

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

### **REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

DATE ISSUED:	October 15, 2015	REPORT NO. PC-15-112
ATTENTION:	Planning Commission, Agenda of Octobe	er 22, 2015
SUBJECT:	VERIZON WIRELESS RIDGEWOOD PÅ PROCESS THREE	RK - PROJECT NO. 379009
REFERENCE:	Report to the Hearing Officer; Report No. I ( <u>http://www.sandiego.gov/development-</u> services/pdf/hearingofficer/reports/2015/He	
OWNER/	CITY OF SAN DIEGO	

APPLICANT: VERIZON WIRELESS

#### SUMMARY

**Issue(s):** Should the Planning Commission approve or deny an appeal of the Hearing Officer's decision to approve the installation of a new wireless communication facility located at 12604 La Tortola (Ridgewood Neighborhood Park) in the Rancho Penasquitos Community Planning area?

Staff Recommendation(s): Deny the appeal and Uphold the Hearing Officer's approval of Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403, and Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402.

<u>Community Planning Group Recommendation</u>: On March 3, 2015, the Rancho De Los Penasquitos Community Planning Board voted 11-7-0 to support the project with the following conditions:

- 1. Increase the mono-Eucalyptus tree height to 53-feet with maximum foliage and shape;
- 2. Add five 24-inch boxed Canary Island Pine trees;
- 3. Add five 15-gallon Carob trees in the grove;
- 4. Require that future wireless carriers to this site obtain a recommendation from the planning board.

The mono-Eucalyptus tree was originally proposed at 50-feet in height and the CPG wanted the applicant to increase the height to 53-feet so that all branches extended an

additional 36-inches above the proposed antennas to maintain a realistic tree appearance. Verizon's Radio Frequency engineer was able to redesign the facility to comply with the underlying RS-1-14 zoning height limit of 30-feet. By reducing the height, the visual impacts of the structure will be significantly reduced. Furthermore, the antennas shall be screened accordingly with the proposed configuration.

The Park and Recreation Department considered the Rancho De Los Penaquitos Planning Board's condition for additional landscaping but was unable to accommodate the request due to the State's mandatory water restrictions. Nevertheless, the existing mature landscaping at this location serves as a backdrop to sufficiently integrate the 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree.

Future carriers interested in pursuing a WCF application at this park are required to submit a new application to comply with the current regulations and procedures at the time of the submittal, including obtaining community planning group recommendations.

**Environmental Review:** This project was determined to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article 19 Section 15303 on April 15, 2015. An appeal of the CEQA determination was previously filed and the City Council denied that CEQA appeal on June 30, 2015 pursuant to Resolution No. 309829.

**Fiscal Impact Statement:** None with this action. All cost associated with the processing of the application are recovered through a despot account funded by the applicant.

Code Enforcement Impact: None with this action.

Housing Impact Statement: None with this action.

#### BACKGROUND

Verizon Wireless is proposing to install a new Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) at Ridgewood Neighborhood Park located at 12604 La Tortola in the RS-1-14 zone (Attachment 3). The park site is surrounded by residential uses to the west, east, and south, and bordered by the Los Penasquitos Reserve to the north. A new wireless facility is necessary to address Verizon's coverage and capacity issues in this area as reflected in the coverage map (Attachment 12). As a result, Verizon's Radio Frequency (RF) Engineer issued a search ring, "Kika," which is the area in which existing coverage and capacity needs improvement. Verizon Wireless also submitted a Justification Map that identified the zones, existing Verizon sites and the Kika coverage search ring within a one mile radius. As illustrated in the Justification Map, the search ring consists of primarily residential uses (Attachment 12).

Verizon Wireless selected the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park as their primary candidate due to the topography and the opportunity to avoid placement on a residentially used property. Topography plays an important role in this area as the intended coverage objective is primarily for the single family residential area around Paseo Montril and La Tortola as well as the open space along Los Penasquitos Canyon hiking trails. Therefore, Verizon's analysis concluded that there were no other siting solutions available that would comply with the WCF regulations and address both the coverage and capacity issue for the Kika search ring.

On August 26, 2015, the Hearing Officer heard the proposed project at a noticed public hearing. After taking public testimony in opposition to and in favor of the project, the Hearing Officer approved Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403, and Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402. On September 1, 2015, Don't Cell Our Park (DCOP) filed an appeal of the Hearing Officer's decision to approve Project Number 379009. Additionally, on September 8, 2015, Mr. Steven Smith filed a separate appeal application.

#### DISCUSSION

**Project Description:** Verizon Wireless is proposing to install a new Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) that consists of twelve (12) antennas and twelve (12) Remote Radio Units (RRUs) concealed on a 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree. The equipment associated with this project is located inside a 220-square foot Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) enclosure with a trellis roof and a chain link lid.

The mono-Eucalyptus tree is proposed on the southwestern edge of the park within an area containing several mature tree species at varying heights, including several eucalyptus trees at least 50-feet tall. The area provided the opportunity to use a taller mono-Eucalyptus tree (which would allow Verizon to increase their coverage and capacity) because the tree is placed among other tall trees, thereby providing appropriate visual context and integration opportunity along with the ability to utilize a taller tree to help integrate it amongst the taller species.

The location is directly adjacent to a hillside with homes above to the west, set back more than 1000 feet, and homes in the east, set back more than 300 feet from the proposed antenna location. Verizon selected the location within the park in order to integrate with the existing Eucalyptus trees (Attachment 3). The Park and Recreation Department considered the Rancho De Los Penaquitos Planning Board's condition for additional landscaping but was unable to accommodate the request due to the State's mandatory water restrictions. Nevertheless, the existing mature landscaping at this location serves as a backdrop to sufficiently integrate the 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree (Attachment 10).

The mono-Eucalyptus tree was originally proposed at 50-feet. Verizon's Radio Frequency engineer was able to redesign the facility to comply with the underlying RS-1-14 zoning height limit. By reducing the height, the visual impacts of the structure will be significantly reduced. The mono-Eucalyptus tree will be designed to include certain integration elements resulting in a realistic tree appearance. First, the mono-Eucalyptus tree includes a branch count of 3-branches per foot for a heavy density appearance. Second, the branches are designed to extend 24-inches in front of each antenna. The coverage as a result of the branch extension would provide the appropriate foundation in screening the majority of the WCF. Additionally, antenna socks will be employed to increase the foliage density. The antenna socks are sleeves designed to wrap around the entire antenna. Eucalyptus leaves constructed of fiberglass materials are attached onto the sleeves. This practice of installing antenna socks increases the concealment of the antennas and blends them into the tree foliage. Finally, the antennas, RRUs, and mounting apparatus will be painted to match the bark to achieve the best visual results (Attachment 9).

The equipment associated with this project will be located inside an 11-foot by 20-foot Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) enclosure with a stucco finish and painted tan/sandstone finish. A trellis roof will also be installed with a chain link lid directly below to secure the structure. The CMU wall is 8-feet high, not including the trellis roof. The proposed enclosure is located northeast of the mono-Eucalyptus tree and is set back approximately 15-feet, 6-inches from the edge of the park's sidewalk path. With Park and Recreational Department's support, Verizon is proposing to plant and maintain native shrubs surrounding the equipment enclosure. Also, the CMU enclosure will be coated with anti-graffiti paint.

Wireless Communication Facility Regulations: The site is located within the RS-1-14, a residential zone. WCFs are permitted in residential zones and on dedicated parkland with a Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP), pursuant to Land Development Code (LDC) Sections 141.0420(d)(2) and 141.0420(d)(4). Additionally, a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) is required to locate a WCF in dedicated parkland pursuant to LDC Section 141.0420(i)(2). A Site Development Permit (SDP) is also required pursuant to LDC Section 126.0504, since the project is within 100 feet of sensitive biological resources. The WCF regulations require the applicant to use all reasonable means to conceal or minimize the visual impacts through integration with existing structures or among other existing uses. Integration shall be accomplished through the use of architecture, landscape and siting solutions (LDC § 141.0420(g)(2). Verizon is proposing to limit their antenna sizes up to 72-inches in length and 21-inches in width in order to comply with LDC § 141.0420(g)(1) which requires WCF to use the smallest and least visually intrusive antennas.

The mono-Eucalyptus tree and the associated equipment enclosure design meet the integration requirement stated in LDC Section 141.0420(g). The mono-Eucalyptus tree has been designed to include the latest faux tree standards. The faux tree is sited in an area where there is existing mature landscaping of varying height and will not interfere with any park related uses. The equipment enclosure is located away from the field and is a design that is commonly found in other City parks. Similar to the mono-Eucalyptus tree, the equipment enclosure is also located so as not to interfere with park uses consistent with Charter Section 55 and Council Policies 700-06 and 600-43.

The above ground equipment enclosure was an issue considered during the Hearing Officer hearing. Staff had also raised questions during the review in reference to a potential subterranean vault. Verizon's representative had expressed several negative factors in pursuing a vault. First, to accommodate a subterranean vault, the area below the proposed equipment enclosure would have to be significantly excavated and then backfilled. Such disturbance would increase the negative impacts to the park during construction in addition to the adjacent environmentally sensitive lands compared to the above ground equipment enclosure. Second, a minimum of two above ground exhaust vents would be required to vent the cabinets. These vents would generate additional noise whereas the above ground enclosure will be air-cooled and will not generate noise. Lastly, the portion of the park where the associated equipment is proposed is within the 100 year flood plain and requires flood proofing. Under-grounding equipment vault has historically been difficult to waterproof given the coaxial cables that require penetration into the

vault to connect to the radio cabinets. As a result, Verizon decided to pursue an above ground equipment enclosure which is allowed with an NDP, pursuant to LDC Section 141.0420(i)(2) and approved by the Director of the Park and Recreation Department (Attachment 16).

<u>Council Policy 600-43</u>: These guidelines establish a hierarchy from the most preferred locations (Preference 1) to the least preferred locations (Preference 4) for WCFs. The project is proposed within a Preference Level 2 location according to Council Policy 600-43, which categorizes WCFs according to land uses in which they are located. Verizon's technical analysis identified the area of intended coverage as primarily residential uses. Verizon's representative investigated potential sites near Mercy Road and Interstate 15; however it was concluded that this area would not be able to provide the required coverage (eg. the Kika search ring). Based on the information submitted by Verizon, staff was unable to identify any other lower Preference Level locations within the search ring and concluded that the current Ridgewood Neighborhood Park is the only available candidate to address the Kika search ring.

Appeal Application (DCOP): Don't Cell Our Parks (DCOP) filed an appeal of the August 26, 2015, Hearing Officer decision to approve project number 379009 (Attachment 13). The appeal identifies the following grounds for appeal: Factual errors, conflict with other matters, and the findings required for approval are not supported. Provided below is a summary of the appeal issues followed by staffs response to those issues.

**Appeal Issue #1:** City Council Policy No. 700-17, Section VII states in pertinent part: "[f]ollowing designation of a park, nonconflicting nonrecreational uses may only be permitted upon recommendation of the Park and Recreation Board and approval of the City Council."

The Hearing Officer and the appellate body here (the Planning Commission) do not have the jurisdiction or authority to hear this matter, and on those grounds alone should not, and cannot, approve the proposed permits for the Project.

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #1 (DCOP):* Land Development Code Section 141.0420 along with Council Policy 600-43 were adopted by City Council to help regulate the placement of wireless facilities. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 141.0420(d)(4), a Neighborhood Use Permit is required for WCFs proposed in dedicated parkland where the antennas associated with the WCF are located more than 100 feet from the property line of the following primary uses: day cares, elementary and middle schools, single or multi-unit residences. The 100 feet is measured from the two closest points.

Additionally, pursuant to the Municipal Code Section 141.0420(i)(2), if the proposed wireless communication facility is located on city-owned property that has been formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance for park, recreation, or cemetery purposes, equipment enclosures shall be placed underground unless the Park and Recreation Director determines that an above-ground equipment enclosure would not violate Charter section 55 (Attachment 16) and a Process Two Neighborhood Development Permit is granted in accordance with Section 126.0402. Finally, a Site Development Permit (SDP) is also required pursuant to LDC Section 126.0504, since the project is within 100 feet of sensitive biological resources.

**Appeal Issue #2:** The San Diego City Charter trumps the San Diego Municipal Code and City Council Policy.

Section 2 of the San Diego Charter ("Charter") grants power to the City to make and enforce laws and regulations "subject to the restrictions and limitations provided in this Charter."

Section 55 of the Charter sets out explicit restrictions on the use of the dedicated parkland. The approval, permitting, construction, and installation of wireless facilities are not authorized without a two-thirds of the San Diego electorate. The protections set forth in the Charter prohibit our parks from being used in this manner without a public vote. Therefore, the decision of the Hearing Officer is invalid because it unlawfully conflicts and violates Charter Section 55.

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #2 (DCOP):* Please refer to staff's memo to the Hearing Officer dated August 26, 2015 (Attachment 15).

**Appeal Issue #3:** The Project has already been reviewed, considered, and approved by the City Council by being granted a Class 3 CEQA Exemption. This pre-approval and consideration has infected the review and consideration of the subject permits, thereby necessitating appellant to file an action in the Superior Court of San Diego.

Staff Response Appeal Issue #3 (DCOP): Pursuant to LDC Section 128.0208, after an application for a discretionary permit is deemed complete, a determination that a project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) can be made. Once a determination is made, a Notice of Right to Appeal (NORA) is prepared and posted for ten (10) business days. In this case, the project was determined to be categorically exempt from the CEQA pursuant to Article 19 Section 15303 (New construction) on April 15, 2015. An appeal of the CEQA determination was filed by Don't Cell Our Park (DCOP) and the City Council denied the appeal on June 30, 2015 pursuant to Resolution No. 309829. The discretionary project was then set for a public hearing before the Hearing Officer, which is consistent with the requirements set forth in the Municipal Code. The scope of this subject hearing only includes the appeal of the project, and not the environmental determination.

**Appeal Issue #4:** In his comment before making a decision, the Hearing Officer stated that he would not consider the legal issues raised because he believed there were "other avenues." This reasoning and justification is incorrect, arbitrary and a failure of the Hearing Officer to apply the facts of this case to applicable law.

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #4 (DCOP):* The Hearing Officer was able to make the findings identified in staff's report to support the proposed Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Project. These same findings are included in the Resolution before the Planning Commission (Attachment 5).

<u>Appeal Application #2 (Mr. Steven Smith)</u>: Mr. Steven Smith filed a separate appeal application on September 8, 2015 (Attachment 14). The appeal identifies the following grounds for appeal: Factual errors, conflict with other matters, and the findings required for approval are

not supported. Provided below is a summary of the appeal issues followed by staffs response to those issues.

Appeal Issue #1: There are major aesthetic problems with this proposed Wireless Facility which will "detract from the recreational or natural character of the parkland." The park features two sport courts, two sets of children's play equipment, picnic tables, benches, health and wellness stations, sidewalks, walking paths, and sweeping natural views of Los Penasquitos Nature Preserve. The proposal places an antenna structure with a 20 foot upper diameter 10 feet from the heavily utilized walking path. Park users walking this path will be in the shade of the antenna, which is not aesthetic and contrary to the purpose of a park. In addition, the boxy 20' x 11' x 9' (LWH) equipment structure will be only 15.5 feet from the walking path and will block significant portion of the view to the Los Penasquitos Nature Preserve from this path. It will be clearly visible from all area of the park. This park was carefully designed and laid out to feature the view of the Nature Preserve by siting the sports courts, picnic tables, fencing, and grove of taller trees against the north hillside, leaving the view to the Preserve open and intact. Aesthetics such as views and openness are an important part of the enjoyment, function, and use of a park. The enjoyment of the beauty of the park is a use. This facility would interfere with these aesthetics, disturb the environmental integrity of the parkland, and under CP 700-06, would be definition interfere with park use.

Staff Response Appeal Issue #1 (Mr. Steven Smith): The proposed WCF was designed and located to limit any visual impacts to the existing character of Ridgewood Neighborhood Park. As described by Mr. Steven Smith, Ridgewood Neighborhood Park is adjacent to the Los Penasquitos Preserve and contains a grove of mature live eucalyptus trees against the hillside to the west. The proposed placement of a 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree adjacent to the existing live Eucalyptus trees would provide a natural landscape setting for proper integration. The landscape setting in this situation includes live Eucalyptus trees that are significantly taller than the proposed WCF, and thus allowing the WCF to blend in with the surrounding landscape backdrop. Siting solutions continues to be a challenge for WCFs designed as faux landscaping and the best solutions often involves placing the faux tree structures amongst other live trees in addition to implementing the latest tree design for maximum concealment. In an effort to preserve a realistic Eucalyptus tree appearance, specific design measures identified as permit conditions and on the exhibits will be implemented as part of the project (Attachments 6 and 8).

Siting a WCF in a park can be difficult depending on the surrounding design variables. Past designs for Wireless Communication Facilities on City dedicated parkland includes ball field park light poles, faux-pine trees, faux-flag poles and attachments onto existing recreation center buildings. Naturally, existing vertical elements would be the first design consideration however; no current or future lighting is planned for Ridgewood Neighborhood Park. Instead, Verizon concentrated on a siting solution that would result in the least visual impact. By installing a faux-Eucalyptus tree adjacent to and surrounded by other live mature eucalyptus trees, views to and from this antenna location would be screened and appropriately integrated to reduce potential visual impacts which is required pursuant to LDC Section 141.0420(g)(6).

Appeal Issue 2: There is a loss of Park usability in at least two areas:

a) A prime secluded shaded area next to the grove of trees would be lost due to the proposed siting of the antenna. This is evidenced by the need to relocate at least one picnic table, most likely both tables, from the antenna site. This picnic area is a well designed and well utilized feature of the park. This area will be compromised by siting the antenna in this location and people will stop using this area. Note that the representative of Parks and Recreation that spoke at the Hearing Officer Hearing, indicated that they did not know if one or both picnic tables would need to be moved, and that it had not been decided where it/they would be moved to.

b) There will be a disruption to one of the circuit training stations. The circuit training course is a perfect quarter-mile concrete loop/track with strategic circuit training stations located specific distances apart along the loop. One of the main circuit training stations is a balance beam approximately 6' long. It is presently sited along the walking path next to several trees and looks out over the Nature Preserve, and is where Verizon is proposing to put the faux Eucalyptus tree antenna tower. The plans show that it will be relocated next to the sport court fence, disrupting the proper spacing of the circuit, and it will no longer have a view of the Preserve, thus taking away from the quality of the course.

Staff Response Appeal Issue #2 (Mr. Steven Smith): The existing benches and tables adjacent to the proposed mono-Eucalyptus tree will not be impacted nor relocated as part of this project. These benches will be shaded by the existing mature live eucalyptus trees and will continue to be available to the public without any additional impacts. The circuit training station involving the balance beam will be relocated to a separate location. This location was reviewed and authorized by the Park and Recreation Department (Attachment 16).

**Appeal Issue #3:** The Hearing Officers Finding 1 for SDP, NDP, and a NUP that "The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan" is in error. The equipment building is sited at a prominent area of the park that overlooks the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. The park features and unhindered 180° view of native chaparral in the open space preserve. The proposed equipment building is in the middle of this view it will become the most prominent feature of the park, creating extensive negative visual impact.

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #3 (Mr. Steven Smith):* The proposed equipment enclosure has been designed to reduce and minimize all visual impacts to Ridgewood Neighborhood Park and the adjacent Los Penasquitos Preserve. The purpose and intent of the regulation and the General Plan is to "minimize the visual impact." From the inception of this project, Verizon focused on limiting the overall size of the equipment enclosure to 250-square feet allowed under Land Development Code Section 141.0420. In an effort to reduce the equipment footprint, Verizon opted not to use an emergency generator and configured their equipment to minimize its presence. The equipment enclosure is proposed to be a neutral color with stucco finish, a chain link lid for security and a trellis top to enhance the design similar to trellis found in residential areas. The equipment enclosure as designed is low profile allowing it to better assimilate into the existing vegetation as well as the new landscape proposed by Verizon.

**Appeal Issue #4:** New federal regulations passed under the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 may affect the antenna height and configuration and take precedence over city regulations. A request for modification can be submitted, and must be approved by the City. The federal regulations apply now and are being incorporated into Municipal Code as the Spectrum Act Wireless Communications Facilities, under Section 141.0420. This project, and all future WCF projects, needs to be evaluated with the maximum height permitted under these facility modifications regulations. In this case, a 55' high antenna tower cited in the proposed location would impact the park even more, and tower over the walking path and picnic area. It will not fit in well with the existing grove of trees and will pose visual impacts from the Public right-of-way. It will negatively impact the aesthetics and use of the park

Staff Response Appeal Issue #4 (Mr. Steven Smith): Under the new Federal Communication Commission's regulation (Section 6409 also referred to as the Spectrum Act) an existing wireless communication facility base station and/or tower can be modified in height and width as defined in the Final Rule and Order. Even so, the applicant is required to submit an application to staff for review in order to determine if the project modifications meet the qualifications for a Spectrum Act project. As part of the qualification, all proposed modifications must meet certain criteria which include maintaining the existing concealment element. The existing concealment element as described in this report and in the permit findings conclude that the mono-Eucalpytus tree designed at 35-feet in height and situated in an area of the park that has mature Eucalyptus trees will maintain a realistic tree appearance. Potential height increases may impact the branching configuration, which will most likely defeat the concealment element, disqualifying it as a Spectrum Act project. Nevertheless, each Spectrum Act application will be reviewed for qualifications and compliance in a case by case basis.

Also, the City of San Diego, as the property owner of the park, is not subject to the Spectrum Act. As property owners, the City and the Park and Recreation Department may not allow any modifications, which is completely independent from the land use regulatory side.

**Appeal Issue #5:** The Environmental review is deficient because it did not study or consider the impact to the animal wildlife corridor in the adjacent Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. From the City of San Diego's website: This area is home to many "rare and endangered species", in addition to being "one of the last relatively untouched coastal canyons in the City of San Diego". The Master Plan of the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve also states that "the City's Park Sensitive Development Criteria should be extended to include the land around the perimeter of the Preserve". The boundary lands of the preserve are also protected under the Master Plan of the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve are also protected under the Master Plan of the Preserve.

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #5 (Mr. Steven Smith):* On April 15, 2015, a determination was made by the City's Environmental Analysis Section and a Notice of Right to Appeal was posted for the Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Park project no. 379009. The project was determined to be categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA State Guidelines, Section 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures). Subsequently, an appeal of the CEQA determination was made and the City Council denied the CEQA appeal on June 30, 2015 pursuant to Resolution No. 309829.

**Appeal Issue #6:** The City Council is violating its own Council Policy by making this a Process 3. Under CP 700-17 section VIII:

"Following the designation of the park, nonconflicting nonrecreational uses may only be permitted upon the recommendation of the Park and Recreation Board and approval of the City Council."

This proposed facility is a nonrecreational use. Under Process Three, it may only be appealed to the Planning Commission. The City Council will not have the opportunity to review and approve the project, which is a requirement of their own policy. Note that the City Council action to deny the CEQA appeal was just that and environmental determination and not a project review for approval.

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #6 (Mr. Steven Smith):* Land Development Code Section 141.0420 along with Council Policy 600-43 was adopted by City Council to help regulate the placement of wireless facilities. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 141.0420(d)(4), a Neighborhood Use Permit is required for WCFs proposed in dedicated parkland where the antennas associated with the WCF are located more than 100 feet from the property line of the following primary uses: day cares, elementary and middle schools, single or multi-unit residences. The 100 feet is measured from the two closest points.

Additionally, pursuant to Land Development Code Section 141.0420(i)(2), if the proposed wireless communication facility is located on city-owned property that has been formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance for park, recreation, or cemetery purposes, equipment enclosures shall be placed underground unless the Park and Recreation Director determines that an above-ground equipment enclosure would not violate Charter section 55 (Attachment 16), in which case a Process Two Neighborhood Development Permit is required. Finally, a Site Development Permit (SDP) is also required pursuant to LDC Section 126.0504, since the project is within 100 feet of sensitive biological resources.

**Appeal Issue #7:** This project has not been approved by the Parks and Recreation Director as required under CP 700-06. The San Diego Parks and Recreation Board has not heard or approve this project, which is required under CP 700-17 and 600-43. The city staff report HO-15-106 only states that: "The Park and Recreation Department participated in the review of the Verizon Ridgewood Neighborhood Park project and determined that it would not violate Charter Section 55."

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #7 (Mr. Steven Smith):* Consistent with all WCF applications in City dedicated parkland, plans and reports are routed to the Park and Recreation Department for review and comment. As a procedure, no different than other discretionary projects, when a reviewer clears their comments from the Project Tracking System (PTS) and no additional issues are raised, that project is signed off and cleared for hearing. As indicated in Mr. Steven Smith's appeal application, Mr. Jeff Harkness, Park and Recreation reviewer cleared all issues on August 5, 2014, concluding Park and Recreation's review.

On August 26, 2015, Mr. Herman Parker, Director of the Park and Recreation Department provided staff with an email specifically stating that the project was approved by the Park and

Recreation Department. This document contains information that is consistently identified throughout the Hearing Officer and Planning Commission reports.

**Appeal Issue #8:** In the 2013 Omni point communications versus city of Huntington Beach decision, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals held that the 1996 Telecommunications Act does not trump restrictions City Charters regarding city owned properties, such as parks. Therefore, City Charter Section 55, and all the City Council Policies that are based on it (CP 600-43, 700-06, 700-17) will apply and take precedence over the 1996 Telecommunications Act. Simply demonstrating a lack of coverage does not automatically grant the right to install a Wireless Communications Facility in a city park. City Charter Section 55, and those Council Policies citing Section 55 must be complied with.

**Appeal Issue #9:** In the 2007 Sprint PCS vs the City of Palos Verde's Estates decision, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals held that the aesthetics issues could be considered by cities to deny cellular facilities, and that those considerations take precedence over the 1996 Telecommunications Act. There are many aesthetics issues that have been pointed out throughout this appeal document. The project should be denied due to these issues and the lack of compliance with the Council Policies 600-43, 700-06, and 700-17).

*Staff Response Appeal Issue #8 & #9 (Mr. Steven Smith):* Land Development Code Section 141.0420 along with Council Policy 600-43 was adopted by City Council to help regulate the placement of wireless facilities. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 141.0420(d)(4), a Neighborhood Use Permit is required for WCFs proposed in dedicated parkland where the antennas associated with the WCF are located more than 100 feet from the property line of the following primary uses: day cares, elementary and middle schools, single or multi-unit residences. The 100 feet is measured from the two closest points.

Additionally, pursuant to the Municipal Code Section 141.0420(i)(2), if the proposed wireless communication facility is located on city-owned property that has been formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance for park, recreation, or cemetery purposes, equipment enclosures shall be placed underground unless the Park and Recreation Director determines that an above-ground equipment enclosure would not violate Charter section 55 (Attachment 16), in which case a Process Two Neighborhood Development Permit is required. Finally, a Site Development Permit (SDP) is also required pursuant to LDC Section 126.0504, since the project is within 100 feet of sensitive biological resources.

Please refer to staff's memo to the Hearing Officer dated August 26, 2015 (Attachment 15).

**Conclusion:** Staff has reviewed the two appeals and re-evaluated the project's conformance with the City's adopted policies and applicable regulations. After reevaluation of the project, staff has confirmed the findings to approve the project. Staff has provided draft findings to support approval of the proposed development (Attachment 5) and draft conditions of approval (Attachment 6). Staff recommends that the Planning Commission deny the appeal and approve the project as proposed.

#### ALTERNATIVE

- 1. Deny the appeal and approve Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and, Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402, with modifications.
- 2. Approve the appeal and deny Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and, Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402, if the Planning Commission makes written based on substantial evidence that the approval is not authorized by state or local zoning law.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Westlake Assistant Deputy Director Development Services Department

Simon Tse

Development Project Manager Development Services Department

Attachments:

- 1. Aerial Photograph
- 2. Community Plan Land Use Map
- 3. Project Location Map
- 4. Project Data Sheet
- 5. Draft Permit Resolution with Findings
- 6. Draft Permit with Conditions
- 7. Environmental Exemption
- 8. Project Plans
- 9. Photosimulations
- 10. Photo Survey
- 11. Community Planning Group Recommendation
- 12. Justification Analysis
- 13. Appeal Application from DCOP (Don't Cell Our Parks)
- 14. Appeal Application from Mr. Steven Smith
- 15. Memo to the Hearing Officer
- 16. Email from Herman Parker (Director of Park and Recreation).





## Aerial Photo

<u>Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Park</u> 12604 La Tortola, San Diego, CA 92129



ATTACHMENT 1



ATTACHMENT 2



ATTACHMENT 3

### **PROJECT DATA SHEET**

PROJECT NAME:		Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Park			
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:		Installation of a new Wireless Communication Facility that consists of twelve antennas on a 35-foot tall mono-eucalyptus. The equipment associated with this project is located inside a 220-square foot CMU equipment enclosure with a trellis roof and a chain link lid.			
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA:		Rancho Penasquitos			
DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS:		Site Development Permit, Neighborhood Development Permit and Neighborhood Use Permit			
COMMUNITY PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION:		Park			
		ZON	ING INFOR	MATION:	
Zone: Height Limit: Front Setback: Side Setback: Rear Setback:	Required: RS-1-14Proposed:  35-feet35-feet35-feet10-feet365-feet from the faux tree10-feet70-feet from the faux tree25-feet115-feet from the faux tree				
ADJACENT PROPERTIES:	LAND USE DESIGNATION & ZONE		NATION	EXISTING LAND USE	
NORTH:	Residential/RS-1-14		-1-14	Residential	
SOUTH:	Penasquitos Reserve/AR-1-1		e/AR-1-1	Open Space	
EAST:	Residential/RS-1-14		-1-14	Residential	
WEST:	Residential/RS-		-1-14	Residential	
DEVIATIONS OR VARIANCES REQUESTED:	None		lone		
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP RECOMMENDATION:	This project was presented to the Rancho De Los Penasquitos Community Planning Board on March 3, 2015 who voted to support the project 11-7-0.				

ATTACHMENT 5

#### PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. PC-XX-XXXX SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 1330404 NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 1330403 NEIGHBORHOOD USE PERMIT NO. 1330402 VERIZON WIRELESS RIDGEWOOD PARK PROJECT NO. 379009

WHEREAS, **CITY OF SAN DIEGO**, Owner, and **VERIZON WIRELESS**, Permittee, filed an application with the City of San Diego for a Site Development Permit (SDP), a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) and a Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP) for a new Wireless Communication Facility (WCF). The WCF consists of twelve (12) antennas and twelve (12) Remote Radio Units (RRUs) located on a 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree in the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park. The equipment associated with this project is located inside a 220-square foot Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) enclosure as described in and by reference to the approved Exhibits "A," on file in Development Services Department, and corresponding conditions of approval for the associated Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402.

WHEREAS, the project site is located at 12604 La Tortola, San Diego, CA 92129, in the RS-1-14 zone of the Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan;

WHEREAS, the project site is legally described as Lot 171 of Map No. 9828, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of Said County;

WHEREAS, on August 26, 2015, the Hearing Officer approved Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402, and on September 1, 2015, that decision was appealed by Don't Cell Our Parks (DCOP) and on September 8, 2015, a separate appeal was also filed by Mr. Steven Smith.

WHEREAS, on October 22, 2015, the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego considered Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402 pursuant to the Land Development Code of the City of San Diego;

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2015 the City of San Diego, as Lead Agency, through the Development Services Department, made and issued an Environmental Determination that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code section 21000 et. seq.) under CEQA Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction) and the Environmental Determination was appealed to City Council, which heard and denied the appeal on June 30, 2015 pursuant to Resolution No. 309829;

NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego adopts the following written Findings, dated October 22, 2015.

#### **FINDINGS**:

#### Site Development Permit 126.0504

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

The Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan does not address WCFs as a specific land use, but Section A.15 of the Urban Design section of the City of San Diego's General Plan addresses Wireless Facilities. The intent is to minimize the visual impact of wireless facilities. The General Plan states that wireless facilities should be concealed in existing structures when possible, or otherwise use camouflage and screening techniques to hide or blend the facilities into the surrounding area. It also states that facilities should be designed to be "aesthetically pleasing and respectful to the neighborhood context." This project is proposed as a 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree supporting twelve (12) panel antennas and associated components. The equipment is proposed in a 220-square foot CMU enclosure designed similar to other park buildings, but with the addition of a trellis roof top similar to trellises found on residential properties. The mono-Eucalyptus tree is proposed in the southwestern portion of Ridgewood Neighborhood Park in an area planted with several mature trees of varying height, including several eucalyptus trees at least 50 feet tall, which lends visual context and integration for the faux tree. As a result, the design of this WCF will respect the neighborhood context and blend into the surrounding area with minimal visual impact.

Based on the project's location and design, the facility will comply with the City of San Diego's General Plan as it relates to Wireless Facilities, and this project would not adversely affect the land use plan.

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

The project consists of twelve (12) antennas and twelve (12) Remote Radio Units (RRUs) on a 35foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree located on the southwestern edge of the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park in an area containing several mature tree species of varying height, including several eucalyptus trees at least 50 feet tall. The equipment associated with this project is located inside a 220-square foot CMU enclosure with trellis roof and a chain link lid, neutral color paint with stucco finish and treated with anti-graffiti paint.

It was determined that the project would not to have a significant effect on the environment and was declared to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15303 (New Construction). The Environmental Determination was appealed to City Council, which heard and denied the appeal on June 30, 2015 pursuant to Resolution No. 309829.

The conditions of approval for the project will require compliance with several operational constraints and development controls intended to assure the continued public health, safety and welfare, including the requirement to obtain building permits which requires compliance with the applicable building, fire, mechanical, and plumbing codes and State and Federal disability access laws.

Additionally, 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." Verizon Wireless submitted an Electro Magnetic Emission (EME) Analysis, which concluded that the project complies with FCC RF Standards. Therefore, the project will not result in any significant health or safety risks to the surrounding area within matters of the City's jurisdiction. In conclusion, the proposed project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

## 3. The proposed development will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code, including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.

The project, as designed, is consistent with the RS-1-14 development regulations and the WCF regulations. Pursuant to LDC Sections 141.0420(d)(2) and 141.0420(d)(4) a Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP) is required. No deviations are being proposed with this project. LDC Section 141.0420(g)(1) states that wireless communication facilities shall utilize the smallest, least visually intrusive antennas, components and other necessary equipment. The proposed WCF contains two different antenna models with different dimensions. To ensure compliance with this section of the regulation, Verizon will be limiting their antenna sizes up to 72-inches in length and 21-inches in width. For instance, in the past, the mono-eucalyptus tree designs have been approved to support antennas up to 96-inches in length. Therefore, the WCF is proposing to use the smallest and least visually intrusive antennas. Verizon will also be operating without a microwave dish which is often requested for their new installation.

LDC Section 141.0420(g)(2) states that the applicant shall use all reasonable means to conceal or minimize the visual impacts of wireless communication facilities through integration. Integration with existing structures or among other existing uses shall be accomplished through the use of architecture, landscape and siting solutions.

For this project, the mono-Eucalyptus tree and the associated equipment enclosure design have been designed to meet the integration requirements. The mono-Eucalyptus tree is sited in an area where there is existing mature landscaping of varying height and will not interfere with any park related uses. The equipment enclosure is located away from the sports field and is a design that is commonly found in other City parks. Similar to the mono-Eucalyptus tree, the equipment enclosure is also located so as not to interfere with park uses consistent with Charter Section 55 and Council Policies 700-06 and 600-43.

The mono-Eucalyptus tree will be designed to include certain integration elements resulting in a realistic tree appearance. First, the mono-Eucalyptus tree includes a branch count of 3-branches per foot for a heavy density appearance. Second, the branches are designed to extend 24-inches in front of each antenna. The coverage as a result of the branch extension would provide the appropriate foundation in screening the majority of the WCF. Additionally, antenna socks will be employed to increase the foliage density. The antenna socks are sleeves designed to wrap around the entire antenna. Eucalyptus leaves constructed of fiberglass materials are attached onto the sleeves. This practice of installing antenna socks increases the concealment of the antennas and blends them into the tree foliage. Finally, the antennas, RRUs, and mounting apparatus will be painted to match the bark to achieve the best visual results.

Pursuant to Land Development Code (LDC) Section 141.0420(i)(2), WCFs located above ground on city-owned property that has been formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance for park purposes, must have a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) and a determination by the Park and Recreation Department Director that the above-ground enclosure would not violate Charter Section 55.

The 220-square foot CMU equipment enclosure is located southeast from the proposed monoeucalyptus tree in the southern portion of the park and is set back more than 15 feet from the main pathway through the park. The enclosure will be painted a neutral color with a stucco finish and a trellis roof top. Although the WCF regulations require equipment to be located underground, LDC Section 141.0420(i)(2) provides an alternative for above-ground equipment with the granting of an NDP and when the Park and Recreation Department Director determines that the above ground enclosure would not violate Charter Section 55. The Park and Recreation Department participated in the review of the Verizon Ridgewood Neighborhood Park project and determined that it would not violate Charter Section 55.

The project, as designed and located, complies with the Wireless Communication Facility regulations as it will be minimally visible through the use of architecture, landscape and siting solutions. The location of the WCF is along the southwesterly periphery of the park and set back approximately 325 feet from La Tortola and will not interfere with park use or pose visual impacts from the public right-of-way. As a result of the design and location, the project will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code.

#### Supplemental Findings--Environmentally Sensitive Lands

### 1. The site is physically suitable for the design and siting of the proposed development and the development will result in minimum disturbance to environmentally sensitive lands;

The project site is located within the southwestern portion of the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park, on the border of park landscaping and native habitat associated with the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. The project is proposed within an area of disturbed habitat and grading and trenching as described below would result in minor, direct impacts to environmentally sensitive lands.

The mono-Eucalyptus tree, located on the southwesterly side of the developed park, and the equipment enclosure, located to the southeast of the mono-Eucalyptus tree, would require minimal grading to accommodate the caisson and footings. Trenching for the conduits between the mono-Eucalyptus tree and the equipment enclosure as well as conduit for power and telco to utilities in the Paseo Montril right-of-way will occur immediately adjacent to the main walking path from La Tortola through the park. The project has been designed and appropriately located to result in minimal disturbance to environmentally sensitive lands.

## 2. The proposed development will minimize the alteration of natural land forms and will not result in undue risk from geologic and erosional forces, flood hazards, or fire hazards;

The proposed project will incorporate a foot print of approximately 230 square feet on this 8.53 acre park site. An additional 650-linear feet of disturbance for trenching for power/telco between the mono-Eucalyptus and the equipment enclosure and on to the power source in the Paseo Montril right-of-way, will occur as a result of this project. It has been determined that these

grading activities will not cause alteration of natural land forms and will not cause undue risk from geologic or erosional forces or flood or fire hazards.

### 3. The proposed development will be sited and designed to prevent adverse impacts on any adjacent environmentally sensitive lands;

The project site within Ridgewood Neighborhood Park, consists of mostly disturbed habitat and does not contain environmentally sensitive lands, but is immediately adjacent to environmentally sensitive vegetation and the MHPA, which is further to the west, beyond the park boundary. The project will result in minor, direct impacts to Tier II and Tier IV habitats, which when calculated, are considered to be less than significant and do not require mitigation consistent with the City's Land Development Manual - Biology Guidelines. Conditions pertaining to Land Use Adjacency for the MHPA as well as those related to monitoring during construction have been included in the permit to ensure there are no impacts to the environmentally sensitive lands.

### 4. The proposed development will be consistent with the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan;

The proposed project is not expected to result in adverse edge effects to the habitat in the adjacent MHPA preserve from drainage and toxics generated during project construction or from invasive species establishment after project construction. Specifically, the proposed project is at minimum, approximately 95 feet east of the MHPA preserve boundary and an existing dirt road (also corresponding to a water authority easement), which acts as barriers between the proposed project and the MHPA boundary. In addition, the project occurs within the maintenance limits of the park and incorporates BMPs to reduce the potential discharge of sediment/toxins. The project is also proposing native laurel sumac or lemonade berry shrubs for enhanced landscaping.

The remaining MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines associated with lighting, barriers, brush management, and grading/land development would not be applicable to the proposed project since outdoor lighting is not proposed, no new roads are proposed, and no brush management or manufactured slopes would be required as part of the project.

However, the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines associated with noise is expected to be applicable to the proposed project as it pertains to special status species (e., coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher), if these species were to utilize (e.g., nest) the habitat in the adjacent MHPA during the construction phase of the project only. A noise study was conducted by Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. Per the noise study, noise generated from operation of the proposed project (e.g., cooling systems for the exterior mounted site electronics equipment cabinets at 32 dBA) will not exceed 60 dBA at the edge of the MHPA or at the edge of the riparian habitat (Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. 2014). As a result, noise generated from operation of the proposed project would not impact potentially present special status species (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher) at the edge of the MHPA or at the edge of riparian habitat. However, construction equipment noise levels may reach up to 65 dBA at the edge of the MHPA and as a result, it is a permit condition requirement that project construction activities avoid the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher (between March 1 and August 15), least Bell's vireo (between March 15 and September 15), and southwestern willow flycatcher (between May 1 and August 30). Impacts to the above listed species would be significant and would require implementation of project mitigation measures

listed within the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Requirements section of this associated permit to reduce the potential impact to a level below significance.

The City's MSCP Subarea Plan Section 1.2.4 identifies the location adjacent to the project site as the northern area, Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. The Long-Range Management Goals identified in the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan include maintaining and enhancing the quality of the environment and to provide public enjoyment, safety, and education. Both the equipment and the mono-Eucalyptus are located in areas that will result in minimal interference with the existing park use. The installation of this WCF will increase the capacity and coverage for current Verizon subscribers visiting the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park and the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve, as well as for the residents in the sumounding community.

A growing amount of users have a cellular device for emergency use only. These users rely on their devices as a vital means of getting help during personal and other emergencies. During wide spread emergencies the capacity of an existing site may be impacted resulting in incomplete calls. This proposed WCF at Ridgewood Park will address this safety concern while complying with the MSCP Subarea Plan and the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan. Land Use Adjacency conditions have been included in the permit to ensure there are no impacts to the MHPA, therefore, the project is in compliance with the City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan.

5. The proposed development will not contribute to the erosion of public beaches or adversely impact local shoreline sand supply; and

The project site is approximately 8.5 miles away from the nearest local shoreline or public beach. Additionally, the permit includes conditions requiring a Water Pollution Control Plan and a Best Management Practices Maintenance Agreement to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer in order to meet the City's Storm Water Standards and ongoing permanent BMP maintenance prior to construction permit issuance. Thus, the proposed project will not contribute to the erosion of public beaches or adversely impact local shoreline sand supply.

# 6. The nature and extent of mitigation required as a condition of the permit is reasonably related to, and calculated to alleviate, negative impacts created by the proposed development.

The proposed project would result in minor, direct impacts to 0.002 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub-baccharis dominated (Tier II Habitat), 0.001 acres of Eucalptyus woodland (Tier IV Habitat), 0.05 acres of disturbed habitat (Tier Habitat), and .010 acres of urban/developed lands (Tier IV Habitat). Impacts to Tier I-IIB Habitats less than 0.1 acres are not considered significant under CEQA; therefore, the 0.002 acres of impact to Diegan coastal sage scrub-baccharis dominated is not significant and would not require mitigation. Impacts to Tier IV Habitats would be less than significant under CEQA since these habitats are not regionally considered to have high conservation value requiring mitigation.

These impacts include grading to accommodate the caisson and footings for the mono-eucalyptus tree, and trenching for the conduits associated with the power and telco. All proposed utility lines are designed to avoid and minimize intrusion into the MHPA. Consistent with the MSCP Subarea Section 1.4.2, the grading and the trenching associated with this project will be routed through the developed park areas and outside of the MHPA. Potential indirect impacts to the adjacent environmentally sensitive lands is not expected to occur as a result of this project, however,

conditions related to monitoring during construction and Land Use Adjacency have been included in the permit to alleviate potential negative impacts associated with the proposed development.

#### Neighborhood Development Permit Section 126.0404

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

The Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan does not address WCFs as a specific land use, but Section A.15 of the Urban Design section of the City of San Diego's General Plan addresses Wireless Facilities. The intent is to minimize the visual impact of wireless facilities. The General Plan states that wireless facilities should be concealed in existing structures when possible, or otherwise use camouflage and screening techniques to hide or blend the facilities into the surrounding area. It also states that facilities should be designed to be "aesthetically pleasing and respectful to the neighborhood context." This project is proposed as a 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree supporting twelve (12) panel antennas and associated components. The equipment is proposed in a 220-square foot CMU enclosure designed similar to other park buildings, but with the addition of a trellis roof top similar to trellises found on residential properties. The mono-Eucalyptus tree is proposed in the southwestern portion of Ridgewood Neighborhood Park in an area planted with several mature trees of varying height, including several eucalyptus trees at least 50 feet tall, which lends visual context and integration for the faux tree. As a result, the design of this WCF will respect the neighborhood context and blend into the surrounding area with minimal visual impact.

Based on the project's location and design, the facility will comply with the City of San Diego's General Plan as it relates to Wireless Facilities, and this project would not adversely affect the land use plan.

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

The project consists of twelve (12) antennas and twelve (12) Remote Radio Units (RRUs) on a 35foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree located on the southwestern edge of the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park in an area containing several mature tree species of varying height, including several eucalyptus trees at least 50 feet tall. The equipment associated with this project is located inside a 220-square foot CMU enclosure with trellis roof and a chain link lid, neutral color paint with stucco finish and treated with anti-graffiti paint.

It was determined that the project would not to have a significant effect on the environment and was declared to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15303 (New Construction). The Environmental Determination was appealed to City Council, which heard and denied the appeal on June 30, 2015 pursuant to Resolution No. 309829.

The conditions of approval for the project will require compliance with several operational constraints and development controls intended to assure the continued public health, safety and welfare, including the requirement to obtain building permits which requires compliance with the applicable building, fire, mechanical, and plumbing codes and State and Federal disability access laws.

Additionally, 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." Verizon Wireless submitted an Electro Magnetic Emission (EME) Analysis, which concluded that the project complies with FCC RF Standards. Therefore, the project will not result in any significant health or safety risks to the surrounding area within matters of the City's jurisdiction. In conclusion, the proposed project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

# 3. The proposed development will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code, including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.

The project, as designed, is consistent with the RS-1-14 development regulations and the WCF regulations. Pursuant to LDC Sections 141.0420(d)(2) and 141.0420(d)(4) a Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP) is required. No deviations are being proposed with this project. LDC Section 141.0420(g)(1) states that wireless communication facilities shall utilize the smallest, least visually intrusive antennas, components and other necessary equipment. The proposed WCF contains two different antenna models with different dimensions. To ensure compliance with this section of the regulation, Verizon will be limiting their antenna sizes up to 72-inches in length and 21-inches in width. For instance, in the past, the mono-eucalyptus tree designs have been approved to support antennas up to 96-inches in length. Therefore, the WCF is proposing to use the smallest and least visually intrusive antennas. Verizon will also be operating without a microwave dish which is often requested for their new installation.

LDC Section 141.0420(g)(2) states that the applicant shall use all reasonable means to conceal or minimize the visual impacts of wireless communication facilities through integration. Integration with existing structures or among other existing uses shall be accomplished through the use of architecture, landscape and siting solutions.

For this project, the mono-Eucalyptus tree and the associated equipment enclosure design have been designed to meet the integration requirements. The mono-Eucalyptus tree is sited in an area where there is existing mature landscaping of varying height and will not interfere with any park related uses. The equipment enclosure is located away from the sports field and is a design that is commonly found in other City parks. Similar to the mono-Eucalyptus tree, the equipment enclosure is also located so as not to interfere with park uses consistent with Charter Section 55 and Council Policies 700-06 and 600-43.

The mono-Eucalyptus tree will be designed to include certain integration elements resulting in a realistic tree appearance. First, the mono-Eucalyptus tree includes a branch count of 3-branches per foot for a heavy density appearance. Second, the branches are designed to extend 24-inches in front of each antenna. The coverage as a result of the branch extension would provide the appropriate foundation in screening the majority of the WCF. Additionally, antenna socks will be employed to increase the foliage density. The antenna socks are sleeves designed to wrap around the entire antenna. Eucalyptus leaves constructed of fiberglass materials are attached onto the sleeves. This practice of installing antenna socks increases the concealment of the antennas and blends them into the tree foliage. Finally, the antennas, RRUs, and mounting apparatus will be painted to match the bark to achieve the best visual results.

Pursuant to Land Development Code (LDC) Section 141.0420(i)(2), WCFs located above ground on city-owned property that has been formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance for park purposes, must have a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) and a determination by the Park and Recreation Department Director that the above-ground enclosure would not violate Charter Section 55.

The 220-square foot CMU equipment enclosure is located southeast from the proposed monoeucalyptus tree in the southern portion of the park and is set back more than 15 feet from the main pathway through the park. The enclosure will be painted a neutral color with a stucco finish and a trellis roof top. Although the WCF regulations require equipment to be located underground, LDC Section 141.0420(i)(2) provides an alternative for above-ground equipment with the granting of an NDP and when the Park and Recreation Department Director determines that the above ground enclosure would not violate Charter Section 55. The Park and Recreation Department participated in the review of the Verizon Ridgewood Neighborhood Park project and determined that it would not violate Charter Section 55.

The project, as designed and located, complies with the Wireless Communication Facility regulations as it will be minimally visible through the use of architecture, landscape and siting solutions. The location of the WCF is along the southwesterly periphery of the park and set back approximately 325 feet from La Tortola and will not interfere with park use or pose visual impacts from the public right-of-way. As a result of the design and location, the project will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code.

#### Neighborhood Use Permit - Section 126.0205

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

The Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan does not address WCFs as a specific land use, but Section A.15 of the Urban Design section of the City of San Diego's General Plan addresses Wireless Facilities. The intent is to minimize the visual impact of wireless facilities. The General Plan states that wireless facilities should be concealed in existing structures when possible, or otherwise use camouflage and screening techniques to hide or blend the facilities into the surrounding area. It also states that facilities should be designed to be "aesthetically pleasing and respectful to the neighborhood context." This project is proposed as a 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree supporting twelve (12) panel antennas and associated components. The equipment is proposed in a 220-square foot CMU enclosure designed similar to other park buildings, but with the addition of a trellis roof top similar to trellises found on residential properties. The mono-Eucalyptus tree is proposed in the southwestern portion of Ridgewood Neighborhood Park in an area planted with several mature trees of varying height, including several eucalyptus trees at least 50 feet tall, which lends visual context and integration for the faux tree. As a result, the design of this WCF will respect the neighborhood context and blend into the surrounding area with minimal visual impact.

Based on the project's location and design, the facility will comply with the City of San Diego's General Plan as it relates to Wireless Facilities, and this project would not adversely affect the land use plan.

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

The project consists of twelve (12) antennas and twelve (12) Remote Radio Units (RRUs) on a 35foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree located on the southwestern edge of the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park in an area containing several mature tree species of varying height, including several eucalyptus trees at least 50 feet tall. The equipment associated with this project is located inside a 220-square foot CMU enclosure with trellis roof and a chain link lid, neutral color paint with stucco finish and treated with anti-graffiti paint.

It was determined that the project would not to have a significant effect on the environment and was declared to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15303 (New Construction). The Environmental Determination was appealed to City Council, which heard and denied the appeal on June 30, 2015 pursuant to Resolution No. 309829.

The conditions of approval for the project will require compliance with several operational constraints and development controls intended to assure the continued public health, safety and welfare, including the requirement to obtain building permits which requires compliance with the applicable building, fire, mechanical, and plumbing codes and State and Federal disability access laws.

Additionally, 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." Verizon Wireless submitted an Electro Magnetic Emission (EME) Analysis, which concluded that the project complies with FCC RF Standards. Therefore, the project will not result in any significant health or safety risks to the surrounding area within matters of the City's jurisdiction. In conclusion, the proposed project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

# 3. The proposed development will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code, including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.

The project, as designed, is consistent with the RS-1-14 development regulations and the WCF regulations. Pursuant to LDC Sections 141.0420(d)(2) and 141.0420(d)(4) a Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP) is required. No deviations are being proposed with this project. LDC Section 141.0420(g)(1) states that wireless communication facilities shall utilize the smallest, least visually intrusive antennas, components and other necessary equipment. The proposed WCF contains two different antenna models with different dimensions. To ensure compliance with this section of the regulation, Verizon will be limiting their antenna sizes up to 72-inches in length and 21-inches in width. For instance, in the past, the mono-eucalyptus tree designs have been approved to support antennas up to 96-inches in length. Therefore, the WCF is proposing to use the smallest and least visually intrusive antennas. Verizon will also be operating without a microwave dish which is often requested for their new installation.

LDC Section 141.0420(g)(2) states that the applicant shall use all reasonable means to conceal or minimize the visual impacts of wireless communication facilities through integration. Integration

with existing structures or among other existing uses shall be accomplished through the use of architecture, landscape and siting solutions.

For this project, the mono-Eucalyptus tree and the associated equipment enclosure design have been designed to meet the integration requirements. The mono-Eucalyptus tree is sited in an area where there is existing mature landscaping of varying height and will not interfere with any park related uses. The equipment enclosure is located away from the sports field and is a design that is commonly found in other City parks. Similar to the mono-Eucalyptus tree, the equipment enclosure is also located so as not to interfere with park uses consistent with Charter Section 55 and Council Policies 700-06 and 600-43.

The mono-Eucalyptus tree will be designed to include certain integration elements resulting in a realistic tree appearance. First, the mono-Eucalyptus tree includes a branch count of 3-branches per foot for a heavy density appearance. Second, the branches are designed to extend 24-inches in front of each antenna. The coverage as a result of the branch extension would provide the appropriate foundation in screening the majority of the WCF. Additionally, antenna socks will be employed to increase the foliage density. The antenna socks are sleeves designed to wrap around the entire antenna. Eucalyptus leaves constructed of fiberglass materials are attached onto the sleeves. This practice of installing antenna socks increases the concealment of the antennas and blends them into the tree foliage. Finally, the antennas, RRUs, and mounting apparatus will be painted to match the bark to achieve the best visual results.

Pursuant to Land Development Code (LDC) Section 141.0420(i)(2), WCFs located above ground on city-owned property that has been formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance for park purposes, must have a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) and a determination by the Park and Recreation Department Director that the above-ground enclosure would not violate Charter Section 55.

The 220-square foot CMU equipment enclosure is located southeast from the proposed monoeucalyptus tree in the southern portion of the park and is set back more than 15 feet from the main pathway through the park. The enclosure will be painted a neutral color with a stucco finish and a trellis roof top. Although the WCF regulations require equipment to be located underground, LDC Section 141.0420(i)(2) provides an alternative for above-ground equipment with the granting of an NDP and when the Park and Recreation Department Director determines that the above ground enclosure would not violate Charter Section 55. The Park and Recreation Department participated in the review of the Verizon Ridgewood Neighborhood Park project and determined that it would not violate Charter Section 55.

The project, as designed and located, complies with the Wireless Communication Facility regulations as it will be minimally visible through the use of architecture, landscape and siting solutions. The location of the WCF is along the southwesterly periphery of the park and set back approximately 325 feet from La Tortola and will not interfere with park use or pose visual impacts from the public right-of-way. As a result of the design and location, the project will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, based on the findings hereinbefore adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego, the appeals by both Don't Cell Our Parks (DCOP) and Mr. Steven Smith are hereby denied and the Hearing Officer decision to approve the project is upheld, and that Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and Neighborhood

#### ATTACHMENT 5

Use Permit No. 1330402 is hereby GRANTED by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego to the referenced Owner/Permittee, in the form, exhibits, terms and conditions as set forth in Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Simon Tse Development Project Manager Development Services

Adopted on: October 22, 2015 Internal Order No. 24004872 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

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

#### INTERNAL ORDER NUMBER: 24004872

#### SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 1330404 NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 1330403 NEIGHBORHOOD USE PERMIT NO. 1330402 VERIZON WIRELESS RIDGEWOOD PARK PTS NO. 379009 PLANNING COMMISSION

This Site Development Permit No. 1330404, Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 and, Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402 is granted by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego to the **CITY OF SAN DIEGO**, Owner and **VERIZON WIRELESS**, Permittee, pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code [SDMC] sections 126.0201, 126.0401, 126.0501, 131.0401, 141.0420 and 143.0101. The site is located at 12604 La Tortola in the RS-1-14 zone of the Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan. The project site is legally described as Lot 171 of Map No. 9828, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of Said County.

Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit, permission is granted to Owner and Permittee for a new Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) described and identified by size, dimension, quantity, type, and location on the approved exhibits [Exhibit "A"] dated October 22, 2015, on file in the Development Services Department.

The project shall include:

- a. A new Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) for twelve (12) antennas and (12) twelve Remote Radio Units (RRUs) on a 35-foot tall mono-Eucalyptus tree. The equipment associated with this project is located inside a 220-square foot enclosure as illustrated in the approved 'Exhibit A' dated October 22, 2015; and
- b. Landscaping; and
- c. 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. If this permit is not utilized in accordance with Chapter 12, Article 6, Division 1 of the SDMC within the 36 month period, this permit shall be void unless an Extension of Time has been granted. Any such Extension of Time must meet all SDMC requirements and applicable guidelines in effect at the time the extension is considered by the appropriate decision maker. This permit must be utilized by **October 22, 2018**.

2. This approval and corresponding use of this site shall **expire on October 22, 2025.** Upon expiration of this approval, the facilities and improvements described herein shall be removed from this site and the property shall be restored to its original condition preceding approval of this permit unless the applicant of record files a new application for a facility which will be subject to compliance with all regulations in effect at the time.

3. No later than ninety (90) days prior to the expiration of this approval, the Owner/Permittee may submit a new application to the Development Services Department for consideration with review and a decision by the appropriate decision maker at that time. Failure to submit prior to the deadline will be cause for enforcement for noncompliance, which may include penalties and fines.

4. Under no circumstances, does approval of this permit authorize the Owner/Permittee to utilize this site for WCF purposes beyond the permit expiration date. Use of this permit approval beyond the expiration date of this permit is prohibited.

5. 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.

6. While this Permit is in effect, the subject property shall be used only for the purposes and under the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate City decision maker.

7. This Permit is a covenant running with the subject property and all of the requirements and conditions of this Permit and related documents shall be binding upon the Owner/Permittee and any successor(s) in interest.

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

9. 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.).

10. The Permittee shall secure all necessary building permits. The Permittee is informed that to secure these permits, substantial building modifications and site improvements may be required to comply with applicable building, fire, mechanical, and plumbing codes, and State and Federal disability access laws.

11. Construction plans shall be in substantial conformity to Exhibit "A." Changes, modifications, or alterations to the construction plans are prohibited unless appropriate application(s) or amendment(s) to this Permit have been granted.

12. All of the conditions contained in this Permit have been considered and were determinednecessary to make the findings required for approval of this Permit. The Permit holder is required to comply with each and every condition in order to maintain the entitlements that are granted by this Permit.

If any condition of this Permit, on a legal challenge by the 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 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.

The Permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its agents, officers, and employees from any and all claims, actions, proceedings, damages, judgments, or costs, including attorney's fees, against the City or its agents, officers, or employees, relating to the issuance of this permit including, but not limited to, any action to attack, set aside, void, challenge, or annul this development approval and any environmental document or decision. The City will promptly notify Permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and, if the City should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the Permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or its agents, officers, and employees. The City may elect to conduct its own defense, participate in its own defense, or obtain independent legal counsel in defense of any claim related to this indemnification. In the event of such election, Permittee shall pay all of the costs related thereto, including without limitation reasonable attorney's fees and costs. In the event of a disagreement between the City and Permittee regarding litigation issues, the City shall have the authority to control the litigation and make litigation related decisions, including, but not limited to, settlement or other disposition of the

matter. However, the Permittee shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement unless such settlement is approved by Permittee.

#### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE PROTECTION DURING CONSTRUCTION:**

#### 13. Prior to Construction -

- A. **Biologist Verification**: The permittee shall provide a letter to the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) section stating that a Project Biologist (Qualified Biologist) as defined in the City of San Diego's Biological Guidelines (2012), has been retained to implement the project's biological monitoring program. The letter shall include the names and contact information of all persons involved in the biological monitoring of the project.
- B. **Preconstruction Meeting:** The Qualified Biologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting, discuss the project's biological monitoring program, and arrange to perform any follow up mitigation measures and reporting including site-specific monitoring, restoration or revegetation, and additional fauna/flora surveys/salvage.
- C. Biological Documents: The Qualified Biologist shall submit all required documentation to MMC verifying that any special mitigation reports including but not limited to, maps, plans, surveys, survey timelines, or buffers are completed or scheduled per City Biology Guidelines, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance (ESL), project permit conditions; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); endangered species acts (ESAs); and/or other local, state or federal requirements.
- D. BCME: The Qualified Biologist shall present a Biological Construction Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit (BCME) which includes the biological documents in C above. In addition, include: restoration/revegetation plans, plant salvage/relocation requirements (e.g., coastal cactus wren plant salvage, burrowing owl exclusions, etc.), avian or other wildlife surveys/survey schedules (including general avian nesting and USFWS protocol), timing of surveys, wetland buffers, avian construction avoidance areas/noise buffers/ barriers, other impact avoidance areas, and any subsequent requirements determined by the Qualified Biologist and the City ADD/MMC. The BCME shall include a site plan, written and graphic depiction of the project's biological mitigation/monitoring program, and a schedule. The BCME shall be approved by MMC and referenced in the construction documents.
- E. Avian Protection Requirements: To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or any native/migratory birds, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre-construction survey shall be

conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation). The applicant shall submit the results of the preconstruction survey to City DSD for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected, a letter report or mitigation plan in conformance with the City's Biology Guidelines and applicable State and Federal Law (i.e. appropriate follow up surveys, monitoring schedules, construction and noise barriers/buffers, etc.) shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that take of birds or eggs or disturbance of breeding activities is avoided. The report or mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented to the satisfaction of the City. The City's MMC Section and Biologist shall verify and approve that all measures identified in the report or mitigation plan are in place prior to and/or during construction.

- F. **Resource Delineation:** Prior to construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the limits of disturbance adjacent to sensitive biological habitats and verify compliance with any other project conditions as shown on the BCME. This phase shall include flagging plant specimens and delimiting buffers to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., habitats/flora & fauna species, including nesting birds) during construction. Appropriate steps/care should be taken to minimize attraction of nest predators to the site.
- G. Education: Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall meet with the permittee or designee and the construction crew and conduct an on-site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved construction area and to protect sensitive flora and fauna (e.g., explain the avian and wetland buffers, flag system for removal of invasive species or retention of sensitive plants, and clarify acceptable access routes/methods and staging areas, etc.).

#### 14. During Construction -

- A. Monitoring: All construction (including access/staging areas) shall be restricted to areas previously identified, proposed for development/staging, or previously disturbed as shown on "Exhibit A" and/or the BCME. The Qualified Biologist shall monitor construction activities as needed to ensure that construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas, or cause other similar damage, and that the work plan has been amended to accommodate any sensitive species located during the pre-construction surveys. In addition, the Qualified Biologist shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR shall be e-mailed to MMC on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of monitoring, the 1<sup>st</sup> week of each month, the last day of monitoring, and immediately in the case of any undocumented condition or discovery.
- B. **Subsequent Resource Identification:** The Qualified Biologist shall note/act to prevent any new disturbances to habitat, flora, and/or fauna onsite (e.g., flag plant specimens for avoidance during access, etc). If active nests or other previously

unknown sensitive resources are detected, all project activities that directly impact the resource shall be delayed until species specific local, state or federal regulations have been determined and applied by the Qualified Biologist.

#### 15. Post Construction Measures -

A. In the event that impacts exceed previously allowed amounts, additional impacts shall be mitigated in accordance with City Biology Guidelines, ESL and MSCP, State CEQA, and other applicable local, state and federal law. The Qualified Biologist shall submit a final BCME/report to the satisfaction of the City ADD/MMC within 30 days of construction completion.

#### MHPA LAND USE ADJACENCY REQUIREMENTS:

16. Prior to issuance of any construction permit or notice to proceed, DSD/ LDR, and/or MSCP staff shall verify the Applicant has accurately represented the project's design in or on the Construction Documents (CD's/CD's consist of Construction Plan Sets for Private Projects and Contract Specifications for Public Projects) are in conformance with the associated discretionary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The applicant shall provide an implementing plan and include references on/in CD's of the following:

- A. **Grading/Land Development/MHPA Boundaries:** MHPA boundaries on-site and adjacent properties shall be delineated on the CDs. DSD Planning and/or MSCP staff shall ensure that all grading is included within the development footprint, specifically manufactured slopes, disturbance, and development within or adjacent to the MHPA. For projects within or adjacent to the MHPA, all manufactured slopes associated with site development shall be included within the development footprint.
- B. **Drainage**: All new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the MHPA shall be designed so they do not drain directly into the MHPA. All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials prior to release by incorporating the use of filtration devices, planted swales and/or planted detention/desiltation basins, or other approved permanent methods that are designed to minimize negative impacts, such as excessive water and toxins into the ecosystems of the MHPA.
- C. Toxics/Project Staging Areas/Equipment Storage: Projects that use chemicals or generate by-products such as pesticides, herbicides, and animal waste, and other substances that are potentially toxic or impactive to native habitats/flora/fauna (including water) shall incorporate measures to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the MHPA. No trash, oil, parking, or other construction/development-related material/activities shall be allowed outside any approved construction limits. Where applicable, this requirement shall incorporated into leases on publicly-owned property when applications for renewal occur. Provide a note in/on the CD's that states: "All construction related activity that

may have potential for leakage or intrusion shall be monitored by the Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative or Resident Engineer to ensure there is no impact to the MHPA."

- D. Lighting: Lighting within or adjacent to the MHPA shall be directed away/shielded from the MHPA and be subject to City Outdoor Lighting Regulations per LDC Section 142.0740.
- E. **Barriers:** New development within or adjacent to the MHPA shall be required to provide barriers (e.g., non-invasive vegetation; rocks/boulders; 6-foot high, vinyl-coated chain link or equivalent fences/walls; and/or signage) along the MHPA boundaries to direct public access to appropriate locations, reduce domestic animal predation, protect wildlife in the preserve, and provide adequate noise reduction where needed.
- F. **Invasives:** No invasive non-native plant species shall be introduced into areas within or adjacent to the MHPA.
- G. Brush Management: New development adjacent to the MHPA shall be set back from the MHPA to provide required Brush Management Zone 1 area on the building pad outside of the MHPA. Zone 2 may be located within the MHPA provided the Zone 2 management will be the responsibility of an HOA or other private entity except where narrow wildlife corridors require it to be located outside of the MHPA. Brush management zones will not be greater in size than currently required by the City's regulations, the amount of woody vegetation clearing shall not exceed 50 percent of the vegetation existing when the initial clearing is done and vegetation clearing shall be prohibited within native coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitats from March 1-August 15 except where the City ADD/MMC has documented the thinning would be consist with the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. Existing and approved projects are subject to current requirements of Municipal Code Section 142.0412.
- H. Noise: Due to the site's location adjacent to or within the MHPA where the Qualified Biologist has identified potential nesting habitat for listed avian species, construction noise that exceeds the maximum levels allowed shall be avoided during the breeding seasons for the following: California Gnatcatcher (3/1-8/15). If construction is proposed during the breeding season for the species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys shall be required in order to determine species presence/absence. If protocol surveys are not conducted in suitable habitat during the breeding season for the aforementioned listed species, presence shall be assumed with implementation of noise attenuation and biological monitoring.

When applicable (i.e., habitat is occupied or if presence of the covered species is assumed), adequate noise reduction measures shall be incorporated as follows:

Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the City Manager (or appointed designee) shall verify that the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) boundaries and the following project requirements regarding the coastal California gnatcatcher are shown on the construction plans:

NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, GRADING, OR OTHER CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15, THE BREEDING SEASON OF THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER, UNTIL THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS HAVE BEEN MET TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY MANAGER:

- A. A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST (POSSESSING A VALID ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SECTION 10(a)(1)(A) RECOVERY PERMIT) SHALL SURVEY THOSE HABITAT AREAS <u>WITHIN THE MHPA</u> THAT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 DECIBELS [dB(A)] HOURLY AVERAGE FOR THE PRESENCE OF THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER. SURVEYS FOR THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER SHALL BE CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE PROTOCOL SURVEY GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE WITHIN THE BREEDING SEASON PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY CONSTRUCTION. IF GNATCATCHERS ARE PRESENT, THEN THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE MET:
  - I. BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15, NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, OR GRADING OF OCCUPIED GNATCATCHER HABITAT SHALL BE PERMITTED. AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; <u>AND</u>
  - BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15, NO CONSTRUCTION II. ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR WITHIN ANY PORTION OF THE SITE WHERE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD RESULT IN NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 dB (A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED GNATCATCHER HABITAT. AN ANALYSIS SHOWING THAT NOISE GENERATED BY CONSTRUCTION. ACTIVITIES WOULD NOT EXCEED 60 dB (A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED HABITAT MUST BE COMPLETED BY A QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN (POSSESSING CURRENT NOISE ENGINEER LICENSE OR REGISTRATION WITH MONITORING NOISE LEVEL EXPERIENCE WITH LISTED ANIMAL SPECIES) AND APPROVED BY THE CITY MANAGER AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES DURING THE BREEDING SEASON, AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE
STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; <u>OR</u>

III. AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A **OUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN, NOISE ATTENUATION MEASURES** (e.g., BERMS, WALLS) SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WILL NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF HABITAT OCCUPIED BY THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER. CONCURRENT WITH THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF NECESSARY NOISE ATTENUATION FACILITIES, NOISE MONITORING\* SHALL BE CONDUCTED AT THE EDGE OF THE OCCUPIED HABITAT AREA TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS DO NOT EXCEED 60 dB (A) HOURLY AVERAGE. IF THE NOISE ATTENUATION TECHNIOUES IMPLEMENTED ARE DETERMINED TO BE INADEOUATE BY THE OUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN OR BIOLOGIST, THEN THE ASSOCIATED CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL CEASE UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT ADEQUATE NOISE ATTENUATION IS ACHIEVED OR UNTIL THE END OF THE BREEDING SEASON (AUGUST 16).

\* Construction noise monitoring shall continue to be monitored at least twice weekly on varying days, or more frequently depending on the construction activity, to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB (A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB (A) hourly average. If not, other measures shall be implemented in consultation with the biologist and the City Manager, as necessary, to reduce noise levels to below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, limitations on the placement of construction equipment and the simultaneous use of equipment.

- B. IF COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHERS ARE NOT DETECTED DURING THE PROTOCOL SURVEY, THE QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST SHALL SUBMIT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO THE CITY MANAGER AND APPLICABLE RESOURCE AGENCIES WHICH DEMONSTRATES WHETHER OR NOT MITIGATION MEASURES SUCH AS NOISE WALLS ARE NECESSARY BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15 AS FOLLOWS:
  - I. IF THIS EVIDENCE INDICATES THE POTENTIAL IS HIGH FORCOASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER TO BE PRESENT BASED ON HISTORICAL RECORDS OR SITE CONDITIONS, THEN CONDITION A.III SHALL BE ADHERED TO AS SPECIFIED ABOVE.

### II. IF THIS EVIDENCE CONCLUDES THAT NO IMPACTS TO THIS SPECIES ARE ANTICIPATED, NO MITIGATION MEASURES WOULD BE NECESSARY.

### **ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS:**

17. The project proposes to export 23 cubic yards of material from the project site. All excavated material listed to be exported, shall be exported to a legal disposal site in accordance with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (the "Green Book"), 2009 edition and Regional Supplement Amendments adopted by Regional Standards Committee.

18. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Permittee shall obtain a grading permit for the grading proposed for this project. All grading shall conform to requirements in accordance with the City of San Diego Municipal Code in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.

19. The drainage system proposed for this development is private and subject to approval by the City Engineer.

20. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Permittee shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications.

21. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit the Permittee 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.

22. 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 90 days of the approval of this development permit by filing a written protest with the City Clerk pursuant to California Government Code 66020.

23. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Permittee shall assure by permit to construct the utility trench in the special flood hazard area to current City of San Diego and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards, to satisfactory to the City Engineer.

### PARK AND RECREATION REQUIREMENTS:

24. In the event that the Landscape Plan and the Site Plan conflict, the Site Plan shall be revised to be consistent with the Landscape Plan such that landscape areas are consistent with the Exhibit 'A' Landscape Development Plan.

25. Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy or activation of WCF, it shall be the responsibility of the Permittee to install all required landscape and obtain all required landscape inspections.

26. All required landscape shall be maintained in a disease, weed and litter free condition at all times. Severe pruning or "topping" of trees is not permitted. The trees shall be maintained in a safe manner to allow each tree to grow to its mature height and spread.

27. If any required landscape (including existing or new plantings, hardscape, landscape features, etc.) indicated on the approved construction document plans is damaged or removed during demolition or construction, it shall be repaired and/or replaced by the Permittee in kind and equivalent size per the approved documents to the satisfaction of the Park & Recreation Department and the Development Services Department within 30 days of damage or Certificate of Occupancy or a Final Landscape Inspection.

28. Landscape and/or hardscape areas disturbed during construction shall be repaired/replaced by the Permittee to the satisfaction of the Park & Recreation Department And the Development Services Department, prior to final inspection.

### PLANNING/DESIGN REQUIREMENTS:

29. This approval permits the following as illustrated on the approved Exhibit "A":

- a. Six (6) antennas with the following dimensions: 72" by 14.8" by 7.1"; and
- b. Six (6) antennas with the following dimensions: 55" by 21" by 7.1".

30. The WCF shall conform to the approved construction plans.

31. Photosimulations shall be printed on the construction plans.

32. The Permittee shall install and maintain appropriate warning signage on the WCF as required by State and Federal regulations. The Permittee shall be responsible for complying with all State and Federal regulations.

33. The accuracy and validity of the Radio Frequency Compliance Report, submitted by the Permittee, shall be assured while the WCF is in operation.

34. All facilities and related equipment shall be maintained in good working order and free from trash, debris, graffiti and designed to discourage vandalism. Any damaged equipment shall be repaired or replaced within thirty (30) calendar days of notification by the City of San Diego.

35. No exposed pipes or mounting apparatus absent antennas shall be present at any time on the mono-Eucalyptus tree. Mounting pipes shall not be longer than the antennas.

36. All proposed hand-holes shall be covered with bark material to match the mono-Eucalyptus tree trunk to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department.

37. All coaxial conduits shall be routed up through the caisson and into the mono-Eucalyptus tree to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department. "Doghouse" cable housings are not permitted.

38. Branches from the mono-Eucalyptus tree shall extend a minimum of 24-inches beyond the proposed antennas to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department.

39. All exposed cables, brackets and supports shall be painted to match the mono-Eucalyptus tree to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department.

40. Antenna socks (designed to match the mono-Eucalyptus tree) fully covering the front and back of the antennas (and any other components) shall be used.

41. The applicant shall provide color samples of the mono-Eucalyptus tree branches and bark prior to Building Permit issuance. This is to ensure that the proposed components integrate with the surrounding landscape. Staff will pre-approve the color sample prior to Building Permit issuance. The exact samples shall be used during the FINAL INSPECTION. The color approved by Planning Staff must be identical to the as-built mono-Eucalyptus.

42. Any future modifications to the antennas must be approved by Development Services. The Permittee shall provide evidence demonstrating compliance with Federal standards for radio frequency emissions in accordance with the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and any subsequent amendments.

43. The Permittee shall place appropriate signage on the WCF as required by CAL-OSHA/FCC to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department. The Permittee shall be responsible for complying with all State and Federal regulations, as applicable.

44. The Permittee shall notify the City within 30 days of the sale or transfer of this site to any other provider or if the site is no longer operational, in which case, the removal and the restoration of this site to its original condition shall be required.

45. All private outdoor lighting shall be shaded and adjusted to fall on the same premises where such lights are located and in accordance with the applicable regulations in the SDMC.

## **INFORMATION ONLY:**

- The issuance of this discretionary use permit alone does not allow the immediate commencement or continued operation of the proposed use on site. The operation allowed by this discretionary use permit may only begin or recommence after all conditions listed on this permit are fully completed and all required ministerial permits have been issued and received final inspection.
- Please note that a **Telecom Planning Inspection Issue** will be placed on the project prior to Final Clearance from the City's Building Inspector to ensure compliance with the

approved plans and associated conditions. <u>Prior to calling for your Final Inspection from</u> <u>your building inspection official</u>, please contact the Project Manager listed below at (619) 687-5984 to schedule an inspection of the completed facility. Please schedule this administrative inspection at least five working days ahead of the requested Final Inspection date.

- Per LDC §59.5.0404 Construction Noise (a), It shall be unlawful for any person, between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of any day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day, or on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the San Diego Municipal Code, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays, to erect, construct, demolish, excavate for, alter or repair any building or structure in such a manner as to create disturbing, excessive or offensive noise unless a permit has been applied for and granted beforehand by the Noise Abatement and Control Administrator.
- Any party on whom fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions have been imposed as conditions of approval of this 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-section 66020.
- This development may be subject to impact fees at the time of construction permit issuance.

APPROVED by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego on October 22, 2015 and Approved Resolution No. PC-XX-XXX.

#### ATTACHMENT 6

Site Development Permit No. 1330404 Neighborhood Development Permit No. 1330403 Neighborhood Use Permit No. 1330402 October 22, 2015

AUTHENTICATED BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Simon Tse Development Project Manager

NOTE: Notary acknowledgment must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.

The undersigned Owner/Permittee, by execution hereof, agrees to each and every condition of this Permit and promises to perform each and every obligation of Owner/Permittee hereunder.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO Owner

By\_

NAME TITLE

VERIZON WIRELESS Permittee

By\_

NAME TITLE

NOTE: Notary acknowledgments must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.

### **ATTACHMENT 7**

### NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

(Check one or both) TO: X

X Recorder/County Clerk P.O. Box 1750, MS A-33 1600 Pacific Hwy, Room 260 San Diego, CA 92101-2422 Office of Planning and Research 1400 Tenth Street, Room 121 Sacramento, CA 95814 FROM: City of San Diego Development Services Department 1222 First Avenue, MS 501 San Diego, CA 92101

SCH No.: N/A

PROJECT TITLE/ NO.: VERIZON RIDGEWOOD PARK / 379009 PROJECT LOCATION-SPECIFIC: 12604 La Tortola, San Diego, CA PROJECT LOCATION-CITY/COUNTY: San Diego/San Diego

DESCRIPTION OF NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT: A NEIGHBORHOOD USE PERMIT, NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT and SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to construct, operate, and maintain a wireless communication facility that includes the following: installation of twelve panel antennas, twelve remote radio units and three surge protectors mounted to a 35-foot mono-eucalyptus; two Global Positioning System antennas, equipment cabinets installed within an approximately 220-square-foot new concrete block equipment enclosure. The project would also include installation of electrical and telecom conduit within new trenches. The project is located at 12604 La Tortola in Ridgewood Park. Furthermore, the project is located within the RS-1-14 zone and the Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 171 of Map No. 9828.)

NAME OF PERSON OR AGENCY CARRYING OUT PROJECT: Leslie S. Vartanian, Verizon Wireless, 15505 Sand Canyon Avenue, Irvine CA, 92618, (949) 286-8623.

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: 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures).
- () STATUTORY EXEMPTIONS:

REASONS WHY PROJECT IS EXEMPT: The City of San Diego conducted an environmental review that determined the project would not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. The project meets the criteria set forth in CEQA Section 15303 that allows for new construction, one single-family residence in a residential zone. Furthermore, the exceptions listed in CEQA Section 15300.2 would not apply in that no cumulative impacts were identified; no significant effect on the environmental were identified; the project is not adjacent to a scenic highway; nor is the project identified on a list of hazardous waste sites pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON: E. Shearer-Nguyen

Telephone: (619) 446-5369

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.

Senior Planner SIGNATURE/TITLE

April 15, 2015 date of Project Approval

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

DATE RECEIVED FOR FILING WITH COUNTY CLERK OR OPR



		TACHMENT 8 APPLICANT:
		APPLICANT:         VERIZON WIRELESS         15505 SAND CANYON AVE.         BUILDING "O", FIRST FLOOR         IRVINE, CA 92618         PROJECT INFORMATION:         KIKA         (RIDGEWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PARK)         12604 LA TORTOLA         SAN DIEGO, CA 92129         REVISIONS:         REVISIONS:         REVISIONS:         REVISIONS:         A 05/12/14 90% ZONING DRAWING JP         0 06/27/14 REVISE EQUIP, PLAN JP         1 08/11/14 PLAN CMNTS JP         2 11/18/14 REVISE SHELTER JP         3 02/09/15 CPG COMMENTS JP
		CONSULTANT:
RED PERMITS		PLANCON
RMIT.		TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROJECT MANAGEMENT
NTRACTOR NOTES		302 STATE PLACE ESCONDIDO, CA 92029
	REV	CCDD 13225 DANIELSON ST, SUITE 200 POWAY, CA 92064 TEL: (858) 668–2828 FAX: (858) 668–2827 LICENSER:
ANTENNA PLAN		
		SHEET TITLE:
		SHEET TITLE: TITLE SHEET
ANTENNA PLAN		



SCALE	NOTE

IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.



1. THE APPLICANT SHALL OBTAIN A NONEXCLUSIVE RIGHT-OF-WAY USE AGREEMENT FROM THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO FOR THE PROPOSED WORK IN THE LA TORTOLA AND PASED MONTRIL RIGHT-OF-WAY.

2. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT, THE PERMITTEE SHALL ENTER INTO A MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT FOR THE ONGOING PERMANENT BMP MAINTENANCE, SATISFACTORY TO THE CITY ENGINEER

3. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT, THE PERMITEE SHALL INCORPORATE ANY CONSTRUCTION BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES NECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH CHAPTER 14, ARTICLE 2, DIVISION 1 (GRADING REGULATIONS) OF THE SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL CODE, INTO THE CONSTRUCTION PLANS OR SPECIFICATIONS.

4. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT THE PERMITEE 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.

5. THE OWNER OF THE SUBJECT PROJECT SHALL OBTAIN AN ENCROACHMENT MAINTENANCE REMOVAL AGREEMENT, FROM THE CITY ENGINER, FOR TELCO CONDUITS TRENCHING, IN THE THE LA TORTOLA AND PASEO MONTRIL RIGHT-OF-WAY.

THE APPLICANT SHALL OBTAIN A PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY PERNIT FOR THE PROPOSED WORK IN THE LA TORTOLA AND PASEO MONTRIL RIGHT-OF-WAY.

7. THE PROPOSED EQUIPMENT SHELTER WILL NOT BLOCK OR ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN.

#### GRADING DATA TABLE:

APPROX. 23 CU. YD.
(FROM MONO-EUC. CAISSON)
APPROX. 8 CU. YD.
(FOR SHELTER FOUNDATION)
APPROX. 9 CU. YD.
(FOR SHELTER FOOTING)
F CUT:APPROX. 2 FT.
APPROX. 8 CU. YD.
(FOR SHELTER FOUNDATION)
F FILL:APPROX. 2 FT.

**verizon**wireless

15505 SAND CANYON AVE. BUILDING "D", FIRST FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92618

PROJECT INFORMATION:

ATTACHMENT

### KIKA

(RIDGEWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PARK) 12604 LA TORTOLA SAN DIEGO, CA 92129

<u> </u>								
REVISIONS:								
REV.	DATE DESCRIPTION							
A	06/12/14	90% ZONING DRAWING	JP					
0	06/27/14	REVISE EQUIP. PLAN	JP					
1	08/11/14	PLAN CMNTS	JP					
2	11/18/14	REVISE SHELTER	JP					
3	02/09/15	CPG COMMENTS	JP					

CONSULTANT:

PLANCONS

TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROJECT MANAGEMENT 302 STATE PLACE ESCONDIDO, CA 92029

ENGINEER:





13225 DANIELSON ST, SUITE 200 POWAY, CA 92064 TEL: (858) 668-2828 FAX; (858) 668-2827

LICENSER:

SHEET TITLE:

SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER:



140'	$11 \times 17$ : 1" = $140' - 0"$
	24x36: 1" = 70'-0"



### **ATTACHMENT 8**



AZIMUTH RAD CENTER

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

29'

155

155\*

155

155

225

225

225

225

60°

60\*

60.

60"

(31) PROPOSED MANUAL TRANSFER SWITCH

- (30) PROPOSED STEPDOWN TRANSFORMER
- (29) PROPOSED IRRIGATION LINE (CONNECT TO THE MAINLINE OF THE EXISTING IRRIGATION SYSTEM)
- (28) PROPOSED NATIVE SHRUBS TO SCREEN EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE, TOYON (HETEROMELES ARBUTIFOLIA) OR LEMONADEBERRY (RHUS INTEGRIFOLIA)
- 27 PROPOSED COAX AND HYBRID FIBER/POWER CABLES IN PVC CONDUITS ROUTED UNDERGROUND
- PROVIDE WEEP HOLE OPENINGS AT 26 BASE OF WALL FOR DRAIN (TYP.)
- (25) PROPOSED COAX CABLE TRAY
- 24 PROPOSED CONCRETE SLAB INSIDE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE
- 23 PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE
- 22 PROPOSED 3'-6"x15'-0" RAISED CONCRETE PAD FOR EQUIPMENT CABINETS
- (21) PROPOSED CHAINLINK LID
- 20 PROPOSED CONCRETE LANDING
- 19 PROPOSED MANDATORY NFPA HAZARD AND WARNING PLACARDS MOUNTED TO DOOR
- (18) PROPOSED 4' WIDE LOCKABLE ACCESS DOOR AND FRAME WITH VERIZON WIRELESS SIGNAGE
- 17 PROPOSED NORTHSTAR TELCO CABINET MOUNTED TO WALL
- (16) EXISTING SMALL TREE TO REMAIN
- (15) PROPOSED APPLETON PLUG PASS THROUGH [TWO (2) MINIMUM OPEN CELLS AT GRADE]
- (14) PROPOSED GENERATOR RECEPTACLE. MOUNTED TO WALL
- 13 PROPOSED MANUAL TRANSFER SWITCH MOUNTED TO WALL
- 12 PROPOSED ELECTRICAL PANEL MOUNTED
- 11 PROPOSED 4A: 40-B: C FIRE EXTINGUISHER INSIDE A NEMA 3R CABINET MOUNTED TO WALL
- PROPOSED WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURE (1) WITH MANUAL TIMER SWITCH (TOTAL OF 4)
- 9 PROPOSED 6" DIA, CONDUIT STUB-UP FOR COAX CABLES (TOTAL OF 6) COVERED BY METAL SHROUD
- (8) PROPOSED RAYCAP DC SURGE PROTECTION UNIT MOUNTED TO WALL (TOTAL OF 2)
- PROPOSED GPS ANTENNA MOUNTED ON EQUIPMENT CABINET (TOTAL CF 2)
- (6) PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS COMMSCOPE RBA72-36 DC POWER PLANT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD
- 5 PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS ERICSSON RBS 6102 AND BBU CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD
- 4 PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'-O" HIGH CMU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE. STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH.
- 3 PROPOSED UNDERGROUND JOINT UTILITY TRENCH
- 2 PROPOSED ELECTRICAL CONDUIT WITHIN UNDERGROUND TRENCH
- PROPOSED TELCO CONDUIT WITHIN UNDERGROUND TRENCH
- KEYED NOTES:



32 ON MONOEUCALYOTUS NEAR RRUS (TOTAL OF 3), PAINTED 4 DARK GREEN	
33 PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS RRU WITH A2 MODULE GREEN, STACKED (TOTAL OF 12)	
34) PROPOSED ANTENNA MOUNT, PAINTED DARK GREEN	
35 PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 35' HIGH MONOEUCALYPTUS TO BE MANUFACTURED BY SOLAR COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL (SCI)	
36 PROPOSED PIPE TO PIPE STAND-OFF BRACKET	
37 OUTLINE OF PROPOSED MONOEUCALYPTUS BRANCHES, 20' DIAMETER CANOPY	
BEIM THE	
A RINAL WITH 250	

ANTENNA TYPE

CCI HPA-45R-BUU-H6

AMPHENOL HTXCW451619R000G

AMPHENOL HTXCW451619R000G

CCI HPA-45R-BUU-H6

CCI HPA-45R-BUU-H6

AMPHENOL HTXCW451619R000G

AMPHENOL HTXCW451619R000G

CCI HPA-45R-BUU-H6

CCI HPA-45R-BUU-H6

AMPHENOL HTXCW451619R000G

AMPHENOL HTXCW451619R000G

CCI HPA-45R-BUU-H6

SECTOR

ALPHA-1

ALPHA-2

ALPHA-3

ALPHA-4

BETA-1

BETA-2

BETA-3

BETA-4

GAMMA-

GAMMA-2

GAMMA-3

GAMMA-4

MICROWAVE

ANTENNA SIZE

72"Lx14.8"Wx9.0D

55"Lx21.0"Wx7.1"D

55"Lx21.0"Wx7.1"D

72"Lx14.8"Wx9.0D

72"Lx14.8"Wx9.0D

55"Lx21.0"Wx7.1"E

55"Lx21.0"Wx7.1"E

72"Lx14.8"Wx9.0D

72"Lx14.8"Wx9.0D

55"Lx21.0"Wx7.1"D

55"Lx21.0"Wx7.1"D

72"Lx14.8"Wx9.0D

NONE

PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS PANEL ANTENNAS, PAINTED DARK

A-6 A-6 A-6

(31) GREEN [(6) 55"Lx21.0"Wx7.1D AND (6) 72"Lx14.8"Wx9.0"D] (TOTAL OF 12)

KEYED NOTES:





EAST ELEVATION

16'

SCALE

24x36: 1/8" = 1'-0"

2

### **ATTACHMENT 8**



$\frac{P \text{ OF } PROPOSED \text{ MONOEUCALYPTUS BRANCHES}}{ELEV. 35'-0^{\circ}}$ $\frac{P \text{ OF } PROPOSED \text{ MONOEUCALYPTUS BRANCHES}}{ELEV. 35'-0^{\circ}}$ $\frac{P \text{ ROPOSED VZW ANTENNAS AND STEL POLE}{ELEV. 35'-0^{\circ}}$ $\frac{P \text{ ROPOSED VZW ANTENNAS AND STEL POLE}{ELEV. 32'-0^{\circ}}$ $\frac{P \text{ REVISIONS:}}{P \text{ ROPOSED VZW ANTENNAS AND STEL POLE}$ $\frac{EV. 23'-0^{\circ}}{ELEV. 23'-0^{\circ}}$ $\frac{REV}{DATE} \frac{D \text{ ESCRIPTION}}{D \text{ A D6/12/14 B0Z ZONING DRAMING}}$ $\frac{0 \text{ 66/22/14 ROME EOUP. PLAN}}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/11/14 PLAN CMATS}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/2010 PLAN}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/2010 PLAN}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/2010 PLAN}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/2010 PLAN}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/2010 PLAN}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/2010 PLAN}}$ $\frac{2 \text{ 11/16/14 } ROME EOUP. PLAN}{1 \text{ 08/2010 PLAN}}$		AT	TACHMENT 8
	SCALE NOTE:		APPLICANT:
	IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT	and a subscription of the second second	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<b>verizon</b> wireless
			BUILDING "D", FIRST FLOOR
2 OF PROPOSED MONOCUCALITYTUS BRANCHES ELEV. 35"-0"       (RIDGEWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD P/ ISO4 LA TORTOLA SNDEOL CA 52123         PROPOSED V2W ANTENNAS AND STELL POLE ELEV. 23"-0"       (REVISIONS: REV. DATE ELEV. 23"-0"         PROPOSED V2W ANTENNA RAD CENTER ELEV. 23"-0"       (REVISIONS: REV. DATE ELEV. 23"-0"         CROUND LEVEL ELEV. 23"-0"       (REVISIONS: REV. DATE ELEV. 23"-0"         CROUND LEVEL ELEV. 20"-0"       (REF)         CROUND LEVEL ELEV. 0"-0" (REF)       (REF)         CONSULTANT:       (RECOMMUNICATIONS PROJE MANAGEMENT 302 STATE PLACE ESCONDED, CA 92029         16"       SCALE         11417: 1/16" = 1'-0"       1         CONSULTANT:       (RECOMMUNICATIONS PROJE MANAGEMENT 302 STATE PLACE ESCONDED, CA 92029         16"       SCALE         11417: 1/16" = 1'-0"       1         ELEV. 0"-0" (REF)       1         CONSULTANT:       (RECOMMUNICATIONS PROJE MANAGEMENT 302 STATE PLACE ESCONDED, CA 92024         16"       SCALE         11417: 1/16" = 1'-0"       1         102       CONSULTANT:         24:36: 1/8" = 1'-0"       1         102       CONSULTANT:         24:36: 1/8" = 1'-0"       1         11225 DAWELSON ST, SUFE 20 POW, CASE 3223 FAX: (ESS) 688-2823         11225 DAWELSON ST, SUFE 20 POW, CASE 323 FAX: (ESS) 688-2823         <			
CONTROLOGIES MATCHINAS AND STELL POLE PROPOSED V2W ANTENNAS AND STELL POLE DELEX 32-0* PROPOSED V2W ANTENNAS AND STELL POLE DELEX 32-0* CLEX 32-			(RIDGEWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PARK)
ELEX. 32*-0*         PROPOSED VZW ANTENNA RAD CENTER         ELEX. 23*-0*         ELEX. 23*-0*         CONSTRUCTION         ELEX. 23*-0*         CONSTRUCTION         CONSTRUCTION         CROUND LEVEL         ELEX. 0*-0*         CROUND LEVEL         ELEX. 0*-0*         ELEX. 0*-0*         CROUND LEVEL         ELEX. 0*-0*         ELEX. 0*-0*         CROUND LEVEL         ELEX. 0*-0*         ELEX. 0*-0*         CONSULTANT:         PLAN COME         CONSULTANT:         PLEX. 0*-0*         CONDARCE         PROPOSED TRELUS ABOVE         E	ELEV. 35'-0" F		SAN DIEGO, CA 92129
$\frac{15}{24 \times 35} = 17 - 0^{-1} + \frac{11}{24 \times 36} = 17 - 0^{-1} $	ELEV. 32'-0"	- 1	REVISIONS:
	PROPOSED VZW ANTENNA RAD CENTER ELEV. 29'-0"	~	REV. DATE DESCRIPTION BY
COUND LEVEL     CONSULTANT:      CO			
CROUND LEVEL CROUND LEVEL CONSULTANT: CONSULTANT: PLAN COM CONSULTANT: PLAN COM CONSULTANT: PLAN COM CONSULTANT: PLAN COM CONSULTANT: PLAN COM CONSULTANT: CONSULTANT: PLAN COM CONSULTANT: CONSULTANT: PLAN COM CONSULTANT:			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			00/05 615 750
CROUND LEVEL     CONSULTANT:      CONSULTANT:      CONSULTANT:      CONSULTANT:      PLANCOM     CONSULTANT:      CONSUL		direct solution	2 11/18/14 REVISE SHELTER JP
$\begin{array}{c} \hline \\ \hline $			3 02/09/15 CPG COMMENTS JF
$\begin{array}{c} \hline \\ \hline $		a and a design of the second se	
$\begin{array}{c} \hline \\ \hline $			
ELEV. 0'-0' (REF) $+$ TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROJE MANAGEMENT 322 STATE PLACE ESCONDIDO, CA 92029 TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROJE MANAGEMENT 322 STATE PLACE ESCONDIDO, CA 92029 ENGINEER: PDC CORPORATION COLOR PDC CORPORATION I 3225 DANIELSON ST, SUITE 20 PDC CORPORATION I 3225 DANIELSON ST, SUITE 20 POWAY, CA 92029 I 3225 DANIELSON ST, SUITE 20 PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'-0" HIGH CMU WALL EOUPMENT ENCLOSURE EQUIPMENT CAGINET MOUNTED ON CORCRETE PAD TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0"		an a	CONSULTANT:
ELEV. 0'-0' (REF) $+$ TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROJE MANAGEMENT 322 STATE PLACE ESCONDIDO, CA 92029 TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROJE SCALE 11x17: 1/18" = 1'-0" 1 ENGINEER: PDC CORPORATION COLOR PDC CORPORATION COLOR PDC CORPORATION I 3225 DANIELSON ST, SUITE 20 PDC CORPORATION I 3225 DANIELSON ST, SUITE 20 I SECON ST, SUITE 20		+	PLANCON
$\begin{array}{c} 302 \text{ STATE PLACE} \\ \hline 9 \text{ SCALE} \\ \hline 11 \text{ STATE PLACE} \\ \hline 124 \text{ SGALE} \\ \hline 13225  DANIELSON ST. SUITE 20 POWAY, CA 92064 \\ \hline 13225 \text{ DANIELSON ST. SUITE 20 POWAY, CA 9206 \\ \hline 13225 \text{ DANIEL$	ELEV. 0'-0" (REF) +		TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROJECT
$= \frac{15^{\circ}}{10^{\circ}} \text{ scale } \frac{11 \times 17^{\circ} \cdot 1/16^{\circ} = 1^{\circ} - 0^{\circ}}{24 \times 36^{\circ} \cdot 1/8^{\circ} = 1^{\circ} - 0^{\circ}} 1$ $= \frac{15^{\circ}}{24 \times 36^{\circ} \cdot 1/8^{\circ} = 1^{\circ} - 0^{\circ}} 1$ $= \frac{10^{\circ}}{10^{\circ}} \frac{10^{\circ}}{1$	A-3		302 STATE PLACE
SCALE 24x36: 1/8" = 1'-0" T CLEV. ±9'-0" SCALE 24x36: 1/8" = 1'	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e		ESCONDIDO, CA 92029
SCALE 24x36: 1/8" = 1'-0" T ENGINEER: PDC CORPORATION CONCERNENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'-0" HIGH CAU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE STUCCO AND PAINTED TANYSANDSTONE FINISH. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	$16' \qquad 11x17' 1/16'' = 1'-0''$		
PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'-0" HIGH CAU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		4	ENGINEER:
PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'0" HIGH CARU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE, STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. (1/A.3) TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS			
PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EDUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'0" HIGH CAU WALL EOUIPMENT ENCLOSURE, STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. (1) COP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS			
PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'0" HIGH CAMU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE, STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. (1) COP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS			
PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'0" HIGH CMU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE. STUCCO AND PANTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS		and the second	
PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ON CONCRETE PAD ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'-0" HIGH CWU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE, STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. 1 TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS			
PROPOSED TRELLIS ABOVE EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'-0" HIGH CMU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE. STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2			
EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'0" HIGH CAU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE, STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. (1) A-3 TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS			LICENSER:
EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'0" HIGH CAU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE, STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. (1) A-3 TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS	PROPOSED TREILIS ARCINE		
EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED ON CONCRETE PAD PROPOSED VERIZON WIRELESS 8'0" HIGH CMU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH. TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEV. ±9'-0" ELEVATIONS	EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE		
CHU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE. STUCCO AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH.	EQUIPMENT CABINET MOUNTED		
AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH.	CMU WALL EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE. STUCCO		
TOP OF PROPOSED EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE ELEV. ±9'-0" C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	AND PAINTED TAN/SANDSTONE FINISH.		
ELEV. ±9'-0"	() ()		
ELEV. ±9'-0"	<u> </u>		
ELEVATIONS	EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE		
	ELEV.	±9'-0'	
		- Carlorente	ELEVATIONS
SHEET NUMBER:	τ <sup>'</sup> Β		
SHEET NUMBER:			La anti-
SHEET NUMBER:			
			SHEET NUMBER:
I I ASSA BASA		Sadavrot	
16' 11x17: 1/16" = 1'-0"	$\frac{16'}{11\times17} \frac{1}{16'} = 1'-0''$		
SCALE $\frac{11 \times 17.1716}{24 \times 36:178} = 1^{-0}$ 2.		2	





## **ATTACHMENT 9**

Photosimulation of proposed telecommunications site



Photosimulation of proposed telecommunications site



## PHOTO STUDY & KEY MAP

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE A NEW DIGITAL PCS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

> Verizon Wireless "KIKA" 12604 La Tortola San Diego, CA 92129

Prepared for: City of San Diego Development Services Department 1222 First Avenue San Diego, CA 92101

Prepared by:

PlanCom, Inc. Contractor Representatives for Verizon Wireless

302 State Place Escondido, CA 92029 Contact: Kerrigan Diehl, Planning Consultant (619) 223-1357

June 18, 2014





## East Elevation



## North Elevation

verizonwireless



## Southeastern Elevation



## Proposed Equipment Location





## View North



## View East



View South



Overall View of the Site





Aerial View of Subject Site



City of San Diego Development Services 1222 First Ave., MS-302 San Diego, CA 92101

## Community Planning Committee Distribution Form Part 1

Project Name:		Project Number:	Distribution Date:		
Verizon Ridgewood Park		379009	12/17/2014		
Project Scope/Location:					
A new Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) Io Penasquitos Community Planning area (CD 5). Th a faux eucalyptus tree. The equipment associated trellis. The project as designed requires a PDP, N	e WCF consists of with this project i	of twelve antennas and tw s located inside a 250-squ	elve remote radio units concealed on uare foot CMU enclosure with a		
Applicant Name:		Applicant Phone	Number:		
Curtis Diehl		(951) 833-5779			
Project Manager:	Phone Number	: Fax Number:	E-mail Address:		
Tse, Simon	(619) 687-598	84 (619) 446-5245	STse@sandiego.gov		
Project Issues (To be completed by Communit	y Planning Com	mittee for initial review	):		
Attach Additional Pages If Necessary. Printed on recycled paper. N	Projec City of Develo 1222 F San Di	return to: t Management Division 'San Diego pment Services Departme irst Avenue, MS 302 ego, CA 92101 www.sandiego.gov/develor			
Printed on recycled paper. Visit our web site at <u>www.sandjego.gov/development-services</u> . Upon request, this information is available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities.					



City of San Diego Development Services 1222 First Ave., MS-302 San Diego, CA 92101

## Community Planning Committee Distribution Form Part 2

Project Name:		Projec	t Number:	Distribution Date:	
Verizon Ridgewood Park			379009	12/17/2014	
Project Scope/Location:					
A new Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) located Penasquitos Community Planning area (CD 5). The We on a faux eucalyptus tree. The equipment associated v trellis. The project as designed requires a PDP, NUP, N	CF consists of tw vith this project i	velve ant s located	ennas and twelv inside a 250-sq	ve remote radio units concealed uare foot CMU enclosure with a	
Applicant Name:			Applicant	Phone Number:	
Curtis Diehl			(951) 833-	5779	
Project Manager:	Phone Numb	er: F	ax Number:	E-mail Address:	
Tse, Simon	(619) 687-59	984 (6	19) 446-5245	STse@sandiego.gov	
Committee Recommendations (To be completed for FACILITY (WLF), PTU # 579009 AT FIDGELU TREE WITH TWEIVE ANTENNAS AS PRESENT	·Initial Review MD PAPL, 12, ED WITH T	): TO AP 604 IA HE FOU	PROVE THE V TORTOLA FO OWINA CO	ERIZON WIRELESS COMMUNI IR A PROPOSED FAUX EUCAUN NOITIGNS:	CATION Prvs
O Vote to Approve	Member	rs Yes	Members No	Members Abstain	
With Conditions Listed Below		rs Yes	Members No 7	Members Abstain -O	
Vote to Approve         Mem           With Non-Binding Recommendations Listed Below         Mem		rs Yes	Members No	Members Abstain	
Vote to Deny Member		s Yes	Members No	Members Abstain	
No Action (Please specify, e.g., Need further information, Split vote, Lack of Continued quorum, etc.)					
CONDITIONS: 1) IN CREASE HEIGHT 3 FEET BOXED CANARY ISLAM PINE TREES AND 5 THAT FUTURE WIRELESS CARRIERS TO THIS	-15 OctUDU	OMROB	TREES IN TH	SHAPE, 2) ADD 5-24" 8 GROVE, AND 3) REQUIRE	
NAME: THOMAS GLARIC	NAME: THOMAS GLARIC TITLE: CHAIR				
SIGNATURE: Dungland			DATE: 3-3-2015		
Attach Additional Pages If Necessary. Please return to: Project Management Division City of San Diego Development Services Department 1222 First Avenue, MS 302 San Diego, CA 92101					
Printed on recycled paper. Visitor Upon request, this information is available					

### SITE JUSTIFICATION Verizon "Kika" 12604 La Tortola San Diego, CA 92129

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This application seeks to install a Wireless Communications Facility (WCF) for Verizon wireless located at 12604 La Tortola in the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park. The project proposes to install a 50' stealth mono-eucalyptus supporting twelve (12) antennas, (12) RRUs and (1) MW dish. The associated equipment necessary to operate the facility will be located at grade inside a 250 sf CMU equipment enclosure with trellis and trim designed to complement the area. The project has been designed to integrate with the existing mature landscape on site while using complimentary building materials and naturalized landscape integration along the exterior of the equipment location.

#### SITE DESIGN

Specifically the project calls for the installation of 3 sectors of 4 antennas with (1) Remote Radio Unit per antenna. Antennas will be painted and screened by FRP foliage socks. The RRUs will be mounted directly behind the antennas. The associated equipment necessary to operate the facility, proposed at grade within a 250 sf integrated equipment building designed to use complimentary building materials and neutral color palette as there are no existing structures within the park. Additionally, native/naturalize ornamental landscape is proposed to screen and help integrate the equipment location so that it do not detract from the park setting.

#### PREFERENCE 2 LOCATION

The proposed facility is located on a zoned residential, RS-1-14 designated property within the PQ Planning Area, however no residential use existing on the site. The project is a Preference 2 location; however the design requires a Planned Development Permit as the height of the proposed Eucalyptus exceeds the 35' height limit in order to better integrate with the existing mature trees all of which are significantly taller than 35'. We believe that the facility as designed is consistent with relevant regulations and provides the best design options to achieve the necessary visual integration while remaining on the periphery of the park so that is primary use is unaffected and unaltered by this siting location.

### ALTERNATIVE SITE ANLYSIS

Topography plays a key role in network engineering of these wireless facilities as the technology is line of sight. Additionally, the existing network supported by established sites also are key influencers. Verizon has several sites in the surrounding vicinity that help serve the area along the commercial corridors but because of the topography and significant elevation drop do not adequately serve the community. The coverage/propagation maps do the best job in graphically representing the coverage need in the area. The existing sites are:

- West Penasquitos located at 12865 Black Mountain Road
- *I-5/Ted Williams* located at 9845 Carmel Mountain Road in the Plaza Rancho Penasquitos shopping center.
- La Quinta SD located on the La Quinta Inn at 10185 Paseo Montril.
- *Ice Arena* located on the San Diego Ice Arena at 11048 Ice Skate Place.

In this case, the Ridgewood Neighborhood Park was selected because it meets the primary coverage objective in serving the immediate neighborhood to the northeast and south. Although Views West Neighborhood Park was investigated it was quickly ruled out as viable because of its close proximity to the I-5/Ted Williams existing site and its ground elevation at approximately 500 feet is significantly higher than that of Ridgewood Park at 300 feet. With a 200' elevation gain the site's coverage would "see" right over the intended neighborhood. Additionally, locating on the Views West Neighborhood Park would have also been locating on a neighborhood park surrounded by residential therefore it was an alternative candidate that did not contribute to a more preferred design/siting opportunity.

### **CO-LOCATION OF WIRELESS FACILITIES**

There are no other known WCFs on site. The Eucalyptus will be designed for colocation should another carrier be interested in the park so that a second structure is not needed to support additional antennas.

#### ATTACHMENT 12

**Kika** 12604 La Tortola San Diego, CA 92129



# Existing coverage











1/21/2015



6/23/2014

**ATTACHMENT 13** 

(BBS)
<b>T C C D</b>

City of San Diego **Development Services** 1222 First Ave. 3rd Floor San Diego, CA 92101

## Development Permit/ Environmental Determination Appeal Application

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

In order to assure your appeal application is successing Information Bulletin 505, "Development Perm	fully accepted and processed, you r its/Environmental Determination A	nust read and understand opeal Procedure".
1. Type of Appeal: Appeal of the Project Appeal of the Environmental Determination	ermination	
2. Appellant: Please check one Applicant Officially r	ecognized Planning Committee 🛛 "	Interested Person" Per M.C. Sec. 113.0103
Name: DON'T CELL OUR PARKS (DCOP)	E-mail Address: shermanlaw@aol.com	
Address: City: 1901 1ST AVE., SUITE 219 SAN DIEGO	State: Zip Code: Te	lephone: 519) 702-7892
3. Project Name: Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Park	nakala – oponina 2000 kon oponina av oponina kalkar – oponiska	
4. Project Information Permit/Environmental Determination & Permit/Document No.: SDP, NDP, and NUP	Date of Decision/Determination:	City Project Manager:
Decision: (Describe the permit/approval decision)	08/26/15	SIMON TSE
This decision was the approval of a Site Development Permit, and Neighborhood Use Permit for the construction and installa		dgewood Park.
5. Grounds for Appeal: (Please check all that apply)	anna an	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
<ul> <li>Factual Error</li> <li>Conflict with other matters</li> <li>Findings Not Supported</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>New Information</li> <li>City-wide Significance (i</li> </ul>	Process Four decisions only)
Description of Grounds for Appeal (Please relate your descr Chapter 11, Article 2, Division 5 of the San Diego Municipal Co	iption to the allowable reasons for app <u>de</u> . Attach additional sheets if necess	eal as more fully described in ary.)
(See Attachment A)		
	1000 Mar	
	RE.	ECEIVED
		SEP 2 2015
	DEVE	OPMENT SERVICES
6. Appellant's Signature: I certify under penalty of perjury tha	t the foregoing, including all names an	d addresses, is true and correct.
Signature:	Date: <u>7-1</u>	-15
Note: Faxed appeals are not ac	cepted. Appeal fees are non-refund	able.
	b site at <u>www.sandiego.gov/development-s</u>	
Upon request, this information is available	e in alternative formats for persons with dis	abilities.

DS-3031 (08-15)

### ATTACHHMENT A

This appeal fully incorporates the August 26, 2015 comment letter filed with the City before the Hearing Officer by Craig A. Sherman on behalf of Don't Cell Our Parks, as well as the written and oral comments made at the June 30, 2015 hearing before the City Council on the related matter and approval for the same project. (Appeal of Environmental Determination for the Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Park Project, Project No. 379009.)

1. City Council Policy No. 700-17, Section VII states in pertinent part: "[f]ollowing designation of a park, nonconflicting nonrecreational uses may only be permitted upon recommendation of the Park and Recreation Board and approval of the City Council."

The Hearing Officer and the appellate body here (the Planning Commission) do not have the jurisdiction or authority to hear this matter, and on those grounds alone should not, and cannot, approve the proposed permits for the Project.

2. The San Diego City Charter trumps the San Diego Municipal Code and City Council Policy.

Section 2 of the San Diego Charter ("Charter") grants power to the City to make and enforce laws and regulations "subject to the restrictions and limitations provided in this Charter."

Section 55 of the Charter sets out explicit restrictions on the use of dedicated parkland. The approval, permitting, construction, and installation of wireless facilities are not authorized without a vote of two-thirds of the San Diego electorate. No municipal code or policy cited by City project manager Simon Tse is applicable, and even if they were, none can conflict or take precedence over the City Charter. Further, the stated City policy - that any activity may be authorized *so long as it does not interfere with recreation or park purposes* - is an impermissible and invalid conflict.

Even if such a policy were valid, there is substantial local resident testimony (before the Hearing Officer and City Council) that the Project would encroach on running and walking paths, free standing exercise equipment (installed by the City to be part of the park), park benches, and other viewsheds and uses. The Applicant has admitted, in comment given on August 26, 2015, that some of the uses will be impaired and that park facilities will be relocated. The Hearing Officer mentioned, but failed to consider, the interference the Project will cause to recreation and park purposes. Further, local residents, making public comment, noted the obtrusive and view-blocking nature of the Project. Park users and residents (and the City's general citizenry) do not want to see such artificial trees in their parks when trying to enjoy the natural environment and adjacent nature preserve. These are substantial interferences and conflicts. The protections set forth in the Charter prohibit our parks from being used in this manner without a public vote. Therefore, the decision of the Hearing Officer is invalid because it unlawfully conflicts and violates Charter Section 55.

3. The Project has already been reviewed, considered, and approved by the City Council by being granted a Class 3 CEQA Exemption. This pre-approval and consideration has infected the review and consideration of the subject permits, thereby necessitating appellant to file an action in the Superior Court of San Diego.

4. In his comment before making a decision, the Hearing Officer stated that he would not consider the legal issues raised because he believed there were "other avenues." This reasoning and justification is incorrect, arbitrary, and a failure of the Hearing Officer to apply the facts of this case to applicable law.

ATTACHMENT 14



## Development Permit/ FORM Environmental Determination DS-3031 Appeal Application August 2015

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

In order to assure your appeal application is successfully accepted and processed, you must read and understand Information Bulletin 505, "Development Permits/Environmental Determination Appeal Procedure".					
1. Type of Appeal: Appeal of the Project	t				
Appeal of the Environ		mination			
2. Appellant: Please check one Applicant	Officially rec	(	Interested Person" Per M.C. Sec. 113.0103		
Name: Steven Smith		E-mail Address: stevecv08@san.rr.com			
Address: 12775 La Tortola	City: San Diego		elephone: 858)538-7674		
3. Project Name: Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Park, Project Num	per 379009				
4. Project Information Permit/Environmental Determination & Permit/Doc		Date of Decision/Determination:	City Project Manager:		
SDP 1330404, NDP 1330403, and NUP 1330402	uniont No	08/26/15	Simon Tse		
Decision: (Describe the permit/approval decision)	nt Dormit Mai	abbarband Dermit Dermit and			
The decision was the approal of a Site Development Neighborhood Development Permit for the constru- Communications Facility in Ridgewood Park.	uction and insta	allation of a Verizon Wireless			
5. Grounds for Appeal: (Please check all that a	pply)				
Factual Error		New Information			
<ul> <li>Conflict with other matters</li> <li>Findings Not Supported</li> </ul>		City-wide Significance (	Process Four decisions only)		
		l'an ta tha a llasa th			
Description of Grounds for Appeal (Please rela Chapter 11, Article 2, Division 5 of the San Diego	e your descrip Municipal Cod	tion to the allowable reasons for app e. Attach additional sheets if necess	eai as more tuily described in sary.)		
See Attachment A - grounds for appeal					
See Attachment B - photographs		RECE	VED		
		RECE	VLL		
			2015		
		SEP 9			
		ODIE	NT SERVICES		
		DEVELOPME			
6. Appellant's Signature: I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing, including all names and addresses, is true and correct.					
Signature: VE 1 VIL Date: 9/8/2015					
Note: Faxed appeals are not accepted. Appeal fees are non-refundable.					
Drinted on required namer Visit our web site at when andiago cru/davelanment aswiece					

Printed on recycled paper. Visit our web site at <u>www.sandiego.gov/development-services</u>. Upon request, this information is available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities.

### Attachment A - page 1 of 5

Steven Smith was present at the Hearing Officer hearing on August 26, 2015, spoke in opposition to the project, and is an interested party eligible to file this appeal.

San Diego City Council Policy 700-06 states:

<u>Dedicated or Designated Parkland and Open Space</u>: The City may grant authorization for encroachment on dedicated or designated parkland and open space if it is determined by the responsible department that the requested action would not only meet criteria for General City property as stated above, but would also be **consistent with City Charter Section 55; i.e., that it would not change or interfere with the use or purpose of the parkland or open space**. Permission for encroachment on dedicated or designated parkland and open space that would benefit only a private party shall not be granted.

a. In addition to complying with the above criteria, **proposed telecommunications facilities must be disguised such that they do not detract from the recreational or natural character of the parkland or open space. Further, proposed telecommunication facilities must be integrated with existing park facilities, and must not disturb the environmental integrity of the parkland or open space.** 

1. There are major aesthetic problems with this proposed Wireless Facility which will "detract from the recreational or natural character of the parkland". The park features 2 sport courts, two sets of children's play equipment, picnic tables, benches, health and wellness stations, sidewalks, walking paths, and sweeping natural views of Los Penasquitos Nature Preserve. The proposal places an antenna structure with a 20 foot upper diameter 10 feet from the heavily utilized walking path. Park users walking this path will be in the shade of the antenna, which is not aesthetic and contrary to the purpose of a park. In addition, the boxy 20' x 11' x 9' (LWH) equipment structure will be only 15.5 feet from the walking path and will block a significant portion of the view to the Los Penasquitos Nature Preserve from this path. It will be clearly visible from all areas of the park. This park was carefully designed and laid out to feature the view of the Nature Preserve by siting the sport courts, picnic tables, fencing, and grove of taller trees against the north hillside, leaving the view to the Preserve open and intact. Aesthetics such as views and openness are an important part of the enjoyment, function, and use of a park. The enjoyment of the beauty of the park is a use. This facility would interfere with these aesthetics, and disturb the environmental integrity of the parkland, and under CP 700-06, would by definition interfere with park use.

2. There is a loss of park usability in at least two areas:

a) A prime secluded shaded area next to the grove of trees would be lost due to the proposed siting of the antenna. This is evidenced by the need to relocate at least one picnic table, most likely both tables, from the antenna site. This picnic area is a well-designed, and well-utilized feature of the park. This area will be compromised by siting the antenna in this location and people will stop using this area. Note that the representative of Parks and Recreation that spoke at the Hearing Officer Hearing, indicated that they did not know if one or both picnic tables would need to be moved, and that it had not been decided where it/they would be moved to.

### Attachment A - page 2 of 5

b) There will be a disruption to one of the circuit training stations. The circuit training course is a perfect ¼ mile concrete loop /track with strategic circuit training stations located specific distances apart along the loop. One of the main circuit training stations is a balance beam approximately 6' long. It is presently sited along the walking path next to several trees and looks out over the Nature Preserve, and is where Verizon is proposing to put the faux eucalyptus tree antenna tower. The plans show that it will be relocated next to the sport court fence, disrupting the proper spacing of the circuit, and it will no longer have a view of the Preserve, thus taking away from the quality of the course.

**3:** The Hearing Officers Finding 1 for a SDP, NDP and a NUP (HO-15-106) that "The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan" is in error. The equipment building is sited at a prominent area of the park that overlooks the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. The park features an unhindered 180 degree view of native chaparral and the open space preserve. The proposed equipment building is in the middle of this view it will become the most prominent feature of the park, creating extensive negative visual impact.

Excerpt from the Hearing Officer findings, HO-15-106, attachment 5:

"The Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan does not address WCFs as a specific land use, but SectionA.15 of the Urban Design section of the City of San Diego's General Plan addresses Wireless Facilities. The intent is to minimize the visual impact of wireless facilities. The General Plan states that wireless facilities should be concealed in existing structures when possible, or otherwise use camouflage and screening techniques to hide or blend the facilities into the surrounding area. It also states that facilities should be designed to be "aesthetically pleasing and respectful to the neighborhood context." ... "The equipment is proposed in a 220square foot CMU enclosure **designed similar to other park buildings**, but with the addition of a trellis rooftop similar to trellises found on residential properties. ... As a result, the design of this WCF will respect the neighborhood context and **blend into the surrounding area with minimal visual impact.**"

<u>There are no "park buildings", or any other buildings in this park, so the design can not be "similar to</u> <u>other park buildings"</u>. This proposed equipment facility will be the first building in the park, and will be visible from all locations in the park, especially the walking path and the sports field. The building is concrete masonry and the building envelope can not be hidden. Adding landscaping will do little to disguise the 9 foot tall, 20 foot wide building, and there are no structures or topographic features in that location that the building will "blend into", let alone have "minimal visual impact". In addition, a significant portion of the view to the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve to the south-west, which is one of the most striking features of this park, will be permanently blocked resulting in a huge visual impact.

Attachment A - page 3 of 5

4. New federal regulations passed under the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 may affect the antenna height and configuration and take precedence of over city regulations. A request for modification can be submitted, and must be approved by the City. The federal regulations apply now and are being incorporated into the Municipal Code as the Spectrum Act Wireless Communications Facilities, under Section 141.0420. The federal regulation states:

SEC. 6409. WIRELESS FACILITIES DEPLOYMENT. (a) FACILITY MODIFICATIONS .— (1) IN GENERAL .—Notwithstanding section 704 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–104) or any other provision of law, a State or local government may not deny, and shall approve, any eligible facilities request for a modification of an existing wireless tower or base station that does not substantially change the physical dimensions of such tower or base station.

Non-substantial has been defined by the FCC as an increase of height up to 10% or 20 feet, whichever is greater. A second array of antenna panels is also permitted as part of the modification. This project, and all future WCF projects, needs to be evaluated with the maximum height permitted under these Facility Modifications regulations. In this case, a 55' high antenna tower sited in the proposed location would impact the park even more, and tower over the walking path and picnic area. It will not fit in well with the existing grove of trees and will pose visual impacts from the public right-of-way. It will negatively impact the aesthetics and use of the park.

5. The Environmental review is deficient because it did not study or consider the impacts to the animal wildlife corridor in the adjacent Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. From the City of San Diego's website: This area is home to many "rare and endangered species", in addition to being "one of the last relatively untouched coastal canyons in the City of San Diego". The Master Plan of the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve also states that "the City's Park Sensitive Development Criteria should be extended to include the land around the perimeter of the Preserve". The boundary lands of the preserve are also protected under the Master Plan of the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve.

Barry Martin, founder of the San Diego Tracking Team, a 501(c)(3) California nonprofit corporation, submitted a document for the August 26 Hearing to Project Manager Tse, regarding the animal wildlife corridor. This document, along with citations, is part of the public record. The concerns in that document are excerpted as follows:

This proposed project area lies adjacent to one of the most constricted and formerly heavily traversed Multiple Species Conservation Program wildlife corridors in the county. This corridor is the only wildlife movement route that connects the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve to habitats east of I-15, which is essential for maintaining genetic diversity of species. This, in turn, is essential for the long-term viability of Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. We have seen that further development and increases in human activity...adjacent

### Attachment A - page 4 of 5

to constricted wildlife movement areas further constricts and often chokes off these narrow corridors, thus increasing habitat fragmentation. At minimum this decreases the probabilities of normal wildlife use and alters the natural mix of species [...] This means that further compromises to an already stressed habitat decreases habitat viability over the long term.

**6.** The City Council is violating its own Council Policy by making this a Process 3. Under CP 700-17 section VIII:

"Following designation of a park, nonconflicting nonrecreational uses may only be permitted upon recommendation of the Park and Recreation Board and approval of the City Council."

This proposed facility is a nonrecreational use. Under Process 3, it may only be appealed to the Planning Commission. The City Council will not have the opportunity to review and approve the project, which is a requirement of their own policy. Note that the City Council action to deny the CEQA appeal was just that, an environmental determination and not a project review or approval.

7. This project has not been approved by the Parks and Recreation Director as required under CP 700-06. The San Diego Parks and Recreation Board has not heard or approved this project, which is required under CP 700-17 and 600-43. The city staff report HO-15-106 only states that: "The Park and Recreation Department participated in the review of the Verizon Ridgewood Neighborhood Park project and determined that it would not violate Charter Section 55." In the Cycle review document L64A-003A, the from 8-5-14 by Parks and Recreation reviewer Jeff Harkness (per Charlie Daniels) only shows specific issues checked off, such as correction of items shown on the plans. There is no indication in the cycles that any determination of compliance to City Charter Section 55 and the applicable council policies including 600-43, 700-06, 700-17 was made. There is no information on record as to what determination was made by Parks and Recreation and who made that determination. A signed determination needs to be part of the public record before the project can be approved. A secret determination prevents the public from having an opportunity to provide input or respond, and may be illegal. Prior to any determination being made by the Parks and Recreation staff, the San Diego Parks and Recreation Board should have reviewed the project and made a recommendation. The only Parks and Recreation review that has been made (and was fully noticed to the public) was by the Rancho Penasquitos Recreation Council, which voted unanimously against approval.

### Attachment A - page 5 of 5

**8.** In the 2013 Omnipoint Communications vs City of Huntington Beach decision, the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals held that the 1996 Telecommunications Act does not trump restrictions in City Charters regarding city owned properties, such as parks. Therefore, City Charter Section 55, and all the city council policies that are based on it (CP 600-43, 700-06, 700-17) will apply and take precedence over the 1996 Telecommunications act. Simply demonstrating a lack of coverage does not automatically grant the right to install a Wireless Communications Facility in a city park. City Charter section 55, and those Council Policies siting section 55 must be complied with.

**9.** In the 2007 Sprint PCS vs the City of Palos Verdes Estates decision, the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals held that aesthetics issues could be considered by cities to deny cellular facilities, and that those considerations take precedence over the 1996 Telecommunications Act. There are many aesthetic issues that have been pointed out throughout this appeal document. The project should be denied due to these issues and the lack of compliance with the Council Policies 600-43, 700-06, and 700-17.

## Ridgewood Park/Verizon - Aesthetics Steve Smith - 09/02/2015







Ridgewood Park/Verizon – Loss of Use Steve Smith – 09/02/2015





		City of San Diego O HEARING O	FFICER	
	IN OI	<b>PPOSIT</b>	ION	
Agenda It	tem Number <u>/</u>	Z Date	8/26/15	
SUBJECT	NERIZON	) WIRELES	5	-
	RIDCE EU	1000 PARK		
NAME	STEVEN) :	SMITH		
		DRTDUA Street		۲.
<u>Shrè</u> State	A TEGO C	<u>A 92/29</u> Zip	858-538- Telephone	207
REPRES	ENTING <u>Se</u>	LF		
ARE YOU YES		N ORGANIZED	PRESENTATION	?
IF YES, I	JIST SPEAKEF	RS IN ORDER (	OF PRESENTATIO	)N:

۰ ٤ ۱



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## MEMORANDUM

DATE:	August 26, 2015
TO:	Hearing Officer
FROM:	Simon Tse, Development Project Manager, DSD
SUBJECT:	<b>RE:</b> Verizon Wireless Ridgewood Park PTS No. 379009 - Compliance with the City of San Diego's Charter Section 55

This memo responds to the comment letters suggesting that the proposed wireless communications facilities (WCF) in Ridgewood Park would violate San Diego Charter Section 55.

Charter Section 55 requires that dedicated parkland be used for park purposes, unless otherwise approved by a vote of the public. The City's practice has been to allow WCF on dedicated parkland as long as the project does not interfere with park purposes and satisfies all applicable City regulations. The City Attorney's Office previously opined that WCF "designed and sited so as not to detract from or interfere with the park or its uses, does not violate the dedication to park use or Charter Section 55." (CAO MOL 2001-23 at p. 18-20.) City regulations are as follow:

- Council Encroachment Policy 700-06 anticipates WCF in parks as long as they do not detract from park purposes.
- San Diego Municipal Code section 141.0420(d) and (i) anticipate WCF in parks by permitting them with an NUP and, an NDP if the associated equipment enclosure is above-ground and if the Park and Recreation Director determines that the enclosure does not violate Charter section 55. Section 141.0420(f) also requires a design that is the least visually intrusive, that uses all reasonable means to minimize visual impacts, and that integrates the WCF with existing structures and landscapes.
- San Diego General Plan section UD-A.15 requires WCF to minimize visual impact, be aesthetically pleasing, and respect the neighborhood context.

For the proposed Ridgewood Park WCF, the Development Services Department relied on the following factors that suggest the project does not interfere with park purposes and satisfies City regulations:

• The Park and Recreation Department determined that the project would not change or interfere with the use of Ridgewood Park as a neighborhood park. The City's standard process for this

Park and Recreation determination was applied here: On January 21, 2015, Park and Recreation Department cleared all associated issues identified in the previous assessment letter which included the evaluation for Charter Section 55, deeming the project not to change or interfere with park uses.

- The WCF is disguised as a mono-eucalyptus tree concealing the antennas and the associated equipment.
- The antenna is proposed to be only 72 inches long and 21 inches wide, even though a 35-foot-tall mono-eucalyptus tree often supports a 96-inch antenna.
- The mono-eucalyptus tree branches are extended 24 inches in front of each antenna.
- The mono-eucalyptus tree has a heavy branch density (3 branches per foot) for a realistic tree appearance.
- The mono-eucalyptus tree mounting apparatus would be painted to match the bark.
- No microwave dish is requested with the project, even though such dishes are usually requested.
- The WCF foot print is minimal considering the WCF regulations allow equipment enclosure up to 250 square feet in size; Verizon is proposing 220 square feet.
- The equipment enclosure is proposed to be a neutral color with a stucco finish, a chainlink lid for security and a trellis top to enhance the design similar to trellis found in residential areas.
- The equipment enclosure is a design commonly approved for other City parks. It is low profile allowing it to better assimilate into the existing vegetation as well as the new landscape proposed by Verizon to further integrate it into the setting.
- The equipment enclosure will be naturally air cooled. No condensers or mechanical cooling mechanisms are proposed.
- The 35-foot-tall mono-eucalyptus tree will be located near mature landscaping including several 50-foot-tall eucalyptus trees, which will ensure the mono-eucalyptus tree does not stand out, and will maintain park aesthetics and character by providing visual context and integration.
- The mono-eucalyptus tree and the equipment enclosure is on the periphery of the park, located away from the sports field and set back from street to ensure the WCF does not interfere with park use.

Simon Tse | <u>Stse@sandiego.gov</u> | Development Project Manager | Office: 619-687-5984 | Development Services | 1222 First Ave 5th Floor San Diego CA 92101

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Parker, Herman" <<u>HParker@sandiego.gov</u>> Date: August 26, 2015 at 8:41:35 AM PDT To: "Tse, Simon" <<u>STse@sandiego.gov</u>> Subject: Ridgewood Park-Verizon

Good morning,

I have determined that the design and location of the facilities proposed for the Ridgewood Park by Verizon Wireless are such that those facilities will not detract from or interfere with the park or its uses. The features of the proposed mono-eucalyptus tree allow it to integrate with the other trees in the immediate vicinity. Also, the minimal footprint, height, location, and design features of the equipment housing allow that facility to integrate aesthetically. Because both facilities will be set back from the field, they will not interfere with park uses.

Herman

Herman D. Parker, Director City of San Diego | Park and Recreation Department <u>HParker@sandiego.gov</u>| 26 619.236.6643

*"To effectively serve and support communities"* City of San Diego Strategic Plan

