

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 3, 2009

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:06 p.m. by Chairman Haller at the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

Present: Commissioners Randall Hamerly, Bob Moore and Michael Willhite, Vice Chairman John Gamboa and Chairman Richard Haller

Absent: None

Staff Present: John Jaquess, Community Development Director

Lawrence A. Mainez, City Planner

Sean Kelleher, Assistant Planner

Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Haller.

2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT

There was none.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Minutes of February 19, 2008, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Vice Chairman Gamboa and seconded by Commissioner Hamerly to approve the Minutes of February 19, 2008, as submitted.

Motion unanimously passed on a 5 - 0 vote.

4.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

4.1 A Conditional Use Permit Application (CUP 008-008) submitted by T-Mobile USA for the construction of a sixty-foot (60') tall, Unmanned Co-locatable Wireless Telecommunication Facility (Mono Eucalyptus), and associated Equipment. The proposed Project is located on the northeast corner Base Line and Church Street. 7223 Church Street, Highland. (APN: 0288-461-36). Representative: Monica Moretta, Omnipoint Communications.

Both Chairman Haller and Commissioner Hamerly stated they had a conflict of interest since they both reside in the East Highlands Ranch and indicated they would be unable to participate in the Item.

Both Chairman Haller and Commissioner Hamerly left the Dais at 6:09 p.m.

Staff noted there were still three (3) Commissioners remained and that Vice Chairman Gamboa would preside over the Meeting.

Vice Chairman Gamboa introduced the item and called for Staff's presentation.

Assistant Planner Kelleher gave the presentation from the Staff Report. He provided the historical background, description and location of the proposed Project. He indicated the parking will be consistent with the Shopping Center and further explained the height of the proposed Project and the Applicant's request of the additional height. He further explained a letter was received today and was distributed to the Commissioners prior to the Meeting and the Resident raised concerns regarding aesthetics and the electromagnetic field. Assistant Planner Kelleher then explained the Color Renderings to the Commission, indicated the Applicant is in the audience and concluded his presentation and opened the floor for discussion.

Vice Chairman Gamboa asked if the Commission had questions of Staff.

A question was asked by a Commissioner regarding the word, "co-locatable" and if it means more than one. Staff responded that it could be up to three (3) providers on the Facility and explained / provided some examples of cell tower locations to the Commission.

Vice Chairman Gamboa asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if the Applicant would like to make a presentation.

Ms. Monica Moretta, of Omnipoint Communications, of Sequoia Deployment Services, One Venture, Suite 200, Irvine, California, who is the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. She stated she represents T-Mobile and how they have discussed the Conditions of Approval (COAs) and the Applicant requested a change with Planning COA Nos. 26 and 28 and how the Staff Report indicated the Applicant would be required to construct a wall around the Facility and would take an additional one (1) parking space (from the Shopping Center). Ms. Moretta stated other than that, the COAs are correct and that T-Mobile would comply.

Vice Chairman Gamboa asked if the Commission had any questions of the Applicant.

(Note: City Planner Mainez left the Chamber at 6:13 p.m.)

Discussion ensued between the Commission, Ms. Moretta and Staff regarding how Planning COA No. 26 is implemented and is a standard COA, and the Planning COA No. 28 is also a standard COA. The Applicant proposes to use

bollards to protect the Facility other than a wall for security reasons and how the Site is currently screened on three (3) sides and on the other side is landscaped. Staff indicated that it is amenable to Staff if the Applicant construct bollards which would be installed at the base of the Cellular Tower.

Note: City Planner Mainez returned at 6:16 p.m.)

Staff explained the existing Trash Enclosure design and location, as well as the microcell cable lines to the Commission.

Further discussion ensued between the Commission, Ms. Moretta and Staff regarding the Planning COA Nos. 26 and 28 and was resolved the COAs in question, were, in fact, COA Nos. 24 and 26 and not 28. The setbacks were discussed in Planning COA No. 26 and would remain in place, there would be no additional screening required Planning COA No. 24 and could be deleted and that Planning COA No. 28, should not have been brought up.

A Commissioner asked then about the deletion of Planning COA No. 24, and Staff responded that would be a part of the Commission's recommendation.

Vice Chairman Gamboa asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff or any further comments from the Applicant's Representative.

A question was asked by a Commissioner if the Applicant has constructed a Mono-Eucalyptus Tree Facility before in the area. Ms. Moretta responded no, but in Los Angeles County and Orange County and indicated there is a site in Orange County located on Guasti Road and would provide address / locations to the Commission. Ms. Moretta added there is one located in Redlands before Wabash Avenue and provided a photograph of it to the Commission to review. Staff added the Applicant would be returning to the Design Review Board (DRB) for the overall design of the Tower at a future DRB Meeting. A question was asked by a Commissioner if the Tower would look like the one in the photograph and Ms. Moretta responded affirmatively.

A question was asked by a Commissioner how the Applicant selects a site to install a cell tower. Ms. Moretta responded there are many variables which include if the site can be a co-locatable location, the property owner, lease, objective of the facility, if there is no / or weak service, not receiving or dropped calls and indicated there is a problem at the Base Line / Church Street location

and further indicated with the proposed added height, that would satisfy the objective to improve reception.

A question was asked by a Commissioner if that would be to improve customer service and Ms. Moretta responded that is correct and added more customers are using cell phones as their home phones. A comment was made by a Commissioner how he had two separate providers; one for the house would work / have reception, but the other one would not.

Vice Chairman Gamboa asked if the Commission had any further questions of the Applicant or Staff. Hearing none, he then asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item. He then asked if the Commission had any further discussion amongst the Commissioners. Hearing none, and there being no further questions of Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, Vice Chairman Gamboa then called for the question.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Willhite and seconded by Commissioner Moore to:

1. Adopt a Negative Declaration and direct Staff to File a Notice of Determination with the San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board, and;
2. Adopt Resolution 09-002 approving Conditional Use Permit (CUP 008-008), subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval, as amended with the following:

Delete Planning COA

~~24. A six-foot (6') tall decorative screening wall shall be installed around the proposed lease area.~~

and;

3. Adopt the Findings of Fact.

Motion carried on a 2 - 1 vote with Vice Chairman Gamboa dissenting and the abstentions of Commissioner Hamerly and Chairman Haller.

A Commissioner asked Vice Chairman Gamboa why he dissented. Vice Chairman Gamboa responded he is not satisfied with the proposed design of the Facility. The Applicants indicate how their Facility will be perfect and blend in with the area, but in the end, the Facility looks like pipe cleaners. On drawings, they look perfect, but when the Facility is constructed, they look like garbage and indicated he has not liked one design yet.

5.0 LEGISLATIVE

There were no items.

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Staff explained the anticipated items scheduled for the March 17, 2009, Joint DRB / PC Study Session Meeting.

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business Vice Chairman Gamboa declared the meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

Submitted by:

Linda McKeough,

Community Development Administrative Assistant III

Approved by:

John Gamboa, Vice Chairman

Planning Commission