From: Jim Mosher <jimmosher@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 11:10 AM

To: Planning Commissioners

Cc: Murillo, Jaime

Subject: Comments on PC agenda Item 3 (Verizon/AT&T telecom facility)
Attachments: 2018May17_PC_AgendaItem_3_Comments_JimMosher.pdf

I just learned this morning that today's Planning Commission meeting is going to be held at 4:00 p.m. instead of the usual 6:30.

Please find attached some written comments based on a quick review of the Agenda Item 3 staff report.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Mosher

May 17, 2018, Planning Commission Item 3 Comments

These comments on a Newport Beach Planning Commission <u>agenda</u> item are submitted by: Jim Mosher (<u>jimmosher@yahoo.com</u>), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229).

Item No. 3. VERIZON AND AT&T MONOPOLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY (PA2018-010)

- 1. I think there could be a problem with the noticing of this item, in that the sign announcing this hearing, which must be posted on the site, may have gone missing. If that is the case, I believe the hearing should be re-scheduled to a time such that the site will have been posted (continuously) with the sign for the code-required ten days.
- 2. Poles of this sort are really ugly. There are examples of them along Newport Boulevard in Costa Mesa, north of 22nd Street. Sometimes, as there, an American flag is hung limply from the top few feet, presumably to fit someone's definition of "stealth." It doesn't help It doesn't stealth it. It doesn't look like a flagpole. It remains unsightly.
- 3. When this proposal was before the City Council as <u>Item 26</u> on April 12, 2014, I remember dissenting Council member Tony Petros said this particular design was so ugly that if it ever got built, someone should string a <u>Pink Floyd Flying Pig</u> between the poles. That is an image I had to <u>Google to understand</u>, but having done so, I agree.
- 4. It seems particularly poor planning to put such an ugly, industrial looking monument in such an in-your-face public location at the entrance to what has been approved as <u>a future luxury tennis resort</u>. Have the Tennis Club developers consulted as to their opinion about this location?
- 5. As the staff report explains, this is, rightfully, among the lowest class of antenna configurations allowed in Newport Beach. The staff report dutifully explains why the higher priority configurations are "unfeasible." I don't buy any of that.
 - a. I doubt existing roof tops could *not* be used, and with better aesthetics (for example, a fully screen enclosure in the roof center).
 - b. I doubt false trees at the current location are unfeasible (see comment #6).
 - i. If one was possible in Corporate Plaza, why not in Corporate Plaza West?
 - c. I doubt alternative locations were studied with due diligence.
 - i. For example, isn't there a less obtrusive location behind the nursery, or elsewhere on the golf course property?

- 6. On October 8, 2015, as Item 5, the Planning Commission approved a fake tree cell site installation (a "monoeucalyptus") for Verizon at 23 Corporate Plaza (after the previous approval of monopoles at the present location).
 - a. Why was a faux tree (a more desirable configuration) "feasible" there and not here?
 - b. As best I can tell, the facility approved in Corporate Plaza has neither been built nor is it included in Verizon's coverage analysis. Why not? Understanding the status of that proposal seems important to the present decision.
- 7. Should the current configuration be considered, when it was approved by the City Council in 2014 (see comment #3), there seemed to be a promise the ugliness of the poles would be screened with live trees (see Staff PowerPoint from 2014).
 - a. Is that still part of the proposal?
 - b. If not, why not?
- 8. The RF Coverage Maps of Attachment No. PC 6 provide a most peculiar depiction of local roads and areas showing some minor secondary streets while omitting some major roads, and missing entire land masses. It all makes me doubtful of their veracity, and certainly of the care with which they were prepared.
 - a. The AT&T maps on handwritten pages 79 and 82 prominently label Bayside Drive as "Pacific Coast Highway" – suggesting a lack of familiarity with the area and its problems.
 - b. The Verizon maps on pages 75-77 seem to be missing Balboa Island, and puzzlingly appear to show no coverage in all water areas (among which it includes the islands).
 - c. The AT&T maps on pages 79 versus 80 show remarkably little change as a result of adding the new antennas.
 - d. The two carriers puzzlingly don't seem to agree on the effectiveness of antennas at the proposed location. Page 76 (Verizon) shows an essentially omnidirectional reach. Page 84 (AT&T) shows something only vaguely similar, while page 81 (AT&T) predicts something quite different (working much more effectively to the north, and especially south, and not as well to the east or west).
- The statement of the heights allowed by <u>PC 40</u> and the Sight Plane height standard of <u>Ordinance No. 1371</u> from 1971 in Facts 1.5 and 1.6 on page 35 is confusing at best. I'm not sure I understand why the 43 feet allowed in this proposal would not be allowed on a roof top.

From:	KB <karenborja@juno.com></karenborja@juno.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, May 16, 2018 9:54 PM
То:	Planning Commissioners
Cc:	Dept - City Council
Subject:	Commission Agenda Item #3 on 5/17 discussing cell phone coverage
2	and Navya art Basela Blancia a Caranciasian and City Cavasil
יט	ear Newport Beach Planning Commission and City Council,
	the Planning Commission meeting on May 17th, agenda item #3 scusses permits to install two 43 foot tall monopoles at 1600 Newport
Ce	enter Drive. It is my understanding this will only help patrons of askinon Island.
1 6	ismon island.
A	s a parent and a resident of Corona Del Mar cell phone coverage in my
ho	ome and surrounding neighborhoods are important to me and my mily. I have missed phone calls from my sons school due to no cellular
cc	overage. I strongly encourage you to approve additional cell towers in sommercial areas contingent upon the telecommunication companies
in	stalling small antennas to street poles in residential areas with little to coverage.
Si	ncerely,
	aren Borja
	-

Planning Commission - May 17, 2018 Item No. 3c Additional Materials Received After Deadline Verizon and AT&T Monopole Telecommunications Facility (PA2018-010)

Corona Del Mar, CA 92625