

**APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001**

1 **ROLL CALL**

2
3 Time: The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

4
5 Location: North Berkeley Senior Center.

6
7 Commissioners Present: Curl, Hicks, Howerton, Olson, Poschman, Tabb, Wengraf,
8 Wozniak, Wrenn.

9
10 Staff Present: Barrett, Cederborg, Cowan, Haney-Owens, Kahn.

11
12 **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

13
14 Steve Bloom, a representative of the Sierra Club, asked the Commission for clarification
15 regarding whether the Commission's decision on telecommunications antennas would go
16 into effect immediately following the decision.

17
18 Later in the meeting staff Kahn clarified that the amendment would not take effect until
19 the City Council had acted on it.

20
21 Steve Bloom stated that, as a representative of the Sierra Club, he recommends holding
22 off on making a decision regarding the placement of new antennas in the City of
23 Berkeley for two months, in order to look into the issue more fully.

24
25 Commissioner Tabb asked Steve Bloom if the Sierra Club was previously unaware of this
26 proposed Ordinance.

27
28 Steve Bloom replied that the Sierra Club was unaware until just recently.

29
30 Resident Karen Kho, from Urban Ecology, stated that the zoning should remain
31 unchanged in the 1100th block of Hearst Street due to the fact that Berkeley is in need of
32 more housing. She stated that if the area is rezoned, a precedent would be set for the rest
33 of the city which would be disadvantageous to future housing development.

34
35 Resident Anne Holmes, from Urban Ecology, stated her support for retaining the current
36 R-3 zoning. She stated that the current zoning would encourage more affordable housing
37 developments in proximity to public transportation.

38
39 Resident Kate Bernier stated that the California State Health Department has proclaimed
40 that a sizable portion of Californians are electric sensitive indicating a need for more
41 magnetic radiation protection and underscoring the fact that the proposed increase of
42 antennas is a public health issue. She proposed a workshop at which to discuss the health
43 issues and asked that such an event be open to the entire population of Berkeley,
44 including students.

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

46 Resident Erica Etelson, an attorney who drafted the citizens version of the Wireless
47 Telecommunications Ordinance stated that she is aware of the legal constraints regarding
48 the regulation of such facilities and had made sure not to violate these in the drafted
49 Ordinance. She also explained the difference between the residents' Ordinance and the
50 City's Ordinance.
51
52 Resident Stewart Cohen, from the Bay Area Land Use Coalition, stated that Berkeley
53 needs to encourage the development of low-income housing and the use of public
54 transportation. He stated his opposition to the rezoning of the 1100 block of Hearst Street
55 because this would not be an example of "smart growth", given the potential on that
56 block for developing affordable housing in proximity to public transportation.
57
58 Commissioner Poschman asked whether higher density in this area would help to negate
59 urban sprawl.
60
61 Stewart Cohen stated that smart growth is important in all areas and that the region needs
62 to alter its housing distribution.
63
64 Resident Alyce Landes, the owner of property on Hearst, stated her opposition to the
65 proposed reclassification. She explained that her four rental units are in need of repairs
66 and she is getting a small return on her investment so she can no longer afford to
67 subsidize the property. She stated that much of her land is wasted space due to old,
68 unused sheds. She stated that her plans are to build garden apartments comprised of 14
69 units. She explained that she has already made many changes to her plans due to her
70 neighbors' concerns.
71
72 Commissioner Wengraf asked what number of units she initially proposed.
73
74 Alice Landes replied that 20 units were initially intended and that instead of three stories,
75 the plans have been altered to two stories.
76
77 Commissioner Wengraf asked for the property's size.
78
79 Alice Landes replied that the property is 204 feet deep and 66 feet wide.
80
81 Commissioner Wengraf asked which project in the near vicinity is currently under
82 construction.
83
84 Lynda Hart replied that the project currently underway is at 1115 Hearst. It is a four unit
85 project and the units will be live/work units.
86
87 Resident Dorthy Amiri, the manager of 1155-1163 Hearst, stated her opposition to the
88 proposed downzoning. She stated her support for new housing and said that the proposed
89 development will enhance the area.
90

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

91 Commissioner Wengraf asked if this project has been presented to the Zoning
92 Adjustments Board (ZAB).

93
94 Lynda Hart replied that it has not yet been before the ZAB, but the proposal has been
95 submitted.

96
97 Resident Lynda Hart, property owner of 1155-1163 Hearst, stated her opposition to
98 downzoning the 1100 block of Hearst Street and stated that the current R-3 zoning is
99 appropriate for the location. She stated that interference with this project is an attempt to
100 hinder personal development plans. She cited the General Plan as a recent document that
101 supports the R-3 zoning at this location and stated that changing the zoning to R-2A will
102 contradict the General Plan.

103
104 Resident John Snavely, who lives in one of the apartments that is proposed for
105 redevelopment, stated that the buildings are in poor condition because of improper
106 maintenance, and suggested that the owners preserve the existing structures because they
107 are of historic value. He stated his opposition to the downzoning due to the parking
108 constraints that already exist in the neighborhood.

109
110 Doug Loranger, from SNAFU, stated his concern in regard to the Telecommunications
111 Ordinance submitted to the Commission by the City. He showed the Commission a map
112 of the proliferation of telecommunication towers in San Francisco, stating that there are
113 currently 2400. He urged the Commission to listen to the residents and seriously
114 consider their drafted Ordinance. He explained that local governments have the power to
115 limit the placement of antennas and that there are model ordinances already written that
116 will aid in the implementation of a plan for Berkeley.

117
118 Resident Robert Cabrera, the president of the Berkeley Property Owners Association,
119 stated his opposition to the rezoning. He stated that the limited supply of housing is a
120 serious concern in Berkeley. He stated that he was not allowed to rebuild in a Berkeley
121 location due to rezoning, and currently the space remains vacant.

122
123 Resident Paul Shain, who lives on Delaware Street, stated his support for the rezoning in
124 the 1100 block of Hearst. He stated that most of the neighborhood is opposed to higher
125 density development as this would change the character of the neighborhood. He stated
126 that as it stands, the street is a zoning anomaly. He asked for the Commission to set a
127 public hearing on this matter within 30 days.

128
129 Ruth Knapp, resident of 1159 Hearst, explained the characteristics of the neighborhood
130 and stated that R-2A zoning would match existing development. She stated that
131 discrepancies exist in the current zoning classifications in the area and that multiple low
132 rise developments would still be possible under the R-2A classification. She stated that
133 she was unaware that the location is zoned R-3 until the initiation of the new
134 condominium development.

135

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

136 Resident Elaine Eastman stated her support for rezoning and stated that she is against the
137 tearing down of existing homes and explained that this is not a viable way to increase
138 housing in Berkeley. She stated that one of the justifications for rezoning an area, as
139 mentioned in the staff report is when, "A significant discrepancy exists between existing
140 and permitted uses or development intensity in a specific area of the City." She stated that
141 this condition exists in this block.

142

143 Resident Fred Gadelle, a homeowner on Hearst stated his support for the rezoning of the
144 1100th block of Hearst Street. He stated that the current zoning is not consistent with the
145 character of the neighborhood. He stated that the rezoning to R-2A will still allow multi-
146 family housing development, and will minimize potential traffic impacts in a
147 neighborhood where this is already a serious concern.

148

149 Commissioner Wengraf asked how many new units would be allowed under the R-2A
150 classification.

151

152 Fred Gadelle replied that under an R-2A classification, 22 new units could potentially be
153 added to the entire block, and at the property of 1155-1163 Hearst, eight units would be
154 allowable.

155

156 Kimberly Kline, a resident on Delaware Street, stated that she surveyed parking
157 availability in the area and her findings reveal a lack of parking. She explained that
158 parking issues were drastically worsened with the issuance of parking permits in a nearby
159 area. She stated that the existing infrastructure in the area could not support traffic
160 generated by large developments. She asked the Commission to allow for a Public
161 Hearing on this issue.

162

163 Pam Kurtz, a resident on Curtis Street, stated that the area has traffic problems that
164 include cut through traffic, speeding, and a lack of parking. She also stated that the
165 infrastructure would not be able to withstand R-3 development in this area. She stated
166 her opposition to R-3 zoning and requested that a Public Hearing be set.

167

168 Pam Ormsby, a resident on 1148 Delaware Street, stated that 90 neighbors have signed a
169 petition for rezoning the area to R-2A, including those living in the 1155-1163 cottages.
170 She stated that the zoning is not consistent with what is there and that she is not against
171 development, just unreasonable development.

172

173 Commissioner Tabb asked for clarification on the difference between a Public Comment
174 Period and a Public Hearing.

175

176 Commissioner Wrenn stated that in a Public Hearing, public comments are limited to the
177 agenda item for which the hearing is set, and that a Public Comment Period is open for
178 the public to discuss any issue.

179

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

180 Harry Watamura, a resident at 1144 Delaware, explained that an R-3 development of
181 three stories will limit the amount of sunlight to his garden, thereby potentially killing his
182 garden.

183
184 Resident Rolf Williams asked the Commission to consider allowing a Public Hearing in
185 order to discuss the rezoning of the 1100th block of Hearst Avenue. He stated that
186 parking is already difficult, and the development of larger projects would bring a
187 transient student population to the block, thereby changing the character of the existing
188 family neighborhood.

189
190 Resident Stacey Shulman stated her support for rezoning the 1100th block of Hearst and
191 for an official Public Hearing on this matter. She explained that too much traffic already
192 exists making the area difficult to navigate.

193
194 Resident Mark Matthieu stated his support for the rezoning of the 1100th block of Hearst.
195 He stated that limits must be placed on the amount and size of development.

196
197 Resident Damien Curry stated that he supports the rezoning of the 1100th block of Hearst.

198
199 Resident Deborah Green stated her concern regarding more antennas that may be placed
200 throughout the City and showed the Planning Commission pictures of her property and
201 surrounding areas, highlighting the presence of the radio tower on the City's Public
202 Safety Building.

203
204 Resident Hoss Azimi owns property on the 1100th block of Hearst and initially had plans
205 to build a 12 unit development. After assessing the property and the neighborhood, he
206 decreased the number of units to four and stated that the smaller development has worked
207 well in the area. He stated his support for an R-2A zoning designation.

208
209 Resident Kevin Sutton showed the Commission a map illustrating where wireless
210 antennas could be placed, while retaining the 200 foot buffer. He stated that revisions
211 have been made to the Ordinance drafted by a group of residents, one being that if
212 residents decide a tower should be placed in their area to improve service, they would
213 have the option to allow this.

214
215 Commissioner Tabb asked how a neighborhood would decide this.

216
217 Kevin Sutton replied that if it were passed with a 65% majority, an antenna could be
218 erected in that area.

219
220 Commissioner Wengraf asked about the use of repeaters in Berkeley.

221
222 Kevin Sutton replied that he did not know if repeaters are used in Berkeley, but that they
223 do offer a smaller radius of service.

224

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

225 Resident Constance Sutton stated that the residents' Ordinance regarding
226 telecommunications antennas is made purposely simple in order for companies to clearly
227 know their limits. She stated that this Ordinance includes mandatory spot inspections
228 that will be paid for by the company, and it ensures that the antennas will not be
229 concentrated in one area.

230

231 Commissioner Wozniak asked if wireless companies would be able to provide adequate
232 coverage using this Ordinance, and if they have a study that demonstrates this.

233

234 Constance Sutton replied that a study for future adequate coverage has not been done, but
235 stated that Berkeley currently has adequate coverage.

236

237 Commissioner Wengraf asked how a 200 foot buffer ensures safety.

238

239 Constance Sutton replied that with the 200 foot buffer, vandalism is discouraged because
240 the antennas are no longer an "attractive nuisance" for children.

241

242 Resident David Melly stated that the proposed City Ordinance allows the
243 Telecommunications industry to be held unaccountable for its actions, and that the
244 residents' Ordinance is better able to protect Berkeley's citizens by making permits
245 available for public review.

246

247 Resident Merri Mitchell expressed her concern that the migrating songbirds in Berkeley
248 may be potentially harmed by the placement of wireless towers. She suggested creating
249 an ecologically friendly solution, one being that the City create a tower-free zone along
250 the waterfront, which is along the birds' migration path.

251

252 Resident Andrea Traber stated her opposition to the rezoning of the 1100th block of
253 Hearst. She stated that the rezoning is unjustified and will set a bad precedent for future
254 in-fill development. She stated that this area is a prime location for higher density
255 housing because it close to commercial areas and transit, and because of Berkeley's
256 housing dilemma. She stated that downzoning one side of the block is inappropriate and
257 that it would change the current character of the area.

258

259 Resident Rebekah Pickard stated her support for the rezoning of the 1100th block of
260 Hearst, explaining that the area and its residents have been struggling to maintain a
261 balance of urbanization and garden space, and that the neighborhood must remain livable
262 for the existing residents.

263

264 Commissioner Wozniak asked about parking in the area.

265

266 Rebekah Pickard replied that parking conflicts are constant and the noise generated from
267 the traffic is an issue as well.

268

269 Resident Martha Nicoloff stated that the area in question was originally zoned for six
270 story apartment buildings. She stated that since then, there have been two downzonings

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

271 of the broader area, and that this 1100th block of Hearst somehow did not receive this
272 new zoning designation. She asked that there be a Public Hearing held regarding the
273 rezoning of this block and mentioned that the nearby areas that are zoned at R-4 are an
274 anomaly as well.

275
276 Nick Selby, attorney for Nextel, noted that maps prepared by staff for the Planning
277 Commission showed the limited area that would be available for new wireless antenna
278 installations if a 200 foot buffer were required. He stated that the space afforded by this
279 requirement would not be enough to provide customers with adequate coverage and
280 labeled the residents' Ordinance as exclusionary. He reiterated that health concerns,
281 according to the FCC, cannot be the basis for deciding whether or not to allow antennas.
282 He explained that stealthing the antennas would make them barely visible so as to not be
283 objectionable on aesthetic terms.

284
285 Commissioner Wozniak asked why more wireless antenna sites are needed.

286
287 Nick Selby explained that there is an increasing reliance on cell phones which has
288 overburdened the existing antennas in the Berkeley area.

289
290 Commissioner Wozniak asked if the telecommunications industry could present maps
291 showing exactly where coverage is inadequate.

292
293 Nick Selby replied that he did not have this information.

294
295 A Nextel representative said that photos of antenna sites submitted to the Commission
296 showed that antennas can be stealthed so that they are barely detectable.

297
298 Kristin Jacobson, an attorney for Nextel, voiced her objections to the residents'
299 Ordinance. She stated that their proposal included exclusionary measures and that
300 decisions cannot be made regarding wireless antennas on the basis of health concerns,
301 because this violates the regulations set by the FCC. She explained that currently the
302 service in Berkeley is inferior and that the City would be in violation of the
303 telecommunication laws if it adopted the residents' proposal.

304
305 Commissioner Wozniak asked for a definition of inferior service and where these areas
306 are located.

307
308 Kristin Jacobson replied that inferior service occurs when carriers are not able to support
309 an initiated call. She stated that a map showing locations of existing facilities was
310 previously provided to the Planning Commission and the City Council. She stated that
311 the map showed areas where the service is inadequate and that the strength of the signals
312 have not been gauged for the entire City.

313
314 Commissioner Wozniak asked if the inferior service is due to a lack of capacity or a lack
315 of antenna sites.

316

**APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001**

317 Kristin Jacobson stated that it could be due to both.
318
319 Commissioner Tabb asked how a signal is measured to ascertain whether it is adequate or
320 not.
321
322 Kristin Jacobson stated that she did not have this information, but that an engineer would
323 be able to explain this.
324
325 Commissioner Tabb asked about information regarding the areas that have “inferior
326 service” due to the lack of coverage.
327
328 Kristin Jacobson replied that she did not have a coverage map outlining this information,
329 but that the raw data is available.
330
331 Commissioner Wozniak asked for data on the strengths of signals based on sites Nextel
332 currently operates.
333
334 Kristin Jacobson stated that she will attempt to obtain this information and send it to the
335 Commission.
336
337 Commissioner Wengraf asked about the value of repeaters, if they are used in Berkeley,
338 and if they offer a compromise to a full size antenna.
339
340 Kristin Jacobson replied that repeaters are not a compromise measure, and are only used
341 in narrow circumstances for covering areas like tunnels. She stated that they are not used
342 in Berkeley.
343
344 Robin Smolen, outside counsel for Nextel, stated that currently the City is taxing its
345 citizens for cellular service and should be required to give an opportunity to the cellular
346 companies to improve service by allowing the placement of antennas in the city. She
347 stated that designs for the antennas make them visually insignificant, thereby not causing
348 blight so that there is no basis to exclude wireless facilities. She also stated that there is
349 an increasing reliance on cellular phones due to public safety and security concerns
350
351 Commissioner Wozniak asked if these towers are operated by electricity and if they
352 would be operational in the event of an emergency.
353
354 Kristin Jacobson replied that they do require electricity and that most antennas have
355 back-up generators which would keep them operable in an emergency situation.
356
357 Resident Rhiannon stated that the City of Berkeley already has adequate coverage and
358 stated that the FCC expects cities to consider the cumulative effects of the sites and to
359 regulate accordingly. She stated that the City’s Ordinance lacks standards and she asked
360 the Commission to consider the residents’ Ordinance.
361
362 Commissioner Tabb asked how she is certain that Berkeley has adequate coverage.

**APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001**

363

364 Rhiannon replied that the FCC has stated that all urban areas have adequate coverage,
365 and that their definition of adequate coverage is that service is provided.

366

367 **ORDER OF AGENDA**

368

369 No change.

370

371 **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

372

373 No report.

374

375 **COUNCIL ACTIONS/PLANNING DIRECTOR'S UPDATE**

376

377 Staff Barrett reported that the Dwight/Hillside Zoning Ordinance amendment had
378 undergone a first reading at Council. She stated to the Commission that she will be
379 working with them to adopt a formal work program in order to better prioritize planning
380 requests.

381

382 **FUTURE AGENDAS**

383

384 Staff Haney-Owens stated that telecommunications antennas will be further addressed at
385 the November 14th meeting, and MU-LI will be addressed at the November 28th meeting.
386 She also mentioned that the Southside Plan has not yet been scheduled for Commission
387 discussion.

388

389 **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 10, 2001 MEETING**

390

391 M/S/C to approve the minutes with changes (Poschman/Wengraf). Ayes: Curl, Howerton, 392 Poschman, Tabb, Wengraf, Wozniak, Wrenn. Noes: None. Abstentions: Hicks, Olson. 393 Absent: None.

394

395 **PROPOSED ZONING RECLASSIFICATION OF A PORTION OF THE 1100**
396 **BLOCK OF HEARST AVENUE**

397

398 Commissioner Tabb motioned to set a Public Hearing for the rezoning of the 1100th block
399 of Hearst.

400

401 Commissioner Poschman seconded the motion.

402

403 Commissioner Wozniak inquired about the difference between a Public Hearing and that
404 evening's public comment period.

405

406 Commissioner Wrenn explained that in this case, holding a Public Hearing is a formal
407 legal requirement prior to Commission action on a Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

408 Commissioner Wengraf referred to a letter included in the Commission packet regarding
409 downzoning the 1100th block of Hearst as an example of a taking and spot zoning and
410 asked if that would be a valid argument.

411

412 Staff Barnett stated there is no evidence to identify this downzoning as a taking. She
413 stated that staff will address the spot zoning issue in a revised staff report.

414

415 Commissioner Poschman stated that the hearing does not ensure approval of the rezoning
416 and that the testimony heard that evening raises serious issues relevant to the General
417 Plan. He stated that the criteria used to downzone areas also raises interesting issues and
418 questions and needs to be looked into.

419

420 Commissioner Wozniak asked to hear the staff report regarding this issue.

421

422 Staff Haney-Owens stated that staff has recommended that the R-3 zoning should be
423 retained due to the consistency between the zoning designation, the applicable land use
424 classifications and the pattern of development, as well as the area's proximity to transit.
425 She noted that downzoning residential areas puts the City is at risk of not meeting its
426 regional fair share housing obligation. She also noted that neighborhood concerns could
427 be effectively addressed through the project's design process.

428

429 Commissioner Wrenn stated that according to the General Plan, it is not the City's
430 intention to increase density in residentially zoned areas, and that the General Plan calls
431 for new housing development on the commercial corridors He stated that under these
432 housing development policies, the City's fair share of housing will still be obtainable. He
433 stated that an R-3 classification for the 1100th block of Hearst is anomalous, as are the
434 R4 designations in the City. He stated that R-2A zoning is a closer fit for the existing
435 development pattern, and that therefore there is justifiable cause for setting a Public
436 Hearing on this issue.

437

438 M/S/C to hold a Public Hearing regarding the rezoning of the 1100th block of Hearst,
439 with the date to be worked out between staff and the Chair (Tabb/Poschman). Ayes:
440 Curl, Hicks, Howerton, Olson, Poschman, Tabb, Wengraf, Wozniak, Wrenn. Noes:
441 None. Abstentions: None. Absent: None.

442

443 **ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS: WIRELESS**
444 **TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES**

445

446 Staff Barnett recused herself from the remainder of the meeting due to a potential conflict
447 of interest.

448

449 Commissioner Wozniak asked specifically when coverage is currently needed in order to
450 service wireless customers. He stated that he would like more information from the
451 telecommunication companies.

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

452 Commissioner Poschman asked what would be required to establish adequate coverage in
453 Berkeley. He elaborated on a document he wrote regarding his concerns with the
454 Ordinance.

455

456 Commissioner Tabb asked for the reasoning behind bringing proposed antennas before
457 the Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) rather than handling these projects through the
458 Administrative Use Permit (AUP) process.

459

460 Commissioner Poschman replied that AUP notification is sent only to adjoining and
461 abutting properties, but if each proposed antenna went through the ZAB process,
462 notification would expand to surrounding properties within 300 feet. He stated that
463 servicing wireless facilities is an issue, and that a wider notification should be provided.

464

465 Commissioner Wozniak asked how much servicing an antenna requires.

466

467 Commissioner Poschman stated that, according to Nick Selby's report, each antenna
468 would need to be serviced at least once a month.

469

470 Staff Kahn stated that the antennas on average are serviced one hour once a month for
471 each provider at a location.

472

473 Staff Kahn stated that revisions have been made to the City's Ordinance to address noise
474 and traffic concerns. She stated that the proposed ordinance would require air
475 conditioning units to be enclosed or equipped with noise attenuation devices, and there
476 would be limitations on site access. She noted that routine maintenance and repairs will
477 be confined to business hours and workers will be restricted from servicing antennas via
478 residential areas when possible.

479

480 Commissioner Poschman asked about the installation of past antennas.

481

482 Staff Kahn stated that the City received the most applications for the placement of
483 telecommunications towers after the Telecommunications Act was passed in 1996, and
484 that currently there are 25 sites in the City.

485

486 Staff Kahn noted that in the new Ordinance the City will maintain an inventory of
487 antennas, and each time an application is received, information regarding its location will
488 be made available. She stated that the approval of antennas would require a discretionary
489 permit, which means conditions could be attached that the City deems appropriate, citing
490 as an example the City's authority to increase the range of notification.

491

492 Commissioner Wengraf asked if there have been any noise complaints about existing
493 antennas.

494

495 Commissioner Kahn stated there have been no complaints regarding noise generated
496 from wireless antennas.

497

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

498 Commissioner Wengraf asked to be shown on a map the difference between a 200 foot
499 buffer and a 300 foot buffer, and how this would affect possible antenna placement.

500

501 Nextel staff stated that since 48% of Berkeley is residential, locations would be limited
502 using a 200 foot buffer, and minimal locations would be available with the 300 foot
503 buffer. It was mentioned, however, that no one is proposing a 300 foot buffer at this
504 time.

505

506 Commissioner Wozniak observed that there are only a few sites with multiple carriers,
507 and asked why most of the existing antennas are serviced by a single provider.

508

509 Staff Kahn stated that although this is true, the proposed Ordinance promotes co-location.
510 She stated that as part of the application process, providers would be required to
511 demonstrate why they would not be able to co-locate, and they would have to agree not to
512 impose any requirements on a property owner that would preclude having another carrier
513 locate on the site.

514

515 Commissioner Wozniak asked if any of the existing sites are stealthed.

516

517 Staff Kahn replied that a number of the existing antennas are stealthed; however the new
518 stealthing procedures have improved and they are now camouflaged much more
519 successfully.

520

521 Commissioner Curl asked how many antennas are projected to be placed by the
522 Telecommunications Industry as a result of the passage of this Ordinance. He referred to
523 a map that showed the proliferation of antennas in San Francisco and suggested
524 proliferation of antennas in Berkeley could easily occur if unchecked. He stated that the
525 City should move slowly in the process of adding more antennas since much is still not
526 known about their cumulative effects.

527

528 Commissioner Tabb stated that San Francisco cannot be accurately compared to Berkeley
529 due to the fact that there is a higher residential population and that the population
530 quadruples during the day.

531

532 Commissioner Wozniak asked how many sites are needed to provide adequate coverage,
533 keeping in mind the overlap coverage from adjoining cities.

534

535 Commissioner Wrenn asked the Commission if additional information is necessary to
536 reach a conclusion, or if a decision regarding the Telecommunications Ordinance could
537 be reached during the meeting.

538

539 The general consensus from the Planning Commission was that a decision could not be
540 reached due to a lack of information.

541

APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001

542 Commissioner Wrenn suggested that the Commissioners ask for what is needed to make
543 a decision by the next meeting and express any general concern they may have regarding
544 the Telecommunications Ordinance.

545
546 Commissioner Hicks proposed that the Commissioners examine the present antenna sites
547 to assess the aesthetic impacts.

548
549 Staff Cowan stated that the moratorium on wireless antennas will be lifted at the end of
550 2001, and noted that the item must go to City Council before that time. He explained that
551 there is the risk that the previous Ordinance will be reestablished if action on the new
552 Ordinance does not occur in December. He stated that ideally the City Council would
553 have a decision from the Planning Commission by November 14th, given that the
554 Council must act on this issue by December 18, 2001.

555
556 Commissioner Wozniak asked that the telecommunications industry indicate how many
557 sites they need and that they define "adequate coverage" in more detail.

558
559 A Nextel representative stated that radio frequency engineers will need to address this
560 question and present it to the Planning Commission. She stated that engineers only plan
561 for the network eighteen months to two years in advance.

562
563 Commissioner Poschman stated that he would like the placement of antennas to be
564 required to submit to the ZAB process.

565
566 Commissioner Olson stated that the knowledge of how many antennas are sited at a
567 specific location and the type of antenna is significant because this may affect its
568 reception.

569
570 Commissioner Tabb inquired about the reaction of a Nextel representative after viewing
571 the San Francisco antenna location map and asked what comparisons there may be
572 between San Francisco and Berkeley.

573
574 A Nextel representative stated that the map is not indicative of how the area looks. She
575 stated that many of the antennas may be smaller sites and that it could be misleading.

576
577 Commissioner Tabb asked if multiple antennas are routinely stealthed.

578
579 A Nextel representative stated that antennas are now designed to fit into the existing
580 architecture and to blend in.

581
582 Commissioner Wozniak asked if they use directional antennas.

583
584 A Nextel representative stated that they are now using directional antennas.

585
586 Commissioner Poschman inquired if the pictures provided to the Commission are of
587 residential areas in Berkeley, and if so, where.

**APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OCTOBER 24, 2001**

588

589 A Nextel representative replied that they are not pictures of Berkeley, but residential
590 locations within the Bay Area.

591

592 Kristin Johnston pointed out that Nextel does not place antennas on residential structures
593 but rather on higher buildings within the residential area, such as a church or a hospital
594 since a typical residential dwelling does not provide enough height to make effective use
595 of the antenna.

596

597 Commissioner Poschman stated that Commissioners should look into tower height limits
598 so they may be able to determine how high they should be.

599

600 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

601

602 No report.

603

604 **ADJOURNMENT**

605

606 The meeting was adjourned at 10:20.