



Planning & Economic Development Department

205 S. Willowbrook Ave., Compton, CA 90220 (310) 605-5532 Fax: (310) 761-1488 www.comptoncity.org

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2011

7:00 P.M.

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

205 SOUTH WILLOWBROOK AVENUE

1) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** - The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Turner.

2) **ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present:

Juanita Green-Wright

Lillie Darden

Cleo Turner

Michael Hill

Staff Representatives Present:

Derek Hull

Kenya Wheeler

Anita Aviles

3) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – December 8, 2010. It was moved by Commissioner Turner that the minutes of December 8, 2010 be approved. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hill and carried unanimously.

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that she had issues with the minutes which included grammatical errors. Stating that those errors should be corrected before the minutes can be approved.

Commissioner Hill agreed with the errors and stated that it may be the transcribing.

Commissioner Darden recommended that each Commissioner take a look at the minutes and forward any changes to staff for revisions.

Staff Representative Hull stated that if the Commission desires the minutes don't need to be approved and any changes can be brought to the meeting next month.

It was moved by Commissioner Hill that the approval of minutes for December 8, 2010 be rescinded and that appropriate corrections be made. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

4) **PUBLIC HEARING ITEM(S)**

A. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2677** – A request of Sprint/Nextel to modify an existing transmission tower by replacing six existing panel antennas with three panel antennas, remote radio units, three microwave dish. The maximum height of the tower will remain unchanged at

Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 2 of 17

62 feet and the installation of the related equipment (i.e. gps antenna, equipment cabinet, etc). The site is located at 1400 W. Greenleaf Blvd., Compton, in the B (Buffer) zone.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the property is located at 1400 W. Greenleaf Blvd. in the Third Council District. Nearest intersections are Central Avenue and Greenleaf Blvd.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project site land use designation is Open Space (O). The adjacent land uses are as follows: to the North are Open Space (O) and Low Density Residential (LDR), to the South is Industrial (I), to the East is Open Space (O), and to the West is N/A – City of Carson. The adjacent zonings are as follows: to the North is Low Density Residential (R-L), to the South is Heavy Manufacturing (M-H), to the East is Buffer (B), and to the West is N/A – City of Carson.

The project is located within the Redevelopment Project Area overlay district.

Staff Representative Hull stated that Sprint/Nextel is proposing to modify an existing antennas mounted on a Southern California Edison electrical transmission tower by replacing six existing panel antennas with three panel antennas with remote radio units and three microwave dish antennas at a maximum height of 62 feet. The applicant also proposes to install required ground mounted equipment (i.e. gps antennas, equipment cabinet, etc.) at 1400 West Greenleaf Blvd., Compton. Records indicate that Sprint's wireless facility was initially approved in 2000 by Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2339.

Staff Representative Hull stated that Sprint/Nextel in conjunction with Clearwire is working on upgrading their existing network to provide to high speed wireless broadband network service (4G) in the Greater Los Angeles area. Sprint/Nextel is the parent company of Clearwire. Clearwire was created by Sprint/Nextel for financial and marketing purposes. Clearwire provides high speed wireless broadband services and works in conjunction with the existing Sprint/Nextel network. The applicant is requesting a modification of an existing Conditional Use Permit to modify an existing wireless facility in accordance with Section 30-26 and 30-46 of the Compton Municipal Code.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the site is a rectangular shaped parcel of land approximately 25,000 square feet in size (.57 acres) and has 1,210 lineal feet of street frontage along Greenleaf Blvd.

The project is Categorically Exempt in accordance with Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (Class 1 Existing Facilities).

According to the City's location standards for Personal Wireless Service Facilities (PWSFs) ordinance (30-46 C.M.C.), the subject site is neither an Opportunity Site nor an Avoidance Area; issues/concerns: That even though this proposal does not comply with the intent of the siting standards of ordinance 30-46 it is an existing wireless facility site; alternative sites



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 3 of 17

were unsuitable for applicant in that it did not provide the required Radio Frequency coverage for the desired area.

Staff has applied a condition of approval to Conditional Use Permit 2677 limiting the duration of approval to a 10 year term. Staff further recommends that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2677 subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report.

Planning staff concluded their presentation and opened the discussion to questions from the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Green-Wright questioned staff and noted that in the Alternatives Analysis it states that the notices were sent on July 29, 2010 to properties owners and no correspondence have been received as of January 5, 2010. Chairperson Green-Wright clarified if it was meant to be January 5, 2011.

Staff Representative Hull stated that this was a continued case.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked if July 29, 2010 was when the notices were mailed out.

Staff Representative Hull stated that, that was for the first hearing and there was a second re-noticing.

Commissioner Darden asked if a second notice is sent out or unless there was someone present at the meeting objecting the project.

Staff Representative Hull stated that typically a second notice doesn't have to be sent if we indicate at a public hearing that a hearing is going to be rescheduled.

Commissioner Darden stated she notice that Condition 7 is require for two of the cases, "That the approval (in writing) from the State of California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) must be obtained prior to building permit issuance" and it is not required for the other three of the cases.

Staff Representative Hull stated that these are specifically required for cases that are located within public utility elements. This condition is for the cases that are located on the Southern California Edison towers.

Applicant's Representative, John Moreland, 2903-H Saturn St., Brea, stated that in response to Commissioner Darden's comment, since this is for wireless broadband, technically, they are not regulated by the State of California Public Utilities Commission. The State of California Public Utilities Commission does not regulate wireless internet but that it is regulated by the FCC. For this site since they are located in a utility tower documentation



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 4 of 17

would be able to be provided as the Planning Director stated. Mr. Moreland stated that Sprint/Nextel did review all the conditions of approval and agree with all of them except for Condition 35, which states "That construction, use and property development shall be initiated within 180 days" and wishes that it be revised to read 365 days instead of 180 days. The reason is because Sprint/Nextel just launched their 4G network and is currently assessing the network and seeing which sites are going to need to be built and which sites are not going to need to be built to enhance the 4G network which would require a drive of every street in Southern California all the way from Reno Valley to Ventura County and this is not expected to happen until the fall 2011. Mr. Moreland requested that Condition 36, which states "That failure, at any time, to exercise this use for 24 consecutive months subsequent to the date of approval shall render this resolution automatically null and void without benefit of a public hearing" and Condition 5 which states "That the applicant shall submit to the Planning and Economic Development Department for planning review of CUP related improvements within six months of Planning Commission approval" be amended. Mr. Moreland stated that Sprint/Nextel could comply with those two conditions but in terms of the construction part and when it is expected to occur it won't happen until the end of the year. Sprint/Nextel is in agreement with all the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Turner asked for clarification about his request regarding Condition No. 5.

Mr. Moreland stated that Sprint/Nextel can meet Condition 5 and would just have to submit another application to Planning and Economic Development Department within six months for review of the conditions of the approval, therefore he is not requesting revisions of that condition.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked staff regarding Condition 35 of there is any reason why we will not be able to change that 180 days to 365 days legally.

Staff Representative Hull stated that Condition 35 complies with an ordinance amendment that goes beyond the purview of this Commission to not enforce the Compton Municipal Code, so in this regard this is in accordance with the ordinance. He is not aware if the Commission would have any provisions that would alleviate that other than initiating an ordinance to change it.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked what their next step would be if approved.

Staff Representative Hull stated that what he recommends that the applicant do if they find that in 180 days they have not initiated construction that they come back to the Commission and explain why they have not started construction. Mr. Hull stated that he would then have to consult with legal counsel to figure out what does this necessitate.

Staff Representative Hull stated that it would really become an issue for code enforcement which would be the enforcement agency that would determine non-compliance. Code



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 5 of 17

Enforcement would notify the applicant this CUP was approved by the Planning Commission and we have noticed that no construction has initiated and we have determined that the applicant has violated the conditions of approval.

Deputy City Attorney, Anita Aviles apologized for the not having her copy the municipal code and asked the Planning Director to see whether or not there is a provision whereby an applicant can come and ask for an extension for this type of action.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that she has represented other cities were they have provisions in their codes were an applicant can come a month before the expiration time and write a letter requesting an extension.

Commissioner Darden asked if the Architectural Review Board or the Building and Safety Department have to review this before they are issued permits.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the Architectural Review Board would not review this because it is not a discretionary body. There may be some permitting activities with Building and Safety but outside of that staff would make an internal decision with Building and Safety in terms of the aesthetical value.

Commissioner Darden asked if the six months be part of the initiation of the required permits from the Building and Safety.

Staff Representative Hull stated that staff is pulling out the ordinance to see what it specifically says in regards to filing in accordance with the ordinance. The department has not been that strict on granting extensions.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the ordinance states that the Planning Director has the purview to waive modifications and this would be considered a modification by the Planning Director, therefore he would have to consider the facts and then make a decision to say that the applicant has done enough due diligence to initiate the project and can continue. At this point based upon what is in the ordinance it appears that Mr. Hull could consider this factor on a staff level after 180 days, if nothing has been initiated, then grant the extension according to Section 30-26.4e. Mr. Hull asked the applicant if he was certain that the project will not be initiated until after that time.

Mr. Moreland stated that he is not certain. That it is pretty much up in the air. As of December 2010, that was when the public official launch the reassessing of the network and it may be additional modifications due to that they may be introducing new technology. Since this was so far along the process, ideally, that is why Sprint/Nextel wanted, if the Planning Commission approves the project obtain approvals and once they get a better idea move forward. Based on the discussion if an extension can be obtain then Condition 35 can remain.



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 6 of 17

Chairperson Green-Wright asked if he is willing to keep it at 180 days.

Mr. Moreland stated that he is willing to keep it at 180 days and essentially asked Sprint/Nextel for a decision and in the event that doesn't go through then he will go to the Planning Director to see what other options are available at that time.

Chairperson Green-Wright commented that Condition 35 will remain as it is.

Mr. Moreland agreed.

Staff Representative Hull stated if the Commission desires they may want to incorporate an additional condition stating that the applicant shall provide the Planning Director a written progress report in six months to indicate if they have or haven't initiated the project. That would at least give me the ability to make a determination to initiate the extension. Now that staff knows that chances are that the applicant will not be able to initiate construction, the applicant should provide a status report on the progress of initiating the construction. That will allow staff to then make a determination to either grant an extension or to inform the Planning Commission that the project has not been initiated and/or that the applicant would need to start based on whatever decision that I will make, it will be based on the review of the case file.

Commissioner Hill made a motion to add a condition that read "That the applicant will provide a progress report to the Planning Director within six months indicating if the project has or has not been initiated" to the conditions of approval.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked if that is what 30-26.4e states.

Staff Representative Hull stated that for any modification to an existing approved case the Planning Director may grant a year extension.

Commissioner Turner seconded the motion to add the condition of approval.

There being no further comments, Commissioner Darden moved to close the public hearing regarding **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2677**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Turner moved to approve **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2677** as amended and seconded by Commissioner Darden. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2677** was approved unanimously.

- B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2678** – A request of Sprint/Nextel to modify the existing antenna array of a wireless facility mounted on a transmission tower. The applicant proposes



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 7 of 17

to replace five existing panel antennas with three panel antennas with remote radio units and two microwave dish antennas, at a maximum height of 47' and the installation of the related equipment (i.e. gps antenna, equipment cabinet.) at 1800 S. Santa Fe Ave., Compton, in the B (Buffer) zone.

Commissioner Darden moved that **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2678** be opened. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project is located at 1800 South Santa Fe Avenue in the Fourth Council District. Near the intersection of Santa Fe Avenue and Greenleaf Blvd.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project site land use designation is Open Space (O). Adjacent land uses surrounding the subject site are: to the North and South is Mixed Use (MU) and to East and West is Open Space (O).

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project's site zoning is Buffer (B). the zoning abutting the site is as follows: to the North is Limited Manufacturing (M-L), to the South is Heavy Manufacturing (M-H), to the East is Buffer (B), and to the West is Buffer (B).

The project is located within the Redevelopment Project Area overlay district.

Staff Representative Hull stated that project is Categorically Exempt in accordance with Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (Class 1: Existing Facilities). According to the location standards specified in the City's Personal Wireless Service Facilities (PWSFs) ordinance (30-46 C.M.C.). The subject site is neither an opportunity nor an avoidance area site. Staff stated that this proposal does not need to comply with the intent of the siting standards. Since it is an existing wireless facility site; alternative sites were unsuitable for applicant in that it did not provide the required RF for the desired area. Staff has conditioned that the Conditional Use Permit be limited to a 10 year term.

Staff Representative Hull stated that staff recommends approval of Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2678 subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report.

The applicant, Mr. Moreland stated that they agree to all the conditions of approval. He just requests that the same condition as the previous project be included, that they will provide a progress report within six months to the Director of Planning and Economic Development Department.

Chairperson Green-Wrights stated that from the last meeting this was the one of cases that the description needed to be revised. What is the difference now?



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 8 of 17

Mr. Moreland stated that all five projects needed the revised description what is was, was that original application did not include the GPS antenna which was included in the revised documents.

There being no further comments, Commissioner Turner moved to close the public hearing regarding **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2678**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Hill asked that Condition 35 in this particular case states "That failure, at any time, to exercise this use for 24 consecutive months subsequent to date of approval shall render this resolution automatically null and void without benefit of a public hearing".

Chairperson Green-Wright clarified that what Mr. Moreland is referring is to if they need an extension then they will go back to staff.

Commissioner Hill stated that he did notice that they were similar conditions to the previous case. But 24 months should be more than adequate because that will cover a period of two years.

Staff Representative stated that, that a condition for 24 months is also included in this case.

Commissioner Hill stated that he wants to make sure that it stays consistent.

Commissioner Darden asked what condition would be modified to include that under this case.

Staff Representative Hull stated that a new condition can be added which would be Condition 37 that can read "That the applicant will provide a progress report to the Planning Director within six months indicating if the project has or has not been initiated".

Commissioner Hill moved to approve **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2678** as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2678** was approved unanimously.

- C. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2675** – A request of Sprint/Nextel to modify an existing wireless facility by adding three panel antennas with tower mounted amplifiers (TMA's) and three microwave dishes on an existing vertical architectural element that extends beyond the roof line at a maximum height of 50 feet and the installation of the related equipment (i.e. gps antenna, equipment cabinet, etc.) on Sprint/Nextel's existing roof mounted equipment platform at 2201 N. Long Beach Blvd., Compton, in the C-L (Limited Commercial) zone.

Commissioner Darden moved that **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2675** be opened. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner.



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 9 of 17

The project is located in the second Council District , near the intersection are Orchard Ave. and Stockton St.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project site's land use designation is Mixed Use (MU). The adjacent land uses are to the North is N/A – City of Lynwood, to the South is Mixed Use (MU) and Low Density Residential (LDR), to the East is Mixed Use (MU), and to the West is Low Density Residential (LDR).

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project's site zoning is Limited Commercial (C-L). The zoning abutting the site is: to the North is N/A – City of Lynwood, to the South are Limited Commercial (C-L) and Medium Density Residential (R-M), to the East is Limited Commercial (C-L), and to the West is Medium Density Residential (R-M).

The project is located within the Redevelopment Project Area overlay district.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project applicant, Sprint/Nextel, is proposing to modify an existing wireless facility. The applicants are proposing to add three panel antennas with tower amplifiers (TMA's) and three microwave dishes on an existing vertical architectural element that extends beyond the roof line to a maximum height of 50' and the installation of the related equipment on Sprint/Nextel's existing roof mounted equipment platform; the project is Categorically Exempt in accordance with Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (Class 1 Existing Facilities); according to the location standards per the City's Personal Wireless Service Facilities (PWSFs) ordinance (30-46 C.M.C.), the subject site is located on an opportunity site. However, the wireless facility as proposed will be readily visible.

Staff's Issues/Concerns: The existing and proposed antennas are not camouflaged and are readily visible. In addition to painting the antennas to match the building, no other concealment or camouflaging of any type is proposed at this time; Planning Commission Issues/Concerns: Clear up the relationship between Sprint/Nextel and Clearwire and whether the application before them should be considered a modification to an existing wireless facility or a co-location. As noted in the staff report, Sprint/Nextel is the parent company of Clearwire. The application for a modification of an existing wireless facility is correct; alternative sites were unsuitable for applicant in that it did not provide the required Radio Frequency coverage for the desired area. Staff would highly recommend that the proposed antennas be completely screened from view; and staff has conditioned that the Conditional Use Permit be limited to a 10 year term.

Staff Representative Hull stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2675 subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report.



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 10 of 17

Commissioner Hill asked staff who would be the responsible party for creating some kind of element to camouflage the antennas. Would the owner of this property or the wireless carriers be responsible?

Staff Representative Hull stated that it would probably be a joint decision. The applicant would have the responsibility to camouflage but the applicant since he is leasing would have to get the consent of the owner of the building to put up any type of camouflage device awning or any type of concealment, so it would probably be a joint effort in both the applicant and the owner's part.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked how many carriers are at that building.

Mr. Moreland (Sprint/Nextel) stated that he provided staff with a list of what other carriers are there, he thinks it is T-Mobile and AT&T. Mr. Moreland responded to Commissioner Hill's question. The microwaves there is a new technology that will allow friendly material for the signal to pass through. Any screening proposed may become an issue when if the material is not compatible with the other carriers because they operate under a different frequency. Additionally, other than Sprint's antennas the others can't be screened because they are outside the leased area and it would require consent from the other carriers, as well as, the property owner. Sprint only has three existing antennas and in order for Sprint to have 3G and 4G network in the same property will require a minimum of six antennas. The location of the antennas would be right at the middle of the copy of the sign element. Whatever type of concealment is provided it is going to stick out and be readily visible. If the sign element doesn't work the other option would be pull off the antennas and relocate them somewhere else in the building. The next option is to do it along the parapet wall but then the issue becomes that the antennas would require a five feet six inch parapet wall to fully screen them and the existing parapet wall is three feet eight inches, so the wall would have to be raised two feet which will not be financially feasible. If the antennas are located back in the building or relocated lower on the sign then we will have what is called a shadowing element where some signal is going to bounce off and is not going to provide the coverage that is needed. There is nothing that can be done with the additional panel antennas in terms of screening other than painting them to match. In terms of the microwave dish it can be reduced to a 14 inch diameter microwave dish or to a 14 by 14 square and it can be placed beneath the antenna. The 14 inch antennas can be located either facing north or facing east but ideally it would be best facing east of the narrowing end element of the sign and the other two microwave dishes we can either be screen behind since they don't require a direct line of site for the existing network. The other two can definitely be screened or placed behind the parapet wall or place some sort of material at the bottom of the sign.

Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 11 of 17

There being no further comments, Commissioner Hill moved to close the public hearing regarding **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2675**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Turner moved to approve **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2675** as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2675** was approved unanimously.

- D. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2676** – A request of Sprint/Nextel requesting to modify an existing wireless facility by adding three panel antennas with tower-mounted amplifier (TMA's) and three dish antennas on an existing mono-pole at a maximum height of 70 feet and the installation of related equipment (i.e. gps antenna, equipment cabinet, etc.) at 301 W. Walnut St., Compton, in the M-H (Heavy Manufacturing) zone.

Commissioner Darden moved that **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2676** be opened. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project is located at 301 W. Walnut St. in the Third Council District, near the intersection is Acacia and Wilmington Ave.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project site land use designation is Industrial (I). Adjacent land uses are to the North is Industrial (I), to the South is Industrial (I), to the East is Industrial (I), and to the West is Industrial (I).

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project's site zoning is Heavy Manufacturing (M-H). The zoning adjacent to the site are to the North and South is Heavy Manufacturing (M-H) and to the East and West is Heavy Manufacturing (M-H).

The project is within the Redevelopment Project Area overlay district.

Staff Representative Hull stated that project analysis is that Sprint/Nextel is proposing to modify an existing wireless facility, a 70 foot high mono-pole. The applicant proposes to install three additional panel antennas, three microwave dishes and 3 TMAs on the existing mono-pole at a maximum height of 70 feet and the installation of the related equipment within the existing Sprint/Nextel equipment enclosure; the project is Categorically Exempt in accordance with Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (Class 1: Existing Facilities); according to the location standards per the City's Personal Wireless Service Facilities (PWSFs) ordinance (30-46 C.M.C.), the subject site is neither an Avoidance Area nor Opportunity Site. Issues/concerns: The existing monopole is readily visible given that it is not camouflaged and because of its height. However this site is not as visible along Walnut Street given the 290 foot setback from the street; no alternative sites were provided by the applicant. The applicant was unable to find locations that provided the required Radio Frequency coverage for the desired area. Staff highly recommends that this wireless facility



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 12 of 17

be relocated to an opportunity site and be completely concealed/camouflaged; and staff has conditioned that the Conditional Use Permit be limited to a 10 year term.

Staff Representative Hull stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2676 subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report.

Mr. Moreland stated that once again he requests that the six month condition be also added.

There being no further comments, Commissioner Hill moved to close the public hearing regarding CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2676. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Hill moved to approve **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2676** as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2675** was approved unanimously.

- E. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2679** – A request of Sprint/Nextel to modify an existing wireless facility by replacing six existing panel antennas with three panel antennas with tower-mounted amplifier (TMA's) and three microwave dish antennas on an existing mono-palm at a maximum height of 47 feet 6 inches and the installation of the related equipment (i.e. gps antenna, equipment cabinet, etc.) at 302 N. Bowen Ave., Compton, in the C-L (Limited Commercial) zone.

Commissioner Darden moved that **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2679** be opened. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project is located in the Second Council District near the intersection are Palmer St. and Compton Blvd.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project site's land use designation is Mixed Use (MU). Adjacent land uses are to the North and South is Mixed Use (MU), to the East is Open Space (O), and to the West is Mixed Use (MU).

The zoning surrounding the site is Limited Commercial.

The project is located within the Redevelopment Project Area overlay district.

Staff Representative Hull stated that project analysis is that Sprint/Nextel is proposing to modify an existing wireless facility on top of a 49' high mono-palm. The applicant proposes to replace six existing antennas with three panel antennas with tower-mounted amplifier (TMA's) and three microwave dish antennas on an existing mono-palm at a maximum



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 13 of 17

height of 47 feet 6 inches and the installation of the related equipment; the project is Categorically Exempt in accordance with Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (Class 1 Existing Facilities); according to the location standards per the City's Personal Wireless Service Facilities (PWSFs) ordinance (30-46 C.M.C.), the subject site is neither an Avoidance Area nor Opportunity Site. Issues/concerns: Partial concealment or camouflaging of the antennas is proposed by the applicant. The panel antennas and TMA's will be screened and camouflaged with the faux palm fronds. However the dish antennas extend beyond the fronds and therefore will be more visible. Staff recommends that the antennas (panel, dish and TMA's) be grouped closer together to minimized the visual impact and that either additional palm fronds be added to fully screen the dish antennas or that the dish antennas be relocated so that they are fully screened by the faux palm fronds; according to the applicant, alternate sites and locations on the subject site were not viable options in that the locations did not provide the required Radio Frequency coverage requirements for the desired area. Staff would highly recommend that this wireless facility be relocated to an opportunity site or be completely concealed/camouflaged with the faux palm fronds; and staff has conditioned that the Conditional Use Permit be limited to a 10 year term.

Staff Representative Hull stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2679 subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report.

Resident, Floyd Smith, 409 North Bullis Rd., Compton, stated that he has been a resident for 34 years and he is not aware of when the cell tower was put up, "If anyone would know it would be me" he said. Mr. Smith stated that since the property needs to be redeveloped he suggested that the City consider putting in mixed use at that location. Mr. Smith stated the he is aware that it is regulated under FCC and asked the applicant if they are also regulated under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Mr. Moreland in the audience (inaudible).

Mr. Smith stated that what he basically wants to know is who gave authorization to put up the tower. Mr. Smith stated that he does not have a problem with new technology the only thing that he is concerned about is that it is safe because there are schools in the area.

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that staff can give him a copy of the FCC Exposure Report to the area. She stated that she is not aware of when the tower was built and asked the applicant if he was aware.

Mr. Moreland in the audience (inaudible).

Staff Representative Hull stated that this was approved by the Commission in 1998.



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 14 of 17

Mr. Smith stated that he is not against it he just wants to make sure that it is safe and that it does not impede further development.

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that when the Commission looks at these they make sure that they are within the FCC guidelines.

Mr. Moreland stated that he works with over 60 jurisdictions and this jurisdiction asks for a lot of information and he wants to commend the Commission for that because he lives about 100 feet from a cell tower and he is aware that his City doesn't asked for all of that.

Mr. Moreland stated that in regards to the Condition No. 9, he brought this before engineers and the antennas cannot be moved closer because of signal degradation. He is requesting that this condition be revised to "That the antennas (panel, dish and TMA's) shall be grouped closer together to minimized the visual impact or utilize an alternative screening method subject to the Planning and Economic Development Department review and approval" that will allow to have different types of fronds, the illustrated one looks older, the newer ones would be able to screen that upper antenna that sticks out. That would be the request and that the six month condition be added.

Staff Representative Hull stated that staff does not have objection to Mr. Moreland's request and the condition can be modified to the applicant's request. Mr. Hull asked the applicant to restate his request.

Mr. Moreland stated that it should read "That the antennas (panel, dish and TMA's) shall be grouped closer together to minimized the visual impact or utilize an alternative screening method subject to the Planning and Economic Development Department review and approval".

There being no further comments, Commissioner Turner moved to close the public hearing regarding **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2679**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hill and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Hill moved to approve **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2679** with amended condition and add condition 34. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2679** was approved unanimously.

- F. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2688** - A request of Iglesias De Restauración to establish a church/public assembly use in existing buildings located at 1310-1320 N. Long Beach Blvd with a proposed parking lot for additional off-site parking at 1508 N. Long Beach Blvd. in the C-L (Limited Commercial) zone.

Staff Representative Hull stated that staff is requesting that this item be continued because staff is requesting that applicant submit revised plans.



5) INFORMATIONAL ITEMS (A Report of Previously Approved Cases)

Commissioner Darden asked that Items a, c, f, and g be pulled for discussion. Two of those cases were approved in 2007 and two were approved in 2008 and staff is recommending that all four cases be declared null and void. Commissioner Darden asked staff if there been any activity on any of those cases at any time (i.e. ARB, approval of plans, or Building and Safety permits) and stated that due to the economy loans for construction and the demand may have delay the original plans of the applicants. One of the conditions of approval in all the projects is the project be initiated within 180 days. She understands that it is the responsibility of the applicant to inform the Planning Department or/and the Commission to request an extension. Commissioner Darden recommends as a courtesy to the applicants and to the owner that they be given the opportunity to respond in writing regarding the status of the project. As mentioned at the last meeting staff needs to send a certified letter and have the applicant respond in writing for the record, maybe allow them to respond within 30 days. That will make it clear that the Commission has given them the opportunity.

Staff Representative Hull stated that he concurs with the Commissioner Darden that a certified letter be sent to the applicant asking them if they still intend to construct the project before the item can be closed. This is actually very critical as the ordinance indicates that these cases would be closed and if the applicant is interested in revising the plans they have to apply for a new application. That would mean new fees and new review of the application.

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that last month she inquired regarding the property on Alondra and Dwight.

Staff Representative Hull stated that approximately three weeks ago the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) presented to Council an opportunity to purchase the condominium development of the project. The church part is under-going its completion and it was funded through the church itself. There are still some off-site improvements that they are completing, the City anticipates the church will be opening within a month. They are going through their plan check with the Building and Safety to correct all deficiencies of the town-home development. The original developer lost it in foreclosure so it was put out for purchase. The CRA and other entities have provided an option to purchase. Council approved for CRA to move forward in acquiring the property and are currently negotiating with the bank. The bank that holds the note is East-West Bank. The latest is that they are still in discussion.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked if it is acquire by the City will CRA complete the project.

Staff Representative Hull stated that CRA will either complete the project, demolish the structures, and/or prepare the land for development by a private developer or will turn it over to a private developer to complete what is already built.

Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 16 of 17

Chairperson Green-Wright asked if that does happen, would they have to redraw the lines for the church vs. the housing because the way it was originally setup the church did not have enough parking and that is going to be a problem.

Staff Representative Hull stated that they have a separate parking lot that is delineated by a wrought iron fence that is located in the front.

Staff Representative Hull stated that an assessment will also be done to determine if the frames can be preserved.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked Commissioner Hill if he has had the opportunity to go out again to Toys R Us Express.

Commissioner Hill stated that he has not had the opportunity, but they are expected to close by the end of January.

6) OLD BUSINESS

Previously discussed under Informational Items.

7) NEW BUSINESS

Staff Representative Hull asked the Commission if they all had received the updates to the General Plan and asked if they were satisfied with the changes. Mr. Hull stated that he is aware that there were some concerns at the last meeting related to some information that was missing. He wants the Commission to know that since he became the Director in November he has embarked in trying to get additional feedback from the various departments He apologized for not having all the information on time but he just wanted to get it in the Commission's hands. Since the December presentation gaps of information have been filled in. The numbers were put-in in addition to completing the Health Element and the Implementation Plan. Staff will be presenting to the City Manager and the Assistant City Manager a PowerPoint presentation, meetings with the Mayor and Council to go over the plan, and then making a City Council meeting presentation. Staff does not know the exact dates yet, but it is going to be closer to the end of the month and once staff knows for certain the Commission will be invited come out to show support. Then staff will have the task of the setting up the community meetings and turning over the documents to certain state departments. Two departments are required to review specific sections of the document. The State Housing and Community Development has to review the Housing Element and the Air Quality Element has to be reviewed by AQMD, and Attorney General Kamala Harris who's office will receive the entire document as a courtesy to her and ask for her review. Those activities will be occurring in the coming months.

Chairperson Green-Wright thanked Mr. Hull for the information. She asked regarding the next Planning conference in April that will be held in Boston.



Planning Commission Minutes

January 12, 2011

Page 17 of 17

Staff Representative Hull stated that it is from April 9th to the 12th.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked if any of the Commissioners are interested in attending.

None of the Commissioners were interested. Chairperson Green-Wright stated that would attend.

Staff Representative Hull stated that next year it is going to be hosted here in Los Angeles.

8) COMMISSION COMMENTS

The Commission thanked Mr. Hull for the Christmas Luncheon.

9) AUDIENCE COMMENTS

It was moved by Commissioner Hill that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and carried unanimously.

**DEREK R. HULL, DIRECTOR
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**JUANITA GREEN-WRIGHT,
CHAIRPERSON**

