

CLAREMONT ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

MEETING AGENDA

“We are a vibrant, livable, and inclusive community dedicated to quality services, safety, financial strength, sustainability, preservation, and progress with equal representation for our community.”

City Council Chamber
225 Second Street
Claremont, CA 91711



Wednesday
October 09, 2019
7:00 PM

COMMISSIONERS

MARK SCHOEMAN
CHAIR

WAEN MESSNER

BOB PERRY

BRIAN WORLEY

JOHN NEIUBER

SCOTT HORSLEY

FRANK PERRI

CALL TO ORDER THE MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

ROLL CALL

CEREMONIAL MATTERS, PRESENTATIONS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Commission has set aside this time for persons in the audience who wish to comment on items that ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA, but are within the jurisdiction of the Architectural Commission. Members of the audience will later have the opportunity to address the Architectural Commission regarding ALL OTHER ITEMS ON THE AGENDA at the time the Commission considers those items.

At this time the Commission will take public comment for 30 minutes. Public Comment will resume later in the meeting if there are speakers who did not get an opportunity to speak because of the 30-minute time limit.

The Brown Act prohibits the Commission from taking action on oral requests relating to items that are not on the agenda. The Commission may engage in a brief discussion, refer the matter to staff, and/or schedule requests for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

The Commission requests, but does not require, speakers to identify themselves. When you come up to speak, please state your name unless you wish to remain anonymous. Each speaker will be allowed four (4) continuous minutes.

CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed on the consent calendar are considered to be routine. The Architectural Commission or one or more Commissions and/or Committees have previously considered most of the items on the consent calendar. The Commission may act on these items by one motion following public comment.

Only Commissioners may pull an item from the consent calendar for discussion.

The Commission will waive reading of resolutions. Each resolution will be numbered following Commission approval.

Now is the time for those in the audience to comment on the consent calendar. Each speaker will be allowed four (4) continuous minutes to comment on items on the consent calendar.

1. ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2019

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Architectural Commission approve the Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes of September 25, 2019.

Attachment(s): Draft Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes of September 25, 2019

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM

2. RESOLUTION TO DENY ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE PLAN REVIEW #16-A09, REVIEW OF PROPOSED 63-FOOT TALL STEEPLE/BELL TOWER TO SERVE AS A CONCEALED WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY FOR VERIZON WIRELESS LOCATED AT 509 S. COLLEGE AVENUE. (#16-SUDP11, A STAFF LEVEL SPECIAL USE & DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW IS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS APPLICATION) APPLICANT - SMARTLINK, LLC ON BEHALF OF VERIZON WIRELESS

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Architectural Commission adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CLAREMONT TO DENY ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE PLAN REVIEW #16-A09, REVIEW OF PROPOSED 63-FOOT TALL STEEPLE/BELL TOWER TO SERVE AS A CONCEALED WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY FOR VERIZON WIRELESS LOCATED AT 509 S. COLLEGE AVENUE. (#16-SUDP11, A STAFF LEVEL SPECIAL USE & DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW IS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS APPLICATION) APPLICANT - SMARTLINK, LLC ON BEHALF OF VERIZON WIRELESS citing the following criteria pursuant to Section 16.300.060.A of the Municipal Code were not met: General Plan Consistency, Compatibility of Form with Surrounding Development, Compatibility of Quality with Surrounding Development, Internal Consistency of Design, and Health and Safety

Attachment(s): Draft Denial Resolution

PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

Each speaker providing public comment will be allowed four (4) continuous minutes to speak, which cannot be delegated.

REPORTS**Commission**

Mayor/Chair Meeting

Commissioner Comments

Staff

Briefing on Council Meetings

Briefing on Other Items

Upcoming Agendas and Events

ADJOURNMENT

THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE CLAREMONT ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION WILL BE HELD ON OCTOBER 23, 2019, AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE CLAREMONT CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER, 225 SECOND STREET.

MATERIALS RELATED TO AN ITEM ON THIS AGENDA, AND SUBMITTED TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA, ARE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC IN THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE AT 207 HARVARD AVENUE, CLAREMONT, MONDAY THROUGH THURSDAY, 7 AM – 6 PM. SUBJECT MATERIALS WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE ON THE CITY WEBSITE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE - www.ci.claremont.ca.us. For more information, please call the City Clerk's Office at 909-399-5461.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990, THIS AGENDA WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE IN APPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVE FORMATS TO PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES. ANY PERSON WITH A DISABILITY WHO REQUIRES A MODIFICATION OR ACCOMMODATION IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN A CITY MEETING SHOULD CONTACT THE CITY CLERK AT 909-399-5461 "VOICE" OR 1-800-735-2929 "TT/TTY" AT LEAST THREE (3) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING, IF POSSIBLE.

I, NHI ATIENZA, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT OF THE CITY OF CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING AGENDA WAS POSTED AT CLAREMONT CITY HALL, 207 HARVARD AVENUE, ON OCTOBER 3, 2019, PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54954.2.

ANY ITEMS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN INITIATED BY 10:00 P.M. WILL BE CONTINUED TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEETING. FURTHER, ANY ITEM INITIATED BEFORE 10:00 P.M. ON WHICH A CONCLUSION HAS NOT BEEN REACHED BY 10:15 P.M. WILL BE CONTINUED TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION.

POST THROUGH: OCTOBER 10, 2019



Claremont Architectural Commission

Agenda Report

File #: 3081

Item No: 1.

TO: ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

FROM: BRAD JOHNSON, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

DATE: OCTOBER 9, 2019

Reviewed by:
Finance Director: N/A

SUBJECT:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2019

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Architectural Commission approve the Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes of September 25, 2019.

PUBLIC NOTICE PROCESS

This item has been noticed through the regular agenda notification process. Copies are available at the City Hall public counter, Youth Activity Center, Alexander Hughes Community Center, and City website.

Submitted by:

Prepared by:

Brad Johnson
Community Development Director

Nhi Atienza
Administrative Assistant

Attachment:

Draft Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes of September 25, 2019

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**
Wednesday, September 25, 2019 – 7 p.m.
City Council Chamber
225 W. Second Street, Claremont, California

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Schoeman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS HORSLEY, NEIUBER, PERRI, PERRY, SCHOEMAN, AND WORLEY

ABSENT: COMMISSIONER MESSNER

ALSO PRESENT CHRIS VEIRS, PRINCIPAL PLANNER; NIKOLA HLADY, ASSOCIATE PLANNER; AND NHI ATIENZA, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

CEREMONIAL MATTERS, PRESENTATIONS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS1. **Selection of Chair and Vice Chair**

Principal Planner Veirs invited the Commissioners to nominate a Chair to the Architectural Commission.

Commissioner Neuber nominated Commissioner Schoeman to be the Chair of the Commission. Commissioner Perry seconded the nomination. Commissioner Schoeman accepted his nomination.

Principal Planner Veirs invited public comment. Seeing no requests to speak, public comment was closed.

Commissioner Neuber moved to approve Commissioner Schoeman as Chair of the Architectural Commission for 2019-2020; seconded by Commissioner Perry; and, carried on the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: HORSLEY, NEIUBER, PERRI, PERRY, SCHOEMAN, AND WORLEY

NOES: None

ABSENT: COMMISSIONER MESSNER

Chair Schoeman invited the Commissioners to nominate a Vice Chair to the Architectural Commission.

Commissioner Neiuber nominated Commissioner Perry as Vice Chair of the Architectural Commission. Commissioner Horsley seconded the nomination. Commissioner Perry accepted his nomination.

Chair Schoeman invited public comment. Seeing no requests to speak, public comment was closed.

Commissioner Neiuber moved to approve Commissioner Perry as Vice Chair of the Architectural Commission for 2019-2020; seconded by Commissioner Horsley; and, carried on the following vote:

**AYES: COMMISSIONERS: HORSLEY, NEIUBER, PERRI, PERRY,
SCHOEMAN, AND WORLEY**
NOES: None
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER MESSNER

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Schoeman invited public comment. Seeing no requests to speak, public comment was closed.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes of September 11, 2019

Chair Schoeman invited public comment. Seeing no requests to speak, public comment was closed.

Staff noted that there were two written public comments that had been distributed to commissioners and made available to the audience in the Council foyer.

Commissioner Perry moved that the Architectural Commission Meeting Minutes of September 11, 2019, be approved as submitted; seconded by Commissioner Perri; and, carried on a vote as follows:

**AYES: COMMISSIONERS: HORSLEY, NEIUBER, PERRI, PERRY, AND
SCHOEMAN**
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONER: WORLEY
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER: MESSNER

PUBLIC HEARING

3. Architectural and Site Plan Review #16-A09, Review of Proposed 63-Foot Tall Steeple/Bell Tower to Serve as a Concealed Wireless Telecommunications Facility for Verizon Wireless Located at 509 S. College Avenue. (#16-SUDP11, a Staff Level

Special Use & Development Permit Review is Associated with this Application)
Applicant – Smartlink, LLC on Behalf of Verizon Wireless

Associate Planner Hlady presented a PowerPoint presentation and addressed Commissioners' questions regarding the: a) applicant addressing Staff's concerns; b) evaluation of other possible locations; c) request for any community feedback; d) height of existing building; e) purview of the Architectural Commission; f) material used for the St. Ambrose Church bell tower; and g) rationale for trapezoidal shape.

Jim Rogers of Smartlink, LLC, and applicant for Verizon Wireless ("Verizon") stated that Verizon identified a gap in coverage in 2013 and worked with a prior company to select the rear parking lot for a tower. He took over the project in 2016. It was determined that the previous design, which included a faux-tree structure, did not make sense, the selected location took out too many parking spaces, and the area would need to expand further to accommodate for landscaping; hence the current location. This location did not affect any function or parking spaces, blended better on the site, and would give the church visual notice. The location and height would cover the majority of a coverage gap that extends from the San Bernardino freeway to First Street between Indian Hill Boulevard and Mills Avenue. He noted that adding the decorative tip of the trapezoid raised the height by 3 feet. He worked closely with Staff and has met all the code requirements. This is a good facility and Verizon will provide all FCC compliance certifications. He urged the Commission to approve the project.

Commissioner Perry inquired if the applicant in the site assessment process considered the surrounding community since this is a sensitive issue.

Mr. Rogers responded yes, it would be foolish not to. In the St. Ambrose bell tower, he consulted with the neighborhood and it turned out to be a good project. He explained that Verizon did look at a number of locations, but that available sites in this area are limited. The church was interested in the project and took to the proposed drawings. In order to propose a site, he must have a willing property owner.

Commissioner Worley inquired if the facility will allow other carriers to piggy-back off of it. Mr. Rogers stated that Verizon does not prohibit it and has never stopped it from happening. The current design lends itself well to co-location as it could be accomplished by a simple swap-out of the lower panels.

Commissioner Horsley inquired why the street trees are so small and if the size of the trees affected the frequency. Mr. Rogers replied that those are existing trees, the project plans add some addition trees on the right of way to soften the area, and yes, the size of trees does affect signal transmission.

Commissioner Schoeman had the following questions:

- What material will be used for the skin of the tower? Per Mr. Rogers, it would be plywood with a stucco exterior.
- Who will be responsible to maintain the tower? Per Mr. Rogers, Verizon is.

- To only cover 2/3 of the area, would it be better is put in a facility further away to have 100% coverage? Per Mr. Rogers, current usage demands are more residential as opposed to commercial in the past. Verizon has identified this as an issue area since 2013.
- If we were to limit the tower to 50 feet, would it kill the project? Mr. Rogers said he would need to consult with Verizon on that. He then noted that lower towers result in the need for more facilities and those facilities may not be in good locations. If there was a better location, we would have considered it.

Commissioner Worley inquired if Mr. Rogers envisioned any change in technology for broader coverage. It's always guess work as there will always be new technology. From his experience, the trend shows more facilities, even with the development of new technology due to the growth in consumer demand.

Commissioner Schoeman had the following additional questions:

- What about 5G? Per Mr. Rogers, it is not proposed for this tower or area.
- Will 5G have the same footprint as the tower and poles on the right-of-way? Per Mr. Rogers, it will be put on existing towers or street poles (small cells). It might be a combination of tower and street poles, which will not be screened.
- Are we building something that will be obsolete in ten years? Per Mr. Rogers, no.

Chair Schoeman invited public comment.

Steven Adams lives just west of the spiritual center and his comments are as follows:

- The facility will not cover 100% of the area, which is a folly.
- The property line shown on the map is in error as it includes 10 feet of his property. The setback is 39 feet as opposed to the 49 feet.
- Building this structure will reduce his property value by 20%. He is retired, lives on social security, and will not be able to sustain this loss.
- Architecturally, this six-story structure does not fit in a residential area and Claremont does not allow for high rises.
- He lives right next door and has not received any notice except for the 10-day notice.
- To address the concern over the loss of parking spaces, he has never seen the parking lot full.
- Since church does not pay taxes, the schools will not receive any benefit from the property rental.

Lori Bleich lives 407 feet away from the church and had the following comments:

- She has health concerns.
- She is appalled that this has been in the works for ten years and she's just finding out about it.
- She has been in her home since 1991, has a lot of equity in it, and is concerned about the 20% devaluation of her property. Verizon or the City does not have any right to do so.
- HUD has categorized cell towers as a hazard and nuisance.

- Whether the health concern is valid or not, public perception will drive people away from the neighborhood.
- From her research of realtors, she has found that cell towers deter sales, lower home prices, and are undesirable due to stigma.
- She believes that this is a commercial facility and it does not belong in a residential area.
- There may not have been complaints with the St. Ambrose facility since that community is mainly comprised of apartment renters with no say.
- According to the Tax Relief Act of 2012, companies can raise the tower by 20 feet without any notification.
- This facility does not belong in a residential area and begs Smartlink to look for another location.

Jesus Gomez stated that the purpose of a church bell tower is to pull the community together. The words used today are, “disguise, screen, and hide.” These words are used since it is harmful, not wanted, and is a business proposal. This is a business transaction for money, not for the benefit of the community. The Commission should have done their job to screen this from getting to this point.

Edward Graff is a resident of Upland, former member of the church’s board of trustees, and former employee of Verizon/Frontier. The tower is an important communication structure to Claremont. The rental income will be used for repairs/upgrades and 10% will be donated to local organizations. He and his wife are very much a part of the community through their involvement and request that the Commission approve the design and construction of the tower.

Fiona Luke expressed her concerns for the massive eye soar standing apart from the other structures, loss of control for any additional height upon approval, health issues, and decrease in property value. It is not a lack of cellular service in the area, it's only Verizon. This is a business decision. She urged the Commission to balance the needs of the community.

Laura Amador's comments are as follow:

- She is opposed to the project and request for the Commission to deny it.
- There is a potential 20% to 30% decrease in property value.
- She is submitting 50 signatures opposing the project.
- There is a lack of information provided, she requested for alternative sites to be provided to residents. Why was Technip not considered?
- If the area is zoned for this tower, it does not architecturally fit into the neighborhood. This project only reflects the two groups, Verizon and Claremont Spiritual Living Center, not the broader community.
- She proposed that the zoning be changed to reduce the impact on the residences.
- She challenged to Commission to follow the European Union's lead to bring all parties to the table and require stricter distance requirements.
- The Commission should follow the code to protect the residents.
- The project should be taken elsewhere.

Marianne Cordova Green is a member of the Claremont Spiritual Living Center. She stated that we all need cell tower and dog parks, but do not want them close to us. The tower will help the church maintain its facilities, which is hard to do these days. We live in an urban area and need our cell phones. The church does not care where the tower goes. We may lose the church if we are not able to maintain the facility. Something will eventually be built in the space, its just part of urban living.

Lois Sicking Deeter, a 30 year Upland resident stated the following:

- Verizon has not provided any data for the gap in coverage since 2013. They are back now because 5G is here. Verizon was in Upland last year trying for 5G.
- She is not able to find the agenda packet and is seeing it for the first time tonight. She finds the photo to not be in perspective and the drawings are not to scale.
- Verizon has not provided the data for alternative sites. They found the first willing participant and went with it.
- Upland is way ahead of Claremont in regards to its codes regarding the distance from a cell tower to residence. It now requires 1,500 feet in clearance as opposed to 100 feet in Claremont; 3,000 feet in Mt. Baldy.

James Mallean objected to the project. He just received notice of the project from his neighbor, not the City. Verizon should be able to select a commercial site but chooses to pick on the economically declining church and its neighbors. This is not a bell tower, the church never had a bell tower, and it is an eye sore. He thanked his neighbors for notifying him and urged the Commission to reconsider.

Murray Wentz, president of the College Oaks board, spoke on behalf of 32 units. The residences do not want the cell tower; citing health concerns and depreciating property values. He questioned if the tower is 100 feet away from the closest residence. From his own measurements, unit 110 is less than 90 feet from the tower and his house is 200 feet from the tower. His view of the mountains from the balcony will be replaced by the tower. There is no place for a tower in a residential area. He urged the Commission to deny the project. He would have never bought his home if he knew a tower would be built. Verizon is preying on the church as opposed to a costly commercial space. He inquired if any of the Commissioners would allow a tower within 200 feet of their front door.

Gina Vallerma is currently working to evaluate site specific architecture to build a sustainability plan. We cannot continue to do business as usual. We must look at it holistically to include political, economic, cultural, and environmental factors. We cannot involve social aesthetic without engaging the community. Architecture has the capacity to build into social thinking, it is forward thinking. She invites Verizon to look at the County sustainability plan and start working together so that the future generation is not drastically impacted.

Yvonne Wentz, a 29 year residence of the College Oak town homes care about the environment and enjoy living in Claremont. She inquired about the notification time and process; and the number of residences notified. The notice she received looked like

junk mail. Is the City purposely hiding the project, hoping for the mail to be tossed? Why was the community not involved in the initial concept? The tower is offensive and does not fit in the community. Her view of the mountains and tall trees will be ruined. The tower is emotionally harmful and it just feels like the south side is being dumped on again. She is a Verizon customer and does not have any issues. Cell towers cause more interference.

Kim George has been in the community for 45 years. She just found out about the meeting at 5:00 pm tonight. She lives one block away from the proposed monstrosity. She just paid off her home and will face a potential loss in equity. She feels for the struggling church, but the church cannot sell out the neighborhood. This will impact the whole neighborhood.

Laura Perrini explained why her neighbors are calling the tower a monstrosity: 1) the tower is two and a half times the peak of the church, further dwarfing the structure; 2) the church has a low angular roofline, which does not match the tower; and 3) the church has a distinctive ridgeline that swoops to the peak, which is unusually curvy next to the structure. Except for the church' input in the design process, no one asked the community for input. She does not understand the trapezoid. She inquired about markings recently painted on the ground near the site

Reverend Tracy Earlywine of the Claremont Spiritual Living stated that the church is not tax exempt and they do rent out their facilities for revenue. The church is not desperate and is not in it for the money. What we have is a building that needs renovation, if this works great; if not, the church will still be here. Our board of trustees rotates every three years, however this situation came about, and we want to work from here. We strive to be good neighbors and have no desire to alienate anyone. We would like to see the project go through and do not have any vested interest in how it looks or where it goes. We are open to conversations with anyone.

Cheryl Armstrong's comments are as follows:

- The trapezoid will only have any affect if one is in the air. It will not have relevance on the street level.
- The parking lot light pole installation will not fit into the neighborhood.
- The tower is reminiscent of a guard tower. It is unpleasant and is not an asset.
- This tall structure is being dumped on a low-slung community.
- After several years of planning, the neighbors are only consulted recently. It would have been nice to have a community meeting.
- If the tower deems obsolete, will Verizon take the tower down?
- What benefit is the City receiving from this project?
- She urged the Commission to reconsider the project, no one wants it.

Danielle Leese stated that he purchased his house seven years ago without a tower and is opposed to it. It is an ugly eye soar that will impose health risk and lower property values.

Resident stated that this is a business deal. Verizon does not care about our health or quality of life. There is nothing intrinsic about Verizon; people have other providers to choose from.

Dale Vinski followed up on Mr. Wentz' statement of would you like a tower next to your house. The tower at St. Ambrose seemed a lot smaller than this one. The idea of community involvement is a sham. The company consulted with three church parishioners, one stated they live in Upland and the other two did not state where they live. There was not community input.

Bridgett Evangelista stated that her front door will look directly at this tower. She does not want to wake up to this 365 days of the year.

Resident stated that the tower reminded her of the Tower of Terror. It is not pretty and it will stand out in the community. If it is placed in the parking lot, it will be facing her house. She inquired if the Commission would want to look at this each day.

Ray M. Evangelista is angry that he is just receiving notice of this project. He wife is correct, that would be the view from his home. He inquired why the project is category exempt from CEQA and would like to receive more information to share with his neighbors based on the 2013 Freedom of Information Act. He also asked if the Commission would like to see this from their homes. He is frustrated and angry that corporations are taking over everything and this is what the Commission is letting happen.

Commissioner Schoeman reminded Mr. Evangelista that the Commission is only receiving comments at this time and will respond to questions later in the meeting. He also encouraged Mr. Evangelista to come into City Hall tomorrow to get the all information he needs. Mr. Evangelista continued to call for an immediate response from the Commission and addressing the audience rather than the commission.

Principal Planner Veirs acknowledged Mr. Evangelista's frustration, reviewed standard meeting procedures for him, and assured him that staff and the commission would provide responses once public comments were completed.

Anonymous Resident stated that the tower is hideous. If the Commission approves the project, it would be like giving the neighborhood the "middle finger". Verizon needs to dig deeper into their pockets for a commercial property and stop preying on the church in a residential area. This will impact the community financially. He urged the Commission to reconsider and consider the community's feelings.

Claremont High School Student stated that the tower is hideous. He was raised in a religious family. What would it say if the tower is three times the size of the church? It is just disrespectful.

Chair Schoeman invited any additional public comment. Seeing no requests to speak, public comment was closed.

Principal Planner Veirs and Associate Planner Hlady addressed the following public inquiry:

- The project is exempt from CEQA since the tower is an accessory structure to existing church use.
- The City has always taken a strong stance regarding the health and aesthetic impact of wireless. Generally, we encourage new antennas are mounted to existing buildings.
- Cities have been required to back off on regulations. We are aware of these new laws, but have not had to deal with it yet. Of the many facilities that have been modified under the law, none have requested increased height.
- When an application comes in, it is reviewed at staff level to meet code. In this case there have been several iterations that were not deemed adequate and had gone away. In August this application was finally deemed complete and slated for a hearing. Notice was given. The code requirement for a hearing is for a 10 day notice to be sent to the surrounding 300 feet area. This is our normal notice process. The agenda packet is uploaded to the City website and emailed to the Commissioners on Thursday afternoon. There is no code requirement for community input prior to the hearing notice. It is the start of the public involvement process.
- For a tower that is deemed obsolete or abandoned, the code does require the applicant to carry a bond to pay for the removal. There are also annual use and health certifications that must be provided to show compliance with Federal safety requirements.
- The St. Ambrose tower is the same size as the tower being proposed here. All photo simulations are vetted for scale. The photos tonight are very honest. If anything, they overstate the size of the tower.
- The paint markings on the ground may be for survey work. We are nowhere close to construction.
- The City does not receive direct payments from private wireless systems. We only react to the applicant's proposals. We do require maps showing existing coverage levels to confirm need.

Commissioner Schoeman requested for a review of what the Commission is approving and under what condition.

Per Associate Planner Hlady, the Commission is approving the 12 general design review criteria, with the additional standards of the 100 feet clearance, screening of the device, height, and context.

Mr. Rogers addressed the following public inquiry:

- We followed the regulations outlined in the zoning ordinance and process. There was no requirement for community outreach. As far as Mr. Rogers is concerned, this is still on the table.
- The concerns of health, property values, and notification are all outside of the scope of the Architectural Commission. The FCC regulates health exposures to the public,

which is lower than what they allowed to be exposed to. The exposure is 1/1,000th of what is allowed. The resident that lives 470 feet away will be exposed at a rate of 1/1,000th. Health is not an issue. Yes, there is a difference between exposures from a phone to the ear as opposed to a cell tower. Health studies from the American Cancer Society can be provided. There are no known issues with cell towers. People believe what they believe. Studies show no property depreciation due to cell towers, perhaps with the exception of a mono pole in the front yard.

- The church location is to service the residential area.

The Commission took a break at 9:23 pm.

The Commission reconvened at 9:32 pm.

Commissioner Schoeman reminded the audience of the meeting process; encouraged them to trust the process; and if need, appeal the decision with the City Council who will have a greater judging scope.

Commissioner Perri stated that there is room for discussion between the church and community. The church seems flexible. Architecturally, it's a 60-foot tower. He will take the resident's comments regarding the sloping roof. This is a business transaction, points were made on both sides, and he is disappointed that there is not an outreach program.

Commissioner Horsley appreciated the community participation. The church architecture does not lend itself well to such a tall piece. Given the constraints, the applicant did a decent job with the project. He hears the community. The street view is a detriment to the public.

Commissioner Worley clarified that this is the Architectural Commission, not City Council. The Architectural Commission is charged with looking at the architecture, not the economic or social economic impacts. He encouraged the audience to work with the City Council for an appeal process or code change for earlier notifications. He requested for clarification on the ability for companies to add 20 feet to existing towers. Principal Planner Veirs noted that he would have to research this, but noted that the City has not received such requests, to date. Commissioner Worley then stated that, for this reason alone, he would not approve the project. He understands the need for cell phones and Verizon is economic entity. They have the right to engage with a willing partner. He is concerned about the vista from the south.

Commissioner Perry stated that his role in the Commission is constraining. There needs to be a better process to deal with controversial issues. This needs to be a collaborative conversation not restricted to architecture. Looking at the 12 points of the General Plan: 1) Consistency is responded into in an emotional way, which is undesirable; 2) Design and Architecture - the scale and proportion is not fitting in terms of the location for view shed and the identity of the community; and 3) Design of the tower (height and mass) doesn't compliment the church. This does not achieve the General Plan mandate to protect the neighborhood.

Commissioner Neiuber echoed Commissioners' encouragement to contact City Council regarding code changes and the City Manager's office to receive weekly newsletters. The Architectural Commission receives meeting information Thursday evening prior to the meeting. We have no predispositions and are here to receive your comments. Many of the things said tonight are out of our purview. We rely on Staff to study the project. City staff does not look for sites, we only react. In looking at the architectural design: 1) it is not consistent with the General Plan; 2) it is not compatible with the surroundings; 3) typically the tower will match the church, but this one does not; and 4) the view from the street is not compatible.

Commissioner Schoeman stated that towers work well in compatible surrounding development. He is a big fan of the simple form, but not in a restrictive area. This is just poor design. The view from the south is poor design. If we were to allow for towers in restrictive space, we need to be more particular. This tower does not belong on this space. He is also disappointed in the lack of community engagement. From past experience, he would knock on his neighbors' doors before starting a project. The power of architecture is that it affects the environment and, in turn, affects us. He entertained a motion to continue the item or deny it.

Commissioner Neiuber stated that regardless of the code, it is good practice to engage the community.

Commissioner Neiuber moved that the Architectural Commission deny file #16-A09, Review of Proposed 63-Foot Tall Steeple/Bell Tower to Serve as a Concealed Wireless Telecommunications Facility for Verizon Wireless Located at 509 S. College Avenue. (#16-SUDP11, a Staff Level Special Use & Development Permit Review is Associated with this Application) Applicant – Smartlink, LLC on Behalf of Verizon Wireless citing that the following criteria pursuant to Section 16.300.060.A of the Municipal Code were not met: General Plan Consistency, Compatibility of Form with Surrounding Development, Compatibility of Quality with Surrounding Development, Internal Consistency of Design, and Health and Safety; seconded by Commissioner Worley, and carried on a vote as follows:

**AYES: COMMISSIONERS: HORSLEY, NEIUBER, PERRI, PERRY,
SCHOEMAN, AND WORLEY**
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER MESSNER

This decision can be appealed within ten calendar days.

4. Sign Review File #19-S04 Request for a New Sign Program for the Claremont Lincoln University Building Located at 150 W. First Street. Applicant – Eagle Signs on Behalf of the Claremont Lincoln University

Associate Planner Hlady presented a PowerPoint presentation and addressed Commissioner Neiuber's question regarding backlit and halo illuminated signs.

Drew Solame, Eagle Signs stated that this is a great example of everyone working together according to the code. The design is cohesive with the architecture and will continue into the building. We do need the panel and letters. If we were to drill the letters through the Corten ACM, it would require wiring. With the panels, the wiring is concealed in the letters; panels can be easily changed or removed. The satin black corresponds to everything. The illumination complies with title 24. The letter will glow, but no light will be cast forward.

Chair Schoeman invited public comment. Seeing no requests to speak, public comment was closed.

Commissioner Perri asked for clarification on the white and silver letters. He likes the signs. It's attractive.

Commissioner Horsley noted that the signs looked great. He likes the darker background. It's elegant and attractive. If he had to make a slight change, it would be the trapezoid shape of the freestanding monument sign; making the right side straight and the left side slanted. Per Mr. Solame, he had originally designed it that way, but it just didn't look right.

Commissioner Worley thought the signage was well thought out. The cafe tenant may feel a little shorted on the sign. Beautiful job.

Commissioner Neiuber stated that it's an excellent program. He had the same thought as Commissioner Horsley, but understands how this is probably the best solution. The signs are in keeping with the architecture and the values of CLL.

Commissioner Perry finds the signs to be pleasing. He describes it as contemporary, clean, well proportioned, with a good color combination and lighting. He recommended restudying the 150 street address number as it may be obscured by parking or landscaping.

Commissioner Schoeman agrees with the comments of the Commissioners. He does agree that the street sign will be superfluous. He does not care for the tenant box signs on the monument sign.

Upon consideration of the review criteria, Commissioner Perry moved that the Architectural Commission adopt Resolution No. 2019-10 of the Architectural Commission of The City of Claremont file #19-S04 Request for a New Sign Program for the Claremont Lincoln University Building Located at 150 W. First Street. Applicant – Eagle Signs on Behalf of the Claremont Lincoln University; seconded by Commissioner Perri, and carried on a vote as follows:

**AYES: COMMISSIONERS: HORSLEY, NEIUBER, PERRI, PERRY,
SCHOEMAN, AND WORLEY**

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: COMMISSIONER MESSNER

This decision can be appealed within ten calendar days.

REPORTS

Commission

Mayor/Chair Meeting

Commissioner Schoeman updated the Commission on the items discussed:

- A video with the Police Association is circulating in regards to Measure CR. A discussion as to how we bring clarity to the public regarding the measure.
- There was a moment of silence for the Police Chief's wife.
- He spoke of his appreciation for the Architectural Commission and his counter part, on the Planning Commission for passing the ADU code.
- All Commissions are full – no vacancies.
- The second reading of the ADU was last night and is slated for approval October 28, 2019.
- The first West Nile patient has been identified in Claremont.

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Worley stated that the Public Art Committee met at the beginning of month. A bench project has been approved at Griffith Park. It will be a collaboration between the artist and the students at Sumner Elementary. There was also talk about developing rules for murals on private property.

Commissioner Neuber commented that the Ad Hoc Committee for City Design Guidelines and Historic Preservation is almost done with a draft preservation ordinance. Last Friday, he joined Richard Rosenbluth and Chris Veirs to attend the California Preservation Foundation's workshop in Pasadena. We learned that we are on track to having a draft ordinance that is consistent best practices.

Staff

Briefing on Council Meetings

Principal Planner Veirs reported on items of interest from the previous night's City Council meeting.

Briefings on Other Items

There was no report.

Upcoming Agendas and Events

Principal Planner Veirs commented on what items will be coming before the Commission at the October 9, 2019 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schoeman adjourned the meeting at 10:44 p.m.

Chair

ATTEST:

Administrative Assistant



Claremont Architectural Commission

Agenda Report

File #: 3085

Item No: 2.

TO: ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

FROM: BRAD JOHNSON, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

DATE: OCTOBER 9, 2019

Reviewed by:
Finance Director: N/A

SUBJECT:

RESOLUTION TO DENY ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE PLAN REVIEW #16-A09, REVIEW OF PROPOSED 63-FOOT TALL STEEPLE/BELL TOWER TO SERVE AS A CONCEALED WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY FOR VERIZON WIRELESS LOCATED AT 509 S. COLLEGE AVENUE. (#16-SUDP11, A STAFF LEVEL SPECIAL USE & DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW IS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS APPLICATION) APPLICANT - SMARTLINK, LLC ON BEHALF OF VERIZON WIRELESS

SUMMARY

At its September 25, 2019 meeting, the Architectural Commission reviewed Architectural and Site Plan Review file 16-A09 and expressed an intent to deny the application. The commission directed staff to return to this meeting with a draft denial resolution detailing the reasons the application could not be approved as described by the Commission during their comments on the project. The requested draft denial resolution is attached.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Architectural Commission adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CLAREMONT TO DENY ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE PLAN REVIEW #16-A09, REVIEW OF PROPOSED 63-FOOT TALL STEEPLE/BELL TOWER TO SERVE AS A CONCEALED WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY FOR VERIZON WIRELESS LOCATED AT 509 S. COLLEGE AVENUE. (#16-SUDP11, A STAFF LEVEL SPECIAL USE & DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW IS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS APPLICATION) APPLICANT - SMARTLINK, LLC ON BEHALF OF VERIZON WIRELESS citing the following criteria pursuant to Section 16.300.060.A of the Municipal Code were not met: General Plan Consistency, Compatibility of Form with Surrounding Development, Compatibility of Quality with Surrounding Development, Internal Consistency of Design, and Health and Safety

PUBLIC NOTICE PROCESS

This item has been noticed through the regular agenda notification process. Copies are available at the City Hall public counter, Youth Activity Center, Alexander Hughes Community Center, and City website.

Submitted by:

Brad Johnson
Community Development Director

Prepared by:

Chris Veirs
Principal Planner

Attachment:

Draft Denial Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2019 -

A RESOLUTION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CLAREMONT DENYING ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE PLAN REVIEW #16-A09, REVIEW OF PROPOSED 63-FOOT TALL STEEPLE/BELL TOWER TO SERVE AS A CONCEALED WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY FOR VERIZON WIRELESS LOCATED AT 509 S. COLLEGE AVENUE. APPLICANT – SMARTLINK, LLC ON BEHALF OF VERIZON WIRELESS

WHEREAS, on October 13, 2016, the applicant filed a request for architectural and site plan review and Special Use and Development Permit (SUDP) approval for the construction of a new church steeple/bell tower that would serve as a concealed wireless telecommunications facility at the subject property, which is owned and used by a church; and

WHEREAS, new commercial wireless telecommunications facilities located on private property require the approval of a Special Use and Development Permit pursuant to Claremont Municipal Code (CMC) Section 16.100.040.C as well as architectural and site plan review pursuant to CMC Section 16.100.040.I; and

WHEREAS, on September 12, 2019, a notice of public hearing regarding the Architectural Commission review of the design of the proposed addition was mailed to surrounding property owners and residents in the 300-foot radius of the subject site; and

WHEREAS, the Architectural Commission held a public hearing on September 25, 2019, at which time all persons wishing to testify in connection with the revised proposal were heard and said proposal was fully studied; and

WHEREAS, on September 25, 2019 the Architectural Commission voted unanimously to direct staff to prepare a denial resolution for adoption at their next regularly scheduled public hearing finding that the project did not satisfy certain General Review Criteria in CMC Section 16.300.060;

WHEREAS, on October 9, 2019 held a duly noticed meeting to adopt a denial resolution.

Section A. The Architectural Commission finds that the following review criteria of Section 16.300.060.A of the Claremont Municipal Code cannot be met regarding the above-described project as follows:

2. General Plan Consistency – The proposed steeple/bell tower and wireless telecommunications facility are not consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. Specifically, the proposed project fails to support the following General Plan Policy:

- a. *Protect neighborhoods from impacts from non-residential development (Policy 2-2.4)*; in that the project fails to adequately protect the surrounding residential properties in terms of visual impacts from the large tower structure. The design of the proposed tower, which conceals the

wireless equipment, has an imposing presence that represents a detrimental impact to the surrounding residences that is impossible to mitigate, given the height of the tower structure and the lack of other tall structures or trees both on the subject property and on those that surround it.

3. Compatibility of Form with Surrounding Development – The proposed tower and concealed wireless facility will visually dominate the established development pattern of the surrounding area and cannot be found to be compatible with existing development in terms of scale and height. While steeple and bell towers are often found on church properties, the subject church property is characterized by low-lying existing structures, wide expanses of surface-level parking lots and some tall, mature trees. The residential uses that surround the subject property are characterized by low-lying structures with a majority of the single-family residential homes being one-story in height. As such, the 63-foot tall tower stands out as inconsistent with surrounding development and cannot avoid unduly interfering with and visually dominating the surrounding urban context. Further, the rectilinear design of the proposed tower fails to appropriately relate to the architectural forms of the existing architecture on the site, which features gently sloping roofs and subtle angles.

4. Compatibility of Quality with Surrounding Development – The steeple/bell tower and concealed wireless facility lacks an architectural character that is readily compatible with surrounding development, nor does it represent an enhancement to the surrounding urban context. The design of the proposed tower attempts to take cues from and relate properly to the existing architecture on the site to achieve a desirable architectural form, but fails to do so, given the stark difference in form and height between the tower structure and the low-lying architecture on the subject property and those that surround it.

5. Internal Consistency of Design – While the design of the proposed tower is architecturally consistent on all four of its sides, applying the same architectural treatments and finishes, it cannot be considered to be consistent with the architectural design of the existing architecture on the church property. The stark verticality of the proposed tower is not consistent with the low-lying nature of the existing structures on the site. Even though the existing church building reaches a maximum height of approximately 27-feet at the peak of its roof ridge, most of the building, which is the most notable one on the property, is low-lying, with its eaves extending to a point very close to the ground.

12. Health and Safety – The imposing and out-of-scale appearance of the proposed tower would, if built, have a visual effect as viewed from adjacent public streets that is detrimental to the public interest, convenience, and welfare. While the proposed tower would screen the wireless telecommunications equipment from view, the tower itself has an imposing appearance inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood in which it is located resulting in the potential impacts to the public interest and the ability of the neighborhood's residents and visitors to enjoy its ambiance and suburban character.

Section E. The Architectural Commission Chair shall sign this resolution and the Commission's secretary shall attest to the adoption thereof.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 9th day of October, 2019.

Architectural Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Architectural Commission Secretary