



City of Corona

400 S. Vicentia Ave.
Corona, CA 92882

Minutes - Draft

Infrastructure Committee

COUNCIL MEMBER JASON SCOTT
COUNCIL MEMBER EUGENE MONTANEZ

ADVISORY MEMBER
VICE CHAIR KIRK BENNETT
COMMISSIONER JEFF RUSCIGNO

Wednesday, November 1, 2017

8:00 AM

Council Board Room

1. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order by Council Member Jason Scott at 8:00 am. In addition to Advisory Members with Vice Chair Kirk Bennett absent, the following individuals were in attendance:

Darrell Talbert, City Manager	Nelson Nelson, Public Works Director
Kerry Eden, ACM/Admin Svcs. Dir	Tom Koper, Asst. Public Works Dir.
Joanne Coletta, Comm. Dev. Dir.	Bob Tran, Senior Engineer
Terri Manuel, Planning Manager	Dennis Ralls, PW Program Manager
Tara Paul, Program Supervisor	Tom Moody, General Manager
David Montgomery-Scott, Library & Rec. Services Director	

Others Present:

Patrick Faranal, National Sign	Don Kindred, Resident
D.T. Kelhi, National Sign	Dennis Armstrong, Resident
Mr. Landry, Property Owner	Ivano Stamegna
Timothy Ballon, All American Asphalt	Carlos Cueva, Nora Homes
Crystal Howard, Enviromine	Henry "Hank" Lozano, Resident
Victor Elia, KWC Engineers	Carlos Padilla, Resident
Chris Barnett, Renegade Towers	Alysia Padilla-Vaccaro, Resident
Michael Miller, Renegade Towers	Ben Louk
Peter Blied, PLANCOM	Joe Morgan, Resident
Michael Shay, Resident	
Violet Shay, Resident	
Mohammad Khan, Resident	
Samantha Wadhwan, Resident	
Erin Atkins, Resident	
Ian Atkins, Resident	
Paul C. Klein, Resident	

Agenda Items

2. [17-1252](#) Discussion for a variance from the city's sign ordinance to increase the height of an existing pole sign by 15 feet for a total height of 30 feet for Carl's Jr. restaurant located at 1865 West Sixth Street due to the raised

elevation of Sixth Street from the State Route 91 project.

(Community Development)

Action: Information & Discussion

Ms. Terri Manuel, Planning Manager, presented to the Committee illustrations of the existing and proposed parcel identification sign for the Carl's Jr. restaurant on West Sixth Street. The establishment is located where Sixth Street was reconstructed with increased ascending elevation as part of the 91 Project improvements. The business wishes to raise the existing sign higher as the code currently limits the height of the sign to 15 feet from grade. The six-foot retaining wall adjacent to the sign effectively reduces the sign height to less than the allowable 15-foot height. Therefore, the owner wishes to apply for a variance for the sign height to be increased to 30 feet to off-set the deleterious effect the new street elevation has on the sign.

The Committee reviewed the exhibits that included the existing sign and a photo-simulation of a higher sign, and expressed no objection to the variance application.

3. [17-1253](#)

Discussion for a variance from the development standards of the Single Family Residential zone of the Downtown Revitalization Specific Plan to allow an existing single family residence located at 404 South Merrill Street to reduce its side and rear yard setbacks to enable the owner to process a lot line adjustment or parcel map to be able to sell the undeveloped portion of the property to allow another single family residence.

(Community Development)

Action: Information & Discussion

Ms. Terri Manuel, Planning Manager, presented to the Committee with illustrative exhibits a potential setback variance to be processed to enable the subject property to be subdivided into two lots. She explained the technical application of setback requirements based on lot orientation (front, sides and rear property lines) and that the definition of those depends on the front of a lot being the shortest distance along a public street. The subject site that is just under 15,000 square feet could subdivide into two lots meeting the minimum lot area of 7,200 square feet. Whereas one lot would be vacant, the other would continue to contain the existing home. What is now a sufficient side yard setback for the existing home at 6.48 feet (5-foot minimum based on the zoning requirements), that setback would be deficient in meeting what will be its rear setback by definition (required 10 feet) with the lot split. Approval of the variance would allow the owner to be able to sell off what is now the vacant and unusable half of the subject property that could not otherwise be sold.

The Committee expressed no objection to the owner pursuing the variance provided that the resultant lots met all of other minimum requirements for

the lot split.

4. [17-1254](#)

Discussion on All American Asphalt's request to extend their existing surface mine permit for a period of 100 years and extract an additional 65 million tons within the existing boundary of their quarry located at 1776 All American Way.

(Community Development)

Action: Information & Discussion

Ms. Joanne Coletta, Community Development Director, provided an overview of the request by All American Asphalt including history and background of the existing surface mine permit. The existing permit originally issued under the county expires in 2021. The company's request is for that to be extended for 100 years (similar to the recent Vulcan Materials surface mine permit extension) and for approval to mine deeper to 400 feet above mean sea level making an additional 65 million tons of aggregate available. Groundwater monitoring occurs and will continue with wells that exist across the site. The boundaries of the mining will remain the same with no horizontal expansion and the current 24-hour operations will remain. Ms. Coletta presented exhibits that illustrated the phasing from two to five phases, the relocation of the asphalt plant within the quarry boundaries, and the ample open space buffering from the residential area further to the northeast along Indiana Avenue. She explained that the permit extension will involve a Development Agreement with the city including extraction royalties, similar to the Vulcan Materials agreement.

Mr. Timothy Ballon, All American Asphalt, further explained operations that involve aggregate production between 1:00 and 11:00 a.m. and daily plant maintenance that takes place from 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mr. Ballon elaborated further about the plant footprint and quarry boundaries that will not expand and pointed out the narrowing toward the northeast where the open space buffer is preserved.

Upon inquiry by Council Member Montanez, Ms. Crystal Howard, Enviromine, and Mr. Ballon clarified the ownership boundaries and that the additional mining depth would be another 100 feet. Council Member Montanez recommended that the full ownership boundary be depicted on the exhibits so that the full extent of buffering can be clearly seen.

In response to Commissioner Ruscigno's inquiry, Ms. Coletta stated that the comparison to Vulcan's permit extension is that it was recently approved for 100 years to 2113. The extension for All American Asphalt would carry its permit to 2121.

Mr. Nelson Nelson, Public Works Director, asserted that these mine locations supply the best aggregate in California in proximity to where the demand occurs, and the extensions would keep the supplies continuing

until depletion. Ms. Coletta explained that site reclamation cannot begin until the surface mining is fully depleted and closed. She also stated that the process will evaluate traffic impacts just as did the Vulcan expansion process, but that increased trip generation is not anticipated, rather just the extension of the same levels of production for a longer time.

Mr. Tom Moody, General Manager, affirmed that the groundwater monitoring is good and the company is cooperative for the placement of even more monitoring wells to ensure protection of the groundwater sources.

To inquiry from Council Member Montanez about the frequency of street sweeping in the area, Mr. Ballon confirmed that All American has this done every week on Thursdays extending from the project site entry on Magnolia Avenue up to both the I-15 on- and off-ramps. Vulcan does the street sweeping every week on Tuesdays. Council Member Montanez requested that more detailed information about the street sweeping be part of the application submittal.

To inquiry from Commissioner Ruscigno about possible screening of the plant and silos, Mr. Ballon responded that the site entry is landscaped and that the addition of more landscape may be possible, provided that it is not in the active quarry area. Mr. Ballon also responded that the primary end user for their aggregate production is their own asphalt plant as well as Robertson's Ready Mix. All American has plants in Perris, Irwindale, Irvine and Westminster.

Mr. Joe Morgan, Resident, asserted his objection to what he referred to as an endless stream of trucks, asking why there could not be more rail spur use and why the material cannot come alternatively from someplace else. He stated that this item should go before a study session since it affects the entire east end of the city.

The Committee asked if this item would come back for an update and Ms. Coletta confirmed it would to discuss the terms of the Development Agreement.

5. [17-1255](#)

Review of the revised plan for the previously entitled expansion of Dollar Self Storage located between the terminus of Third Street and terminus of Quarry Street, adjacent to the Temescal Channel in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone.

(Community Development)

Action: Information & Discussion

Ms. Terri Manuel, Planning Manager, presented to the Committee a proposal to revise the previous entitlement for the expansion of the Dollar Self-storage facility at the terminus of Third Street. Exhibits were

distributed which illustrated the original design and the revised design. Where the previous entitlement in 2016 provided for a site configuration with one two-story building and two single-story buildings up against the property line to the Temescal Channel, the new configuration features one building centrally located with storage access on both sides of the building. The previous entitlement featured 442 storage units and 25 RV parking spaces. The new proposal features 601 storage units, 48 lockers, and six RV spaces. The previous entitlement had a large retaining/building wall up against the channel that was architecturally enhanced with spandrel glass windows. The revised plan features a northeast elevation with storage access roll-up doors on the lower level that is built into the grade and varied materials featuring masonry, stucco and standing seam metal roofing with cornice trim at the corners. The revisions will go through a major modification to the previously approved conditional use permit.

The Committee reviewed the exhibits and noted that the previous entitlement looked better and recommended that the applicant revise the plan to incorporate the aesthetic features applied to the previous plan. The Committee also noted that the concept landscape plan featured no planting along the northeast property line and recommended screen landscaping rather than just the bark mulch as shown, and further asked that more detail be provided on the lockers, their size, configuration and photo examples of where they have been used.

6. [17-1256](#)

Discussion on the potential application by Renegade Towers, LLC for a conditional use permit for an 80 foot high monopine telecommunications tower proposed on the west side of Skyline Drive between Chase Drive and Foothill Parkway (north of 3298 Skyline Drive) in the R-1A Zone (Single Family Residential, one acre minimum lot size).
(Community Development)

Action: Information & Discussion

Ms. Joanne Coletta, Community Development Director, introduced to the Committee exhibits illustrating a wireless telecommunications tower that Renegade Towers is proposing to place on a vacant, residential property on the west side of Skyline Drive between Chase Drive and Foothill Parkway to fill a service gap in the area. The installation is designed as a 76-foot high mono-eucalyptus tree. She explained that the project proponent has had several meetings with city staff, and staff has explained to the company representatives why the location cannot be supported by city staff. As the proponent asserts the location is essential for the necessary coverage in the area and other alternatives are not viable, they were instructed that an outreach to the community would be necessary to garner support for the location. Renegade Towers representatives held two outreach meetings in September with one on a Thursday evening and the other on a Saturday afternoon. Shortly thereafter, e-mails of protest were sent to city representatives from the nearby residents.

Mr. Chris Barnett of Renegade Towers presented a power point that detailed cell coverage across the southern part of the city (radii from existing towers) and the coverage gap in the referenced area and photo-simulations of the tree as it would be located in an area that is prevalent with mature trees that the tower would blend in with. He explained that the tower is designed to accommodate antenna arrays of up to three carriers. Renegade builds the tower and then leases to Verizon, AT&T, Sprint and T-Mobile. He acknowledged that the city's preference is that these towers be located in commercial or industrial zones, but no such zones exist in this area where there is service gap. The service is important for general use but also for emergency response situations as well, and a single use pole accommodating three users is less impactful than would be three separate towers for the various carriers. He referred to the city's General Plan that promotes wireless infrastructure stating that 51% of homes now are mobile phone use exclusively. Service is also needed for hikers and bikers in the area too as well as utility service providers. In terms of the negative feedback arising from the area residents, he categorized the general reasons being 1) perceived health risks; 2) aesthetics; 3) real estate values; 4) wi-fi availability in homes; and 5) alternative cell types such as small cell or micro-cell facilities. He explained that these installations operate below the safety standard thresholds set by the FCC accepted by the World Health Organization and the American Cancer Society and cell phone use itself is higher exposure than cell towers. In terms of view shed, the tower would be visible from the rear yards of the first row of residences to the east, but would be of minimal visual impact as the separation distance is at least 100 feet and the tower would blend with other mature trees in the area. To the contention of real estate values, he stated that a 2004 study based up north of 70 sites and 1,600 homes concluded that there was no difference in real estate values based upon the location of cell towers. To the contention that wi-fi is now available in homes eliminating the need for cell towers, he stated that private homes are not the only users of cell service. As for the alternative of small cells or microcells, since these are single user installations and cover much smaller areas, the proliferation of these to satisfy the service gap would be significant. He compared the service areas to the throw of a sprinkler system in that it is not so much a distance issue as it is topography and ridgelines that can obstruct signals.

A number of nearby residents attended the meeting to offer their comments related to the proposed project. The objections raised by those in attendance included the impacts to the views from the residential properties; perception of health impacts being enough; proximity of the tower to residences and the level of antennas with living areas; other sites in the vicinity away from the residences that would be better; home

purchase intentionally away from any power lines and toxic sites; residents such as those with pacemakers that are more vulnerable to electro-magnetic frequencies; impacts to thousands of hikers using Skyline as a trailhead in that area.

Mr. Tom Koper, Assistant Public Works Director, informed that the installation of the cell tower would trigger public improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk, etc., along the entire frontage of the parcel where it would be installed per the municipal code requirements.

Commissioner Ruscigno expressed his disfavor of the location since it is in a residential area asserting that there are plenty of other areas as options. Council Member Montanez expressed his concurrence with staff's reservations about the location further expressing, however, that the city cannot use the health, safety arguments as a basis for a denial pointing to school sites and parks that now accommodate many of these installations. Council Member Scott noted the recent legislation that was vetoed by the governor resulting in continued local control over the placement of these installations, and he concurred that the location is not good urging the exploration of other sites to the west or even the small cell installations as an alternative.

7. [17-1257](#) Presentation regarding traffic control for the California Avenue Sewer Project.
 (Public Works Department)
 Action: Information & Discussion

 Item pulled.

8. [17-1259](#) Discussion regarding the ultimate configuration of Golden Harvest Drive.
 (Public Works Department)
 Action: Information & Discussion

Tom Koper, Assistant Public Works Director reported that Griffin Homes/Nova Homes is preparing to develop Tract Map 31373, located in the area of East Upper Drive, Lester Avenue, and Lemon Grove Lane, and that one of the requirements of the development is the construction of Golden Harvest Drive. Mr. Koper further reported that past discussions had determined that Golden Harvest Drive would have to be constructed as a narrower rural road, rather than a standard City street, to accommodate the creek that runs along its north side.

In order to address concerns posed by residents regarding potential traffic volumes on a rural road and pedestrian safety, staff proposed implementing a design where Golden Harvest Drive was constructed as two cul-de-sacs (one accessible from Lemon Grove Lane, and the other accessible from Lester Avenue), with sidewalk on the south side for

pedestrian access. This design would ultimately eliminate through-access from Lemon Grove Lane to Lester Avenue, and reduce traffic volumes on the rural road. Mr. Koper stated that the Fire Department has been made aware of the proposed design, and has indicated their approval.

Council Member Montanez asked the residents in attendance for input regarding the proposed design.

Ben Louk, Resident, stated that he was speaking on behalf himself and his neighbors, and that they do not support the proposed design. Mr. Louk clarified that the main reason for their opposition pertained to safety, and that closing Golden Harvest Drive to through-traffic would eliminate a potential evacuation route for the residents on Lester in the case of an emergency.

Council Member Montanez asked staff if an alternative was considered with an emergency gate connecting the two cul-de-sacs on Golden Harvest. Mr. Koper responded that the alternative was considered, but that it was not the option preferred by the Fire Department.

Carlos Padilla, Resident, addressed the Committee and expressed his support of constructing Golden Harvest Drive as a dual cul-de-sac. Mr. Padilla stated that he feels constructing Golden Harvest Drive as a through street that connects Lester Avenue and Lemon Grove Lane would encourage cut-through traffic and increase the number of vehicles in the area.

Council Member Jason Scott asked if a traffic study was performed for Lester Avenue at its projected build-out. Mr. Koper stated that a traffic study was conducted, and that the traffic volume on Lester Avenue was minimal.

After continued discussion, the Committee recommended that staff move forward with the proposed dual cul-de-sac design, and pursue the option of installing an emergency gate that would allow through-traffic in the case of an emergency.

9. [17-1260](#) Discussion regarding a fee waiver for the Santa Ana River Trail.
(Public Works Department)
Action: Information & Discussion

Nelson Nelson, Public Works Director addressed the Committee, and distributed a hand-out outlining the scope of work and project schedule for a project aimed at improving the Santa Ana River Trail. Mr. Nelson reported that the project is being funded and constructed by Riverside County and the Army Corps of Engineers, and is ready to move into Phase

2.

After briefly discussing the project, Mr. Nelson sought the Committee's recommendation regarding waiving the City fees associated with the project, and acknowledged that a formal request for the fee waiver would need to be brought before the full City Council for consideration and approval. Mr. Nelson clarified that the fees associated with the project were roughly \$14,000.00.

After a brief discussion, the Committee expressed its support for the fee waiver, and requested that Mr. Nelson prepare item for City Council consideration.

10. [17-1261](#)

Discussion regarding closing Sixth Street for the City Holiday Lighting Ceremony.

(Public Works Department)

Action: Information & Discussion

David Montgomery-Scott, Library & Recreation Services Director provided a brief overview of the 2017 Holiday Lighting Event, and discussed a proposal whereby this year's event would be expanded onto Sixth Street to accommodate stage activities and booths for local vendors, organizations, and businesses. In order to accommodate the expanded event, staff is proposing the temporary closure of Sixth Street, between Vicentia Avenue and Buena Vista Avenue, from 12:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. on Sunday, December 3, 2017.

Mr. Montgomery-Scott reported that Sixth Street traffic would be diverted around the event using Second Street, and that patrons wishing to access the businesses in the affected portion of Sixth Street could do so by using the alley to the south. Mr. Montgomery-Scott further reported that all of the businesses in the affected area have been notified, and would be invited to participate in the event.

After a brief discussion, the Committee supported the closure of Sixth Street to accommodate the expansion of the City Holiday Lighting Event.

11. Public Comments

Mr. Joe Morgan, Resident, expressed his disagreement with Ms. Joanne Coletta's comments.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.