



City of Corona

400 S. Vicentia Ave.
Corona, CA 92882

Minutes - Final

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

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