

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level 450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804

July 12, 2017

6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Jonathan Livingston, Chair
Michael Hannah
3 vacancies

Tom Leader, Vice Chair
Bhavin Khatri

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Tom Leader and Boardmembers Michael Hannah and Bhavin Khatri

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Roberta Feliciano and Hector Lopez, and Attorney James Atencio, and special telecommunications counsel Jonathan Kramer

RECOGNITION AND AWARDS PRESENTATION (5:00 P.M. TO 6:00 P.M.) – Held previously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None).

Public Forum – Brown Act

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, spoke of his vision for a European modern coffee shop and teen club in Richmond.

City Council Liaison Report – Mayor Tom Butt was not present.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Livingston announced that there were no Consent Calendar items.

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Wednesday, July 26, 2017 by 5:00 p.m. and he announced it after each affected item.

Public Hearings:

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

1. **PLN17-193 - NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH AN ACCESSORY DWELLING**

Description **(HELD OVER FROM JUNE 28, 2017)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT ON A VACANT LOT.

Location 611 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE
APN 534-081-018
Zoning RL2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
Owner MB WORLD GROUP LLC
Applicant TONY VENTOSA
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and brief description of the applicant's request for approval of a design review permit to construct a new single family residence with a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), landscaping and other site improvements on a vacant lot. He said staff recommends approval and was available for any questions of the Board.

Boardmember Hannah questioned and confirmed that the applicant can provide more than the required 2 parking spaces for a total of 3 parking spaces.

Chair Livingston said the applicant has indicated sloping the entire driveway from the back to the front which would require raising the grade by 20" for 80 feet which is 1% and he asked how they will address drainage if they cannot slope the driveway.

Boardmember Hannah asked how this would also affect neighboring properties and how the applicant would manage the stormwater. He also did not see gutters from the roof.

Tony Ventosa, applicant, said he designed the project and he introduced Manuel who is the owner of the property. He has two young children who need space to play, as well as his father who needs to live with them. This will be their first home and they are trying to get the project approved.

Vice Chair Leader suggested the two parking spaces which are in the back of the lot be moved to the side of the house or closer to the one in front, as the owners would save money on concrete and the children would have more room in the back. Mr. Ventosa agreed.

Vice Chair Leader asked and confirmed landscaping was irrigated.

Chair Livingston asked what is planted in the front yard, and Mr. Ventosa said it was mostly bulbs and groundcover.

Boardmember Hannah asked how stormwater would be managed, and Mr. Ventosa said they need to solve how to have it go into the vegetation. He confirmed they would install gutters and design it away from the concrete.

Chair Livingston opened the public comment period, and there were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair Livingston suggested requiring the fence height to be no more than 6' off of existing grade so if a 2' wall is installed, the neighbor will not have an 8' fence. Mr. Lopez noted the code was a maximum of 8' to the sides of the property. Commissioner Hannah suggested a condition to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

require no more than 8' on the sides of the property. Mr. Lopez added that there would be a survey done for the building sign-off, as well as stormwater management.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Leader/Hannah) to approve PLN17-193 with staff's recommended design review findings and staff's recommended conditions with the additional condition to 1) require gutters and downspouts around the entire perimeter of the roof for both units; 2) fencing shall be no higher than 8' above existing grade to adjacent properties; and 3) slide the two rear parking spaces forward to open up room in the rear subject to proper turning radius; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None).

2. PLN17-055 MENDOZA SECOND STORY ADDITION

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 630 SQUARE FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION.

Location 2121 GAYNOR AVE

APN 529-070-020

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

Owner LETICIA MENDOZA-ALVAREZ

Applicant LITO GALVAN

Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and brief description of the applicant's request for approval of a design review permit to construct a second story addition. The project was reviewed by a subcommittee of two Boardmembers who provided comments and staff believes all revisions have been incorporated and recommends approval.

Chair Livingston asked if there were design guidelines for this area, and Mr. Lopez said no. However, staff feels the building is well designed given comments from the subcommittee of Boardmembers.

Boardmember Khatri referred to the Electric Code and addition on the top floor. He asked if the applicant was creating an additional breaker panel. Mr. Lopez said the applicant is constructing an addition as a fourth bedroom. The Building Department will check this and if it is not sufficient, the applicant will need to upgrade it.

Boardmember Hannah said one redeeming feature of the building was the fireplace and exterior brickwork chimney. He asked why the designer would not want to retain and extend what is there. Mr. Lopez clarified that they plan to extend the chimney.

Boardmember Hannah referred to drawing 2.A.8 and suggested the plans be updated to show the retention of the brick chimney.

Leticia Mendoza-Alvarez, owner noted they are putting stucco on the outside of the chimney to match the new look of the house, and Mr. Lopez noted this was recommended by Boardmember Woldemar.

Ms. Mendoza-Alvarez said they purchased the home about 8 years ago and they saw potential for improvement and preservation of its style; however, the house is very old with the need for significant remodel. They want the addition on the second floor due to their family size of 6 plus their grandparents and also want to center the entryway to provide a better look to the front.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

Boardmember Hannah recognized and thanked Ms. Mendoza-Alvarez for the great work on the design and hoped their family enjoys the renovations.

Vice Chair Leader voiced his support.

Chair Livingston referred to the way the tile wraps around the house and said the designer did not show how to finish the tile.

Ms. Mendoza-Alvarez said they are keeping the tile on the roof, but the only difference is that it will be slanted. Chair Livingston suggested continuing the new and the old so the ends fit and wrap together better.

Chair Livingston opened the public comment period, and there were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Leader) to approve PLN17-055 with staff's recommended four design review findings and staff's recommended 11 conditions of approval and the following additional conditions: Condition 12; to add gutters and downspouts and Condition 13; to recreate the existing tile wrap around the edges and repeat this detail at any applicable area for the new building; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None).

3. PLN17-023 NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

Description (HELD OVER FROM JUNE 28, 2017) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT AND VARIANCE FOR A NEW ±1,613 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A 2,800 VACANT LOT.

Location 247 S 3RD STREET

APN 550-120-018

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

Owner RADZIAK WAWRZYNIEC

Applicant SERGIO CASANOVA

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and brief description of the applicant's request for approval of a design review permit and variance for a new single family residence on a 2,800 square foot lot. The project was continued from the previous DRB meeting given the applicant was not present and the Board had questions. The applicant made further changes to extend the stone veneer base along the sides of the building and trim at the front.

Chair Livingston said the City has a requirement for the inside garage space to be no less than 10'x20'. There is a forced air unit and hot water heater which is in the way of the car and he believes the Building Department will not approve this.

Mr. Lopez said as part of the recommendation, staff is asking that this be removed from that area and said there is an alternative space.

Chair Livingston questioned the location of the garbage cans. Mr. Lopez stated the garbage cans are very slim and he clarified their location at the back yard.

Sergio Casanova, designer/applicant, stated he is representing the owner who lives in San Francisco and is purchasing the lot for he and his family to live.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

Boardmember Hannah referred to wrapping stone around the front and he clarified it would extend to the second window on the side. For the right elevation under Drawing B.A.2, he suggested going back to align with the main second floor above at a minimum and provided a sketch to Mr. Lopez. He said the other comment was to make the second story front window trim consistent with the other window trims and not flaring it out at the bottom. He also recommended removing the shutters because they are false and the area is too tight to the corner of the stucco.

Mr. Casanova said he agreed with removing the shutters, but said the stone wainscoting will not be seen from the front at all. While it might look okay, it is a cost issue. He also said there is a wooden fence to block it.

Boardmember Hannah said they want to embed this into the architecture as the fence could be removed and is not a requirement, as well as trees. He thought the money saved on the shutters could be used for the extra stone and flare out bottom window trim.

Boardmember Hannah added that his third comment is the arch at the front entry should be a true or elliptical arch and not a rounded flat arch, and the front door should be code minimum.

Vice Chair Leader referred back to the garbage area and asked and confirmed there would be a 3' wide sidewalk along the side of the house. Mr. Casanova added there is a pad as well on the side.

Chair Livingston asked where the fence starts and stops on the sides. Mr. Casanova said the first portion at the front will be 3' high to up to 6' at the back and there will be no gate in the front.

Chair Livingston referred to the masonry on the left side which is a protection barrier between the neighbors leading to the front door and said it does not match the front elevation and he suggested making the front elevation match the side elevation. Boardmember Hannah noted this was a graphic error and confirmed with the applicant that they both match.

Chair Livingston opened the public comment period and there were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Khatri/Leader) to approve PLN17-023 with staff's recommended four design review findings and staff's recommended conditions of approval with the additional condition that; 1) the masonry will return on the right side to the building line above; 2) that the shutters will be eliminated in the front elevation; 3) to eliminate the dog ears at the bottom of the window trim; 4) require the front entry arch to be elliptical; and 5) that the side elevation masonry should match the front or the lower of the two; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None).

Recusal:

Boardmember Leader recused himself from participating in Items 4 and 5 and left the meeting.

- 4. PLN16-658, PLN16-682, PLN16-683, PLN16-684, PLN16-685, PLN16-686, PLN16-687, PLN16-688, PLN16-689, PLN16-695, PLN16-696, PLN16-697, PLN16-698, PLN16-699, PLN16-701: DESIGN REVIEW FOR 15 SMALL CELL SITE NODES**

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REQUESTS FOR 15 DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT APPLICATIONS TO INSTALL A SMALL CELL SITE ON EXISTING PG&E POLES LOCATED WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, ADJACENT TO THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 600 CHANSLOR AVENUE (PLN16-658), 330 CHANSLOR AVENUE (PLN16-6821), 112 CHANSLOR AVENUE (PLN16-683), 145 6TH STREET (PLN16-684), 520 BISSELL AVENUE (PLN16-685), 310 BISSELL AVENUE (PLN16-686), 336 BISSELL AVENUE (PLN16-687), 156 2ND STREET (PLN16-688), 110 BISSELL AVENUE (PLN16-689), 438 S 26TH STREET (PLN16-695), 2404 CUTTING BLVD. (PLN16-696), 370 S 24TH STREET (PLN16-697), 708 CHANSLOR AVENUE (PLN16-698), 1000 CHANSLOR AVENUE (PLN16-699), AND 401 S 28TH STREET (PLN16-701). GENERALLY EACH PROJECT CONSISTS OF THE APPLICANT ADDING ANTENNAS, POLE ARMS, RADIO TRANSMISSION AND POWERING EQUIPMENT, AS WELL AS CABLES AND WIRES ON AND ATTACHED TO AN EXISTING PG&E POLE TO BENEFIT T-MOBILE. ALL SITES EXCEPT PLN-685, -696, AND -699 ARE LOCATED WITHIN THE RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT. PLN16-685 IS LOCATED IN THE CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE ACTIVITY CENTER ZONING DISTRICT, PLN16-696 IS IN THE CM-1, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, RESIDENTIAL/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICTS, AND PLN16-699 IS IN THE CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT.

Owner PG&E UTILITY POLES; CITY OF RICHMOND RIGHT-OF-WAY

Applicant EXTENET SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA) LLC

Planner LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

5. **PLN16-690, PLN16-691, PLN16-692, PLN16-693, PLN16-694, PLN16-700, PLN16-702, PLN16-703, PLN16-704, PLN16-705, PLN16-706, PLN16-707, PLN16-708, PLN16-709, PLN16-710, PLN16-711: DESIGN REVIEW FOR 16 SMALL CELL SITE NODES**

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REQUESTS FOR 15 DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT APPLICATIONS TO INSTALL A SMALL CELL SITE ON EXISTING PG&E POLES LOCATED WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, ADJACENT TO THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 612 12TH ST. (PLN16-690), 646 12TH ST. (PLN16-691), 601 HARBOUR WAY (PLN16-692), 685 HARBOUR WAY (PLN16-693), 1632 BISSELL AVE. (PLN16-694), 1458 YORK ST. (PLN16-700), 1200 ROOSEVELT AVE. (PLN16-702), 1801 BISSELL AVE. (PLN16-703), 1830 CHANSLOR AVE. (PLN16-704), 101 17TH ST. (PLN16-705), 1400 CHANSLOR AVE. (PLN16-706), 335 21ST ST. (PLN16-707), 1434 BISSELL AVE. (PLN16-708), 2033 CHANSLOR AVE. (PLN16-709), 1458 YORK ST. (PLN16-710), AND 533 HARBOUR WAY (PLN16-711). GENERALLY EACH PROJECT CONSISTS OF THE APPLICANT ADDING ANTENNAS, POLE ARMS, RADIO TRANSMISSION AND POWERING EQUIPMENT, AS WELL AS CABLES AND WIRES ON AND ATTACHED TO AN EXISTING PG&E POLE TO BENEFIT T-MOBILE. PLN-690, -691, -700, -702 AND -701 ARE LOCATED WITHIN THE RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT. PLN16-692, -693, AND -711 ARE LOCATED IN THE CM-2, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, NEIGHBORHOOD DISTRICT, PLN16-694, -703, -707, AND -708 IS IN THE CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE ACTIVITY CENTER ZONING DISTRICT/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICTS, PLN16-704, -705, AND -709 ARE IN THE RM-2/IS-1, MEDIUM-

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICTS, AND PLN16-706 IS IN THE CM-1/IS-1, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, RESIDENTIAL/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICTS.

Owner PG&E UTILITY POLES; CITY OF RICHMOND RIGHT-OF-WAY
Applicant EXTENET SYSTEMS (CALIFORNIA) LLC
Planner LINA VELASCO TENTATIVE Recommendation: **RECOMMEND
CONDITIONAL APPROVAL TO PLANNING COMMISSION**

Jonathan Kramer, Head of Telecom Law Firm, said their firm has worked as a legal advisor for the City on the small cell site projects. A group of 15 sites has already been heard by the Planning Commission and the second group of 16 will be heard on July 20th.

Ms. Feliciano stated on behalf of Ms. Velasco, she will present both Items 4 and 5. She said Item 4 was reviewed at the June 29th Planning Commission meeting and approved. During that meeting the Commission voiced concerns regarding aesthetic impacts and asked the Board to make a recommendation for the remaining 16 sites, or Item 5. With that, the Board would also make a decision on Item 4 even though the CUPs have been approved for those 15 sites.

Ms. Feliciano said the 31 small cell sites are to be located on right-of-way poles. One-third is in commercial mixed use zones and the remaining in residential zones. The applicant team is present with a mockup and presentation for the Board. She said Jonathan Kramer is also available to answer questions or provide guidance on both items.

Chair Livingston asked if the Board has conditions of approval before them, and Ms. Feliciano stated these are listed in the staff report. There are no formal additions except that the Commission expressed concerns regarding aesthetics and wanted to refer this to the DRB. Dr. Kramer added that the Commission also requested a mockup be provided to the DRB and felt it would inform the DRB's decision.

Chair Livingston asked for an explanation of SB 649. Dr. Kramer said this bill is currently going to the Assembly which would substantially change the process of locating cell sites on utility poles, City owned light standards or anything vertical that the City owns or controls. A hearing was held today which passed that committee. It would change this process to a ministerial one. The bill, if passed, would still allow the City to create design standards and check the installations against those, but the standards would more or less be a one-size-fits-all for the City.

If passed by the Assembly, it would go to the Senate and then for the Governor's signature and it could also be vetoed. He explained under federal law, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 states local governments must make a determination on wireless projects within a reasonable timeframe. From 1996 to 2008, this was not a problem but the FCC established a "shot clock". For new projects, it is 150 days from the application date to a decision. The applicant tonight has "tolled" the applications so staff can accommodate all projects, but it is a fast track and expires around the 24th or 28th of this month. If the shot clock is missed, the applicant would have 30 days to sue the City and have a judge make a decision. However, AB 57 was passed 3 years ago which said if a City missed a deadline projects would be deemed approved by operation of law.

Chair Livingston stated that if these are approved, it would more or less become the aesthetic which would be asked of other carriers. Therefore, he saw this as a general approval. Dr.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

Kramer said each installation is different and each carrier has different equipment as well. The design before the Board tonight is unlikely a similar design of at least two other carriers.

Chair Livingston asked and confirmed that carriers buy transmitters from multiple vendors and antennas are based on what the wireless carrier wants to cover, such as a full 360 degree pattern. The projects tonight are small cell sites and cover about one-third of that.

Chair Livingston suggested creating guidelines and Dr. Kramer said until more is known about whether the law passes or not, the City cannot develop guidelines. The City has DRB standards and the City's wireless ordinance that exist which currently constrain the process. If SB 649 passes, the City will engage in a process to come up with citywide standards, but this applicant has a complete application and the City must act on it.

Chair Livingston said all cities are dealing with the same issue slightly different, and he asked how Richmond fits into all of this. He asked if Richmond can look at other cities to compare as to what it might like to see.

Dr. Kramer said the Board can request this to provide a comparison so as to be treated equally or better. Tonight, the Board should discuss the projects before them and Extenet is the applicant and contractor building a network for T-Mobile. Many technical questions and constraints come from T-Mobile's engineering, and Extenet is a telephone corporation registered with the PUC.

Boardmember Khatri asked if there is a standard already created which Richmond could use for all carriers.

Dr. Kramer said yes, if SB 649 passes, and if it does not pass, the standards would be initiated by the City Council.

Boardmembers then discussed carriers, housing of equipment on poles, laws regarding FCC compliance, RF and electrical output of antennas, and cell coverage.

Charles Lindsey, Extenet Small Cell Wireless Network, applicant, gave a brief background of their company and said they are not a contractor for T-Mobile but they are one of their clients. They are a telephone infrastructure company specializing in wireless cellular equipment, wireless broadband and fiber infrastructure. They identify a need for coverage and capacity off load and they install infrastructure in that area. The client leases that infrastructure from them to transmit their signal. He noted there is a tremendous draw on the network and other carriers can come behind T-Mobile and use this equipment.

Mr. Lindsey then gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding updates to JPA and telephone poles, showing two radios and transmitters per pole painted brown to match the pole and painted transformers which he recommended as a condition, and a series of photographs and views of examples of poles, outdoor cabinets and equipment related to the installations.

Chair Livingston asked why they need to suspend the apparatus 6" off of the pole. Mr. Lindsey said GO95 rules restrict them from flush mounting to the pole but if the City conditions this, they can do this. He then discussed recommendations to paint equipment grey and not brown.

Chair Livingston pointed to a pole in San Francisco with an antenna on top and asked if this would be similar. Mr. Lindsey said this design is not available for the JPA poles as they are proposing the use of telephone poles.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

Chair Livingston questioned paint standards. Dr. Kramer said the City requires a flat, non-reflective brown or grey to match the pole. If it fades or chips, this would be a code enforcement issue and the City would send a notice for repainting. He suggested this also be a condition of approval.

Boardmember Khatri asked if there was a possibility to combine boxes. Mr. Lindsey said they could do this but the boxes would become much larger. After looking at photo-simulations and other designs, they thought it would be better for the community.

Chair Livingston asked for the cost difference for putting the outdoor cabinets into the ground. Mr. Lindsey said there are issues regarding ADA and accessibility issues, as well as additional noise because the units need to be cooled underground.

Chair Livingston asked for Dr. Kramer's opinion regarding the ground mounted radio control units.

Dr. Kramer said there are specific vaults for this type of equipment and located in various jurisdictions. He agreed there are ADA issues and a number of sites for these projects have very narrow sidewalks which would not support undergrounding, but some would. If the DRB wished to require this, they can and the issue of cooling is typically not significant. The bigger issue is ADA compliance and he has visited hundreds of underground facilities and noise is not an issue as well because there is background noise which is substantially greater.

Boardmember Hannah asked if the flush mounting can be done with the weather head detail and the meter mounting. Mr. Lindsey said the meter mounting is a GO95 requirement.

Chair Livingston asked and confirmed Mr. Lindsey did not have specifications with him regarding the ground mounted boxes, as this is not part of their application.

Dr. Kramer noted these finish and are flush to grade and are vaults and would remove the boxes from the sides of the poles. The PG&E power meter element would still be at the pole due to the tariff requirement, and he described the conduit. Mr. Lindsey noted this installation is done by PG&E separate from their application.

Chair Livingston opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

MARK MASON, Richmond, referred to his written comments included in the packet and cited visual blight and history of the City's non-responsiveness to it. He voiced concerns, stating he lives within a few meters of two proposed installations and said the neighborhood has been inundated with billboards, signage, and construction, and this will add to blight. He asked that the City underground its utilities at some time in the future and thinks this technology will be obsolete in a few years.

KARRY WANG asked if staff or the consultant responded to Dr. Mason's letter and voiced concerns regarding health implications from the installations, asked what improvements would be seen other than cell phone coverage for residents and asked how sites were selected.

MARY BROWN voiced concerns with the potential she will not get a choice in carriers other than T-Mobile, asked what benefits residents receive, and voiced concerns with health impacts

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

from noise and radiation. She also asked if the City could restrict the mass production of so many cell facilities which are concentrated within a few streets.

Dr. Kramer addressed speakers' comments and discussed health safety standards and the fact that cell facilities are well below the FCC limits, said each wireless carrier operates on its own assigned frequencies so residents can use whichever carrier they want, said the City does not receive rents or profits from the installations, said residents would need to be 5 feet to any antennas to experience any health risk and utility workers switch off the site for maintenance purposes. He explained that safety signage must be posted per FCC law, and he concluded by stating permits are limited to a 10 year review.

Mr. Lindsey invited residents and Boardmembers to a July 17th neighborhood outreach meeting where engineers from Hammett & Edison will answer questions and be providing a presentation.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmembers thanked the applicant team for their presentation and Dr. Kramer's consultation, recognized federal law standards, recommended two-tone painting and use of underground vaults be used wherever possible, flush mounting, and addressing blight.

Dr. Kramer suggested the DRB consider a condition stating the DRB recognizes this is an issue of first impression and that the decisions made are not precedent for future deployment of future locations or other configurations. Given SB 649, the DRB should maintain its flexibility for the future and engage in a separate process to develop design standards for all sites.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Khatri) to approve PLN16-658, PLN16-682, PLN16-683, PLN16-684, PLN16-685, PLN16-686, PLN16-687, PLN16-688, PLN16-689, PLN16-695, PLN16-696, PLN16-697, PLN16-698, PLN16-699, PLN16-701: DESIGN REVIEW FOR 15 SMALL CELL SITE NODES, with staff's recommended design review findings and staff's recommended conditions and the following additional conditions: 1) that the DRB recognizes this is an issue of first impression and that the decisions made are not precedent for future deployment of future locations or other configurations; 2) to require the control radio units and associated wires and bundles be housed in underground vaults wherever possible given constraints of ADA; 3) that the 1/3 bottom part of the antennas be painted brown and the top 2/3 grey and that paint shall be 2-part, flat Kenar brand or similar; and 4) that the all conduit be flush mounted; approved by voice vote: 3-0-1 (Ayes: Hannah, Khatri and Livingston; Noes: None; Recused: Leader).

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to recommend conditional approval to the Planning Commission of PLN16-690, PLN16-691, PLN16-692, PLN16-693, PLN16-694, PLN16-700, PLN16-702, PLN16-703, PLN16-704, PLN16-705, PLN16-706, PLN16-707, PLN16-708, PLN16-709, PLN16-710, PLN16-711: DESIGN REVIEW FOR 16 SMALL CELL SITE NODES, with staff's recommended design review findings and staff's recommended conditions and the following additional conditions: 1) that the DRB recognizes this is an issue of first impression and that the decisions made are not precedent for future deployment of future locations or other configurations; 2) to require the control radio units and associated wires and bundles be housed in underground vaults wherever possible given constraints of ADA; 3) that the 1/3 bottom part of the antennas be painted brown and the top 2/3 grey and that paint shall be 2-part, flat Kenar brand or similar; and 4) that the all conduit be flush mounted; approved by voice vote: 3-0-1 (Ayes: Hannah, Khatri and Livingston; Noes: None; Recused: Leader).

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

Dr. Kramer stated he will inform the Board and staff regarding any updates for SB 649.

Board Business

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements – None**
- B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements – None**

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, July 26, 2017.