficient in size and shape to accommodate the proposed use, meets all development standards and other features required in order to adjust the use to those existing or permitted future uses on land in the neighborhood;
4. That the site for the location of the wireless service provider relates to streets and highways properly designed and improved to carry the type of traffic generated or to be generated by the proposed use. The site to be utilized by the wireless carrier was originally designed to handle all traffic generated by the conditionally permitted use allowed at the site;
5. The conditions for the proposed use are reasonably related to the use to address potential effects of the proposed use, and are necessary to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare and the best interests of the neighborhood.

This includes the modification to Planning Conditions of Approval number three (3) as follows:

3. The applicant shall provide a "full foliage" monopine with a tapered trunk. Simulated foliage for the monopine shall begin at a height of fifteen feet (15'); the span of the foliage (north end to south end and east end to west end) at its widest point shall be twenty-six (26') feet. The monopine will contain a minimum of one hundred seventy-six (176) branches (4 branches per every 1.5 feet starting at 15 feet high ending at 75 feet plus a five-foot crown with the bottom crown branches a minimum of six feet in length for simulation of a real pine). The trunk/monopole shall have a full simulated bark exterior from the ground up **and match the submitted photo simulations as shown**. The antenna panels/sectors and supports shall be painted to match the simulated foliage and shall not project beyond the branches of the monopine. All connections from the monopine to the equipment shelter and/or other support equipment shall be placed underground. (Mitigation Measure No. 1)

D. **CINGULAR WIRELESS, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 881** for the installation of a new approximately 80-foot tall cellular telecommunications mono-eucalyptus and the addition of a 185 square foot equipment shelter within an 800 square foot lease area on an existing 1.5 acre residential parcel located at 854 Wabash Avenue in the R-E, Residential Estate District.

Project Planner David Jump referred to the rendering of the mono-eucalyptus that he passed out to the commission earlier in the meeting. Mr. Jump gave a brief presentation of the proposed project. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Miller asked staffs opinion relative to eliminating the block wall in favor of the chain link fence. Mr. Jump stated that there would be less pedestrian traffic and visibility with Wabash Avenue being realigned more to the west, and that Dr. Irvin's landscaping should conceal the area well.

Commissioner Osborne asked what the distance would be between the cell towers and future residences. Mr. Jump responded that the distance would be approximately 100 feet.

Chairman Macdonald asked why there was not a photo simulation available showing the mono-eucalyptus in relation to the site location. Mr. Jump stated that new photo simulations were not available due to the product being so new. Mr. Jaquess commented that the applicant did not know where the new homes would be situated and would require coordination with Granite Homes.

Commissioner Shamp questioned the diameter of the base of the tree trunk. Mr. Jump stated that he did not see any formal documentation relative to the size but commented that the tree shown in the photographs and PowerPoint presentation were the same. Mr. Jaquess stated that the engineered trees do have a thicker trunk and are more sizeable in order to bolt them down and resist heavy winds from blowing them over.

Commissioner Miller had concerns relative to the longevity of the chain link fence and was not in favor of the durability of the enclosure. Mr. Jaquess stated that the equipment is inside a structure with a roof on it that is architecturally designed to look like a shed, which is why the chain link fence was not a concern to staff.

Commissioner Shamp had concerns about the acoustics generating from the five ton unit on the side of the building and that a block wall would mitigate it. Mr. Jump commented that a noise study was

completed relative to the air conditioning units and stated that the units will be acoustically insulated as part of the structure so that they will not emit disruptive noise.

Commissioner Miller commented that the tree looked like an upside-down tripod and that the three branches seem to go out uniformly from the trunk. Mr. Jump stated that there would be the ability to add branches to the top of the tree.

Commissioner Miller supports the eucalyptus tree but commented the tree presented did not look natural due to the uniform branches. He suggested modifying the tree so that the central trunk towers above the other branches.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Michael Blackwell, representing Cingular Wireless, addressed the concerns of the commission relative to the eucalyptus tree. Mr. Blackwell commented that branches could be added to the sides and top portions of the tree where a crown could be introduced for a more rounded, natural look. He stated that a central, larger trunk up the middle is not the way the tree was engineered and would require a full redesign of the product. Mr. Blackwell also addressed issues relative to the chain link fence, the equipment shelter and the air conditioning units.

Commissioner Miller referred to the three trunks and asked if they could vary in height. Mr. Blackwell commented on several alternatives such as using a treatment of a crown or topper with varying heights. Commissioner Miller stated that varying heights with crowns would be a reasonable mitigation.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit No. 881 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code."

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 881 subject to the following findings, submitted plans, and attached conditions of approval:

1. The use applied for at this location is conditionally permitted in the R-E, Residential Estate District under the provisions of Chapter 18.178.090 and 18.192.020 of the Municipal Code, which allows the placement of public utility structures and service facilities to be permitted in any zone when such uses are determined by the City to be essential or desirable for the public health, safety, and welfare subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit;
2. The proposed establishment of the wireless facility at this location is necessary and desirable for the development of the community, is in harmony with the various elements or objectives of the General Plan, and is not detrimental to existing uses or to uses specifically permitted in the zone;
3. The project site is sufficient in size and shape to accommodate the proposed use, meets all development standards and other features required in order to adjust the use to those existing or permitted future uses on land in the neighborhood;

4. That the site for the location of the wireless service provider relates to streets and highways properly designed and improved to carry the type of traffic generated or to be generated by the proposed use. The site to be utilized by the wireless carrier was originally designed to handle all traffic generated by the conditionally permitted use allowed at the site;
5. The conditions for the proposed use are reasonably related to the use to address potential effects of the proposed use, and are necessary to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare and the best interests of the neighborhood.

This includes the modification to Planning Conditions of Approval number three (3) as follows:

3. The applicant shall provide a "full foliage" mono-eucalyptus with a tapered trunk. Simulated foliage for the mono-eucalyptus shall begin at a height of fifteen feet (15'), the span of the foliage (north end to south end and east end to west end) at its widest point shall be a minimum of fifteen (15') feet. The mono-eucalyptus will contain a minimum of two hundred and forty (240) branches (6 branches per every 1.5 feet starting at 15 feet high ending at 75 feet plus a **crown with varying heights as they project from the ends of the longest of the proposed trunks** and bottom crown branches a minimum of six feet in length for simulation of a real eucalyptus) or an amount as determined appropriate by the Planning Commission. The trunk/monopole shall have a full simulated bark exterior from the ground up. The antenna panels/sectors and supports shall be painted to match the simulated foliage and shall not project beyond the branches of the mono-eucalyptus. The design of the mono-eucalyptus shall mimic as close as possible a real eucalyptus tree with small branches along all main branches to provide thick foliage for concealment of antennas and all support structures to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. All connections from the mono-eucalyptus to the equipment shelter and/or other support equipment shall be placed underground. In addition, all HVAC, meters, doors to the equipment shelter, and any other required exterior equipment shall be placed on the side of the shelter which will conceal their presence to motor vehicles or pedestrians.(Mitigation Measure No. 1)

V. ADDENDA

- A. A report on a sign at 321 Alabama Street.

Assistant Director John Jaquess gave a brief presentation relative to an approved sign at 321 Alabama Street.

VI. MINUTES

- A. July 25, 2006

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of July 25, 2006.

VII. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF AUGUST 1, 2006

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council Actions of August 1, 2006.

VIII. ADJOURN TO SEPTEMBER 12, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting at 4:24 p.m. to September 12, 2006.

Christine Szilva
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department