1. Call to Order - 6:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call
   Commissioners: Donald Murphy (Chair), Steven Lilley (Vice-Chair), Robin Aeschliman, Bill Bluhm, Jeanne Byrne, Mark Chakwin (Secretary), William Fredrickson.

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Public Comments
   a. Written Communications
      Communications relevant to PC jurisdiction, but not related to a matter on this agenda, are attached under this agenda item.
   b. Oral Communications
      Comments from the audience will not receive PC action. Comments must deal with matters subject to the jurisdiction of the PC and will be limited to three minutes. Comments regarding agenda items shall be heard at the time such items are called. Whenever possible, letters should be submitted to the PC in advance of the meeting.

5. Consent Agenda
   a. Receive Approved January 23, 2019, Historic Resources Committee Minutes
      Description: Receive minutes (no action needed)
      CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378
   b. Receive Approved February 12th, 2019, Architectural Review Board Minutes
      Description: Receive minutes (no action needed)
      CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

6. Regular Agenda
   a. Address: 550 Central Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-171-098)
      Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) 19-0020
      Description: Consider an appeal of the HRC’s February 27, 2019, denial of an Architectural Permit for the installation of two (2) clerestory skylights on the south-facing ridge of the ± 24’ tall existing 1977 public library addition. The new total height at these two locations will be approximately 27’4.5”. The library is on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). No other exterior alterations are proposed at this time.
Zone District/General Plan Designation: Unclassified (U) / Public
Coastal Zone: Yes  Archaeological Sensitivity: Yes  Historic Resources Inventory: Yes
CEQA Status: This project has been determined to be CEQA Exempt under CEQA Guidelines, Class 31, Section 15331, Historic Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation.
Applicant/Owner: Daniel Gho, Public Works Director
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

b. Address: 207 16th Street (APN 006-281-009)
Application #: Use Permit (UP) 18-0975
Description: A Use Permit is required for a proposed Verizon wireless facility to be developed on the roof of an existing 3-story building which is currently being remodeled. The building is located in the Downtown Commercial zoning district which has a height limit of 40'. The top of the proposed screening enclosure will be 51’2” in height. A separate equipment cabinet and antenna rack will also be located on the roof nearby, but at a lower elevation. Per Section 23.64.120 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code, a UP is required for both the proposed use and an exception to the height limit of the zoning district.

Zone District/General Plan Designation: Downtown Commercial (C-D) / Commercial
Coastal Zone: No  Historic Resources Inventory: No  Area of Special Biological Significance: Yes
CEQA Status: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines, Section 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures)
Applicant/Owner: Sequoia Deployment Services for Verizon Wireless / Peony 1031 LLC; Limonium 1031 LLC
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

7. Presentations
None

8. Council Liaison Announcements

9. Commissioner and Staff Announcements

10. Adjournment

The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of devices are available to assist those who are deaf or hard of hearing.

GENERAL NOTICE
- Please note that Section 65009(b)(2) of the California Government Code provides that legal challenges to the City's action on a project may be limited to only those issues raised in testimony during the public hearing process. PC will not consider any new items after 9:00 p.m. Any items remaining on the agenda will be continued either to the next regular meeting or to a special meeting at the discretion of PC. This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are welcome to attend.

NOTICE TO APPLICANTS
- Appearance by Applicant/Representative: Applicants or their representatives must be present at the meeting for which their item, including those items on the Consent Agenda, is scheduled. If unable to attend, the applicant must submit a written request for continuance prior to the meeting. The item may be denied if continuance is not requested.
• **Submittal of Written Communications:** In order to receive due consideration by the Planning Commission, written communications pertaining to agenda items should be submitted to the Community Development Department by **9 A.M. the day prior to the meeting**. Materials submitted subsequent to that time, or directly to the Planning Commission at the meeting, may, at the Commission’s discretion; result in a continuance of the item.

• **Appeals and Appeal Period:** Decisions rendered by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council using a form available at the Community Development Department. The appeal form, plus an appeal fee, must be filed within 10 days of the action being appealed. The aforementioned appeal period notwithstanding, the City Council reserves the right to call up for review Planning Commission decisions until its next regularly scheduled meeting. No building permit pertaining to a Planning Commission action may be issued until the appeal period has passed.

• **Judicial Time Limits:** This serves as written notice that Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC) §1.20.010 incorporates §1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California and provides a ninety-day limitation for judicial review of any final administrative decision by the council, or any board, commissioner, or officer of the city.
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1. Called to Order - 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call
   HRC Members Present: Claudia Sawyer (Chair), Mark Travaille, Joseph Rock (Vice-Chair), Jill Kleiss (Secretary), Mimi Sheridan, Rick Steres, Wilda Northrop

3. Approval of Agenda
   On a motion by Vice-Chair Rock, seconded by Member Steres, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the agenda. Motion passed.

4. Approval of HRC Minutes
   a. December 19, 2018 Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve minutes
      On a motion by Member Sheridan, seconded by Member Steres, the Committee voted 5-0-0-2 (Member Kleiss and Vice-Chair Rock abstain) to approve the December 19, 2018 HRC minutes. Motion passed.

5. Public Comments
   a. Written Correspondence
      Written correspondence was received from Mr. Anthony Ciani on January 22, 2019 pertaining to item 9a – Overview of PGMC Table 23.70.012-1, Types of Review, Applications, and Roles of Review Authorities.
   b. Oral Communications
      None.

6. Reports of Council Liaison
   Councilmember Tomlinson introduced herself as the new City Council liaison and stated she looks forward to being the Council Liaison for this Committee. Councilmember Tomlinson also thanked member Wilda Northrop for her service and welcomed Committee member Geoff Walsh who was not present at the meeting.

7. Items to be Continued or Withdrawn
   None.
8. Consent Agenda

a. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-1022 for 703 Congress Ave.
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Paul Dean
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory

b. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 19-0001 for 769 Spruce Ave.
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Samuel Parlaveccio
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory

c. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 19-0006 for 1049 Morse Dr.
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Linda Temple
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory

On a motion by Member Sheridan, seconded by Vice-Chair Rock, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion passed.

9. Regular Agenda

a. Overview of PGMC Table 23.70.012-1, Types of Review, Applications, and Roles of Review Authorities
   Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
   CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378
   Recommended action: Discuss and accept as information

   Anastazia Aziz, Principal Planner, provided an overview of the PGMC Table 23.70.012-1,
   Types of Review, Applications, and Roles of Review Authorities

   Chair Sawyer opened the floor to public comment.

   Mr. Anthony Ciani, resident, spoke regarding this item.

   Committee members discussed the item and agreed to continue this item for further
   discussion to a future meeting.

10. Presentations and Trainings

a. Applying the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties
   Webinar (1 hr, 15 min.), presented by the California Preservation Foundation
   Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
   CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378
Staff played the pre-recorded California Preservation Foundation webinar on “Applying the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties”.

11. Reports of HRC Members

Chair Sawyer provided a status update on the Downtown Commercial Design Guidelines project.

12. Reports of Staff

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, informed the Committee that the next HRI Update Advisory Group meeting will be on Monday, January 28, 2019.

13. Adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE.

Jill Kleiss, Secretary  
2/27/19  
Date
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1. Called to Order – 4:02 pm

2. Roll Call
   Architectural Review Board Members Present: Sarah Boyle, Jeff Edmonds, Michael Gunby, Terrence Coen, Garrett Van Zantan
   Absent: Jen Veitengruber

3. Election of Officers: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary
   Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
   CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

   Member Edmonds nominated Member Boyle for Chair, seconded by Member Gunby. The Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to elect Member Boyle as Chair.
   Motion passed.

   Member Gunby nominated Member Edmonds for Vice Chair, seconded by Member Coen. The Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to elect Member Edmonds as Vice-Chair
   Motion passed.

   Chair Boyle nominated Member Gunby for Secretary, seconded by Member Coen. The Board voted 5-0-1 to elect Member Gunby as Secretary.
   Motion passed.

4. Approval of Agenda

   On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Member Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to approve the agenda.
   Motion passed.

5. Approval of Minutes
   a. Approval of January 8, 2019 Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve as presented

      On a motion by Member Edmonds, seconded by Member Gunby, the Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to approve the minutes.
      Motion passed.

6. Public Comments
   a. Written Communications
None

b. Oral Communications
Lisa Ciani – Staff Reports and Historic Preservation Ordinance
Betty Aeccklin – Requests ARB members be present for a Zoning Administrator hearing.
Mary Ann Larson Spradling – Voices support of Ms. Aeccklin.

7. Reports of Council Liaison

Mayor Peake provided an update on actions taken by the City Council during its most recent meeting.

8. Consent Agenda
a. Address: 642 Hillcrest Avenue (APN 006-652-015)
   Application #: Use Permit (UP) / Admin. Architectural Permit (AAP) 18-0993
   Description: A recommendation from the ARB to the Planning Commission is needed for exterior and interior alterations to, as well as for a change in use of, an existing detached accessory building in excess of 120 square feet in size. No changes to the existing building are proposed at this time. This review will assist in legitimizing alterations that have occurred in the recent past without the benefit of review.

On a motion by Chair Boyle, seconded by Member Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to approve the Consent Agenda.

9. Regular Agenda
Members of the public are welcome to offer their comments on any of the following items after being recognized by the Chair. Presentations will be limited to three minutes, or as otherwise established by the Commission Chair. Persons are not required to give their name or address, but it is helpful for speakers to state their name in order that they are identified in the minutes.

a. Address: 246 Forest Avenue (APN 006-281-008)
   Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0733
   Description: The proposed project is for the development of two, two-bedroom residential units above the Mum’s Place commercial building located at 246 Forest Avenue. The two units will total ± 2,783 square feet and will be located at the rear one-third of the building overlooking 16th Street. One onsite parking space will be provided in the existing garage. Additional access improvements on the 16th Street side are included as is the return of an infill window on the Forest Ave. façade to match the other existing windows. Although this building is not on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory, it is considered a historic resource given its age and remaining original architectural features. A Phase II Historic Assessment was prepared by a qualified historian which indicates that the project will retain the building’s existing character-defining features and will be undertaken in substantial conformance to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, provided a staff report and answered the Board’s questions.

Jeanne Byrne, the project Architect presented the project and answered the Board’s questions

The Chair opened the floor to public comments.

Lisa Ciani spoke in opposition to the proposed CEQA Exemption, and asked that the project be reviewed by the Historic Resources Committee.
Rick Steres spoke in favor of the project.

Anthony Ciani recommended changes be made to the design to respect the historicity of the building.

Frank Pierce spoke on the proposed CEQA Exemption findings.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

The Board discussed the item.

On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Member Coen, the Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to approve the project with a change to the required number of parking permits, subject to findings, and Class 1 and Class 31 CEQA Exemptions.

**Motion passed.**

b. **Address:** 945 Jewell Avenue (APN 006-131-005)
   **Application #:** Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0946
   **Project Description:** An 808 sq. ft. addition to the rear of an existing 1,080 sq. ft. single-story residence. The ± 11,740 sq. ft. parcel is developed with a detached one-car garage, a small shed, and several trees, all of which will remain. All development standards of the R-1 zoning district will be met. No tree removal is proposed.

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, provided a staff report.

Aaron Tollefson, the project applicant, spoke on the project and answered the Board's questions.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment.

Lisa Ciani asked for the project to be reviewed by the Historic Resources Committee, and also asked for a tribal monitor to be present during ground disturbing activities and for tree protection during construction.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

The Board discussed the item.

The Chair reopened the floor to public comment.

Paul Ratto, the property owner spoke to the tree protection requirements.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

The Board discussed the item.

On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Member Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to approve the project, subject to findings, Class 1 and 31 CEQA Exemptions, with an added condition to have a tribal monitor present during ground disturbing activities.
Motion passed.

c. **Address:** 909 Egan Avenue (APN 006-092-009)
   **Application #:** Architectural Permit (AP) / Tree Permit (TP-D) 18-0896
   **Description:** The project consists of a residential remodel including the demolition of a portion of the rear of the existing two-story house, a 176 sq. ft. attached replacement structure, and a new second-story deck of 77 sq. ft. on the northwest corner of the house to match the existing second-story deck on the northeast corner. The project includes removal of one (1) 19” diameter non-native holly tree which is regulated by Title 12 of the PGMC. The project meets all of the development standards of the R-1 zoning district.

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, provided a staff report.

Doug Howe, the project Architect, presented and answered Board Member’s questions.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment.

Lisa Ciani asked for additional conditions to be imposed on the project.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

The Board discussed the item.

On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Chair Boyle, the Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to approve the project with an added condition requiring a tribal monitor during ground disturbing activities, subject to Findings, modified Conditions of Approval, and Class 1 CEQA Exemption.

**Motion passed.**

d. **Address:** 905 Lighthouse Avenue (APN 006-342-003)
   *This item was continued from the January 8, 2019, ARB meeting.*
   **Application #:** Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 18-0957
   **Description:** The project consists of the demolition of an existing detached garage, the remodel of and 1,284 sq. addition to an existing 1926 Craftsman style residence, and a new single-car detached garage with a 550 sq. ADU above. The project complies with the development standards of the R-4 zoning district.

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, provided a staff report.

Maia Gendreau, the Project Architect, and Rich Gallagher, the owner, presented the project and answered the Board’s questions.

Jim Bustillo spoke in opposition to the project.

Lisa Ciani spoke in opposition to the project.

Joy Calangelo spoke in favor of the project.

A neighbor spoke in opposition of the project.
Karen Bustillo spoke in opposition of the project.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

The Board discussed the item.

On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0-1 (Member Veitengruber absent) to continue the item to a future meeting to allow the project applicant to revise the height of the proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit and to design the primary residence façade to be more sympathetic to the neighborhood.

Motion passed.

10. Reports of ARB Members

Member Gunby provided an update on the Downtown Design Guidelines subcommittee.

Chair Boyle welcomed the newest member of the Architectural Review Board, Garrett Van Zantan.

11. Staff Update

Anastazia Aziz, Principal Planner, provided a status report on the Historic Resources Inventory update.

12. Adjournment – 6:04p.m.

APPROVED BY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Michael Gunby, Secretary

Date
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TO: Chair Murphy and Members of the Planning Commission
FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
MEETING DATE: March 21, 2019
PERMIT & APPLICATION NO.: Architectural Permit (AP) Application No. 19-0020
LOCATION: 550 Central Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-171-098)
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: An appeal of the Historic Resources Committee’s February 27, 2019, denial of the installation of two (2) clerestory skylights on the south-facing ridge of the existing 1977 library addition. The new total height at these two locations will be approximately 27’4.5’’. 
APPLICANT: Daniel Gho, Public Works Director
ZONING/LAND USE: Unclassified/Public
CEQA: Class 31 Categorical Exemption, Section 15331, Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission overturn the Historic Resources Committee’s (HRC) denial of the Architectural Permit for the proposed installation of two (2) clerestory skylights on the south-facing ridge of the existing 1977 library addition. This action is subject to findings, conditions, and a Class 31 CEQA exemption.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
As part of the PG Public Library Renewal Project, the project proposes to install two (2) sets of 4’6” (w) x 3’ (h) wood-framed, fixed clerestory skylights on the ridge of the 1970s addition which is currently approximately 24’ in height. The skylights will be south-facing to improve interior natural light levels and will result in a total height of approximately 27’4.5’’ at these two locations. No other exterior alterations are proposed at this time. Although the library is listed on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), two qualified historians have indicated that, because of the significant alterations and additions that have occurred over the years, the building no longer retains its original historic integrity.
BACKGROUND
Library Renewal Project
The Friends of the Library and the Library Foundation have been meeting, organizing, and fundraising since 2014 and have raised over $2.5 million toward completion of the renewal project. The Library Director indicates that at least 14 public meetings have occurred in the last several years where interested parties were welcome to help inform design changes to the layout of the interior of the building, including ways to let more natural light into the main entrance area; the design showing the proposed clerestory windows, however, was not made available until January of this year.

Furthermore, the renewal project is included on the Council-approved FY 18/19 Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Appeal
On February 27, 2019, this item was reviewed by the HRC at a noticed public hearing. After receiving public testimony and information from the project representatives, Dan Gho, Public Works Director, and Scott Bauer, Library Director, the HRC deliberated on the design of the proposed clerestory windows. A motion to approve the project was made and seconded, but the vote failed due to a three-three split with one abstention.

Site Description
The property is approximately 20,400 sq. ft. in size, is relatively flat and is developed with the City’s public library built in 1907 and funded by the Andrew Carnegie Foundation. Over the years, the original building has been significantly altered including by the large addition on the front elevation which was approved by the Planning Commission in 1976 through the issuance of Use Permit 1163-76. The proposed skylights will be located on this 1976 addition. A historic assessment (Seavey, January 2019) was prepared for this project and is included as an attachment. The City is also undertaking a large interior remodel, but the proposed clerestory windows are the only exterior alterations proposed at this time.

Surrounding Land Uses
The project site is in an area developed with one- and two-story residences on the north and east, Jewell Park to the west and commercial development to the south. The Natural History Museum is located kitty-corner to the library’s southwest corner. The library itself covers the majority of the parcel.

DISCUSSION
Applicable General Plan Policies
The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the City. The Land Use Element includes goals and policies that call for orderly, well-planned, and balanced development, consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. This minor alteration to the roof of the 1976 addition to the PG Library is not inconsistent with “Public” designation expressed in 2.14.4 of the General Plan.

Applicable Zoning Code Regulations
General Plan goals and policies are implemented by Title 23 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC).
Chapter 23.44 of the PGMC describes the permitted uses and development standards of the Unclassified (U) zoning district which was adopted through voter initiative in 1986. Per Section 23.44 of the PGMC, the intent of this chapter is to regulate the development of public facilities, signage relating to public facilities and development standards. There are no established development standards in the U zoning district that regulate height, lot coverage, etc., as these standards are to be developed through the Use Permit process for new development. The Planning Commission granted UP 1163-76 for the addition in 1976, but details on a maximum height for the building were not located.

**Architecture and Historic Resources**

The proposed clerestory skylights will be two (2) sets of wood-framed, fixed windows each set totaling 41.4 sq. ft. of window. The total size of the two new skylights combined will be 82.8 sq. ft. The skylights are proposed as part of the overall interior remodel of the library to allow more natural light into the interior.

As mentioned in the attached historic assessment (Seavey, January 2019), which includes a draft Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Form 523A prepared in August, 2018, by the City’s contracted historic consultant, Page & Turnbull, the building has lost its significance and integrity over the years through additions that were completed outside the guidance of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Mr. Seavey’s analysis indicates that the proposed alteration will not cause a significant adverse effect on the environment.

The photo below of the original Carnegie Library shows a façade that has been completely removed through additions to this south elevation over the years, primarily the large 1976 addition onto which the skylights are proposed to be developed. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties include Rehabilitation as a treatment. The Rehabilitation treatment is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. As such, Rehabilitation is the most frequently used treatment as it allows the most flexibility in terms of additions and alterations.

Both the project historian, Kent Seavey, and Page & Turnbull, note that, although the library as a whole may warrant special consideration locally because of the relationship to the Carnegie legacy, at its locally important architect and builders (McDougall Brothers and Chivers, respectively), the building itself no longer retains the historic integrity generally needed to be found eligible for listing on the national, state or local registry. Although the property is currently on the HRI, both qualified consultants referenced in this report consider the building to be ineligible for listing due to loss of integrity. As such, the proposed skylights on the 1976 addition will not negatively affect a historic resource.
No other exterior alterations are proposed at this time. As the project is not residential in nature, the City’s Residential Design Guidelines are not applicable.

**Landscaping and Fencing**
No changes to the landscaping or fencing are proposed at this time.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)**
In reviewing this action, the City has followed guidelines adopted by the State of California as published in California Administrative Code, Title 14, §15000, et seq. The proposed project is found to be exempt under the Class 31, CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemption, Section 15331, *Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation*.

The Class 31 exemption consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (1995).

**ATTACHMENTS**
A. Application / Appeal Memo Dated February 28, 2019  
B. Draft Permit  
C. CEQA Exemption Form  
D. Seavey Historic Assessment (January 2019)  
E. Site Plan, Elevations  
F. HRC Draft Minutes

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Alyson Hunter  
Associate Planner
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd
Permit Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address: 550 Central Avenue</th>
<th>APN: 006171098000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description: Installation of Two Clerestories on the exterior roof of the Pacific Grove Library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface?  □ Yes  □ No
Will the project impact any tree(s) on site?  □ Yes  □ No

Applicant
Name: City of Pacific Grove
Phone: 831-648-5722
Email: dagho@cityofpacificgrove.org
Mailing Address: 300 Forest Ave

Owner
Name: [Blank]
Phone: Same as Applicant
Email: [Blank]

Mailing Address: [Blank]

Permit Request:
□ CBD: Counter Determination  □ SP: Sign Permit  □ IHS: Initial Historic Screening  □ VAR: Variance
✓ AP: Architectural Permit  □ UP: Use Permit  □ HPP: Historic Preservation  □ MMP: Mitigation Monitoring
□ AAP: Administrative AP  □ AUP: Administrative UP  □ A: Appeal  □ Stormwater Permit
□ ADC: Arch Design Change  □ ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit  □ TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't  □ Other: [Blank]
□ ASP: Admin Sign Permit  □ LLA: Lot Line Adjustment  □ EIR: Environmental Impact  □ Other: [Blank]

CEQA Determination:
□ Exempt  □ Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration  □ Environmental Impact Report
□ Staff  □ HRC  □ Active Permits:
□ ZA  □ PC  □ Active Planning Permit
□ SPRC  □ CC  □ Active Building Permit
□ ARB  □  □ Active Code Violation Permit #:

Overlay Zones:
□ Butterfly Zone  □ Coastal Zone  □ Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)
□ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESH)  □ Other: [Blank]

Planning Staff Use Only:
ZC: [Blank]  GP: [Blank]
Historic Resources Inventory  Archaeologically Sensitive Area

Staff Use Only:
Received by: AH  Assigned to: AH
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INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively “Indemnitees”), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements which may accrue against Indemnitees by reason of the City’s processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney’s fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City’s right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant’s inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City’s duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnities: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City’s misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: ___________________________ Date: ______________

Owner Signature (Required): ___________________________ Date: ______________
TO: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner: Community Development
FROM: Daniel Gho, Public Works Director
DATE: February 28, 2019
RE: Pacific Grove Public Library, Installation of Clerestory Appeal of Historic Resources Committee Decision to the Planning Commission

This memorandum is to request of the Community Development Department that the decision of the Historic Resources Committee, Architectural Permit Application # 19-0020, for the property at 550 Central, Pacific Grove Public Library, be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Over the years, the original library building has been significantly altered including by the large addition on the front elevation which was approved by the Planning Commission in 1976 through the issuance of Use Permit 1163-76.

The current project proposes to install two (2) sets of 4’6” (w) x 3’ (h) wood-framed, fixed clerestory skylights on the ridge of the 1970s addition which is currently approximately 24’ in height. The skylights will be south-facing to improve interior natural light levels and will result in a total height of approximately 27’4.5” at these two locations. No other exterior alterations are proposed. The library is listed on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory, but the proposed project will make the addition of the clerestory on the 1970’s addition.

Public Works and Library staff are requesting that this item be placed on the March 21, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

If you have any questions or need any further information, please contact me at 831-648-5722.
ARCHITECTURAL PERMIT (AP) 19-0020 (APPEAL)  
FOR THE ADDITION OF TWO (2) CLERESTORY SKYLIGHTS ON THE EXISTING SOUTH-FACING ROOF RIDGE OF THE CITY LIBRARY.

FACTS
1. The subject site is located at 550 Central Ave., Pacific Grove, 93950 (APN 006-171-098)
2. The subject site has a designation “Public” on the adopted Pacific Grove General Plan Land Use Map.
3. The project site is located in the Unclassified (U) zoning district. This is a voter-initiative zoning district.
4. The subject site is approximately 20,400 square feet in size.
5. The subject site is currently developed with the 1907 Carnegie Library and subsequent large additions, including the portion of the library built in 1976 which is proposed to be modified by this project.
6. The subject site is located in the Area of Special Biological Significance, the Coastal zone, and is listed on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). This area is also known to be archaeologically sensitive.
7. The proposed alteration qualifies for a Class 31, Section 15331, CEQA exemption for Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation.
8. This Architectural Permit was reviewed by the Historic Resources Committee at a noticed public hearing on February 27, 2019, at which time the permit was denied. The denial has been appealed to the Planning Commission as permitted in PGMC Section 23.74.020.
9. A brief assessment of the proposed project’s potential impacts to the historic resource was prepared by a qualified historian and resulted in a finding of no impact.

FINDINGS
For the Architectural Permit: PGMC Section 23.70.060(f):
1. The architecture and general appearance of the completed project are compatible with the neighborhood;
2. The completed project will neither be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
3. The commission has been guided by and has made reference to applicable provisions of the architectural review guidelines in making its determinations on the structure.

PERMIT
Architectural Permit (AP) 19-0020 for the installation of two (2) clerestory skylights on the south-facing ridge of the ± 24’ tall existing 1977 library addition. The new total height at these two locations will be approximately 27’4.5”.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1. Permit Expiration. This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one (1) year from and after the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.
2. Construction Compliance. All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require Architectural Review Board approval.
3. Terms and Conditions. These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community and Economic Development Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors
of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

4. **Public Works, Fire and Building.** Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a building permit. Any work within the public right-of-way shall require an encroachment permit prior to issuance of the building permit.

5. **Building Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning permit(s) shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:**

1. The Commission determines that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. The Commission hereby approves File No. AP 19-0020 as conditioned and pursuant to CEQA categorical exemption 15331, *Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation*.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the Commission’s 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the owner acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ON THE 21ST DAY OF MARCH, 2019, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:**

- **AYES:** XXX
- **NOES:** XXX
- **ABSENT:** XXX
- **ABSTENTIONS:** XXX  **APPROVED:**

Don Murphy, Chair

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

Daniel Gho, Public Works Director  Date
Property Address/Location: 550 Central Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

File No.: AP 19-0020

Project Description: The installation of two (2) clerestory skylights on the south-facing ridge of the existing 1977 library addition. The new total height at these two locations will be approximately 27’4.5”.

APN: 006-171-098
ZC: Unclassified (U)       GP: Public    Lot Size: ± 20,400 sq. ft.

Applicant Name: Daniel Gho, City of Pacific Grove Public Works Director
Mailing Address: 300 Forest Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Email Address: dgho@cityofpacificgrove.org

Public Agency Approving Project: City of Pacific Grove, Monterey County, California

Exempt Status: (Check One)
☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1):15268))
☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3): 15269(a))
☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c))
☒ Categorical Exemption
Type and Section Number: Class 31, Section 15331

☐ Statutory Exemptions
Type and Section Number: _____________________________
☐ Other: __________________________________________

Exemption Findings:
The project has been reviewed by a qualified historian and found to be in compliance with the Rehabilitation Treatment of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and, therefore, in compliance with the Class 31, § 15331 categorical exemption.

Section 15300.2 (f) or otherwise exceptions to the exemptions do not apply. A qualified historian has determined that the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Contact: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
Contact Phone: (831) 648-3127
Signature: Alyson Hunter    Date: ________________
January 14, 2019

Mr. Daniel Gho-Public Works Director
City of Pacific Grove
2100 Sunset Dr.
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Dear Mr. Gho:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the historic significance of the Pacific Grove Public Library, related to the proposed remodeling project for the 1907 Andrew Carnegie Foundation funded building. As noted in the 2011 Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, the original Mission Revival Style building was designed by the McDougal Brothers, and constructed by local contractor Henry Chivers.

The Historic Context Statement goes on to state that several additions and alterations to the original building envelope took place over time, with the intent to preserve the overall Spanish-influenced architecture of the original design. Unfortunately, those efforts were less than successful, particularly with the employment of some conjectural features that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties does not recommend for work on historic buildings.

Other problems were called out in a 2018 historic assessment of the library by the architectural firm of Page & Turnbull, who found the building to have no physical integrity, confirming an earlier local government review citing the size and extent of the additions to the structure had compromised its historic value.

According to CEQA, eligibility for historic listing of buildings, structures, objects, sites and districts, rests on the twin factors of historic significance, and integrity. Loss of integrity, if sufficiently great, will overwhelm the historic significance a resource may possess and render it ineligible for historic listing. Likewise, a resource can have complete integrity, but if it lacks significance, it must also be considered ineligible. I am in concurrence with these findings and do not think the proposed work will cause a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

HISTORIC PRESERVATION  MUSEUM INTERPRETATION
State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMARY RECORD

Primary # ____________________
HRI # ____________________
Trinomial ____________________
NRHP Status Code 6L

Other Listings ____________________
Review Code ____________________ Reviewer ____________________ Date ____________________

Page 1 of 2 *Resource Name or #: 550 Central Ave (APN 006171098000)

P1. Other Identifier: Central Ave

P2. Location: ☑ Not for Publication ☐ Unrestricted ☑ a. County: Monterey

b. USGS Quad(s): Monterey, California (1997)

c. Address: 550 Central Ave, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006171098000)

d. UTM:

e. Other Locational Data: Latitude, Longitude (Decimal Degrees) 36.62247646481, -121.916280149858

P3a. Description:

- Architectural Style(s): Mission Revival
- Construction Type: Wood Frame
- Number of Stories: 1
- Basement: Not Visible
- Garage: None
- Roof Type(s): Gable
- Roof Material(s): Clay Tile
- Wall Material(s): Stucco
- Window Type(s): Fixed, Awning
- Window Material(s): Wood

- Architectural Features: Recessed Entrance
- Decorative Details: Exposed Rafter Tails, Arched Window(s)
- Alterations: Several large additions; Altered Pattern of Windows and Doors
- Additional Remarks: Original building is L-plan with semi-circular bay. Flanking flat roof volumes are additions. South volume with arcade along Central is an addition.

P3b. Resource Attributes: HP15 (Educational building)

P4. Resources Present: ☑ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photo

*P5b. Description of Photo:
Primary façade, 8/2/2018.

*P6. Date Constructed/Age & Sources:
- Prehistoric
- Protohistoric
- ☑ Historic
- Unknown
1907. Sources: PG HRI Database (6/19/18).

P7. Owner and Address:
City Of Pacific Grove

Pacific Grove, CA 93950

P8. Recorded by:
Hannah Simonson, Page & Turnbull
417 Montgomery Street, 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104

P9. Date Recorded: 8/2/2018

P10. Survey Type: Reconnaissance


*Attachments: ☐ None ☐ Location Map ☐ Sketch Map ☑ Continuation Sheet ☐ Building, Structure, and Object Record
☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record
☐ Artifact Record ☐ Photograph Record ☐ Other:

DPR523A (1/95)

*Required Information
State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
CONTINUATION SHEET

*Resource Name or #: 550 Central Ave (APN 006171098000)
*Recorded By: Hannah Simonson  *Date: 8/2/2018

| Historic Name: Pacific Grove Public Library
| Original Use: Institutional | Present Use: Institutional
| Original Owner: | Architect/Builder: McDougall Brothers (architects); Henry Chivers (builders)

Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement Theme: Social, Religious, or Cultural Institutions, Movements & Trends; Civic Growth

Period of Development:
Integrity: No Integrity
Eligible for Pacific Grove HRI: No
Appears Individually Eligible for National Register/California Register: No
California Historic Resource Status Codes: 6L

Evaluation Notes: Central, north volume of the library is original, but the building has been expanded several times. Due to the size and extent of the additions, the building has been previously determined ineligible for the Pacific Grove HRI through a local government review process. Page & Turnbull concurs with these findings. A status of "6L" has been previously given to the building to indicate that, despite lacking integrity, it may warrant special consideration in local planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National/California Register</th>
<th>PG Municipal Code §23.76</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/1</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>Events, Patterns &amp; Trends</td>
<td>Not found to have sufficient integrity to be eligible under these criteria during the course of this survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Not found to be eligible under these criteria during the course of this survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/3</td>
<td>D, E, F, G, H, I</td>
<td>Architecture &amp; Design</td>
<td>Not found to have sufficient integrity to be eligible under these criteria during the course of this survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/4</td>
<td>Information Potential</td>
<td>Properties were not evaluated for significance under these criteria as part of this survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
3:00 p.m., Wednesday, February 27, 2019
Council Chambers – City Hall – 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA

1. Called to Order - 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call
HRC Members Present: Claudia Sawyer (Chair), Mark Travaille, Joseph Rock (Vice-Chair), Jill Kleiss (Secretary), Mimi Sheridan, Rick Steres, Geoff Welch

3. Election of Officers: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

Member Rock nominated Member Sawyer for Chair, seeing no more nominations, the Chair closed nominations. The Committee voted 7-0-0 to elect Member Sawyer as Chair.

Member Rock nominated Member Sheridan for Vice-Chair, seeing no more nominations, the Chair closed nominations. The Committee voted 7-0-0 to elect Member Sheridan as Vice-Chair.

Member Rock nominated Member Kleiss for Secretary, seeing no more nominations, the Chair closed nominations. The Committee voted 7-0-0 to elect Member Kleiss as Secretary.

4. Approval of Agenda

Vice-Chair Sheridan stated that she will be talking more about historic significance than historic integrity during her presentation.

Chair Sawyer requested to move item 9a on the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

On a motion by Member Rock, seconded by Member Steres, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the agenda as amended. Motion passed.

5. Approval of HRC Minutes
   a. January 23, 2019 Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve minutes

      On a motion by Member Rock, seconded by Vice-Chair Sheridan, the Committee voted 6-0-0-1 (Member Welch abstain) to approve the January 23, 2019 HRC minutes. Motion passed.

6. Public Comments
   a. Written Correspondence
      None.
b. Oral Communications

Ms. Lisa Ciani and Mr. Anthony Ciani addressed the Committee and expressed their concerns pertaining to inconsistencies within the Historic Preservation Ordinance, the HRI Update public comment period, and the handling of project at 246 Forest Ave - Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0733.

7. Reports of Council Liaison

Councilmember Tomlinson informed the Committee and members of the Public about the Community meeting on the Historic Resources Inventory Update project. Councilmember Tomlinson welcomed Committee member Geoff Walsh to the Committee.

8. Items to be Continued or Withdrawn

None.

9. Consent Agenda

a. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 19-0075 for 1208 Surf Ave.

Description: Initial Historic Screening

Applicant/Owner: Gabriela Navarrete

CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA

Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.

Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory

b. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 19-0071 for 522 Beaumont Ave.

Description: Initial Historic Screening

Applicant/Owner: Debby Beck

CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA

Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.

Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory

c. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 19-0093 for 1031 Jewell Ave.

Description: Initial Historic Screening

Applicant/Owner: Joe Cappuccio

CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA

Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.

Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory

Chair Sawyer requested to move item 9a on the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

On a motion by Member Rock, seconded by Vice-Chair Sheridan, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Motion passed.

10. Regular Agenda

a. Previously item 9a on the Consent Agenda

Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 19-0075 for 1208 Surf Ave.

Description: Initial Historic Screening

Applicant/Owner: Gabriela Navarrete

CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA

Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.

Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory
Chair Sawyer pointed that the ineligibility criteria should only be 2b - the property does not exhibit unique architectural, site or locational characteristics.

On a motion by Member Rock, seconded by Vice-Chair Sheridan, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to find that 1208 Surf Ave ineligible as a historic resource because the property does not exhibit unique architectural, site or locational characteristics. Motion passed.

b. Previously item 10a on the Regular Agenda
Address: 550 Central Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-171-098)
Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) 19-0020
Description: The installation of two (2) clerestory skylights on the south-facing ridge of the ± 24’ tall existing 1977 public library addition. The new total height at these two locations will be approximately 27’4.5”. The library is on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). No other exterior alterations are proposed at this time.
Zone District/General Plan Designation: Unclassified (U) / Public
Coastal Zone: Yes  Archaeological Sensitivity: Yes  Historic Resources Inventory: Yes
CEQA Status: This project has been determined to be CEQA Exempt under CEQA Guidelines, Class 31, Section 15331, Historic Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation.
Applicant/Owner: Daniel Gho, Public Works Director
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

Member Rock recused himself because of past working relationship with the project applicant.

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, provided a staff report.

Chair Sawyer opened the floor to public comment.

Daniel Gho, Public Works Director, and Scott Bauer, Library Director spoke regarding this project.

Chair Sawyer closed the floor to public.

The Committee discussed the item.

On a motion to approve the application by Member Travaille, seconded by Vice-Chair Sheridan to approve, the Committee voted 3-3-0-1 (Members Steres, Kleiss, and Sawyer opposed, Member Rock recused).

Due to the tie vote, the motion failed; project was denied.

c. Previously item 10b on the Regular Agenda
Report on 2018 Initial Historic Screenings and Phase I/II Reports
Staff Reference: Anastazia Aziz, AICP, Principal Planner
CEQA status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378
Anastazia Aziz, Principal Planner, provided an overview of the Initial Historic Screenings that were completed in 2018 as well as all Phase I and II reports that were received.

11. Presentations and Trainings
   a. Training on Historic Integrity by HRC Member, Mimi Sheridan
      Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
      CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

       Vice-Chair Sheridan provided a presentation on historic significance and integrity.

12. Reports of HRC Members

       Chair Sawyer provided a status update on the Downtown Commercial Design Guidelines project and informed Committee members and the public regarding the following:

       1) March 1st AIA Lecture Series on Mid-Century architecture;
       2) March 5th Community Meeting on the HRI Update Survey Report and Findings;
       3) March 18th Community Workshop on Downtown Commercial Design Guidelines; and
       4) March 26th Free Webinar on “A Commissioner and Planner’s Primer to the Brown Act”.

       Vice-Chair Sheridan also informed the Committee and public regarding a lecture by Thomas Hines on March 14, 2019 and invited everyone to attend.

13. Reports of Staff

       Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, informed the Committee and members of the public regarding the March 5th Community Meeting on the HRI Update Survey Report and Findings, and invited everyone to attend.

14. Adjourned 4:18 p.m. Next meeting is on March 27, 2019

       APPROVED BY THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE.

_____________________________________   ____________________
Jill Kleiss, Secretary                   Date
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE  
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, California 93950

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Chair Murphy and Members of the Planning Commission

FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner

MEETING DATE: March 21, 2019

LOCATION: 207 16th Street, Pacific Grove

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A Use Permit is required for a proposed Verizon wireless facility to be developed on the roof of an existing 3-story building which is currently being remodeled. The building is located in the Downtown Commercial zoning district which has a height limit of 40’. The top of the proposed screening enclosure will be 51’2” in height. A separate equipment cabinet and antenna rack will also be located on the roof nearby, but at a lower elevation. Per Section 23.64.120 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code, a UP is required for both the proposed use and an exception to the height limit of the zoning district.

APPLICANT: Ben Hackstedde, Sequoia Deployment Services, on behalf of Verizon Wireless

ZONING/LAND USE: Downtown Commercial (C-D) / Commercial

CEQA: Categorical Exemption, Class 3, Section 15303, New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures

RECOMMENDATION: Hold a public hearing to discuss Use Permit No. 18-0975, consider three (3) architectural screening options for the rooftop facility, and approve the Use Permit, subject to recommended findings and Conditions of Approval.

BACKGROUND: On November 21, 2018, the applicant submitted an application for a Use Permit to allow for the installation of a new wireless telecommunications facility (WTF) on the roof of an existing 3-story building that is currently being remodeled. The Use Permit is required per Section 23.64.120 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC or Code) which states that chimneys, cupolas, flagpoles, monuments, radio and other towers, water tanks, and similar structures and mechanical appurtenances may be permitted in excess of height limits provided a use permit is first obtained in each case. The existing building has a rooftop parapet wall which has an average height of 41’ which substantially screens existing HVAC and other equipment on the roof. Existing equipment will not be modified by this project. The current building remodel was approved by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) on February 27, 2018 (AP 18-0096).
DISCUSSION:
Facility Description: Verizon proposes to install six (6) directional panel antennas within a screening structure on the roof of the existing building to enhance its existing 4G wireless service in the area. The screening structure will be approximately 10’ wide by 12’ deep (120 sq. ft.) and extend approximately 8’ above the highest point of the existing parapet wall; the average height of which is 41’ (appr. 43’ at the north end and appr. 39’ at the south end). Within the screening structure, there will be two 4’ antennas, four 6’ antennas, twelve (12) remote radio units (RRUs), non-RF/EMF-transmitting, which shift the entire high-frequency and power electronic segments from the base station to a location adjacent to the antenna functioning as part of the power source, and a surge protection device. Outside the screened area will be located three (3) small metal cabinets for battery, power, GPS and other ancillary equipment. These cabinets will be mostly below the existing parapet wall and substantially visible only from the east elevation which is blocked by existing buildings.

Radio Frequency/Electromagnetic Fields Analysis: The applicant has provided a radio frequency / electromagnetic fields (RF/EMF) report prepared by Hammett & Edison, Inc., a registered California professional engineering consultant qualified to prepare such reports, dated December 14, 2018. This report (attached) analyzes the proposed wireless facility in consideration with other existing facilities in close proximity and concludes that:

Based on the information and analysis above, it is the undersigned’s professional opinion that operation of the base station proposed by Verizon Wireless at 207 16th Street in Pacific Grove, California, can comply with the prevailing standards for limiting human exposure to radio frequency energy and, therefore, need not for this reason cause a significant impact on the environment. The highest calculated level in publicly accessible areas is much less than the prevailing standards allow for exposures of unlimited duration. This finding is consistent with measurements of actual exposure conditions taken at other operating base stations. Locking the roof access door is recommended to establish compliance with public exposure limits; training authorized personnel, marking roof areas, and posting explanatory signs are recommended to establish compliance with occupational exposure limits.

The public exposure recommendations above have been added as Conditions of Approval in the draft permit (attached).

Aesthetics: The applicant has provided three (3) alternative screening options (attached). Each of the options illustrates a rooftop addition to the front of the east elevation, setback approximately 4’ from the edge of the roof. The alternatives show the same size, shape and position of the structure, but different architectural finishes. Although Downtown Commercial Architectural Guidelines are currently under development, none exist at this time.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve Alternative 1 because it continues the aesthetic and design materials of the recent exterior remodel of the building.

ANALYSIS:

The Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act), Section 253, specifies that, although no state or local statute or regulation shall prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the ability to provide any inter- or intrastate telecommunication service, said regulations may protect the public safety and welfare and safeguard the rights of consumers. In other words, local
governments may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities, as long as the local government’s actions do not directly or indirectly prohibit the development of these facilities.

The following is a summary of applicable key provisions of the Act:

**Local Zoning Authority Preserved** – Section 704(a)(7) preserves the authority of State and local governments over decisions regarding the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities, except as provided.

**State and Localities May Not Take Discriminatory or Prohibiting Actions** – The City of Pacific Grove (City) shall not unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services and shall not prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the provision of personal wireless services.

**Procedures for Ruling on Requests to Place, Construct, or Modify Personal Wireless Service Facilities** – Requires local government to act upon a request for authorization to place, construct, or modify personal wireless service facilities within a reasonable time. Any decision to deny a request must be made in writing and be supported by substantial evidence contained in a written record.

**Regulations for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation** – The City is prohibited from denying a permit to install wireless communication equipment based on health concerns over radio frequency emissions, provided that the emissions from the facility comply with FCC standards. The Act also prohibits local jurisdictions from imposing more stringent safety standards than the FCC standards.

Any action to deny an application must be in accordance with 47 U.S.C. §332(c)(7)(B)(ii), (iii), which provides “Any decision by a State or local government to deny a request to place, construct, or modify personal wireless service facilities shall be in writing and be supported by substantial evidence contained in a written record.” The “substantial evidence” standard is deferential to local governments, and generally requires courts to uphold a local finding that is (1) authorized by local law, such as the City Code, and (2) supported by enough evidence for the court to find that reasonable minds could differ as to whether the evidence supports the conclusion. Evidence must be specific to the proposed facility, and "generalized grievances" applicable to all wireless telecommunications facilities are not considered substantial evidence.

PGMC §23.64.120 allows the development of chimneys, cupolas, flagpoles, monuments, radio and other towers, water tanks, and similar structures and mechanical appurtenances to be permitted in excess of height limits provided a use permit is first obtained in each case. The proposed location is in the C-D district, surrounded by C-D and Residential Multi-Family (R-3) districts. PGMC Table 23.31.030 indicates that wireless telecommunication facilities are allowed with a Use Permit in the C-D zone. The proposed site is privately-owned and is not located within a public right-of-way for which the City has recently adopted a regulatory ordinance (Ordinance No. 19-002, titled Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Pacific Grove Adding Chapter 15.30 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code Regarding Utility Encroachments in Public Rights-of-Way, adopted February 6, 2019). As referenced in the PGMC sections above, the subject private property is governed by PGMC Title 23.
The analysis below restates the required findings for a Use Permit, per PGMC §23.70.080(a)(4), and provides staff’s comments based on this particular application:

(A) “The proposed use is allowed with a use permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable provisions of these regulations.”

The proposed facility is to be located on a privately-owned building within the C-D zoning district. As noted above, PGMC. §23.64.120 allows radio and other towers to be permitted in any district subject to first obtaining a use permit. The zoning code does not define “radio and other towers” but defines wireless telecommunication facilities (WTF) as antennas and towers, either individually or together, and associated equipment and structures used for wireless telecommunications purposes. Includes commercial radio, television antennas, and commercial communication transmitters or towers. The WTF use type is clearly enumerated as a use allowed with a Use Permit in the C-D zone per Table 23.31.030.

(B) “The proposed use is consistent with the general plan, the local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan.”

The General Plan is silent with respect to telecommunications equipment and facilities. However, Chapter 2, Land Use, Goal 1, states that development shall, “Provide for orderly, well-planned, and balanced development consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth”. The sensitive location of wireless facilities throughout the City will address the community’s changing digital accessibility needs, will allow new and diverse business opportunities, and will support the critical tourism trade upon which the City relies for revenue. The new facility will also provide additional property tax revenue to the City. The building is not on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) and has just undergone a complete exterior and interior remodel. As proposed, the equipment will not be visible from the street. The project site is not located within the Coastal Zone, nor is it within a Specific Plan area.

(C) “The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use.”

The wireless telecommunication facilities would not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare because the equipment would be installed, maintained and operated in compliance with all applicable public health and safety regulations, including but not limited to all building codes, electrical codes, operational regulations and regulations for exposure to RF/EMF emissions.

Section 704 of the Act expressly preempts local government regulation of the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of RF emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the FCC’s regulations concerning such emissions. The Act also prohibits local jurisdictions from imposing more stringent safety standards than the FCC standards. The RF report
found that the proposal will be below the FCC’s permitted maximums, and therefore will be in full compliance with FCC RF public and occupational safety exposure standard, as conditioned.

The design involves a rooftop installation at a height of 49’ above the surrounding street elevation. The nearest buildings of similar height are the Holman Building to the northeast and the uninhabited bell tower of city hall to the southeast. As the WTF transmits radio signals via line-of-sight, public exposure hazards relating to nearby residences or workplace at that elevation are negligible. As the facility is proposed to be located on a roof, it would not result in significant obstructions that could impede access or create hazards for pedestrians, persons protected under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act, bicyclists or motorists. The equipment would be inaccessible to the general population. A report prepared by Hammet & Edison, Inc., (December 14, 2018) determined the proposed facility will comply with all FCC standards for limiting public exposure to radio frequency energy. As noted in the permit’s conditions of approval, rooftop safety measures will be installed to ensure compliance with these regulations.

(D) “The use, as described and conditionally approved, will not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city.”

The proposed facility would not be detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City because there is no site or context specific evidence in the record at this time to show that the proposed installation would result in such impact. Although public comments for past projects of a similar nature have been made expressing concerns that WTFs may result in negative impact to property values, generalized grievances do not amount to substantial evidence. Accordingly, staff finds that there is no evidence in the record at this time to show that the proposed installation would be detrimental to properties or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city.

(E) “The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity.”

All three (3) of the design alternatives are compatible with the building on which it would be located and with the surrounding built environment. Staff recommends Alternative 1 which best compliments the architectural style and exterior materials of the host building. The proposed use will not generate noise or odors that will adversely impact neighboring uses. Although the screening box, which will be located approximately 4’ from the western edge of the roof and behind a small parapet wall, will be visible from the public right-of-way, the WTF and accessory equipment within will not be. The applicant has provided photo simulations that illustrate the existing and proposed site elevations.

The operating characteristics of the proposed use appear to be compatible with the existing and future land use of the downtown commercial and mixed-use properties nearby, as this project will serve many users within those areas. The installation of the proposed WTF will provide service capacity for some areas that currently have poor service and will boost service levels for areas that currently have good capacity. The proposed project will provide an enhanced level of telecommunication service for
residents, businesses, and visitors. Businesses and residences have come to rely on wireless technologies in their day-to-day operations. Enhanced service levels will support both current and future technologies within the City.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA):
City staff determined the project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Article 19, Section 15303, Class 3, for “construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures; installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures”. The project involves the construction of a small cell wireless communication facility on an existing building.

Furthermore, the project does not qualify for any of the following exceptions to the categorical exemptions found at CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2:

(a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located -- a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

The proposed location is not within an area known to contain any environmental resources of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

(b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

The RF report (Hammett & Edison, December 2018) acknowledges other existing WTFs in the vicinity and asserts that cumulative public exposure of the project-existing conditions is less than prevailing standards.

(c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

There is no evidence in the record that the activity will have a significant effect on public health and safety, protected species, water or air quality, historic resources, or other naturally-occurring or humanmade functions or developments.

(d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.

The project is not located on or near an officially designated state scenic highway.

(e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.
The host building is not listed on the Cortese List which is kept by the California Department of Toxic Substances pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code. There are no such hazardous waste and substances sites located within the City of Pacific Grove.

(f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

The building on which the WTF is proposed to be located was built in 1966 and is not on the City’s HRI. A complete façade upgrade was authorized by the Architectural Review Board in February 2018 under permit AP 18-0096 which has altered the exterior of the building completely. There is no indication that the building qualifies as a historical resource.

CONDITIONS:
Staff recommends approval of the Use Permit based on the design submitted as Alternative 1, findings, and conditions of approval (attached).

ATTACHMENTS:
A. Application
B. Draft Permit
C. CEQA Documentation
D. RF Report
E. Plans and Photo Simulations (Alternatives 1 – 3)

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

__________________________
Alyson Hunter
Associate Planner
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd

Permit Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address: 207 16th St., Pacific Grove, CA 93950</th>
<th>APN: 006-281-009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description: Verizon Wireless is proposing to construct, operate and maintain a new wireless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPICANT/OWNER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Ben Hackstadde w/Sequcia Deployment Services on behalf of Verizon Wireless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 949-259-3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ben.hackstadde@sequcia-ds.com">ben.hackstadde@sequcia-ds.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: 2471 Aspen Street, Suite 200, Lake Forest, CA 92630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Peony 1031 Llc, Limonium 1031 Llc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 831-901-7770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:gij@sgcglobal.net">gij@sgcglobal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: 153 17TH ST, Pacific Grove, CA 92630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permit Request:**

| ☐ CRD: Counter Determination |
| ☐ AP: Architectural Permit |
| ☐ AAP: Administrative AP |
| ☐ ADC: Arch Design Change |
| ☐ ASP: Admin Sign Permit |
| ☐ SP: Sign Permit |
| ☒ UP: Use Permit |
| ☐ AUP: Administrative UP |
| ☐ ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit |
| ☐ LLA: Lot Line Adjustment |
| ☐ LM: Lot Merger |
| ☐ IHS: Initial Historic Screening |
| ☐ HPP: Historic Preservation |
| ☐ A: Appeal |
| ☐ TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't |
| ☐ EIR: Environmental Impact |
| ☐ VAR: Variance |
| ☐ MMP: Mitigation Monitoring |
| ☐ Stormwater Permit |
| ☐ Other: |

**CEQA Determination:**

| ☐ Exempt |
| ☐ Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration |
| ☐ Environmental Impact Report |

**Review Authority:**

| ☐ Staff |
| ☐ HRC |
| ☐ ZA |
| ☒ PC |
| ☐ SPRC |
| ☐ CC |
| ☐ ARB |

**Active Permits:**

| ☐ Active Planning Permit |
| ☐ Active Building Permit |
| ☐ Active Code Violation Permit #: |

**Overlay Zones:**

| ☐ Butterfly Zone |
| ☐ Coastal Zone |
| ☒ Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) |
| ☐ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESH) |

**Property Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot: 5,7,9,11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract: 1st Addn PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC: Commercial C-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP: Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size: 3,201 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Use Only:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received by: A H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assigned to: A H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CERTIFICATION** – I, the undersigned, under penalty of perjury, depose and certify that I am the applicant for this request, that the property owner approves this application and that all statements contained herein, including all documents and plans submitted in connection with this application, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I further acknowledge it is my responsibility to determine whether additional permits are required.

**Applicant Signature:** [Signature]

**Date:** 11-06-2018

**Owner Signature (Required):** [Signature]

**Date:** Updated: 08/17/2017
## Planning Permit Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>25% of base permit fee or $1,000 whichever is greater plus noticing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Update Fee</th>
<th>5% of Permit Fee</th>
<th></th>
<th>$87.65 ( \text{284} )</th>
<th>142.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>$266.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{87.65} )</td>
<td>143.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>25% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>( \checkmark )</td>
<td>( \text{87.65} )</td>
<td>143.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>15% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$0.48 * (# of Mailings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td>( \checkmark )</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>( \checkmark )</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>( \checkmark )</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees: $3,844.80**
## PROJECT DATA SHEET

**Project Address:** Public ROW in front of 618 Sunset Drive, Pacific Grove, CA 93950  
**Submittal Date:**  
**Permit Type(s) & No(s):** Ben Hackeldey, Site Services Deployment Services on behalf of Verizon Wireless

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Required/Permitted</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone District</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Site Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (multi-family projects only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage not counted towards Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Surface Area Created and/or Replaced</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be demolished in feet &amp; % of total*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be built</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stories</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback (specify side)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback (specify side)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Door Setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Parking Spaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncovered Parking Spaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Space Size (interior measurement)</td>
<td>9' x 20'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Driveways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Width(s)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-up Distance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eave Projection (Into Setback)</td>
<td>3' maximum</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances Between Eaves &amp; Property Lines</td>
<td>3’ minimum</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Porch/Deck Projections</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Feature Projections</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; Category of Accessory Buildings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building Setbacks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between Buildings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building Heights</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Heights</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If project proposes demolition to an HRI structure, also indicate % of proposed demolition of the surface of all exterior walls facing a public street or streets, if applicable.

[Rev. 01/14/14]
Letter of Authorization

APPLICATION FOR ZONING/LAND USE ENTITLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>207 16th St., Pacific Grove, CA 93950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number:</td>
<td>006-281-009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I/We, the owner(s) of the above-described property, authorize GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership, a California Limited Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, with offices located at 2785 Mitchell Drive, Walnut Creek, CA 94598, its employees, representatives, agents, and/or consultants, to act as an agent on my/our behalf for the purpose of creating, filing and/or managing any land use and building permit applications, or any other entitlements necessary to construct and operate a wireless communications facility on the above-described property. I/We understand that any application may be denied, modified, or approved with conditions, and that such conditions or modifications must be complied with prior to issuance of building permits.

I/We further understand that signing of this authorization in no way creates an obligation of any kind.

Owner(s): ANTHONY FOUX AND GREGORY ZIMMERMAN

By: ______________________ By: ______________________

Signature: ______________________ Signature: ______________________

Print Name: ANTHONY FOUX Print Name: ______________________

Title: Owner Title: ______________________

Date: 10/16/2018 Date: ______________________

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California
County of MONTEREY

On Oct. 16, 2018 before me, VICTORIA H. ARROYO, Notary Public, personally appeared

ANTHONY FOUX

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: ______________________

VICTORIA H. ARROYO
Notary Public - California
Monterey County
Commission # 2215533
My Comm. Expires Sep 23, 2021
Letter of Authorization
APPLICATION FOR ZONING/LAND USE ENTITLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>207 16th St., Pacific Grove, CA 93950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number:</td>
<td>006-281-009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I/We, the owner(s) of the above-described property, authorize GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership, a California Limited Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, with offices located at 2785 Mitchell Drive, Walnut Creek, CA 94598, its employees, representatives, agents, and/or consultants, to act as an agent on my/our behalf for the purpose of creating, filing and/or managing any land use and building permit applications, or any other entitlements necessary to construct and operate a wireless communications facility on the above-described property. I/We understand that any application may be denied, modified, or approved with conditions, and that such conditions or modifications must be complied with prior to issuance of building permits.

I/We further understand that signing of this authorization in no way creates an obligation of any kind.

**Owner(s):** ANTHONY FOUX AND GREGORY ZIMMERMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By:</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Name:</td>
<td>GREG ZIMMERMAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By:</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Name:</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>10/18/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California
County of monterey

On OCT 18, 2018 before me, VICTORIA H. ARROYO Notary Public, personally appeared Greg Zimmerman who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature:

VICTORIA H. ARROYO
Notary Public – California
Monterey County
Commission # 2215553
My Comm. Expires Sep 23, 2021
June 15, 2017

RE: Sequoia Development Service, Inc. as representative for Verizon

To Whom It May Concern:

Sequoia Development Service, Inc. and its employees are authorized representatives of Verizon and have been contracted to perform cellular site development (i.e. real estate leasing, land use entitlements, materials procurement, architectural engineering, equipment installation, design, and construction, etc.) on behalf of Verizon, in connection with their telecommunications facility.

As an authorized representative of Verizon, Sequoia Development Service, Inc. may submit/order (i.e. land use applications and permits, utilities, real estate leasing, etc.) on behalf of Verizon.

Sincerely,

Cathy Beagle
Verizon
Network Real Estate
July 18, 2018

Re: Sequoia Land Use Planning & Permit Expediting Team

To Whom It May Concern:

The following individuals are employees of Sequoia Deployment Services, Inc. As members of our Land Use Planning and Permit Expediting Team these individuals are authorized to file and process applications on behalf of Sequoia Deployment Services, Inc.

Ben Hackstedde
Len Jensen
Kevin Bishop
Esi Liege
Michael Nazaroff
Michael Shubin

Please call me directly at 619.346.5539 if there is any question regarding the capacities of these individuals.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dayna Aguirre
Planning Manager
Sequoia Deployment Services, Inc.

22471 Aspan Street, Suite 290, Lake Forest, CA 92630
USE PERMIT (UP) No. 18-0975
FOR A ROOFTOP WIRELESS FACILITY ON AN EXISTING THREE-STORY BUILDING
LOCATED AT 207 16\textsuperscript{th} STREET IN DOWNTOWN PACIFIC GROVE

FACTS
1. The project site is located on the roof of an existing 3-story commercial building in downtown Pacific Grove. The address is 207 16\textsuperscript{th} Street and it is located on the east side of 16\textsuperscript{th} St., between Lighthouse Avenue and Laurel Avenue, within the commercial core of the City.
2. The site is zoned Downtown Commercial (C-D) and has a General Plan designation of Commercial.
3. The approximately 3,000 sq. ft. site is surrounded by commercial development to the north, east, and west, the City’s municipal parking lot on the northwest, and a parking lot shared with the Grove Market on the south. The proposed small cell wireless facility will be located approximately 49’ above ground level with a maximum height of the screening structure at 51’ above ground level.
4. Wireless telecommunication facilities may be permitted in the C-D district and “radio and other towers” may be developed in exceedance of the height limit of the zoning district, provided a use permit shall first be obtained in each case, per PGMC Sections 23.31.030 and 23.64.120, respectively.

FINDINGS
1. This project has been determined to be Exempt under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Class 3, Section 15303; exceptions under Section 15300.2 do not apply.
2. Per PGMC. Section 23.70.080(a)(4):
   a. The proposed use is allowed with a use permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable provisions of these regulations;
   b. The proposed use is consistent with the general plan;
   c. The establishment, maintenance, and operation of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use;
   d. The use, as described and conditionally approved, will not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare to the city; and
   e. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
1. Permit Expiration. This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one (1) year from and after the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.
2. Construction and Use Compliance. All activities must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application for this Use Permit, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require Planning Commission approval.
3. Public Works, Fire, and Building. Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a Building Permit. Work taking place in the public right-of-
way shall require an Encroachment Permit prior to issuance of the building permit. The equipment shall be installed, maintained and operated in compliance with all applicable public health and safety regulations, which includes without limitation all building codes, electrical codes, pole installation regulations and regulations for exposure to RF emissions.

4. **Conformance to Plans.** Development of the site shall conform to approved plans for “Pacific Grove Lighthouse – Location Code 386204” (Revised), submitted to the Community Development Department on January 21, 2019, with the exception of any subsequently approved changes. Subsequent changes shall require city approval and may require further CEQA review.

5. **Signature.** The Use Permit is not valid and construction shall not commence until a copy of the permit signed by the permittee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permits and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Community Development Department.

6. **Terms and Conditions.** These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Planning Commission and the Permittee to bind all permittees of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made, and the Planning Commission approves, any such amendments pursuant to the Zoning Code regulations.

7. **Conditions of Approval in Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning permit shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

8. **Traffic Control Plan.** If temporary closure of 16th Street or other public right-of-way is required for construction and/or staging, the permittee shall receive an encroachment permit from the Building Department which includes a traffic control plan to be approved by the City Engineer.

9. **Federal Communications Commission (FCC).** The facility shall be operated in full compliance at all times with applicable FCC guidelines and regulations. Warning signs shall be posted in compliance with FCC guidelines and requirements and to notice about potential exposure to RF emissions.

10. **Signage.** No logos, signs or other forms of advertising are permitted to be installed on antennas or related equipment, with the exception of warning signs as noted above.

11. **Ongoing Operational Safety Requirements.**
   a. The roof access door shall be locked to ensure that unauthorized personnel do not access the area;
   b. All authorized personnel shall have appropriate RF training, including the use of personal monitor use and logout/tagout procedures;
   c. No access within 56 feet directly in front of the Verizon antennas themselves, such as might occur during certain maintenance activities, shall be allowed while the base station is in operation, unless other measures can be demonstrated to ensure that occupational protection requirements are met;
   d. Boundary lines shall be marked on the roof with blue and yellow paint to identify areas within which exposure levels are calculated to exceed the public and occupational FCC limits, respectively, as shown in Figure 3 of the Hammett & Edison Report dated December 14, 2018, on file with CDD; and
   e. Explanatory signs* shall be posted on the inside of the roof access door, at the boundary stripes, and on the screens in front of the antennas, readily visible from any angle of approach to persons who might need to work within that distance. (*See footnote on Pg. 4 of 4 of the H&E Report, Dec. 14, 2018)

12. **Reports.** The permittee shall submit an annual monitoring report prepared by a licensed electrical/mechanical engineer to the Community Development Department for the purpose of demonstrating that the facility is in full compliance with guidelines and regulations established by the FCC regarding radio frequency emissions. The first report shall be due one year from final approval of the building permit required for installation of the equipment, and any other additional reports may be required.
13. **Equipment.** No additional antennas or related equipment may be installed without prior approval from the Community Development Department. The permittee shall remove antennas and equipment that have not been in service for a continuous period of six (6) months.

14. **Road, Sidewalk, and Landscape Condition.** All affected roads, sidewalks, and landscape shall be restored to original or better condition.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:**

1. The Commission determines that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. The Commission authorizes approval of Use Permit No. 18-0975 for a rooftop small cell wireless telecommunications facility and associated equipment, as depicted on the plans received by the City on January 21, 2019.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the permittee acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE**

this 21\textsuperscript{st} day of March, 2019, by the following vote:

- **AYES:** XXX
- **NOES:** XXX
- **ABSENT:** XXX
- **ABSTENTIONS:** XXX

**APPROVED:**

________________________________________
DON MURPHY, Chair

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

_____________________________________________
Ben Hackstedde, Sequoia Deployment Services,
on behalf of Verizon Wireless (Permittee)
NOTICE OF EXEMPTION FROM CEQA

Property Address/Location: 207 16th Street, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

File No. UP 19-0975  APN: 006-281-009

Project Description: A Use Permit is required for a proposed Verizon wireless facility to be developed on the roof of an existing 3-story building which is currently being remodeled. The building is located in the Downtown Commercial zoning district which has a height limit of 40’. The top of the proposed screening enclosure will be 51’2” in height. A separate equipment cabinet and antenna rack will also be located on the roof nearby, but at a lower elevation. Per Section 23.64.120 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code, a UP is required for both the proposed use and an exception to the height limit of the zoning district.

ZC: Downtown Commercial (C-D)  GP: Commercial  Lot Size: appr. 3,000 sq. ft.

Applicant Name: Ben Hackstedde, Sequoia Deployment Services for Verizon Wireless, Inc.
Phone #: 949-259-3344
Mailing Address: 22471 Aspan Street, Suite 290, Lake Forest, CA 92630
Email Address: ben.heckstedde@sequoia-ds.com

Public Agency Approving Project: City of Pacific Grove, Monterey County, California

Exempt Status (Check One):

☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1):15268))
☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3): 15269(a))
☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c))
☒ Categorical Exemption

Type and Section Number: Class 3, Section 15303

☐ Statutory Exemptions

Type and Section Number: ____________________________

☐ Other: ____________________________

Exemption Findings: Class 3, for “construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures; installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures”. The project involves the construction of a small cell wireless communication facility on an existing building.

The project does not qualify for any of the following exceptions to the exemptions, Section 15300.2: location, cumulative impact, significant effect, scenic highways, hazardous waste sites or historical resources.

Contact: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner  Contact Phone: (831) 648-3127

Signature: Alyson Hunter  Date: _______________
Statement of Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers

The firm of Hammett & Edison, Inc., Consulting Engineers, has been retained on behalf of Verizon Wireless, a personal wireless telecommunications carrier, to evaluate the base station (Site No. 386204 “Pacific Grove Lighthouse”) proposed to be located at 207 16th Street in Pacific Grove, California, for compliance with appropriate guidelines limiting human exposure to radio frequency (“RF”) electromagnetic fields.

Executive Summary

Verizon proposes to install directional panel antennas above the roof of the commercial building located at 207 16th Street in Pacific Grove. The proposed operation will comply with the FCC guidelines limiting public exposure to RF energy; certain mitigation measures are recommended to comply with FCC occupational guidelines.

Prevailing Exposure Standards

The U.S. Congress requires that the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) evaluate its actions for possible significant impact on the environment. A summary of the FCC’s exposure limits is shown in Figure 1. These limits apply for continuous exposures and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, regardless of age, gender, size, or health. The most restrictive FCC limit for exposures of unlimited duration to radio frequency energy for several personal wireless services are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wireless Service</th>
<th>Frequency Band</th>
<th>Occupational Limit</th>
<th>Public Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microwave (Point-to-Point)</td>
<td>5–80 GHz</td>
<td>5.00 mW/cm²</td>
<td>1.00 mW/cm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi (and unlicensed uses)</td>
<td>2–6</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS (Broadband Radio)</td>
<td>2,600 MHz</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCS (Wireless Communication)</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS (Advanced Wireless)</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS (Personal Communication)</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR (Specialized Mobile Radio)</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 MHz</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[most restrictive frequency range]</td>
<td>30–300</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Facility Requirements

Base stations typically consist of two distinct parts: the electronic transceivers (also called “radios” or “channels”) that are connected to the traditional wired telephone lines, and the passive antennas that send the wireless signals created by the radios out to be received by individual subscriber units. The transceivers are often located at ground level and are connected to the antennas by coaxial cables. A small antenna for reception of GPS signals is also required, mounted with a clear view of the sky.
Because of the short wavelength of the frequencies assigned by the FCC for wireless services, the antennas require line-of-sight paths for their signals to propagate well and so are installed at some height above ground. The antennas are designed to concentrate their energy toward the horizon, with very little energy wasted toward the sky or the ground. This means that it is generally not possible for exposure conditions to approach the maximum permissible exposure limits without being physically very near the antennas.

**Computer Modeling Method**

The FCC provides direction for determining compliance in its Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65, “Evaluating Compliance with FCC-Specified Guidelines for Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Radiation,” dated August 1997. Figure 2 describes the calculation methodologies, reflecting the facts that a directional antenna’s radiation pattern is not fully formed at locations very close by (the “near-field” effect) and that at greater distances the power level from an energy source decreases with the square of the distance from it (the “inverse square law”). The conservative nature of this method for evaluating exposure conditions has been verified by numerous field tests.

**Site and Facility Description**

Based upon information provided by Verizon, including zoning drawings by Cellsius Engineering Group, dated July 10, 2018, it is proposed to install six JMA Wireless directional panel antennas – four Model MX06FRO640-02 and two Model MX06FRO460-02 – behind view screens to be installed above the roof of the three-story commercial building located at 207 16th Street in Pacific Grove. The four MX06FRO640-02 antennas would employ up to 6° downtilt, would be mounted at an effective height of about 48 feet above ground, 7 feet above the roof, and would be oriented in pairs toward 100°T and 310°T. The two MX06FRO460-02 antennas would employ 2° downtilt, would be mounted at an effective height of about 49 feet above ground, 8 feet above the roof, and would be oriented toward 200°T. The maximum effective radiated power proposed from each antenna group is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>100°T &amp; 310°T</th>
<th>200°T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>19,060 Watts</td>
<td>9,120 Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>5,000 Watts</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular</td>
<td>9,120 Watts</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 MHz</td>
<td>7,420 Watts</td>
<td>3,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Verizon indicates it will operate at reduced power in this band so as not to exceed the emission limit in §24.232 of the FCC Rules.
There are reported similar antennas high on the sides of the equipment penthouse above the roof of the Holman Building located at 542 Lighthouse Avenue, about 360 feet to the northeast, for use by AT&T Mobility and Sprint. For the limited purpose of this study, the transmitting facilities of those carriers are assumed to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Maximum ERP</th>
<th>Antenna Model</th>
<th>Downtilt</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>2,100 watts</td>
<td>Andrew SBNH-1D6565A</td>
<td>3°</td>
<td>65 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>Andrew SBNH-1D6565A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cellular</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>Andrew SBNH-1D6565A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>700 MHz</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Andrew SBNH-1D6565A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprint</td>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>KMW ET-X-WM-18-65-8P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>KMW ET-X-TS-70-15-62-18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>KMW ET-X-TS-70-15-62-18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also reported that similar antennas are installed at Wilkie’s Hotel, located at 1038 Lighthouse Avenue, more than a half-mile away. Due to the distance between the proposed Verizon antennas and the antennas at the Hotel, calculated RF exposure contributions at ground and any nearby buildings from either site on the other are negligible.

**Study Results**

For a person anywhere at ground, the maximum RF exposure level due to the proposed Verizon operation is calculated to be 0.079 mW/cm², which is 15% of the applicable public exposure limit. The maximum calculated cumulative level at ground, for the simultaneous operation of Verizon and the carriers at the Holman Building, and ignoring the signal attenuation due to the intervening buildings, is 16% of the public exposure limit. The maximum calculated cumulative level at the second-floor elevation of any nearby building † is 23% of the public exposure limit. The maximum calculated cumulative level at the second-floor elevation of any nearby residence ‡ is 18% of the public exposure limit. It should be noted that these results include several “worst-case” assumptions and therefore are expected to overstate actual power density levels from the proposed operation. Exposure levels are calculated to exceed the applicable exposure limits in certain areas on the roof of the subject building, as shown in Figure 3.

**Recommended Mitigation Measures**

It is recommended that the roof access door be kept locked, so that the Verizon antennas are not accessible to unauthorized persons. To prevent occupational exposures in excess of the FCC guidelines, it is recommended that appropriate RF safety training, to include review of personal monitor use and lockout/tagout procedures, be provided to all authorized personnel who have access to the structure,

---

† Located at least 45 feet to the north, based on the drawings.
‡ Located at least 270 feet to the west, based on photographs from Google Maps.
including employees and contractors of Verizon and of the property owner. No access within 56 feet directly in front of the Verizon antennas themselves, such as might occur during certain maintenance activities, should be allowed while the base station is in operation, unless other measures can be demonstrated to ensure that occupational protection requirements are met. It is recommended that the boundary lines be marked on the roof with blue and yellow paint to identify areas within which exposure levels are calculated to exceed the public and occupational FCC limits, respectively, as shown in Figure 3. It is recommended that explanatory signs§ be posted on the inside of the roof access door, at the boundary stripes, and on the screens in front of the antennas, readily visible from any angle of approach to persons who might need to work within that distance.

Conclusion

Based on the information and analysis above, it is the undersigned’s professional opinion that operation of the base station proposed by Verizon Wireless at 207 16th Street in Pacific Grove, California, can comply with the prevailing standards for limiting human exposure to radio frequency energy and, therefore, need not for this reason cause a significant impact on the environment. The highest calculated level in publicly accessible areas is much less than the prevailing standards allow for exposures of unlimited duration. This finding is consistent with measurements of actual exposure conditions taken at other operating base stations. Locking the roof access door is recommended to establish compliance with public exposure limits; training authorized personnel, marking roof areas, and posting explanatory signs are recommended to establish compliance with occupational exposure limits.

Authorship

The undersigned author of this statement is a qualified Professional Engineer, holding California Registration Nos. E-13026 and M-20676, which expire on June 30, 2019. This work has been carried out under his direction, and all statements are true and correct of his own knowledge except, where noted, when data has been supplied by others, which data he believes to be correct.

December 14, 2018

§ Signs should comply with OET-65 color, symbol, and content recommendations. Contact information should be provided (e.g., a telephone number) to arrange for access to restricted areas. The selection of language(s) is not an engineering matter, and guidance from the landlord, local zoning or health authority, or appropriate professionals may be required.
The U.S. Congress required (1996 Telecom Act) the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) to adopt a nationwide human exposure standard to ensure that its licensees do not, cumulatively, have a significant impact on the environment. The FCC adopted the limits from Report No. 86, “Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields,” published in 1986 by the Congressionally chartered National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (“NCRP”). Separate limits apply for occupational and public exposure conditions, with the latter limits generally five times more restrictive. The more recent standard, developed by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers and approved as American National Standard ANSI/IEEE C95.1-2006, “Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz,” includes similar limits. These limits apply for continuous exposures from all sources and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, regardless of age, gender, size, or health.

As shown in the table and chart below, separate limits apply for occupational and public exposure conditions, with the latter limits (in italics and/or dashed) up to five times more restrictive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (MHz)</th>
<th>Electro Magnetic Fields (f is frequency of emission in MHz)</th>
<th>Power Density (mW/cm²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Range</td>
<td>Electric Field Strength (V/m)</td>
<td>Magnetic Field Strength (A/m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 – 1.34</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34 – 3.0</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 30</td>
<td>1842/f</td>
<td>4.89/f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 300</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 – 1,500</td>
<td>3.54√f</td>
<td>1.59√f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 – 100,000</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher levels are allowed for short periods of time, such that total exposure levels averaged over six or thirty minutes, for occupational or public settings, respectively, do not exceed the limits, and higher levels also are allowed for exposures to small areas, such that the spatially averaged levels do not exceed the limits. However, neither of these allowances is incorporated in the conservative calculation formulas in the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65 (August 1997) for projecting field levels. Hammett & Edison has built those formulas into a proprietary program that calculates, at each location on an arbitrary rectangular grid, the total expected power density from any number of individual radio sources. The program allows for the description of buildings and uneven terrain, if required to obtain more accurate projections.
RFR.CALC™ Calculation Methodology

Assessment by Calculation of Compliance with FCC Exposure Guidelines

The U.S. Congress required (1996 Telecom Act) the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) to adopt a nationwide human exposure standard to ensure that its licensees do not, cumulatively, have a significant impact on the environment. The maximum permissible exposure limits adopted by the FCC (see Figure 1) apply for continuous exposures from all sources and are intended to provide a prudent margin of safety for all persons, regardless of age, gender, size, or health. Higher levels are allowed for short periods of time, such that total exposure levels averaged over six or thirty minutes, for occupational or public settings, respectively, do not exceed the limits.

Near Field.
Prediction methods have been developed for the near field zone of panel (directional) and whip (omnidirectional) antennas, typical at wireless telecommunications base stations, as well as dish (aperture) antennas, typically used for microwave links. The antenna patterns are not fully formed in the near field at these antennas, and the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin No. 65 (August 1997) gives suitable formulas for calculating power density within such zones.

For a panel or whip antenna, power density \( S = \frac{180}{\theta_{bw}} \times \frac{0.1 \times P_{\text{net}}}{\pi \times D \times h}, \) in mW/cm²,

and for an aperture antenna, maximum power density \( S_{\text{max}} = \frac{0.1 \times 16 \times \eta \times P_{\text{net}}}{\pi \times h^2}, \) in mW/cm²,

where \( \theta_{bw} = \) half-power beamwidth of the antenna, in degrees, and \( P_{\text{net}} = \) net power input to the antenna, in watts, \( D = \) distance from antenna, in meters, \( h = \) aperture height of the antenna, in meters, and \( \eta = \) aperture efficiency (unitless, typically 0.5-0.8).

The factor of 0.1 in the numerators converts to the desired units of power density.

Far Field.
OET-65 gives this formula for calculating power density in the far field of an individual RF source:

\[
\text{power density } S = \frac{2.56 \times 1.64 \times 100 \times \text{RFF}^2 \times \text{ERP}}{4 \times \pi \times D^2}, \text{ in mW/cm}^2,
\]

where ERP = total ERP (all polarizations), in kilowatts,
RFF = relative field factor at the direction to the actual point of calculation, and
\( D = \) distance from the center of radiation to the point of calculation, in meters.

The factor of 2.56 accounts for the increase in power density due to ground reflection, assuming a reflection coefficient of 1.6 (1.6 x 1.6 = 2.56). The factor of 1.64 is the gain of a half-wave dipole relative to an isotropic radiator. The factor of 100 in the numerator converts to the desired units of power density. This formula has been built into a proprietary program that calculates, at each location on an arbitrary rectangular grid, the total expected power density from any number of individual radiation sources. The program also allows for the description of uneven terrain in the vicinity, to obtain more accurate projections.
Proposed Base Station (Site No. 386204 “Pacific Grove Lighthouse”)
Verizon Wireless • 207 16th Street • Pacific Grove, California

Calculated RF Exposure Levels on Roof

Recommended Mitigation Measures
• Lock roof access door
• Mark boundaries as shown
• Post explanatory signs
• Provide training

Notes: See text.
Calculations performed according to OET Bulletin 65, August 1997.

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shaded color</th>
<th>Less Than Public</th>
<th>Exceeds Public</th>
<th>Exceeds Occupational</th>
<th>Exceeds 10x Occupational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary marking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign type</td>
<td>I - Green INFORMATION</td>
<td>B - Blue NOTICE</td>
<td>Y - Yellow CAUTION</td>
<td>O - Orange WARNING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verizon antenna groups

Notes: See text.
# Pacific Grove Lighthouse

**207 16th St.**
**Pacific Grove, CA 93950**

**Location Code:** 386204

**Project Type:** New Site Development

## Site Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>207 16th St. Pacific Grove, CA 93950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>831-372-6321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@pacificgrovelighthouse.org">info@pacificgrovelighthouse.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Zoning Drawing

- Zoning Code: Z-1
- Zoning District: Residential
- Zoning Area: Single Family

## Vicinity Map

![Vicinity Map Image]

## Project Description

- **Location:** 207 16th St., Pacific Grove, CA 93950
- **Project Type:** New Site Development

## Drawing Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheet No.</th>
<th>Title Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>Plan and Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Accessibility Note

- All pathways, paths, and grades shall be designed in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the City of Pacific Grove’s local ADA guidelines.

## General Notes

- All construction shall comply with the City of Pacific Grove’s building codes and regulations.

## Applicable Codes

- California Building Code
- American National Standard Institute Code
- International Building Code
- City of Pacific Grove Zoning Code

## Approvals

- Project Manager: John Doe
- Architect: Jane Smith
- Contractor: Alice Johnson

## Driving Directions

1. **From Monterey Bay Area:**
   - Take Highway 1 to Pacific Grove.
   - Turn right onto 16th St.
   - Parking is available on the street.

2. **From San Francisco Area:**
   - Take Highway 101 to Pacific Grove.
   - Take the Pacific Grove exit and continue on 16th St.
   - Parking is available on the street.

## Do Not Scale Drawings

- **Scale:** 1" = 100'
- ** DNC:** 2018-01
- **Prepared By:** John Doe
- **Reviewed By:** Jane Smith
- **Drawn By:** Alice Johnson

---

**Title Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheet Number</th>
<th>T-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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Alternative 1

PACIFIC GROVE LIGHTHOUSE

207 16th Street  Pacific Grove  CA  93950

PROPOSED ANTENNA SCREEN

PROPOSED EQUIPMENT BEYOND

Location

Existing

Proposed

Looking Northwest From Forest Avenue

Accuracy of photo simulation based upon information provided by project applicant.
Alternative 1
PACIFIC GROVE LIGHTHOUSE
207 16th Street Pacific Grove CA 93950

LOCATION

EXISTING

PROPOSED

LOOKING SOUTHWEST FROM LIGHTHOUSE AVENUE AND FOREST AVENUE

PROPOSED ANTENNA SCREEN BEYOND
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Alternative 1

Pacific Grove Lighthouse

207 6th Street  Pacific Grove  CA  93950

LOCATION

Existing

PROPOSED

Looking south from Lighthouse Avenue

PROPOSED ANTENNA SCREEN

ACURACY OF PHOTO SIMULATION BASED UPON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY PROJECT APPLICANT.
Alternative 2
PACIFIC GROVE LIGHTHOUSE
207 16th Street Pacific Grove CA 93950

LOCATION

©2018 Google Maps

EXISTING

PROPOSED

LOOKING EAST FROM ADJACENT PARKING LOT

PROPOSED ANTENNA SCREEN

PROPOSED EQUIPMENT CABINETS

Accuracy of maps simulation. Based Upon Information Provided By Requested Agency.
Alternative 2

PACIFIC GROVE LIGHTHOUSE

207 16th Street Pacific Grove CA 93950

LOCATION

Existing

PROPOSED

PROPOSED ANTENNA SCREEN

LOOKING NORTHEAST FROM 16TH STREET AND LAUREL AVENUE

Accuracy of photo simulation based upon information provided by project applicant.
Alternative 2

PACIFIC GROVE LIGHTHOUSE
207 16th Street  Pacific Grove  CA  93950

[Images of Location, Existing, Proposed views of the area]

PROPOSED ANTENNA SCREEN

LOOKING SOUTH FROM LIGHTHOUSE AVENUE

©2018 Google Maps
Alternative 3

PACIFIC GROVE LIGHTHOUSE
207 16TH STREET PACIFIC GROVE CA 93950

LOCATION

EXISTING

PROPOSED

LOOKING EAST FROM ADJACENT PARKING LOT

PROPOSED ANTENNA SCREEN

PROPOSED EQUIPMENT CABINETS

©2016 Google Maps

REVISED

RECEIVED

FEB 27, 2019

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE COMMUNITY DEV DEPT

AGREEMENT OF PHOTO SIMULATION BASED UPON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY PROJECT APPLICANT.