

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 21, 2012**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:00p.m. by Chairman Hamerly, in the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

Present: Chairman Randall Hamerly
 Vice Chairman Trang Huynh
 Commissioners Richard Haller
 Milton Sparks
 Michael Stoffel
 Michael Willhite

Absent: Commissioner John Gamboa

Staff Present:Lawrence Mainez, City Planner
 Sean Kelleher, Assistant Planner
 Linda McKeough, Administrative Assistant III

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Hamerly.

2.0 COMMUNITY INPUT

There was none.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Minutes of February 7, 2012, Regular Meeting.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Haller and seconded by Vice Chairman Huynh to approve the Minutes of February 7, 2012, Regular Meeting, as submitted.

Motion carried on a 5 – 0 – 1 vote with the abstention of Commissioner Stoffel and Commissioner Gamboa absent.

4.0 OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

02-21-12.PC

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

- 5.1 An Amendment to Conditional Use Permit (CUP 00-009) to increase the Height and of number of Wireless Facilities on an Existing Unmanned Co-locatable Wireless Telecommunication Facility (Mono-Pine Tree) (CUP 011-006 and DRA 011-005). The Project is located on the southeast corner of Church Street and Merris Street. The address is 8061 Church Street, Highland, CA 92346. APN: 1210-211-01. Representative: John Beke, MetroPCS

Chairman Hamerly identified the Item and then said he would have to excuse himself due to its proximity to property that is owned by the East Highland Ranch and a comment was made by Commissioner Haller that he also has that issue as well and Chairman Hamerly indicated that there is not a quorum. .

City Planner Mainez explained there is no quorum and then explained on proceeding with the process of participating by a blind draw with envelopes containing notes with Nos. 1, 2 and 3 listed on the note and the Commissioner drawing the No. 1 note would participate. The results were Commissioner Haller received the No. 2 note and Chairman Hamerly received No. 3 note. Commissioner Stoffel received the No. 1 note and would participate in order to have a quorum. The other two (2) Commissioners would leave the Dais and either sit in the audience or may excuse themselves.

Chairman Hamerly then turned the Meeting over to Vice Chairman Huynh.

A question was asked by Commissioner Haller if there were any Announcements and City Planner Mainez responded and said that there are no Items scheduled for the Regular Meetings for March 6, and 20, 2012, and will advise the Commission if something changes in the future.

(Note: Both Commissioner Haller and Chairman Hamerly stepped down from the Dais and left from the Chamber at 6:08p.m.

Vice Chairman Huynh re-identified the Item and asked for Staff's presentation.

Assistant Planner Kelleher had distributed a Materials Board prior to the Meeting for the Commission's review and then gave the presentation from the Staff Report and PowerPoint presentation and explained the historical background and proposed Project and Equipment Area's design, the Conditions of Approval and the Applicant's request to the Commission. He indicated that the Applicant's Representative is in the audience for any questions the Commission may have and then concluded his presentation.

02-21-12.PC

Vice Chairman Huynh asked if the Commission had any questions of Staff.

A question was asked by Commissioner Willhite regarding Page 74 of the Staff Report regarding the branches / arrays are already located on the Mono-pine and if they will be brought out a little bit to hide the Facility and indicated he did not see the arrays. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded and explained the location of the arrays shown on the PowerPoint and that Staff is willing to work with the Applicant to adjust the branches in order to screen the existing Equipment better. City Planner Mainez stated the question is if the arrays are smaller / compact than what is on the Facility now and how a person is unable to see the arrays on the illustration on Page 74 of the Staff Report and if there was concern about if the Project would be insufficient in screening the equipment and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded that he would defer to the Applicant and added that when the Photo-simulations graph was taken of the Tower, that approximately fifty percent (50%) of the branches were missing and how a person can see the Equipment so clearly. After the Photo-simulations were taken, the Tower Company would then go back and reinstall the existing branches, but with the proposed Application, the branches will be modified further to ensure the thirty foot (30') spread at fifteen feet (15') from grade and also would be working on getting the shape of the Mono-pine a little bit better. .

A question was asked by Commissioner Stoffel if the branches fell off or if they were never installed and Assistant Planner Kelleher responded both and explained how, over time, maintenance is provided.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh regarding about branches falling off and if Planning Condition of Approval No. 3A on Page 21 of the Staff Report is sufficient enough and was concerned how over time, how items can fall off and if the City conducts an annual or biannual inspection of the Tower and then advise the Applicant and have them upgrade it and is it the responsibility of the Applicant of maintaining the Tower. Assistant Planner Kelleher responded it is the Applicant's responsibility to maintain the Tower. If the Tower may degrade over time, Staff has utilized that COA in the past in which the Operator of the Existing Facility was working under. He further explained when Staff conducted an inspection of one of the previous Co-locations that was approved on the Tower, and under Staff's direction, the Operator replaced the branches and was not an issue.

A question was asked by Vice Chairman Huynh if the Applicant's Engineer has analyzed the Tower's existing foundation to accommodate the additional weight and height of the Tower and if it did not work, then what.

Mr. John Beke, of MetroPCS, 2280 Market Street, Riverside, California, who is the Applicant's Representative, addressed the Commission. He clarified that the Tower is not their Tower and had applied to Co-locate on the Tower and that the

02-21-12.PC

Tower's Owner had run preliminary structural reports and showed that it failed. The Tower Owner's Engineering Department then came up with a modified design, but is unsure of the specifics of it. He further stated that he is an Urban Planner and obtains the Building and Safety Permits and is not an Engineer. He knows that at times, that they will drill into the existing cason and add additional anchor bolts to a depth of ten feet to thirteen feet (10' – 13'). Sometimes, they will install a gusset from the face plate to Pole to give additional rigidity. He further explained as years go by, wind speeds goes up in the Building Code and that up to 85MPH is a standard and the Pole was probably designed for 70MPH and will be engineered to the current Building Codes.

Vice Chairman Huynh asked if the Commission had any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, he then opened the Public Hearing and asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the Item.

Mr. George Einfeldt, 29311 Henderson Lane, Highland, California, who is the General Manager for East Highland Ranch, addressed the Commission. He stated that he is in favor of the Tower's proposal. He does not carry MetroPCS, but uses Verizon and has no vested interest from that standpoint. The EHR noted the COA and how the EHR contracts with Wireless Capital Venture. He explained the historical background on how the Tower's branches had fallen off and how he had worked with the City for resolution and how the Tower looks good now. He was concerned with the Village's aesthetics in that it will not impair their standard of living and he has worked with MetroPCS for approximately nine (9) months and that MetroPCS is a good addition as a carrier, is a lower cost carrier and is beneficial to the economy and recommended the Commission support the proposal.

Vice Chairman Huynh asked if anyone else in the audience would like to speak on the Item. Hearing none, it was then noted that he then closed the Public Hearing and asked if there were any there further questions for the Commission, Applicant or Staff.

A comment was made by Vice Chairman Huynh how the Commission had reviewed the materials and had to consider both the Entitlement and the design review for the Project. He then asked if there were any further questions of Staff. Hearing none, and there being no further questions of the Applicant or of Staff, or discussion amongst the Commissioners, he then called for the question.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Willhite and seconded by Commissioner Sparks 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;

02-21-12.PC

2. Adopt Resolution No. 12-003 approving Conditional Use Permit Application (CUP 011-006) (amending CUP 00-009) and Design Review Application (DRA-011-005), subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval, and the Findings of Fact.

Motion unanimously passed on a 4 – 0 - 3 vote with Commissioners Haller, Gamboa and Chairman Hamerly absent.

6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

City Planner Mainez reiterated there are no Items scheduled for the Regular Meetings for March 6, and 20, 2012, and will advise the Commission if something changes.

7.0 ADJOURN

There being no further business, Vice Chairman Huynh declared the Meeting adjourned at 6:22p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Linda McKeough, Community Development
Administrative Assistant III

Trang Huynh, Vice Chairman
Planning Commission

02-21-12.PC