

**MINUTES:** of the Minor Exception Permit Committee Meeting of the City of Redlands held Thursday, August 22, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. are as follows:

**I. ATTENDANCE & CALL TO ORDER**

**PRESENT:** Mario Saucedo, Planning Commissioner  
Karah Shaw, Planning Commissioner  
Brian Foote, City Planner/Planning Manager  
**STAFF:** Brian Foote, City Planner/Planning Manager

The meeting came to order at 9:05 a.m. with a quorum of Committee members, located at Brookside Park, 1630 Brookside Avenue, Redlands, CA.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A. Minutes of July 28, 2022**

Commissioner Saucedo made a motion to approve the minutes of July 26, 2022, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, and approved 3-0.

**III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no public comments provided on any matters not on the agenda.

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Meeting Location:** 1630 Brookside Avenue, Redlands, CA  
**Meeting Time:** 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as may be heard

**PUBLIC HEARING** to consider **Minor Exception Permit No. 633** – A request to construct a 10-foot-high precision CMU block wall surrounding a proposed equipment enclosure for a proposed wireless facility. The proposed block wall will be located on the southeast portion of the Brookside Park, approximately 25 feet from the front property line. The subject property is located at 1630 Brookside Avenue within the O (Open Space) District. Pursuant to Section 18.168.020 (B) of the Redlands Municipal Code (RMC), “Fences and walls not to exceed six feet (6’) in height shall be permitted along the side and rear property lines, except that no fence or wall exceeding three feet (3’) in height shall be located within any required front yard area.” However, RMC Section 18.168.050 provides for the granting of minor exceptions to the fencing development standards.

**Discussion:** The Minor Exception Permit Committee met at the project location and opened the public hearing at 9:07 a.m. The applicant’s representatives, Deanna Lynn (Project Manager) and Chris Ellis (Project Manager), were present at the meeting to represent Coastal Business Group and AT&T. City Planner Brian Foote read the

project description for a proposed wall as an equipment enclosure and explained the Planning Commission previously approved CUP No. 1166 for the project entitlement and monopole on July 26, 2022.

The Minor Exception Permit Committee walked to the southeastern corner of Brookside Park, adjacent to Brookside Avenue, to examine the site characteristics of the proposed wall and equipment enclosure. The Minor Exception Permit Committee asked the applicant questions in terms of the height, location, setback from property line for the proposed wall, and the height of equipment and the need for a 10'0" high wall that will be highly visible from Brookside Avenue and the nearby children's playground.

Five neighbors attended the meeting to provide public comments and ask questions.

Mary Hernandez (resident of 1633 Brookside Ave.): opposed to MEP No. 633. Ms. Hernandez stated she had never received a public notice in June prior to the Planning Commission hearing for the project approval. She expressed concerns about the proposed wall height and appearance.

Verne Scatliffe (resident of 1639 Brookside Ave.): opposed to MEP No. 633. Mr. Scatliffe stated he had never received a public notice in June prior to the Planning Commission hearing for the project approval. He expressed concerns about the proposed wall height and appearance, future maintenance of the wall exterior and graffiti, future maintenance of the landscaping and cost of irrigation, a monopole tower should not be placed in a public park, Brookside Park is frequently utilized by large numbers of people and particularly the front of the park where the monopole is to be located, and had concerns about the design of the monopole and lack of pictures and actual photos.

Janet Kamaz (resident of 1603 Brookside Ave.): opposed to MEP No. 633. Ms. Kamaz stated she had never received a public notice in June prior to the Planning Commission hearing for the project approval. She expressed concerns about the height and appearance of the monopole tower, possible health effects from radiofrequency emissions, concerns about the pending Lease Agreement with the City, and she believed the monopole facility would decrease her property's resale value.

Jimmy Kamaz (resident of 1567 Brookside Ave.): opposed to MEP No. 633. Mr. Kamaz stated he had never received a public notice in June prior to the Planning Commission hearing for the project approval. He expressed concerns about the proposed wall height and appearance, the process for approving a monopole at a public park, and the future financial arrangement between the applicant and the City regarding a pending Lease Agreement.

George Kamaz (resident of 1603 Brookside Ave.): opposed to MEP No. 633. Mr. Kamaz appeared at meeting site after the public hearing portion of the meeting had been closed. Mr. Kamaz asked questions of staff regarding the project site,

monopole approval, wall height, and stated concerns about health effects from wireless towers.

Commissioners Saucedo and Shaw responded to several of the comments and concerns by explaining the separate entitlement process for CUP No. 1166 (approved on July 26, 2022), the City's general regulations for processing wireless telecommunications facilities, and the separate process currently for a pending Lease Agreement through the Facilities & Community Services Department. Contact information for FCS Department was provided to several attendees. Planning staff will check and verify that public notices had been previously mailed for the CUP No. 1166 Planning Commission hearing to all property owners within a 300-foot radius of the park.

Commissioner Shaw made a motion to continue the proposal (to a date uncertain) and seconded by Commissioner Saucedo.

**Decision:** The Minor Exception Committee voted 3 to 0 to continue the application. The applicant's representatives were asked to provide the following additional information for consideration at a subsequent MEP Committee meeting.

1. Provide information about the height of the proposed equipment shelter structure, and height of the proposed emergency generator (estimated to be approximately 8.4 feet high). Explore feasibility of lowering the grade or slab for the generator to lower its overall height compared to adjacent existing grade.
2. Provide justification and necessity for the requested 10-foot high screen wall, and explore feasibility of a lower wall such as eight feet (8'0") or seven feet (7'0") if possible.
3. Explore feasibility of adjusting placement of the equipment enclosure more toward the easterly side of the approved monopole (i.e., without moving the location of the monopole) so that equipment will be located farther from the children's playground. Note: A minimum separation distance of 100 feet from off-site residential structures (to the east) shall be maintained in accordance with RMC Section 18.178.090(E).
4. Provide noise-generation information such as manufacturer's brochure for the proposed emergency generator, to include noise generation and specifications.

## VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:03 a.m.

---

Brian Foote, AICP  
City Planner/Planning Manager  
City of Redlands

**NOTICE:** The Minor Exception Permit Committee visited the above-referenced property and made a decision on the application(s). If one wishes to appeal a decision, said Appeal must be submitted within ten days from the date of the decision (RMC Section 18.168.100). A formal Appeal, with the appropriate submittal fee, must be submitted to the Development Services Department within the 10-day appeal period. If no Appeal is received within ten days of the decision, then the Minor Exception Committee's action shall be final.