

These minutes will be considered for approval at the Planning Commission meeting of 11-20-2024.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
October 2, 2024 @ 6:00 p.m.  
San Clemente City Hall Council Chamber  
910 Calle Negocio, San Clemente, CA 92673  
Teleconference via [www.san-clemente.org](http://www.san-clemente.org)**

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Cosgrove called the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of San Clemente to order at 6:03 p.m. The meeting was offered in person at San Clemente City Hall Council Chambers, 910 Calle Negocio, San Clemente, California, 92673, and also via live stream from the City's YouTube Channel.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Vice Chair McCaughan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Scott McKhann; Chair Pro Tem M. Steven Camp; Karen Prescott-Loeffler; Vice Chair Gary P. McCaughan, M.D. and Chair Cameron Cosgrove

Commissioners Absent: Brenton Davis and Barton Crandell

Staff Present: Jonathan Lightfoot, City Planner  
Gena Burns, Deputy City Attorney  
Zach Rehm, Principal Planner  
Zachary Ponsen, Assistant City Engineer  
Ryan Kim, Senior Civil Engineer  
John Ciampa, Contract Planner  
Tamara Tatich, Office Specialist

*These minutes reflect the order in which items appeared on the meeting agenda and do not necessarily reflect the order in which items were actually considered.*

**4. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS/SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

None.

**5. MINUTES**

- A. Receive and file Minutes from the Planning Commission Special Meeting of August 21, 2024.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER MCKHANN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PRESCOTT-LOEFFLER, AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS, to receive and file the minutes from the Planning Commission Special Meeting of August 21, 2024.

**B. Received and file Minutes from the Planning Commission Adjourned Meeting of September 18, 2024**

IT WAS MOVED BY CHAIR COSGROVE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKHANN, AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT, to receive and file the minutes from the Planning Commission Adjourned Meeting of September 18, 2024.

**6. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION**

None.

**7. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**A. Parking Modification for Passenger and School Bus Loading Zones for Las Palmas Elementary School**

A request to consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council on parking modification to create designated passenger and school bus loading zones for Las Palmas Elementary School.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHAIR COSGROVE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKHANN, AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT, to approve the Consent Calendar.

**8. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. Continued Public Hearing Project (PHP)23-487, Shoreline Dental Master Sign Program, 1409 South El Camino Real**

A continued public hearing item for the Planning Commission to consider a request for a Discretionary Sign Permit (DSP) 24-003 to establish a Master Sign Program and exceed 25 square feet of signage for a business within the Architectural (A) Overlay District.

The Planning Commission will also consider whether the project is Categorically Exempt from the requirements of the CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15301 (Class 1: Existing Facilities).

Chair Cosgrove opened the public hearing.

Vice Chair McCaughan and Commissioner Prescott-Loeffler disclosed that they were patients of the dentist but could make a fair and impartial decision.

Contract Planner Ciampa presented a PowerPoint entitled: "Shoreline Dental Discretionary Sign Permit DSP24-003." A copy of the Presentation is on file in Planning Division.

In response to Commissioner questions, Contract Planner Ciampa discussed the lighting of the sign; colors of the sign in relation to the building; and use of blues both in decorative tile and in the signage.

Mike Reilly, Applicant, Starfish Signs and Graphics, indicated the proposed tile on the monument sign would match the existing tile in the archways.

There were no public comments.

The Commission thanked the applicant for the revisions through the Design Review Subcommittee; indicated support for tying into the monument sign; and discussed the possibility of changing the cap and base color.

The Commission recommended, but did not require as a condition of approval, that the applicant consider an alternate color for the cap of the monument sign to reflect the color of the roof tile. Indicated that an alternate color of this type can be approved administratively by staff with no amendment to DSP 24-003.

IT WAS MOVED BY VICE CHAIR MCCAUGHAN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PRESCOTT-LOEFFLER, AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT, TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION.

**B. Continued Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 21-268, AT&T Wireless Telecommunications Facility, 4159 Costero Risco**

A continued public hearing item for the Planning Commission to consider a request by AT&T to construct a new Monobroadleaf wireless facility with accompanying ground mounted equipment that would be placed within an expanded enclosure at 4159 Costero Risco.

The Planning Commission will also consider whether the project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under Section 15303 of the CEQA guidelines (14 CCR§ 15303, Class 3: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures).

Chair Cosgrove opened the public hearing.

Contract Planner Ciampa presented a PowerPoint entitled: "AT&T Telecommunication Facility – Conditional Use Permit 21-268" dated October 2, 2024." A copy of the Presentation is on file in Planning Division.

In response to Commission questions, Contract Planner Ciampa and City Planner Lightfoot explained the process for bi-annual inspections; process for selection of

alternative sites considered; differences in process for projects on City owned property, including requirement for lease agreement after approval of CUP .

Will Kazimi, Applicant, presented a PowerPoint outlining site analysis; gap in coverage; alternative site analysis; condition requiring co-locations; and site visit with one of the residents.

In response to Commission questions, Mr. Kazimi clarified the grading and construction difficulties; separate equipment enclosure and tower, connected by cable; measurement of EMF; cumulative of all emitters at 34 percent of the FCC's maximum permissible exposure (MPE) levels; removal of microwave dish; and Alternatives J and K impacted by shadowing effect.

Chair Cosgrove called upon the public to share their comments.

Mike Hughes expressed concern about the current tenant (Verizon/ATC) not maintaining their infrastructure creating dangerous conditions; encouraged remediation of the site prior to allowing a new tenant; and questioned the alternative site analysis.

Robert Locke discussed his work in a cardiac cath lab and expressed concern about EMF and living under power wires.

Derek Miller indicated opposition to the cell phone towers; discussed the Council's previous indication that it did not want multiple facilities; suggested it remain open space; and expressed concern about visual impacts and use of the FCC's 1992 standards.

Megan Miller indicated other members of the public were unable to attend the meeting; and discussed the prior decision for no more than two towers; inaccuracy of the EME-RF report; disarray of the current Verizon site; and alleged 250 petition signatures in opposition.

Allie Malina concurred with her neighbors and requested clarification on the RF measurements.

Marc Whitney indicated 5-6 people showed up for the site visit, and he proposed moving the antenna up and off the trail.

Greg Fuhler/Monica Parr discussed the view of the tower from his home and indicated opposition to building any new towers.

Kimberly Graf, 20-year resident, suggested the trails be walkable; no additional towers; alternative sites; and retaining open space.

Ms. Whitney stated a new tower was not needed, the existing tree was in bad condition and urged denial.

Mr. Kazimi discussed the EME-RF report conducted in 2021 and indicated they could update the report, although the proposed antennas have not changed; updated drawings; noted that the Alternative Site Analysis did not include electricity transmission towers on the other side of the canyon which were too far away to address the gap in coverage; City Code Enforcement can address Verizon maintenance; and location criteria is based on objective coverage.

In response to Commission questions, Mr. Kazimi explained that the RF report would detail the Federal Government regulations; noted that telecom carriers identify gaps in coverage via complaints, lack of speed and reliable coverage; public locations of cell sites; and standard operating procedures for maintenance.

City staff clarified that the trail near the site is dual easement for both utilities and pedestrian purposes.

## RECESS

Chair Cosgrove called a recess at 8:00 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:05 p.m. with all Commissioners present except Commissioners Davis and Crandell.

In response to Commission questions, Deputy City Attorney Burns and City Planner Lightfoot explained Federal law limitations on the Commission's decision; proposed maintenance work by Verizon to clean up the ATC site; trailhead access; prior facility approvals; City lessee, with American Tower as primary lessor; open space zoning; and cell towers as permitted uses with CUP.

The Commission discussed the need to continue the hearing with the following direction:

- Staff to continue addressing maintenance at Verizon/ATC site
- Updated RF report clarifying timelines of exposure; expansion of staff report on Resolution Condition 4.7 RF report to be cumulative with Verizon
- Analysis on maintenance going forward
- Workshop with residents;
- Alternative Site Analysis: provide topo / sight line studies; show shadowing
- Provide trail easement documentation: should signage or gate be used
- Preference to increase distance of facility from trail
- Separate Study Session for the Commission on wireless standards; how and why are sites considered; prior to continued public hearing coming back
- Provide both an approval and a denial resolution when the public hearing resumes, with the denial resolution to consider potential negative impact to

surrounding land use; inability for City to manage the site; nuisance factor; other telecom facilities with nuisance activity.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHAIR COSGROVE, SECONDED BY CHAIR PRO TEM CAMP, AND CARRIED 4-0-1, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT AND VICE CHAIR MCCAUGHAN ABSTAINING, TO CONTINUE THE HEARING, TO A DATE UNCERTAIN, WITH DIRECTIONS TO THE APPLICANT AND STAFF.

**C. Continued Public Hearing Project (PHP) 24-187, Sunset Shores Façade Remodel Permit Amendment, 410 Corto Lane**

A continued public hearing item for the Planning Commission to consider a request for an amendment to Development Permit (DP) 23-415 for exterior improvements, including a height increase for faux roof extensions, façade improvements, and architectural embellishments, to an existing 18-unit condominium building located at 410 Corto Lane within the Pier Bowl Specific Plan and the Architectural (A) Overlay District.

The Planning Commission will also consider whether the project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15301 (Class 1: Existing Facilities).

Chair Cosgrove opened the public hearing.

Principal Planner Rehm narrated a PowerPoint Presentation entitled, "Item 8-C, PHP 24-187 Sunset Shores Façade Remodel Permit Amendment Request," dated October 2, 2024. A copy of the Presentation is on file in Planning Division.

Commissioner McKhann and Commissioner Prescott-Loeffler disclosed that they had visited the site.

Tony Massaro, Architect, discussed work with the City and HOA; explained the effort to create a visually consistent building mass, showed renderings of two building mass design options referenced as Option A and Option B; and referenced past building permits issued for oceanfront deck guardrails.

Scott Delahooke, Board of Directors Sunset Shores, explained the purpose of uniform oceanfront deck guardrails; referenced HOA policy requiring replacement during renovations; and referenced nine unchanged guardrails to be replaced in the future, including three original decks.

In response to Commission questions, Mr. Delahooke discussed the cost of replacing the guardrails.

In response to Commission questions, Mr. Massaro explained the proposed roof parapets design; proposed Option B with stucco; two-tone paint for dimension; and referenced design efforts for asymmetry;

Sam Saul, Reef Gate Shores, discussed successful efforts working with the applicant and indicated support for the proposal.

The Commission discussed the proposed design.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CAMP, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKHANN, AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT, TO APPROVE OPTION B, STRIKING CONDITION TO REPLACE NON-GLASS GUARDRAILS WITHIN 3-YEARS.

#### **D. Continued Housing Element Action Plan – Objective Design Standards**

A continued public hearing item for the Planning Commission to provide recommendations to City Council on Zoning Amendment ZA24-193 to adopt Objective Design Standards, selection of sites previously identified in the Housing Element to be added to the Housing Overlay, and zoning table amendments to authorize additional residential uses within residential, commercial, and mixed-use zoning districts; and finding that the zoning amendment is exempt from CEQA per the Community Plan exemption pursuant to PRC Sec. 21083.3 and Guidelines Sections 15183, 15060(C) and 15061(B)(3).

Chair Cosgrove opened the public hearing.

Principal Planner Rehm narrated a PowerPoint Presentation entitled, "Item 8-D - Housing Element Action Plan – Objective Design Standards, Housing Overlay, & Zoning Amendment," dated October 2, 2024. A copy of the Presentation is on file in Planning Division.

In response to Commission questions, Principal Planner Rehm and City Planner Lightfoot explained that hotel conversions were limited to properties in zones where residential uses are authorized unless preempted by State law; summarized feedback received from the California Coastal Commission and the California Housing and Community Development Department; referenced required timing for review of qualified affordable housing development projects; referenced the legend to Design District maps included in the full document; and described the balance between State Housing laws and the City's Housing Element and Zoning Code.

Jordyn Dahlke, Member of San Clemente Affordable Housing Coalition, indicated opposition with allowing benefits to property owners without providing affordable units and opposed the restriction against conversion of hotels to Permanent Supportive Housing.

Rachel Davidson suggested that moderate-income units should not qualify as affordable; indicated opposition to limitations on conversion of hotels; and encouraged the City to prioritize housing for low/very housing income.

Kathy Esfahani, Chair of San Clemente Affordable Housing Coalition, reiterated opposition to changing the type of developments that qualified for streamlined review in the Housing Overlay and opposed changes to rules regarding motel conversions. She referenced the Coalition's second letter expanding and clarifying the arguments from their first September 17, 2024 letter, including the argument that proposed changes are inconsistent with the Housing Action Plan, Table 2-24 in the Housing Element: Affordable Monthly Rent.

In response to Commission questions, Principal Planner Rehm and City Planner Lightfoot discussed the inclusion of campsites in the City's inventory of affordable overnight accommodation; referenced Goal 5.3 of the Housing Action Plan; referenced the overlap with the State of California's Project Home Key hotel/motel conversion initiative; referenced the design inspiration for the new Surf Zone Objective Design Standards; cited the City's history of parking policies; and summarized the benefits available to developers of qualified affordable housing development projects.

The Commission discussed State regulations to preserve overnight lodging; objective design standards; landscape conditions; and Commissioner McKhann's suggested revisions to the Objective Design Standards.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER MCKHANN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PRESCOTT-LOEFFLER TO CONTINUE BEYOND 11 P.M., AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHAIR COSGROVE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKHANN, AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT, TO RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE ORDINANCE AS AMENDED TO INCORPORATE REVISIONS TO THE OBJECTIVE DESIGN STANDARDS MADE VERBALLY THROUGH COMMISSIONER CONCURRENCE.

**9. NEW BUSINESS**

None

**10. OLD BUSINESS**

None

**11. REPORTS OF COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF**

A. Tentative Future Agenda

City Planner Lightfoot discussed the recent American Planning Association State Conference attended by staff and promotion of Chris Wright to Senior Planner.



B. Administrative Development Permit Report  
None

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

THERE BEING NO OTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE COMMISSION, IT WAS MOVED BY CHAIR COSGROVE, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR CAMP, AND CARRIED 5-0, COMMISSIONERS CRANDELL AND DAVIS ABSENT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 11:08 P.M. TO THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO BE HELD IN-PERSON ON OCTOBER 16, 2024, AT 6:00 P.M., AT THE SAN CLEMENTE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 910 CALLE NEGOCIO, 2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR, SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cameron Cosgrove, Chairman

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan Lightfoot, City Planner

DRAFT