

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE ISSUED:	May 6, 2010	REPORT NO. PC-10-027
ATTENTION:	Planning Commission, Ager	nda of May 13, 2010.
SUBJECT:	CLEARWIRE SPRINT – 939 PROJECT NO. 198041, PRO	
OWNER/ APPLICANT:	Nine Three Nine Coast Mana Sprint Nextel Corporation	gement (See Attachment 11)

#### SUMMARY

**Issue(s):** Should the Planning Commission approve a modification to a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) at 939 Coast Boulevard within the La Jolla Planned District Area?

Staff Recommendation: Approve Conditional Use Permit 700980.

<u>Community Planning Group Recommendation</u>: On March 4, 2010, the La Jolla Community Planning Association voted 13-0-1 to recommend approval of this project (Attachment 10).

**Environmental Review:** This project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Article 19, Section 15301, Existing facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This project is not pending an appeal of the environmental determination. The environmental exemption determination for this project was made on January 11, 2010 and the opportunity to appeal that determination ended January 25, 2010 (Attachment 16).

**Fiscal Impact Statement:** None with this action. All costs associated with the processing of this project are paid from a deposit account maintained by the applicant.

Code Enforcement Impact: None with this action.

Housing Impact Statement: None with this action.



## **BACKGROUND**

The existing 183 foot tall condominium building was approved and constructed prior to the adoption of Proposition D in 1972. The Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone became effective in 2000 with the adoption of the Land Development Code. This overlay prohibits structures from exceeding 30 feet in height. The City Attorney's office issued a Memorandum of Law (MOL) in 2006 which opined that the City of San Diego is prohibited by Proposition D from approving wireless communication facilities that exceeds 30'-0" height limit in the Coastal Overlay Zone unless the placement of the wireless communication facility is located on previously conforming structures that exceed the 30'-0", and the installation is within the structural envelope of the existing structure (Attachment 14). In addition to conforming to the MOL, it has also been determined that Clearwire Sprint's proposed design complies with Land Development Code Section 132.0501, Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone.

The project site is zoned LJPD-5 and is designated for residential use in the La Jolla Community Plan (Attachments 2). The site is adjacent to multi-family units to the north, south and east of the property and Ellen Scripps Browning Park to the west (Attachment 1).

The Wireless Communication Facilities regulations identify this proposal as a Process 4, Conditional Use Permit due to the fact that it is located on a residential use within a residential zone. The project complies with the Wireless Communication Facilities Regulations which require a facility to use all reasonable means to conceal and minimize the visual impacts through architectural integration, landscape and siting solutions. The proposed antennas and equipment will be completely concealed inside the existing stairwell and penthouse and will not be visible to the public (Attachment 7).

## **DISCUSSION**

## Project Description:

Clearwire Sprint proposes to install five (5) new panel antennas and install five (5) new directional antennas inside an existing stairwell and penthouse. These antennas shall be completely concealed behind new FRP screen walls, and will not be visible from any public perspectives. As a result of this modification, a total of six (9) panel antennas and five (5) directional antennas shall be maintained by Clearwire Sprint (Existing Conditional Use Permit 490936). The associated Clearwire Sprint equipment is located inside the rooftop penthouse next to the approved Sprint equipment cabinets.

Due to the topography of the surrounding area, the current location was considered the ideal candidate. As designed, the WCF will be completely concealed inside existing elements behind FRP screening with minimal visual impact to the surrounding homes. The current design allows Clearwire Sprint to fully stealth both the equipment and the antennas from the public perspectives as opposed to other more intrusive designs such as façade mounting the antennas on the building.

<u>Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) Regulations</u> – The site is located on a residential use and is permitted with Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Land Development Section 141.0420(f)(2). As designed, the proposed Clearwire Sprint WCF complies with LDC Section 141.0420(g)(23). This section states, "The applicant shall use all reasonable means to conceal or minimize the visual impacts of the wireless communication facilities though integration. Integration with existing structures among other existing uses shall be accomplished through the use of architecture, landscaping, and siting solutions." The antennas and equipment are completely concealed inside the rooftop penthouse and stairwell. Therefore, this proposed WCF complies with the design requirement as indicated in this section of the code.

<u>Council Policy 600-43</u> – The guidelines establish a hierarchy from the most preferraed locations (Preference 1) to the least preferred locations (Preference 4) for WCFs. The project is proposed within a preference 4 location according to Council Policy 600-43, which categories WCF according to the land use in which they are located. In this case, the property is zoned LJPD-5 and requires a Conditional Use Permit. Nevertheless, the applicant must demonstrate that sites within Preference 1, 2 and 3 were explored in good faith and found unacceptable. The height of the existing penthouse and stairwell allows Clearwire Sprint to provide a significant coverage objective which would result in fewer sites. Multiple buildings would be required to service the same coverage objective which may result in a less desirable design such as faux trees and exterior mounted antennas. As designed, the equipment and antennas are fully stealth, and can be supported by staff.

<u>Community Plan Analysis</u> - The proposed wireless communication facility is located in a residentially designated property within the La Jolla Community Plan. The La Jolla Community Plan recommends that all telecommunication facilities be reviewed and analyzed by the City of San Diego for visual impact. It recommends that all cellular facilities adhere to the Telecommunication Policy.

The proposed wireless communication facility will be completely concealed and camouflaged from the surrounding residential and commercial areas, therefore this facility is consistent with the recommendations contained within the La Jolla Community Plan.

## Project-Related Issues:

The project proposes to install a wireless communication facility inside an existing rooftop stairwell and inside an existing rooftop penthouse. The addition of the proposed wireless communication facility would allow Clearwire Sprint to implement their 4<sup>th</sup> Generation (4G) wireless technology in the La Jolla Community area (Attachment #15). The proposed modification would also include one additional cabinet inside an existing rooftop penthouse resulting in no additional visual impacts to the site.

The project is located within the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, which has a maximum allowable height of 30 feet. However, this is a previously conforming structure and the proposed wireless communication facility will be completely recessed within the structural envelope. As a result, the project will not be violating the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone as discussed in the

Per Land Development Code Section 141.0420(f), wireless communication facilities located on a residential use within a residential zone requires a Conditional Use Permit, Process 4, Planning Commission decision. The project is within a Preference 4 location according to Council Policy 600-43, however, the applicant has demonstrated to staff that the proposed project will be fully integrated with the existing building.

The wireless communication antenna regulations require project applicants to integrate their wireless projects into the architecture of the existing buildings or environment. Wireless communication technology is dependent on clear lines of site and the height where the antennas are proposed is needed to provide coverage to the surrounding area. Staff supports the proposed design as it has been determined that it will not cause any visual impacts to the surrounding community.

## Conclusion:

Staff has reviewed the proposed project and has determined the project is consistent with the purpose and intent of the applicable development regulations of the San Diego Municipal Code, which includes the development regulations of the LJPD-5 zone and the Wireless Communication Antennas Regulations. The required findings can be made (Attachment 8) to support staff's recommendation. Therefore, staff recommends approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 700980 (Attachment 9).

## ALTERNATIVES

- 1. APPROVE Conditional Use Permit No. 700980, with modifications.
- 2. **DENY** Conditional Use Permit No. 700980, if the findings required to approve the project cannot be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Westlake Program Manager Development Services Department

Simon Tse

Associate Planner Development Services Department

WESTLAKE/ST

Attachments:

- 1. Aerial Photograph
- 2. Community Plan Land Use Map
- 3. Project Location Map
- 4. Project Data Sheet
- 5. Project Site Plan(s)
- 6. Project Site Photos
- 7. Project Photosimulation
- 8. Draft Permit with Conditions
- 9. Draft Resolution with Findings
- 10. Community Planning Group Recommendation
- 11. Ownership Disclosure Statement
- 12. Notice of Hearing
- 13. Project Chronology
- 14. Memorandum of Law
- 15. Coverage Map
- 16. Notice of Exemption/Notice of Right to Appeal Environmental Determination





Aerial Photo <u>CLEARWIRE SPRINT- 939 COAST BLVD - PROJECT NO. 198041</u> 939 COAST BLVD, LA JOLLA, CA 92037







Community Land Use Map (LA JOLLA) CLEARWIRE SPRINT-939 COAST BLVD - PROJECT NO. 198041 939 COAST BLVD, LA JOLLA, CA 92037





Project Location Map

<u>CLEARWIRE SPRINT-939 COAST BLVD - PROJECT NO. 198041</u> 939 COAST BLVD, LA JOLLA, CA 92037



## PROJECT DATA SHEET

	PROJECT DATA SH	EET		
<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	SPRINT/CLEAF	SPRINT/CLEARWIRE COAST BLVD		
PROJECT DESCRIPTIO	consisting of two (2) new Clea Clearwire directional antennas penthouse and stairwell behind The associated equipment will	A modification to an existing Wireless Communication Facility consisting of two (2) new Clearwire panel antennas and five (5) new Clearwire directional antennas concealed inside an existing penthouse and stairwell behind Fiberglass Resistant Panel (FRP). The associated equipment will also be concealed within an existing penthouse, not visible to the public.		
COMMUNITY PLAN AR	EA:	La Jolla		
DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS:	Conditio	Conditional Use Permit		
COMMUNITY PLAN LA USE DESIGNATION:	ND La Jolia Plan	La Jolla Planned District Zone 5		
	ZONING INFO	RMATION:		
Zone: Height Limit: Front Setback: Interior Side Setback Street Side Setback: Rear Setback:		<u>Proposed</u> LJPD-5 181 feet 15 feet 7 feet 10 feet 0 feet		
ADJACENT PROPERTIES:	LAND USE DESIGNATION & ZONE	EXISTING LAND USE		
NORTH:	La Jolla Planned District Zone 5	Multi-Family Housing		
SOUTH:	La Jolla Planned District Zone 5	Multi-Family Housing		
EAST:	RM-5-12	Multi-Family Housing		
WEST:	La Jolla Planned District Zone 5	Park		
DEVIATIONS OR VARIANCES REQUESTED:	None			
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP RECOMMENDATION:		mmunity Planning Association voted l of this project. (Attachment 10)		

Sprint Clearwre Together with NEXTEL COAST BLVD (CA-SDG5093) 939 COAST BLVD, SAN DIEGO, CA 92037			Speiner with NEXTEL Stein COPILEY DRIVE, #100, SAN DIEGO, CA 921 PHONE: (888) 650-4200 FAX: (868) 650-4202 DCI PACIFIC DCI PACIFIC ARCHITECTURE * ENGINE FIND * CONSULTING MERCIFICE PARK I SUITE *10 I BY/ORE I CA 8881 MERCIFICE PARK I BY/ORE I CA 8881 MERC		
DEVELOPMENT SUMM	IARY		DRAWING INDEX	APPLICANT INFORMATION	
PROJECT SCOPE OF WORK:   • SFRINT PROPOSES TO MODIFY THE EXISTING UNMANNED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AS FOLLOWS:   • 'SPRINT/CLEARWIRE' DIRECTIONAL ANTENNAS (TOTAL OF 5)   • SPRINT/CLEARWIRE' PANEL ANTENNAS (TOTAL OF 5)   • SPRINT/CLEARWIRE' PANEL ANTENNAS (TOTAL OF 5)   • SPRINT/CLEARWIRE' PANEL ANTENNAS (TOTAL OF 5)   • GPS ANTENNA (TOTAL OF 1)   • EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE: 'SPRINT/CLEARWIRE'   • MIMAX RACK INSIDE (E) SHELTER AT ROOFTOP   • BOXED BELOW IS A LIST OF DEVELOPMENT REGULATION   • DEVAITONS, AND THE REQUIRED PERMITS/APPROVALS, N/A IF LEFT BLANK:   CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT   EXISTING WCFs ON SAME PROPERTY:   1. SPRINT	• ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER: $350-021-25$ • LEASE AREA: EXISTING <u>OWNER:</u> 939 COAST MANAGEMENT ADDRESS: 939 COAST BLVD. LA JOLLA, CA 92037 CONTACT: BARBARA PRINTZ PHONE: (858) 454-0312 <u>BUILDING CODE INFORMATION:</u> • EXISTING BUILDING/STRUCTURE: OCCUPANCY = S2 CONSTRUCTION TYPE = V-B SPRINKLER SYSTEM = NO • PROPOSED STRUCTURE: OCCUPANCY = S2	PROJECTI E Production Constants Product Transformers D 14 Adds March B March B March	SHEET DESCRIPTION    T1 TITLE SHEET   A1 SITE/ROOF PLAN, EQUIP. /ANT. LAYOUT PLANS   A2 ELEVATIONS   A3 ELEVATIONS	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{APPLICANT:} \\ \hline \textbf{CLEAR WIRELESS LLC} \\ 4400 CARILLON POINT \\ KIRKLAND, WA 98033 \\ \textbf{CONTACT: ANNE FORD, PROJECT MANAGER \\ PHONE: (519) 454-1839 \\ FAX: - \\ \hline \textbf{E-MAL: ANNE.FORD@CLEARWIRE.COM} \\ \hline \textbf{ARCHITECT:} \\ \hline \textbf{DCI PACIFIC} \\ 3Z EXECUTIVE PARK, SUITE 110 \\ IRVINE, CA 92614 \\ \hline \textbf{CONTACT: D.K. DO, RA} \\ PHONE: (949) 475-1000 \\ FAX: (949) 475-1001 \\ \hline \textbf{E-MAIL: DK@DCIPACIFIC.COM} \\ \hline \textbf{SITE ACQUISITION:} \\ \hline \textbf{DEPRATTI INC.} \\ 13948 CALLE BUENO GANAR \\ JAMUL, CA 91935 \\ \hline \textbf{CONTACT: SEE PROJECT TEAM FOR INFO. \\ PHONE: (619) 726-8110 \\ FAX: (619) 669-0985 \\ \hline \end{array}$	COAST BLVD COAST BLVD (CA-SDG5093) (CA-SDG5093)
PROJECT TEAM: RF_ENGINEER: INELDA_CUEVAS	CONSTRUCTION TYPE = 52 CONSTRUCTION TYPE = VB SPRINKLER SYSTEM = NO	DRIVING DIRECTIONS	ABBREVIATIONS		
PHONE:   (760) 250-3579     CONSTRUCTION:   PAUL HOKENESS     PHONE:   (818) 231-8889     SITE ACQUISITION:   DEBRA DEPRATTI     PHONE:   (619) 726-8110     PLANNING:   DEBRA DEPRATTI     PHONE:   (619) 726-8110     ARCHITECT:   D.K. DO, RA     PHONE:   (949) 475-1000     SURVEYOR:   N/A     PHONE:   -     CIMIL/STRUCTURAL ENGR.   N/A     PHONE:   -	ZONING INFORMATION: JURISDICTION: SAN DIEGO ZONING DESIGNATION: ZONE 5 LA JOLLA PLANNED DISTRICT COASTAL OVERLAY COASTAL HT. LIMIT LATITUDE: 32°50°54.16° N LONGITUDE: 117°16'33.82° W TOP OF (E) STRUCTURE: 182°-0° AGL BASE OF STRUCTURE: AGL @ BASE	DEPART FROM SAN DIEGO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT START OUT COING EAST TOWARD N HARBOR DR. TURN LEFT ONTO N HARBOR DR. TURN LEFT ONTO W LAUREL ST. TURN LEFT ONTO INDIA ST. MERGE ONTO I-5 N VIA THE RAMP ON THE LEFT. TAKE THE WEST LA JOLLA PKWY EXIT 26A MERGE ONTO I-5 N VIA THE RAMP ON THE LEFT. TAKE THE WEST LA JOLLA PKWY STAY STRAIGHT TO GO ONTO TORREY PINES RD. TURN RIGHT ONTO POSPECT PL. TURN RIGHT TO STAY ON COAST BLVD. TURN RIGHT TO STAY ON COAST BLVD. TURN RIGHT TO STAY ON COAST BLVD. 939 COAST BLVD. IS ON THE LEFT. 939 COAST BLVD., SAN DIEGO, CA 92037-4128 APPROVAL DATE SIGNATURE	CONST CONSTRUCTION CONT CONTINUOUS ID INSIDE DIAMETER IN INCH DBL DOUBLE INFO INFORMATION DIA DIAMETER INSUL INSULATION DIAG DIAGONAL INT INTERIOR DN DOWN CBC CALIFORNIA BUILD	PLYWD PLYWDOD PROJ PROJECT PROP PROPERTY PT PRESSURE TREATED REQ REQUIRED RM ROOM THON, AIR CONDITIONING SHT SHEET SIMULAR SPEC SPECIFICATION SF SQUARE FOOT SS STAINLESS STEEL STRUCT STEL STRUCT STEL STRUCT URAL DING CODE STD STUD	REVISIONS     NO. DATE   DESCRIPTION     1   00-15-00     2   16-20     3   11-00-00     4   12-42-00     5   01-30-10     6   0-30-10     7   00-30-10     8   00-30-10     10   00-30-10     11-00-00   CTY COMMENTS     4   12-42-40     10   00-30-10     11-00-00   CTY COMMENTS     11-00-00   CTY COMMENTS     11-00-00   CTY COMMENTS     12   00-30-30     13   00-30-30     14   12-42-40     15   00-30-30     16   00-30-30     17   COMMENTS     18   00-30-30     10   10-30     10   10-30     10   10-30     10   10-30     10   10-30     10   10-30     10   10-30     10
CODE COMPLIANCE		P.M.:	DET DETAIL DWG DRAWING LBS POUNDS MAX MAXIMUM EA EACH MECHANICAL	SUSP SUSPENDED THRU THROUGH TYP TYPICAL	NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION UNLESS LABELED AS CONSTRUCTION SET
1. CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE CBC-2007 2. CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (INCL. TITLES 24 & 25) 2007 3. ANSI/EIA-222-F LIFE SAFETY CODE 4. NFPA-101-2006 5. CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE CEC-2007 6. CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE CMC-2007	7. CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE CPC-2007 8. LOCAL BUILDING CODE(S) 9. CITY AND/OR COUNTY ORDINANCES ** NOTE: ALL WORK AND MATERIALS SHALL BE PERFORMED AND INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT EDITIONS OF THESE CODES, NOTHING IN THESE PLANS IS TO BE CONSTRUED TO PERMIT WORK NOT CONFORMING TO THESE CODES,	CONST: S/A: R.F.: ZONING: A&E: R.F.: R.F.: REVIEWERS SHALL CLEARLY PLACE INITIALS ADJACENT TO EACH REDLINE NOTE AS DRAWINGS ARE BEING REVIEWED	ELEV ELEVATION MECH MECHANICAL ELEV ELEVATION MIL METAL ELEC ELECTRICAL MFR MANUFACTURE EQ EQUAL MGR MANAGER EQUIP EQUIPMENT MIN MINIMUM EXT EXTERIOR MISC MISCELLANEOUS ROUGH OPENING FIN FINISH FLUOR FLOURESCENT NA NOT APPLICABLE FLR FLOOR NIC NOT IN CONTRAC FT FOOT NIS NOT TO SCALE	UNO UNLESS NOTED DTHERWISE VERT VERTICAL VIF VERIFY IN FIELD W/ WITH W/O WITHOUT	SHEET TITLE TITLE SHEET SHEET NUMBER











Site Photos <u>CLEARWIRE SPRINT- 939 COAST BLVD - PROJECT NO. 198041</u> 939 COAST BLVD, LA JOLLA, CA 92037





**Site Photos** <u>CLEARWIRE SPRINT- 939 COAST BLVD - PROJECT NO. 198041</u> 939 COAST BLVD, LA JOLLA, CA 92037





# Site Photos

<u>CLEARWIRE SPRINT– 939 COAST BLVD – PROJECT NO. 198041</u> 939 COAST BLVD, LA JOLLA, CA 92037







ACCURACY OF PHOTO SAMPLATER BASED UNDER LEPOSHETISH PROV

RECORDING REQUESTED BY CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PERMIT INTAKE, MAIL STATION 501

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO

PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERMIT CLERK MAIL STATION 501

INTERNAL ORDER NUMBER: 24000453

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

## CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 700980 CLEARWIRE SPRINT – COAST BLVD PROJECT NO. 198041 PLANNING COMMISSION

This Conditional Use Permit is granted by the Planning Commission, of the City of San Diego to **NINE THREE NINE COAST MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION**, Owner, and **SPRINT NEXTEL CORPORATION**, Permittee, pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code [SDMC] section Chapter 12, Article 6, Division 2 and Section 141.0420. The site is located at 939 Coast Boulevard in the La Jolla Planned District 5 zone of the La Jolla Community Plan. The project site is legally described as an undivided .15860 interest in and to lots 19 to 23, inclusive and lots 32 to 36 inclusive of Terrace Subdivision. According to map thereof No. 800, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 7, 1895. Except units 3A to 21J, inclusive, as shown on the diagrammatical map attached to and made a part of the amended condominium plan and certificate recoded in compliance with Section 1351 of the California Civil Code, on May 7, 1969 Series 10, Book 1969 as file No. 79165 of official records of said county.

Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit, permission is granted to Owner and Permittee for a wireless communication facility, described and identified by size, dimension, quantity, type, and location on the approved exhibits [Exhibit "A"] dated May 13, 2010, on file in the Development Services Department.

The project shall include:

- a. A modification to an existing Wireless Communication Facility consisting of five (5) new Clearwire panel antennas and five (5) new Clearwire directional antennas concealed inside an existing penthouse and stairwell behind Fiberglass Resistant Panel (FRP). The associated equipment will also be concealed within an existing penthouse, not visible to the public.
- b. Where not otherwise specified in this Conditional Use Permit No. 700980, the existing conditions identified in Conditional Use Permit 490936, PTS 140684 shall apply.

b. Accessory improvements determined by the Development Services Department to be consistent with the land use and development standards in effect for this site per the adopted community plan, California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, public and private improvement requirements of the City Engineer, the underlying zone(s), conditions of this Permit, and any other applicable regulations of the SDMC in effect for this site.

## STANDARD REQUIREMENTS:

1. This permit must be utilized within thirty-six (36) months after the date on which all rights of appeal have expired. Failure to utilize and maintain utilization of this permit as described in the SDMC will automatically void the permit unless an Extension of Time has been granted. Any such Extension of Time must meet all SDMC requirements and applicable guidelines in affect at the time the extension is considered by the appropriate decision maker.

2. No permit for the construction, occupancy or operation of any facility or improvement described herein shall be granted, nor shall any activity authorized by this Permit be conducted on the premises until:

- a. The Owner/Permittee signs and returns the Permit to the Development Services Department; and
- b. The Permit is recorded in the Office of the San Diego County Recorder.

3. Unless this Permit has been revoked by the City of San Diego the property included by reference within this Permit shall be used only for the purposes and under the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit unless otherwise authorized by the Development Services Department.

4. This Permit is a covenant running with the subject property and shall be binding upon the Owner/Permittee and any successor or successors, and the interests of any successor shall be subject to each and every condition set out in this Permit and all referenced documents.

5. The continued use of this Permit shall be subject to the regulations of this and any other applicable governmental agency.

6. Issuance of this Permit by the City of San Diego does not authorize the Owner/Permittee for this permit to violate any Federal, State or City laws, ordinances, regulations or policies including, but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [ESA] and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.).

7. The Owner/Permittee shall secure all necessary building permits. The Owner/Permittee is informed that to secure these permits, substantial modifications to the building and site improvements to comply with applicable building, fire, mechanical and plumbing codes and State law requiring access for disabled people may be required.

8. Construction plans shall be in substantial conformity to Exhibit "A." No changes, modifications or alterations shall be made unless appropriate application(s) or amendment(s) to this Permit have been granted

9. All of the conditions contained in this Permit have been considered and have been determined to be necessary in order to make the findings required for this Permit. It is the intent of the City that the holder of this Permit be required to comply with each and every condition in order to be afforded the special rights which the holder of the Permit is entitled as a result of obtaining this Permit.

10. In the event that any condition of this Permit, on a legal challenge by the Owner/Permittee of this Permit, is found or held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unenforceable, or unreasonable, this Permit shall be void. However, in such an event, the Owner/Permittee shall have the right, by paying applicable processing fees, to bring a request for a new permit without the "invalid" conditions(s) back to the discretionary body which approved the Permit for a determination by that body as to whether all of the findings necessary for the issuance of the proposed permit can still be made in the absence of the "invalid" condition(s). Such hearing shall be a hearing de novo and the discretionary body shall have the absolute right to approve, disapprove, or modify the proposed permit and the condition(s) contained therein.

11. The proposed design complies with the Telecommunication Facility Guidelines as a Complete Concealment Facility and as a result, the permit will not contain an expiration date. It is the responsibility of the wireless carrier and owner(s) to maintain the appearance of the approved facility to the conditions set forth in this permit unless the site is removed and restored to its original condition. Code compliance shall be notified if the appearance or the scope of the project has changed without the approval of the City Manager.

## ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS

12. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications:

13. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E of the City's Storm Water Standards.

## PLANNING/DESIGN REQUIREMENTS:

14. There shall be compliance with the regulations of the underlying zone(s) unless a deviation or variance to a specific regulation(s) is approved or granted as a condition of approval of this Permit. Where there is a conflict (including exhibits) of this Permit and a regulation of the underlying zone, the regulation shall prevail unless the condition provides for a deviation or variance from the regulations. Where a condition (including exhibits) for this Permit establishes a provision which is more restrictive than the corresponding regulation of the underlying zone, then the condition shall prevail.

15. The building materials and paint used for the RF transparent screen shall not result in any noticeable lines or edges in the transition as illustrated in the approved Exhibit "A".

16. One WiMax equipment cabinet shall be located inside the existing penthouse, completely concealed from the public as illustrated in the approved Exhibit "A".

17. All cables and conduits shall be concealed inside the cable tray to the satisfactory of the Development Services Department.

18. The photosimulation(s) for the proposed project must be printed (not stapled) on the building plans. This is to ensure the construction team building the project is aware of what the completed design was approved to look like.

19. The height(s) of the building(s) or structure(s) shall not exceed those heights set forth in the conditions and exhibits (including, but not limited to, elevations, and cross sections) or the maximum permitted building height of the underlying zone, whichever is lower, unless a deviation or variance to the height limit has been granted as a specific condition of this permit.

20. A topographical survey conforming to the provisions of the SDMC may be required if it is determined, during construction, that there may be a conflict between the building(s) under construction and a condition of this Permit or a regulation of the underlying zone. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Owner/Permittee.

21. Any future requested amendments to this Permit shall be reviewed for compliance with the regulations of the underlying zone(s) which are in effect on the date of the submittal of the requested amendment.

22. No mechanical equipment, tank, duct, elevator, cooling tower, mechanical ventilator or air conditioner shall be erected, constructed, converted, established, altered, or enlarged on the roof of any building, unless all such equipment and appurtenances are contained within a completely enclosed, architecturally integrated structure whose top and sides may include grillwork, louvers, and latticework.

23. Prior to the issuance of a construction permit, the telecommunication provider shall provide a certified cumulative radio frequency model study demonstrating compliance with the Federal Communications Commission's Radio Frequency Guidelines. All significant contributors to the ambient RF environment should be considered in the radio frequency model study.

24. Prior to obtaining a Construction Permit the following items must be illustrated on the construction drawings; coax cable tray, meters, telco, A/C units, generator receptacles, cable runs, bridges, dog houses and external ports. These appurtenances must be minimized visually so as to avoid the effect of changing the outward appearance of the project from what was approved on the exhibits.

25. The Owner/Permittee of record is responsible for notifying the city within 30 days of the sale or takeover of this site to any other provider.

26. Once this site is deemed complete from construction, Owner/Permittee is required to send a letter (Subject: Planning Inspection Project Number 198041) to the City of San Diego, Development Services Department requesting for a planning inspection. The site is officially deemed complete once the City Manager signs the letter. The applicant shall be provided with a copy of the signed letter for record purposes.

27. Prior to issuance of construction permits, the Permittee shall pay the Long Term Monitoring Fee to cover the City's costs associated with implementation of permit compliance monitoring.

#### **INFORMATION ONLY:**

This project is not within the FAA Part 77 Noticing Area.

Any party on whom fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions have been imposed as conditions of approval of this development permit, may protest the imposition within ninety days of the approval of this development permit by filing a written protest with the City Clerk pursuant to California Government Code §66020.

Date of Approval: May 13, 2010 PTS No. 198041; Internal No. 24000453 Conditional Use Permit No. 700980

## AUTHENTICATED BY THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT



must be attached per Civil Code section 1180 et seq.

## PLANNING COMMISSION PC REPORT NO. PC-10-027 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPROVAL NO. 700980 CLEARWIRE SPRINT COAST BLVD

WHEREAS, NINE THREE NINE COAST MANAGEMENT, Owner, and SPRINT NEXTEL CORPORATION, Permittee, filed an application with the City of San Diego for a permit to modify an existing Wireless Communication Facility consisting of five (5) new Clearwire panel antennas and five (5) new Clearwire directional antennas concealed inside an existing penthouse and stairwell behind Fiberglass Resistant Panel (FRP). The associated equipment will also be concealed within an existing penthouse, not visible to the public as described in and by reference to the approved Exhibits "A" and corresponding conditions of approval for the associated Permit No. 700980;

WHEREAS, the project site is located at 939 Coast Blvd, within the La Jolla Planned District Zone 5 within the La Jolla Community Plan.

WHEREAS, the project site is legally described as an undivided .15860 interest in and to lots 19 to 23, inclusive and lots 32 to 36 inclusive of Terrace Subdivision. According to map thereof No. 800, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 7, 1895. Except units 3A to 21J, inclusive, as shown on the diagrammatical map attached to and made a part of the amended condominium plan and certificate recoded in compliance with Section 1351 of the California Civil Code, on May 7, 1969 Series 10, Book 1969 as file No. 79165 of official records of said county;

WHEREAS, on May 13, 2010, the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego considered Conditional Use Permit No. 700980 pursuant to the Land Development Code of the City of San Diego; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego as follows:

That the Planning Commission adopts the following written Findings, dated May 13, 2010.

### FINDINGS:

### Conditional Use Permit - Section 126.0305

## 1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan;

Both the City of San Diego General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan addresses wireless communication facilities with specific recommendations. The City of San Diego General Plan recommends minimizing visual impacts by concealing wireless facilities in existing structures when possible. It also recommends that facilities be aesthetically pleasing and respectful to the neighborhood context and to conceal mechanical equipment and devices associated with wireless facilities in underground vaults or unobtrusive structures. The La Jolla Community Plan recommends that all telecommunication facilities be reviewed and analyzed by the City of San

Diego for visual impact. It recommends that all cellular facilities adhere to the Citywide **Telecommunication Policy.** 

Pursuant to the San Diego Land Development Code, wireless communication facilities are permitted in all zones citywide with the appropriate permit process. Wireless communication facilities are separately regulated uses, which have limitations or require compliance with conditions in order to minimize potential impacts. The intent of the regulations is to camouflage facilities from public view. The proposed modifications shall be completely concealed inside the existing stairwell and penthouse behind Fiberglass Resistant Panels (FRP). As a result, the proposed development is consistent with the recommendations identified and would not adversely affect the La Jolla Community Plan or the City of San Diego General Plan and Progress Guide.

#### The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare; 2.

The Telecommunication Act of 1996 preempts local governments from regulating the "placement, construction and modification of wireless communication facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of Radio Frequency (RF) emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) standards for such emissions." To insure that the FCC standards are being met, a condition to require a Radio Frequency Report prior to the issuance of a building permit has been added. 

#### The proposed development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations 3. **M.**... of the Land Development Code, and

× 🕲 🖉 🐩

The project complies with all applicable development regulations of the Land Development Code and the City of San Diego Communication Antenna Regulations (Land Development Code Section 141.0420). This section of the code requires telecommunication facilities to be minimally visible through the use of architecture, landscape architecture and siting solutions. The antennas are concealed inside the existing stairwell and penthouse. The associated equipment is also concealed inside an existing penthouse. The existing use of the property is residential and as such, requires a Conditional Use Permit. There are no deviations from the development regulations or variances requested with this application. Therefore, Sprint Clearwire's project is in full compliance with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code.

#### The proposed use is appropriate at the proposed location. 4.

Typically, the City of San Diego encourages wireless carriers to locate on non-residential properties. In this case, the search ring identifies non-residential properties, but due to the height of the existing building Clearwire Sprint was able to cover a larger objective area with one site. All the proposed antennas are concealed inside the existing stairwell and penthouse. Additionally, Clearwire Sprint is required to submit a Radio Frequency Report demonstrating compliance with Federal Communication Commissions standards. This project has been designed to comply with Section 141.0420 and the Wireless Communication Facility Guidelines. Additionally, this site will address Clearwire Sprint's 4G technology located in the La Jolla Community Area. Thus, the proposed use is appropriate for this site.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, based on the findings hereinbefore adopted by the Planning Commission, Conditional Use Permit 700980 is hereby GRANTED by the Conditional Use Permit 700980 to the referenced Owner/Permittee, in the form, exhibits, terms and conditions as set forth in Permit No. 700980 copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.



	LA IOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNI P.O. Box 889 La Jolla CA 92038 Ph http://www.LaJollaCPA.org Email: <u>Inf</u> <b>Regular Meeting – 4 M</b>	858.456.7900 w@LaJoll#CPA.org	
Attention:	Simon Tse, DPM, City of San Diego		
Project:	Sprint Clearwire Coast Blvd 939 Coast Blvd PN 194433		
INTOLIOU:	to accept the recommendation of the Committee: to approve Sprint Clear Coast Bivd application and forward recommendation to the City.	wire	
Submitted by:	Joseph Calavia.	4 March 2010	
	Joe LaCava, President La Jolia CPA	Date	
DPR Committee	, Feb 2010		
Address: 939 Coa Permits: CUP Project #: 198041 DPM: Simon Tse, Zone: Zone 5 La 1	619-687-5984, stse@sandiego.gov	net	
	tional Use Permit for a wireless communicat g in Zone 5 of the La Jolla Community Plan,		
Subcommittee M	otion:		
-	-1-0) The findings can be made for CUP,		
	is to be located within an existing enclose visually in kind fiberglass.	d penthouse of which a portion of steel we	ali wiil

poer Titles Coast Blud	Project No. (For Dily Use Only)
art II - To be completed when property is hel	d by a corporation or partnership
Partnership <u>v sioring the Ownership Disclosure Statement. 1</u> a <u>Mantified above, will be filed with the City of Sc</u> a property. Please list below the names, <b>bie</b> s a	eral) What State? Corporate Identification No the owner(s) adaptive that an application for a permit, map or other matter, an Diago on the subject property with the interit to record an appunctmence exernst and addresses of all persons who have an interest in the property, recorded or
a partnership who own the property). <u>A signate</u> roperty, Attach additional pages if needed, Note worship during the time the application is being tanager at least thirty days prior to any public he	(e.g., tenents who will benefit from the permit, all corporate officers, and all permers <u>Units required of at least one of the comparate officers or partners who own the</u> r The applicant is responsible for notifying the Project Manager of any changes in processed or considered. Changes in ownership are to be given to the Project aring on the subject property. Failure to provide accurate and current ownership process. Additional pages attached Yes No
Corporate/Partnership Name (type or print): 929 Logst	Corporate/Partnership Name (type or print):
Prowner Hop Franklasse	Conner Teneroluesee
Strant Address 939 ( Oast Blud	Street Address:
Chysen Zo. Jolla CA 9203	7 City/Sizto/Zip:
Phone No. 558-454-0312-	Plinne No: Fax No:
Name of Corporate Officer Partner (type osprint): James W. Walkel	Name of Corporate Officer/Partner (type or print):
The more comme HOA President	Tille (type or print):
Signature: James W. Wal	Kar Signatura ; Deta:
Corporate/Paranetahip Name (type or print):	Corporate/Partnarship Name (Sype or Print):
Coner Tenant/Leases	["Owner   Tenant/Lessen
Street Address:	Sinest Address:
City/State/Zipc	City/State/Zij:
Phone No: Fax No:	Phone No: Fea No:
Neme of Corporate Officer/Partner (type or print):	Name of Corporate Officer/Partner (type or print):
The (type or print):	This (type or print):
Signatum : Dala:	Signature : Data:
Corporate/Partnership Name (type or print):	Corporate/Partnership Name (type or print):
Comer Tenentilessee	Owner Tenentfiscoop
Street Address:	Street Address.
City/State/Zip:	CRy/Stats/Zlp:
Phone No: Fax No:	Phane No. Fax Ha:
	Name of Corporate Officer/Pariner (hype or print):
Name of Corporate Officer/Portition (type or port);	umust en zeckleiste Austriaus-bugget (1966 és harack
Name of Corporate Officer/Portiniar (type or pont): Title (type or print):	Title (type or print):

#### Homeowner

/	Aipren, Muriel
	Alvy, Lidia (Gullo)
16H	Arnold, Mr & Mrs
20H	Asher, Charles & Barbara
8C	Auerbach, Carl & Lenore Lang
15G	Barrie, Douglas & Maryann
12A	Beja, Graciela
6D	Bell, Stanley & Rita
14J	Biderman, Mr & Mrs Bill
16F	Biro, Irene
21C	Bowes, Joan
4A	Brandt, Arthur & Mardell
6J	Brooks, Anne
4J	Bryan-Allen, Mary
4L	Bulfer, Gary
11J	Chadwick, Andrea
16J	Chen, Java & Cathy
16A	Cheng, Jean & Kung, George
19F	Cielak, Frida
5C	Conlon, Suzanne
10B	Cooper, Valerie & Harry
10AF	Cooper, Valerie & Harry
20F	Creelman, Mary Ellen
12G	Vanier (939 Coast Civil Co)
LE	Das, Pankaj & Virginia
20A	David, Clive
8D	Diaz, Antonio & María
4H	Derrick, John
6A	Diaz-Lombardo, Carmelina
6F	Diaz-Lombardo, Carmelina
17A	Draper, Robert & Kathleen
4E	Ebert, Henry & Estelle
5G	Einhom, Daniel & Emily
4D	Fabìani, Mark
6H	Faes, Jose & Ana Luisa
16C	Fainsilber, Josef & Hanna
9D	Farrand, Stephen & Nancy
20B	f⁼eder, Dan
17B	Fisher, Leonard
12E	Formica, Vito & Shirley
21AB	Frederick, Larry & Jean
LD	Acord, Brian
19C	Gaines, Ira &
17D	Gelman, Webster & Gloria
14D	Gerson, Fred & Roben
15HJ	Nobel Charitable Trust
4M	Glinskii, Gennadi & Ana
5H	Gold, Morris & Phyilis
8G	Gorbach, Sherwood & Judith
17GJ	Graham, Ronald & Jane
17F	Graham, Ronald & Jane
7A	Haber, Mrs. Susannah
<b>F F</b>	In Example some Disals Out and

5J	In Foreciosure-Bank Owned
20	to the state of the state of the state

#### 9G In Foreclosure-Bank Owned

Åpt #

Homeowner List - Alphabetic Homeowner

6BC	Haggerty, Dottie Mae
5D	Haggerty, Pat
14B	Hambleton, Enrique & Patricia
17H	Hambleton, Enrique & Patricia
7H	Herman, Jerry & Eileen Mason
4F	Houkom, John & Alexandra Page
12B	Houkom, John & Alexandra Page
21H	Holmes, Col & Mrs Lee & Joan
21J	Holmes, Col & Mrs Lee & Joan
14C	Hurd, Stacy
10H	ittleson, Mr. & Mrs. Alvin
8A	Kalmanson, Alan
18Ç	Karatz, William
9A	Kassar, Barry
9F	Kassar, Barry & Avra
19B	Kassel, Javier
4G	Kontilia, Mykali & Veronica
19G	Kwatek, Irwin
90	Lance, Coleen
14E	Landeros, Natalie
21F	Leslie, Robert & Elizabeth
15D	Levi, Ed & Sara
12H	Lizt, Norman (primary residence)
12J	Lizt, Norman
11G	Lochtefeld, Donna
12F	Lopez & Forestal (Loblum Holding)
5F	Lopez, Carmen & Forestal, Peter
7G	Lyman, Mary Keough
10G	Mackler, Bruce & Irene
12C	Mamorsky, Charlotte
14G	Mauser, Mario & Lillian
4B	Mazzei, William & Barbara
45 7D	
	Glassmeyer, Penny
6E	Mestre, Marcos & Cecilia Mover, Chris
18B	Meyer, Chris
11D	Miller, Robert
LB	Mofidi, Kevin
8J	Minter, Elizabeth
8B	Minocherhomjee, Arda
15E	Minocherhomjee, Arda
20D	Minocherhomjee, Arda
10D	Mount, Walter & Susan
21DE	Nagelberg, David & Teri
LA	McGonigle, John
LC	Norton, Lynn & Donna
20GJ	Norwich, Jean
20E	O'Brien, James & Patricia
5E	Parzen, Judy
18D	Peake, Jan (Daniel S. Block)
11F	Pesin, Mrs Harry (Betty)
101	Determon Betty to

#### 18A Petersen, Betty-Jo . +<sup>1</sup>

Apt #

Homeowner

10C	Podell,Norma
6G	Rahman, Jady
9H	Rapp, Mr & Mrs Fred
8F	Robert, Jean Luc & Jacqueline
8H	Rosenthal, Mason & Lynne
4K	Rosenthal, Mason & Lynne (Beth)
10J	Rumbaugh, Max
14F	Ruttenberg, Harry & Irene
11A	Sable, Mr & Mrs Roy
17E	Sakurai, Atsushi & Katsuko
17C	Salame, Roger & Kristin
7C	Sandoval, Anna Delores
5A	Sampson, Scott & Peggy
16E	Sawan, Victor
15BC	Sheinbein, Stanley & Ruth
18HJ	Shifrin, Gordon & Arleen
7F	Sias, Richard & Jeannette
16B	Small, James & Carol
9,1	Smith, David
15A	Solomon, Bill & Gay
A4C	Staniford, Geoffrey & Khatharya
14A	Stern, Mickey
16D	Stewart, George & Norma
19HJ	Stewart, Philip & Cheryl
11BC	
9Ę	Swerdlow, Adrienne
18E	Tayebi, Sean
19DE	Tayebi, Sean
11H	Toussier, Gail & Solly
5B	Udelf, Irene
18FG	Unruh, Ken & Dixie
8E	Valentini, Peter, Alberta
4C	Veghte, Richard & Jan
21G	Walker, James & Lazer, Harriet
16G	Warren, John & Karen
20C	Weintraub Estate
7E	Wester, Peter
7J	Wendt, Dr. Richard
10E	Whitaker, Dona
7B	Winkleman, Dane
14H	Wolff, Sean & Shiff, Jonathan
15F	Wolk, Gloria

11E Zeisler, Karl & Joan

Updated 02-16-10

ł



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## DATE OF NOTICE: April 27, 2010

# NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE OF HEARING: TIME OF HEARING: LOCATION OF HEARING:	May 13, 2010 9:00 A.M. Council Chambers, 12th Floor, City Administration Building, 202 C Street, San Diego, California 92101
PROJECT TYPE:	CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
PROJECT NUMBER:	PTS #198041
PROJECT NAME:	<u>CLEARWIRE SPRINT 939 COAST BLVD</u>
APPLICANT:	Debra Depratti
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA:	La Jolla
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	1
CITY PROJECT MANAGER:	SIMON TSE, Development Project Manager
PHONE NUMBER:	(619) 687-5984

As a property owner, tenant or person who has requested notice, you should know that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to approve, conditionally approve, or deny an application for a modification to an existing wireless communication facility consisting of two additional Clearwire panel antennas and five (5) new Clearwire directional antennas and one equipment cabinet, all concealed inside a stairwell and a penthouse behind RF transparent materials located at 939 Coast Blvd within the La Jolla Community Planning Area.

The decision of the Planning Commission is final unless the project is appealed to the City Council. In order to appeal the decision of the Planning Commission you must be present at the public hearing and file a speaker slip concerning the application or have expressed interest by writing to the Planning Commission before the close of the public hearing. See Information Bulletin 505 "Appeal Procedure", available at <u>www.sandiego.gov/development-services</u> or in person at the office of the City Clerk, 202 "C" Street, Second Floor. The appeal must be made within 10 working days of the Planning Commission decision. If you wish to challenge the City's action on the above proceedings in court, you may be limited to addressing only those issues you or someone else have raised at the public

hearing described in this notice, or written in correspondence to the City at or before the public hearing.

This project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Article 19, Section 15301, Existing facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This project is not pending an appeal of the environmental determination. The environmental exemption determination for this project was made on January 11, 2010 and the opportunity to appeal that determination ended January 25, 2010.

If you have any questions after reviewing this information, you can contact the City Project Manager listed above.

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request an agenda in alternative format or to request a sign language or oral interpreter for the meeting, call the Disability Services Program Coordinator at 236-5979 at least five working days prior to the meeting to insure availability. Assistive Listening Devices (ALD's) are available for the meeting upon request.

Internal Order No. 24000453

## CLEARWIRE SPRINT 939 COAST BLVD

## PROJECT CHRONOLOGY PTS #198041 INTERNAL # 24000453

Date	Action	Description	City Review	Applicant Response
11/6/2009	First Submittal	Project Deemed Complete		
1/15/2010	First Assessment Letter		70 days	
2/16/2010	Second Submittal			31 days
3/4/2010	Community Planning Group Presentation			16 days
4/5/2010	All issues resolved by applicant			32 days
5/13/2010	Public Hearing – Planning Commission		38 days	
<b>Total Staff Time:</b>		Does not include City Holidays and Furlough	108 days	
Total Applicant Time:		Does not include City Holidays and Furlough		79 days
Total Project Running Time:		From Deemed Complete to HO Hearing		187 days

## Memorandum of Law

SHANNON THOMAS Deputy City Attorney

## OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Michael J. Aguirre

1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1620 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-4178 TELEPHONE (619) 236-6220 FAX (619) 236-7215

#### MEMORANDUM OF LAW

DATE: March 6, 2006

TO: Kelly Broughton, Deputy Director, Development Services Department

FROM: City Attorney

SUBJECT: Wireless Antenna Placement within the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone

#### INTRODUCTION

On November 7, 1971, the voters approved Proposition D. This proposition limits the height of buildings within the Coastal Zone to no more than 30 feet, except in the downtown area. The Coastal Zone is essentially the area from the US-Mexico border to the northern border of the City of San Diego, and from the Pacific Ocean to Interstate 5. The Proposition became effective on December 7, 1972. The Proposition is codified at section 132.0505 of the San Diego Municipal Code, and has been amended three times by the voters to allow for the historic restoration of the chimney and rooftop of the Mission Brewery building, as well as development at Sea World and at the International Gateway of the Americas. The passage of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Act], which limits the City's ability to regulate placement of wireless antennas, and the development of wireless technology since the passage of Proposition D, has created the need to further define what height limits are applicable for wireless antennas within the Coastal Zone.

#### **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

May wireless communication antennas be installed within the Coastal Zone to the façade of existing buildings above 30 feet and may equipment associated with the antennas be installed on the roof tops of those buildings when neither exceeds the height of the existing structure, without violating Proposition D?

#### SHORT ANSWERS

Yes. Wireless antennas that fit within the structural envelope of a pre-existing building may be installed without violating Proposition D. However, compliance with the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 may require the placement of antenna or equipment that exceeds the 30-foot limit in some circumstances.

-2-

#### BACKGROUND

To provide coverage within the coastal area, providers of wireless communications desire to install antennas on existing buildings over 30 feet high in the Coastal Zone. Over the years, City approvals for antenna installation in the Coastal Zone have been given for both flush mounted antennas and recessed antennas. The antennas that were approved as flush mounted have, in some cases, not been installed flush with the building, and may extend as much as 18-24" from the building. The antennas transmit on a line of sight basis between the communication facilities and the mobile users. Antenna height becomes a critical issue in areas with hills or other physical obstructions.

#### ANALYSIS

The City must find a way to comply with the voters' directive as set forth in Proposition D, and still permit wireless antennas to the extent required by federal law. As recently characterized by one court that was attempting to reconcile the Act with local zoning, this type of conflict is indicative of "the ongoing straggle between federal regulatory power and local administrative prerogatives-the kind of political collision that our federal system seems to invite with inescapable regularity." *MetroPCS v. City and County of San Francisco*, 400 F.3d 715, 718 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

#### Ι

#### Local Regulation

Proposition D, with three excepted areas, prohibits the construction of a building or an addition to a building in excess of 30 feet within the Coastal Zone. The ballot argument in favor of Proposition D stated that the measure "preserves the unique and beautiful character of the coastal zone of San Diego." The proper method of measurement, per Proposition D, is in accordance with the Uniform Building Code of 1970. This office has previously opined that for the purposes of complying with Proposition D, measurements should be from the finished grade of a site, rather than the pre-existing grade. City Att'y MOL No. 2004-13 (August 12, 2004). The height of the building is then measured vertically to the uppermost point of the structure. SDMC § 113.0270(a)(3).

The Coastal Zone contains some structures that are over 30 feet in height and were built before the passage of Proposition D. These are "previously conforming" structures. "Previously conforming" is defined as meaning:

> the circumstances where a use, *structure*, or *premises* complied with all applicable state and local laws when it was first built or came into existence, but because of a subsequent change in zone or development regulations, is not in conformance with the current zone or all development regulations applicable to that zone.

Regulations regarding previously conforming structures do not allow the granting of any deviation from the height limit regulations in the Coastal Zone, meaning no new development can exceed the 30-foot limit. SDMC § 127.0102(f). Section 127.0103 and the corresponding tables, 127-01A through 127-01C, set forth what type of permit must be obtained for various development proposals. For example, maintenance, repair or alteration that is less than 50% of the market value of the entire structure or improvement, which does not expand the structural envelope, is permitted with the issuance of a construction permit and a Process 1 review. "Structural envelope" means the three-dimensional space enclosed by the exterior surfaces of a building or structure. SDMC § 113.0103.

-3-

In addition to the above regulations limiting structure height in the Coastal Zone, the City regulates communication antennas City-wide as a separately regulated use in Chapter 14, Article 1, Division 4 of the San Diego Municipal Code. The City of San Diego's stated purpose for separately regulating land uses is to provide "regulations for specific uses that may be desirable and appropriate in a particular zone if limitations or conditions are placed on the development of those uses to minimize detrimental effects to neighboring properties or incompatibility with the permitted uses of the base zone." SDMC § 141.0101.

A wireless antenna used for telephone, paging or similar services that complies with all development regulations and overlays, and that meets the criteria in section 141.0405(e)(1) or (2) is considered a minor communication facility. SDMC § 141.0405(a). Section 141.0405(e) allows minor communication facilities as a limited use or through the issuance of a Neighborhood Use Permit in certain zones, if the facility is concealed from public view or integrated into the architecture or environment through architectural enhancement, unique design solutions, or accessory use structures.

In an effort to encourage collocation and in recognition of the fact that some telecommunication facilities are minimally visible, the Municipal Code also recognizes as minor telecommunication facilities the following:

- (A) Additions or modifications that do not increase the area occupied by the antennas or the antenna enclosure by more than 100% of the originally approved facility and do not increase the area occupied by an outdoor equipment unit more than 150 feet beyond the originally approved facility, if the additions and modifications are designed to minimize visibility;
- (B) Panel-shaped antennas that are flush-mounted to an existing building façade on at least one edge, extend a maximum of 18 inches from the building façade at any edge, do not exceed the height of the building, and are designed to blend with the color and texture of the existing building; or
- (C) Whip antennas if the number of antennas that are visible from the public right of way does not exceed six, if the antennas measure 4 inches or less in diameter, and if they have a mounting apparatus that is concealed from public view.

#### SDMC § 141.0405(e)(2)(A)-(C).

The City's regulations regarding height limits in the Coastal Zone, as well as those regulating the placement of wireless antenna are clearly designed to limit visual and aesthetic

-4-

impacts. Zoning regulations to preserve aesthetics are valid, and in fact the preservation of aesthetics is a traditional basis for zoning regulations. *MetroPCS*, 400 F.3d at 727.

II

#### Federal Regulation

The purpose of the Federal Telecommunication Act of 1996 is "to promote competition and higher quality in American telecommunications services and to 'encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies." City of Rancho Palos Verdes v. Abrams, 544 US 113, \_\_\_\_, 125 S.Ct. 1453, 1455, 161 L.Ed. 2d 316 (2005) (quoting the Act). A general overview of the Act was previously provided by this office. 2001 City Att'y MOL 307. The Act reserves for the states and local governments the right to make decisions regarding the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities. 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(A). However, the regulations may not unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services and shall not prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the provision of personal wireless services. 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(B).

The Ninth Circuit recently ruled for the first time on several of the standards set forth in the Act, most of which are the subject of split rulings by other circuit courts. In *MetroPCS*, the Board of Supervisors for the City and County of San Francisco denied an application by MetroPCS for a conditional use permit [CUP], allowing the installation of a wireless telecommunications antenna atop a public parking garage. The CUP was denied based on findings that: 1) the facility was not necessary to MetroPCS's ability to service that area; 2) the facility was not necessary for the community, because there was already adequate wireless service in the neighborhood; 3) the proposed facility would constitute a visual and industrial blight and would be detrimental to the character of the neighborhood; and 4) the proposed antenna facility was not in conformance with and would not further the policies of the City's General Plan. The Board stated that the CUP denial did not constitute unreasonable discrimination against MetroPCS, did not limit or prohibit access to wireless services, and did not limit or prohibit the filling of a significant gap in MetroPCS's coverage. The Board also stated that the proposed facility was not the least intrusive means to provide wireless coverage in the area.

A provider making a claim of unreasonable discrimination must show that they have been treated differently than other providers with facilities that are similarly situated in terms of the structure, placement or cumulative impact of the proposed facilities. *MetroPCS*, 400 F.3d at 727. In concluding that local zoning regulations may properly discriminate between facilities that have different effects on aesthetics, the court considered the House Conference Report on the Act, which stated that the Act would "provide localities with the flexibility to treat facilities that create different visual, aesthetic, or safety concerns differently to the extent permitted under generally applicable zoning requirements even if those facilities provide functionally equivalent services." HR Conf. Rep. No. 104-458, at 208 (1996). Ultimately, in *MetroPCS*, the court found that the record was insufficient to make a determination on this issue, because there was no systematic comparison of the proposed site with other approved facilities in that neighborhood,

Regulations that prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the provision of personal wireless services are those that constitute either a complete prohibition against wireless service or those

-5-

regulations that have the effect of preventing a provider from closing a significant gap in its own service coverage, along with a showing that there are no feasible alternative facilities or sites. *MetroPCS*, 400 F.3d at 731. A significant gap in service coverage is extremely fact specific and an inquiry may include information such as the physical size of the gap and the number of users affected; however, the gap must be more than individual dead spots within a service area. Id.; *Second Generation Properties, LP v. Town of Pelham,* 313 F.3d 620 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2002). In *MetroPCS*, the record contained numerous directly conflicting accounts as to whether the site was needed to prevent a significant gap in coverage, and so the court did not rule on the merits of that claim. The Act does not require 100% coverage, and federal regulations recognize the existence of "dead spots," defined as "small areas within a service area where the field strength is lower than the minimum level for reliable service." 47 CFR § 22.99; 360° *Communications Company of Charlottesville v. Board of Supervisors of Albemare County*, 211 F.3d 79 (4th Cir. 2000). Cellular geographic service areas licensed to providers of cellular service by the Federal Communications Commission include "dead spots." 47 CFR § 22.911(b).

Once the provider has demonstrated a significant gap in coverage, it must then show that the manner in which it proposes to fill the gap in service is the least intrusive on the values that the denial sought to serve. *MetroPCS*, 400 F.3d at 734. In *APT Pittsburgh Limited Partnership v. Penn Township Butler County of Pennsylvania*, 196 F.3d 469 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir.1999), the court found that APT only submitted evidence that it had been unable to install the system it desired in the locations it desired at a price it desired. The evidence in the record demonstrated that ample other opportunities existed for the plaintiff to install the towers. Some alternatives that the court suggested were choosing a less sensitive site, reducing the tower height, using a preexisting structure or camouflaging the tower and/or antenna. Id. at 479, (citing Sprint Spectrum, LP v. *Willoth*, 176 F.3d 630, 643 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1999)).

The Act requires that any decision to deny a request to place, construct or modify personal wireless service facilities shall be in writing and supported by substantial evidence contained in a written record. 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(B)(ii). These standards were also addressed by the court in *MetroPCS*. The requirement that the decision be in writing means that the written denial, issued separately from the written record, must contain "a sufficient explanation of the reasons for the ... denial to allow a reviewing court to evaluate the evidence in the record supporting those reasons." *MetroPCS*, 400 F.3d at 722 (quoting *Southwestern Bell Mobile Systems, Inc. v. Todd*, 244 F.3d 51, 60 (1<sup>at</sup> Cir. 2001)).

In *MetroPCS*, the court found sufficient a five page decision by the Board of Supervisors which contained a summary of the facts and the proceedings, articulated the reasons for the denial, and included the evidence that supported the ruling. "Substantial evidence" in the context of the Act has been held to mean such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *MetroPCS*, 400 F.3d at 725. It is a reasonable amount of evidence; more than a scintilla, but not necessarily a preponderance. *Id.* In finding that the Board's decision to deny the application by MetroPCS was supported by substantial evidence, the court first noted that San Francisco's zoning ordinances allowed for the consideration of whether the antenna was necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or community. The court went on to hold that the record clearly established that the neighborhood was already served by at least five other providers, and therefore did not need the proposed facility. Although MetroPCS challenged the ability of the City and County of San Francisco to base a decision on need, arguing that the Act preempted the local regulations on this issue, the

-6-

court noted that the Act was "agnostic" on the issue of the substantive content of local zoning regulations and that a decision on aesthetics could prevent the addition of more antennas, which would have the same result of disadvantaging new entrants to the market. Id. at 730 n. 6. The City of San Diego regulations do not allow for an analysis of the needs of the community, only the aesthetics.

Therefore, a provider applying to install an antenna or equipment that violates the City's regulations must show that the installation is necessary to prevent a significant gap in service, of a nature greater than "dead spots" in coverage. Once the provider sufficiently demonstrates that the installation is needed, it must then show that its proposed installation is the least obtrusive method available, in light of the City's concerns regarding height and aesthetics. Any decision by the City to deny a permit must be accompanied by a written decision, supported by substantial evidence in the record.

#### CONCLUSION

The City of San Diego is prohibited by Proposition D from approving wireless antenna or equipment that exceeds 30 feet in the Coastal Zone, unless the placement of antenna or equipment is on previously conforming structures that exceed 30 feet, and the installation is within the structural envelope of that existing structure. However, compliance with the Federal Telecommunication Act of 1996 may require the placement of antenna or equipment that exceeds the 30 foot height limit. In that case, any placement of antenna or equipment that exceeds the structural envelope of a preexisting structure in excess of 30 feet in height should only be permitted when the applicant has demonstrated that the installation is necessary to prevent a significant gap in service and there is no less obtrusive alternative available. Any denial of an application to install wireless facilities must be accompanied by a written record of the decision, supported by substantial evidence in the record.

#### MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE, City Attorney

By

Shannon Thomas Deputy City Attorney

SMT:ats ML-2006-5



## Individual coverage provided by SDG5093

#### NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

TO: <u>X</u> RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK P.O. Box 1750, MS A-33 1600 Pacific Hwy, Room 260 San Diego, CA 92101-2422 FROM: CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT 1222 FIRST AVENUE, MS 501 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH 1400 TENTH STREET, ROOM 121 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

PROJECT NO.: 198041

PROJECT TITLE: SPRINT/CLEARWIRE COAST BLVD

PROJECT LOCATION-SPECIFIC: 939 Coast Blvd, La Jolla, CA 92037

PROJECT LOCATION-CITY/COUNTY: San Diego/San Diego

DESCRIPTION OF NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT: A request for a Conditional Use Permit (Process 4) for a modification to an existing wireless communication facility on the roof of 939 Coast Blvd. The project consists of three (3) new Clearwire panel antennas and six (6) new Clearwire directional antennas concealed inside the existing penthouse behind Radio Frequency panels. The project is located in Zone 5 of La Jolla Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan.

NAME OF PUBLIC AGENCY APPROVING PROJECT: City of San Diego

NAME OF PERSON OR AGENCY CARRYING OUT PROJECT: Clearwire (Attention : Debra Gardner)

5761 Copley Drive, Suite 100 San Diego, CA 92131 760-250-7544

EXEMPT STATUS: (CHECK ONE)

- () MINISTERIAL (SEC. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
- () DECLARED EMERGENCY (SEC. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));
- () EMERGENCY PROJECT (SEC. 21080(b)(4); 15269 (b)(c))
- (X) CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION: EXISTING FACILITIES [15301]
- () STATUTORY EXEMPTIONS:

REASONS WHY PROJECT IS EXEMPT: THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE THE POTENTIAL FOR CAUSING SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. THE PROJECT PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO AN EXISTING WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY.

LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON: Simon Tse

TELEPHONE: (619) 687-5984

IF FILED BY APPLICANT:

- 1. ATTACH CERTIFIED DOCUMENT OF EXEMPTION FINDING.
- 2. HAS A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION BEEN FILED BY THE PUBLIC AGENCY APPROVING THE PROJECT? () YES () NO

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS DETERMINED THE ABOVE ACTIVITY TO BE EXEMPT FROM CEQA

4

SIGNATURE/TITLE

DATE

CHECK ONE: (X) SIGNED BY LEAD AGENCY () SIGNED BY APPLICANT

DATE RECEIVED FOR FILING WITH COUNTY CLERK OR OPR:



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Date of Notice: January11, 2010

# NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Job Order #43-2983

PROJECT NAME/NUMBER: Sprint/Clearwire Coast Blvd COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: La Jolla COUNCIL DISTRICT: 1 LOCATION: 939 Coast Blvd, La Jolla, CA 92037

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Conditional Use Permit (Process 4) for a modification to an existing wireless communication facility on the roof of 939 Coast Blvd. The project consists of three (3) new Clearwire panel antennas and six (6) new Clearwire directional antennas concealed inside the existing penthouse behind Radio Frequency panels. The project is located in Zone 5 of La Jolla Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan.

ENTITY CONSIDERING PROJECT APPROVAL: Planning Commission (Process 4).

**ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** Categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA State Guidelines, Section 15301 (Existing facilities).

**ENTITY MAKING ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** City of San Diego Development Services Staff.

**STATEMENT SUPPORTING REASON FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** The proposed project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15301. None of the exceptions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply, and the project has no potential to result in a significant impact on the environment.

CITY CONTACT:	Simon Tse, Project Manager
MAILING ADDRESS:	1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101-4153
PHONE NUMBER:	(619) 687-5984

On January 11, 2010, the City of San Diego made the above-referenced environmental determination pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This determination is appealable to the City of San Diego Planning Commission. If you have any questions about this determination,

contact the Project Manager above.

Applications to appeal CEQA determination made by staff (including the City Manager) to the City Council must be filed in the office of the City Clerk within 10 business days from the date of the posting of this Notice **OR** 15 business days from the date of the environmental determination, whichever occurs earlier. Applications to appeal CEQA determinations made by the Planning Commission from a Process Two or Three Appeal under SDMC section 112.0506 must be filed in the Office of the City Clerk within 10 business days from the date of the Planning Commission's decision. The appeal application can be obtained from the City Clerk, 202 'C' Street, Second Floor, San Diego, CA 92101.

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request.

1. 1