MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM FULLERTON CITY HALL
THURSDAY, 10:00 A.M., AUGUST 6, 2009

CALL TO ORDER	Chair Zelinka called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT	Zelinka, Voronel, Hughes, St. Paul, Tabatabaee (arrived at 10:07 a.m.), Lopez (arrived at 10:08 a.m.)
COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT	None
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT	Kusch, Coats, and Flores

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Committee Member St. Paul, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee that the minutes of July 16, 2009 be APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 1
PRJ09-00194 – ZON09-00042. APPLICANT: OMNI POINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.; PROPERTY OWNER: ARTEL ENTERPRISES. A request to install telecommunication equipment, including an antenna monopole measuring 65'-0" in height, located at the rear of a residential apartment development (Montclair Apartments) on property located at 2901-2939 Ruby Drive (approximately 300 feet west of the terminus of Ruby Drive) (R-3 zone) (Categorically exempt under Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines) (Staff Planner: Andrew Kusch)

Associate Planner Kusch gave a brief overview of the request.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if there was a trash enclosure on site. Associate Planner Kusch responded that the site does not have any enclosures, but there were trash bins located between the various car ports.

Committee Member Tabatabaee asked if the setbacks were in compliance with Code. Associate Planner Kusch explained that the Fullerton Municipal Code requires setbacks as it relates to residential properties and arterial streets.

Public hearing opened.

Monica Moretta, T-Mobile Representative, explained the proposal was a 65 foot monopine design for the 57 freeway, Cal State Fullerton, and the residential developments in the surrounding area. Ms. Moretta noted the facility design was determined based on the existing landscaping, and believed the design was appropriate for the location. She further noted that future carriers would be able to collocate. Mr. Moretta explained that a slim line design would not address the intended coverage for the area. T-Mobile reviewed alternative locations but

was unable to lease space for a telecommunication wireless facility. Ms. Moretta indicated that the proposed facility will provide the service that is needed to eliminate the gap between two wireless facilities located to the north and south of the proposed facility.

Committee Member St. Paul asked what the range difference was between the monopine and the slim line design. Sanjeev Tirunagaram, T-Mobile Representative, explained that T-Mobile was addressing coverage and capacity issues. He noted that a slim line design would only accommodate one antenna per sector and would not address T-Mobile's capacity issue.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if there were other mono stealth designs. Ms. Moretta responded that there were eucalyptus and elm tree designs. Ms. Moretta noted that the eucalyptus tree foliage does not cover the antennas as well as faux pine needles do.

Committee Member St. Paul asked why the proposed location for the facility was chosen. Ms. Moretta noted that the property owner chose the proposed location because it was less intrusive to residents. T-Mobile also takes into account the location of the facility to the range of coverage.

Committee Member Tabatabaee was concerned about accessibility to the facility for maintenance. Ms. Moretta responded that the separation between the two cabinets was 4 feet, and believed that was sufficient room for accessibility.

Committee Member Voronel asked if the applicant researched if there are existing underground utilities in the area. Ms. Moretta responded that the surveyor indicated where the existing utilities are, and was concerned about the existing water line possibly being an obstacle for the trenching of the utilities.

Ben Stubbs, Montclair Apartments Resident, noted that he was opposed to the antenna because of health risks due to long-term exposure to the radiofrequency (RF) signals, excess towers, and the decline in property value. Mr. Stubbs read a letter he submitted to staff.

Committee Member Lopez asked where the existing towers were located. Committee Member St. Paul responded that they are on the walls of the Meridian Sports Club, Target, and the Holiday Inn.

Committee Member Voronel asked Ms. Moretta if T-Mobile considered collocating. Ms. Moretta explained that is was difficult for a carrier to collocate on a roof mounted facility because a 10 foot separation was required.

Chairman Zelinka asked Ms. Moretta what T-Mobile's position was on public health due to excessive RF frequencies. Ms. Moretta noted that she provided Mr. Stubbs with data regarding radio frequencies and health effects and was prepared to answer those issues outside of this forum. Ms. Moretta explained that T-Mobile usually proposes telecommunication facilities in commercial and industrial zones or collocates when possible.

Committee Member St. Paul asked if monopoles would be phased out with technology. Mr. Tirunagaram responded no, and noted that monopoles of some sort will continue to be used.

Committee Member Lopez asked if the proposed antenna was for dropped calls or capacity. Mr. Tirunagaram explained the capacity difference between monopine and slim line pole designs, and noted the proposed antenna was for dropped calls as well as capacity.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member St. Paul believed that property value decline could happen for a number of reasons, and noted that the Committee could not address that. He noted that the Committee could also not address health risks. Committee Member St. Paul was concerned about the monopine design and noted that he would like to see the monoeucalyptus design.

Committee Member Voronel recommended that existing utilities be referenced on the plans. She noted that an encroachment permit would be needed if T-Mobile will be encroaching on the public right-of-way.

Committee Member Hughes concurred with Committee Member St. Paul.

Chairman Zelinka explained that the City does not have jurisdiction over the Telecommunications Act. He believed the monopine was out of context.

Committee Member St. Paul noted he would like to see the other designs. He recommended continuing the project to the next meeting so that the applicant can submit alternative telecommunication designs.

Committee Member Tabatabaee was concerned about other designs because of the proximity of the proposed antenna to the building.

MOTION made by Committee Member St. Paul to CONTINUE the item to a date certain of August 20, 2009, SECONDED by Committee Member Tabatabaee, and CARRIED unanimously by voting members present.

Ms. Moretta noted that she could bring in photo simulations and structural drawings/calculations of monoeucalyptus designs.

OTHER MATTERS

Chairman Zelinka noted that the City Council has approved the second reading of the Ordinance changes to the design review process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

Adjourned at 10:53 a.m. as Staff Review Committee.

BY: _____
Susana Flores, Secretary