

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 23, 2011

2010-7706 - AT&T [Applicant] **Business Ventures LLC** [Owner]: Special Development Permit to allow a wireless telecommunication facility for a new 60' slimline pole with 9 antennas at **1225 Innsbruck Dr.** (Mitigated Negative Declaration) SM

Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He said staff recommends approval of the Special Development Permit with the recommended conditions of approval found in Attachment B.

Comm. Chang discussed with staff the requirement to paint the pole green and asked why staff is not recommending further screening such as a monopalm. Mr. Mendrin said that typically staff does not require further screening unless the pole is highly visible. **Trudi Ryan**, Planning Officer, said staff felt the slimline pole is unobtrusive; however the Commission has the ultimate aesthetic review.

Comm. Dohadwala discussed with staff that this application meets all setback requirements for an industrial area. Ms. Ryan commented that residential areas have different setback requirements. Comm. Dohadwala suggested other possible options such as a windmill rather than a monopine.

Comm. Sulser asked staff about the slimline design with staff saying that this pole would not accommodate co-location for another provider. Comm. Sulser further asked about co-location. Mr. Mendrin said this is the only application for this area, however if applications were submitted for this site that staff would have to consider number of poles.

Vice Chair Hendricks discussed with staff what this site would look like from other properties, and the required green color for the pole, with staff commenting that color studies indicate dark colors, such as dark green, seemed to recede from vision.

Comm. Hungerford asked staff if the applicant has considered co-locating on the facade of a building with staff saying the proposed location of the pole provides the coverage needed and that building heights are not sufficient.

Comm. Dohadwala discussed with staff the landscaping, suggesting that this might be an opportunity to require additional landscaping or a tree on the site. Ms. Ryan said staff could look at the landscaping on the site; however a large tree too close could interfere with the antennas.

Chair Travis opened the public hearing.

Michelle Weller, applicant representing AT&T, confirmed that there would not be room on the slimline pole for another carrier to co-locate. She said if another carrier submitted an application that that carrier could possibly replace the pole with one that would allow co-location. She said AT&T looked at existing buildings as possible antenna sites, however the locations available did not meet the coverage area needs.

Comm. Sulser commented that the Commission has purview over the aesthetics of the pole and asked Ms. Weller to comment why the slimline pole is better than other options. Ms. Weller commented that the buildings did not have the height needed, and that the slimline pole looks more like a light pole. Ms. Weller said the proposed slimline pole provides what AT&T wants and meets the city ordinance requirements.

Vice Chair Hendricks discussed with Ms. Weller other possible options for AT&T, including co-locating elsewhere, and putting the pole on the other side of the property. Mr. Mendrin referred to Attachment E and discussed the coverage areas and location of the pole. Vice Chair Hendricks discussed with Ms. Weller and staff what the slimline pole would look like.

Chair Travis closed the public hearing.

Comm. Chang moved for Alternative 1 to approve the Special Development Permit with the Recommended Conditions of Approval found in Attachment B. Vice Chair Hendricks seconded the motion.

Comm. Chang said he can make the findings. He said he would prefer to see a monopine, however the proposed pole meets all the requirements.

Vice Chair Hendricks said he can make the findings, however he is concerned that the pole just meets the minimum requirements. He said a tree might look better, but this is an industrial site. He discussed the location of the pole on the site. He said, for future applicants, he would like to see more than just the minimum requirements met.

Comm. Dohadwala offered a Friendly Amendment to have staff look at the existing landscaping and require that a large tree be added to the site if the site is considered under landscaped. Comm. Chang asked staff if the applicant's plans meet the City guidelines for landscaping. Comm. Dohadwala confirmed with staff that with the additional building on the site, that if the site landscaping is legal non-

conforming that additional landscaping can be required incrementally based on the scope of the project. Ms. Ryan said requiring a tree be added to the property would be consistent with the scope of the project. Vice Chair Hendricks confirmed with Comm. Dohadwala that she is requesting a live tree be added, not a monopine. **The Friendly Amendment was acceptable to the maker and seconder of the motion.**

Comm. Sulser said he is torn on his decision about the application. He said his main concern is the aesthetics, and though this pole looks better than some other poles, he wishes the applicant had gone a little further to make this look better. He said he would not be supporting the motion.

Comm. Hungerford said he is also conflicted about this project due to aesthetic reasons. He said the development occurring in the Moffett Park area includes many attractive buildings and industrial facilities and he thinks a more upscale design should be required for this area. He said this pole is better than a pole with a lot of antennas hanging off it; however he does not want to see the slimline poles become the standard for this area. He said he would not be supporting the motion.

Vice Chair Hendricks said he would not change his vote, and noted that this vote should not be considered a precedent for this area. He said he thinks that applicants need to propose projects that address the aesthetics. He said in this case he does not think a monopine or monopalm would make much of a difference.

Chair Travis said he understands the aesthetics argument. He discussed the proposed pole and said that he thinks the pole will be narrower than the photos show. He said he agrees that this decision is not setting a precedent and said he can make the findings and would support the motion.

ACTION: Comm. Chang made a motion on 2010-7706 to approve the Special Development Permit with modified Conditions of Approval: to have staff review the existing landscaping and require a large tree be planted if the site is considered under landscaped. Vice Chair Hendricks seconded. Motion carried 4-2, with Comm. Hungerford and Comm. Sulser dissenting, and Comm. Larsson absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to City Council no later than June 7, 2011.