



CITY OF COSTA MESA

PLANNING COMMISSION

Agenda

Monday, March 23, 2026

6:00 PM

**City Council Chambers
77 Fair Drive**

Announcement:

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54953

Commissioner Martinez will be attending the meeting remotely via Zoom Webinar from:
821 Tomato Alley, Sacramento, CA 95818, USA

The Commission meetings are presented in a hybrid format, both in-person at City Hall and as a courtesy virtually via Zoom Webinar. If the Zoom feature is having system outages or experiencing other critical issues, the meeting will continue in person.

TRANSLATION SERVICES AVAILABLE / SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN DISPONIBLE

Please contact the City Clerk at (714) 754-5225 to request language interpreting services for City meetings. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make arrangements.

Favor de comunicarse con la Secretaria Municipal al (714) 754-5225 para solicitar servicios de interpretación de idioma para las juntas de la Ciudad. Se pide notificación por lo mínimo 48 horas de anticipación, esto permite que la Ciudad haga los arreglos necesarios.

Members of the public can view the Commission meetings live on COSTA MESA TV (SPECTRUM CHANNEL 3 AND AT&T U-VERSE CHANNEL 99) or http://costamesa.granicus.com/player/camera/2?publish_id=10&redirect=true and online at [youtube.com/costamesatv](https://www.youtube.com/costamesatv).

Closed Captioning is available via the Zoom option in English and Spanish.

Members of the public are welcome to speak during the meeting when the Chair opens the floor for public comment. There is no need to register in advance or complete a comment card. When it's time to comment, line up at one of the two podiums in the room and wait for your turn. Each speaker will have up to 3 minutes (or as directed) to address the Commission.

To maintain a respectful and orderly atmosphere during the meeting, attendees shall refrain from using horns or amplified speakers. Signs and props may be brought into the Chamber, provided they do not exceed 11 inches by 18 inches in size and do not hinder the visibility of other attendees. The possession of poles, sticks, or stakes is strictly prohibited.

All attendees must remain seated while in the chamber until instructed by the Presiding Officer to approach and line up for public comment. To ensure safety and maintain order during the proceedings, standing or congregating in the aisles or foyer is strictly prohibited.

Zoom Webinar:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81751062151?pwd=2xqVDVz7jFQmPFKrQaASxZ3nT0BNIB.1>

Or sign into Zoom.com and “Join a Meeting”

Enter Webinar ID: 817 5106 2151 / Password: 065034

- If Zoom is not already installed on your computer, click “Download & Run Zoom” on the launch page and press “Run” when prompted by your browser. If Zoom has previously been installed on your computer, please allow a few moments for the application to launch automatically.
- Select “Join Audio via Computer.”
- The virtual conference room will open. If you receive a message reading, “Please wait for the host to start this meeting,” simply remain in the room until the meeting begins.
- During the Public Comment Period, use the “raise hand” feature located in the participants’ window and wait for city staff to announce your name and unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Comments are limited to 3 minutes, or as otherwise directed.

Participate via telephone:

Call: 1 669 900 6833 Enter Webinar ID: 817 5106 2151 / Password: : 065034

During the Public Comment Period, press *9 to add yourself to the queue and wait for city staff to announce your name/phone number and press *6 to unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Comments are limited to 3 minutes, or as otherwise directed.

4. Additionally, members of the public who wish to make a written comment on a specific agenda item, may submit a written comment via email to the PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov. Comments received by 12:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting will be provided to the Commission, made available to the public, and will be part of the meeting record.

5. Please know that it is important for the City to allow public participation at this meeting. If you are unable to participate in the meeting via the processes set forth above, please contact the City Clerk at (714) 754-5225 or cityclerk@costamesaca.gov and staff will attempt to accommodate you. While the City does not expect there to be any changes to the above process for participating in this meeting, if there is a change, the City will post the information as soon as possible to the City's website.

Note that records submitted by the public will not be redacted in any way and will be posted online as submitted, including any personal contact information.

All pictures, PowerPoints, and videos submitted for display at a public meeting must be previously reviewed by staff to verify appropriateness for general audiences. No links to YouTube videos or other streaming services will be accepted, a direct video file will need to be emailed to staff prior to each meeting in order to minimize complications and to play the video without delay. The video must be one of the following formats, .mp4, .mov or .wmv. Only one file may be included per speaker for public comments. Please e-mail to PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov NO LATER THAN 12:00 Noon on the date of the meeting.

Note regarding agenda-related documents provided to a majority of the Commission after distribution of the agenda packet (GC §54957.5): Any related documents provided to a majority of the Commission after distribution of the Agenda Packets will be made available for public inspection. Such documents will be posted on the city's website and will be available at the City Clerk's office, 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA 92626.

All cell phones and other electronic devices are to be turned off or set to vibrate. Members of the audience are requested to step outside the Council Chambers to conduct a phone conversation.

Free Wi-Fi is available in the Council Chambers during the meetings. The network username available is: CM_Council. The password is: cmcouncil1953.

As a LEED Gold Certified City, Costa Mesa is fully committed to environmental sustainability. A minimum number of hard copies of the agenda will be available in the Council Chambers. For your convenience, a binder of the entire agenda packet will be at the table in the foyer of the Council Chambers for viewing. Agendas and reports can be viewed on the City website at <https://costamesa.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Assistive Listening headphones are available and can be checked out from the City Clerk. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk at (714) 754-5225. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. [28 CFR 35.102.35.104 ADA Title II].

En conformidad con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA), aparatos de asistencia están disponibles y podrán ser prestados notificando a la Secretaria Municipal. Si necesita asistencia especial para participar en esta junta, comuníquese con la oficina de la Secretaria Municipal al (714) 754-5225. Se pide dar notificación a la Ciudad por lo mínimo 48 horas de anticipación para garantizar accesibilidad razonable a la junta. [28 CFR 35.102.35.104 ADA Title II].

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

MARCH 23, 2026 – 6:00 P.M.

**JEFFREY HARLAN
CHAIR**

**JON ZICH
VICE CHAIR**

**ANGELY ANDRADE
PLANNING COMMISSIONER**

**ROBERT DICKSON
PLANNING COMMISSIONER**

**KAREN KLEPACK
PLANNING COMMISSIONER**

**DAVID MARTINEZ
PLANNING COMMISSIONER**

**JOHNNY ROJAS
PLANNING COMMISSIONER**

**TARQUIN PREZIOSI
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY**

**CARRIE TAI
DIRECTOR**

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS

PUBLIC COMMENTS – MATTERS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA
Comments are limited to three (3) minutes, or as otherwise directed.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

CONSENT CALENDAR:

All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless members of the Planning Commission, staff, or the public request specific items to be discussed and/or removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion. The public can make this request via email at PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov and should include the item number to be addressed. Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be discussed and voted upon immediately following Planning Commission action on the remainder of the Consent Calendar

1. [MARCH 9, 2026 UNOFFICIAL MEETING MINUTES](#) [26-203](#)

RECOMMENDATION:

Planning Commission approve the regular meeting minutes of March 9, 2026.

Attachments: [March 9, 2026 Unofficial Meeting Minutes](#)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. [CALL TO REVIEW \(PAPL-25-0004\) ZONING ADMINISTRATOR 26-201 APPROVAL OF A MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT \(PMCP-24-0029\) FOR A NEW WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY AT 2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE](#)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Find that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3) New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures; and
2. Approve Minor Conditional Use Permit (PMCP-24-0029) for a new wireless communication facility at 2065 Placentia Avenue by adopting the attached Resolution.

Attachments: [Agenda Report](#)

1. [Draft Planning Commission Resolution](#)
2. [Filed Application for Review](#)
3. [September 8, 2025 PC Report](#)
4. [Applicant Letter](#)
6. [Plans](#)
5. [Photosims](#)
7. [Alternative Sites Analysis](#)
8. [EME Report](#)
9. [July 17, 2025 ZA Public Comments](#)
10. [September 8, 2025 PC Public Comments](#)

OLD BUSINESS:

1. [OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COSTA MESA 26-202 MUNICIPAL CODE \(TITLE 13 - ZONING CODE\) TO UPDATE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR PERSONAL SERVICES, ARTISAN STUDIO AND RETAIL USES, ACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT USES, EVENT CENTERS AND ASSEMBLY USES, SPECIALIZED FITNESS STUDIOS, AND RELATED COMMERCIAL USES - PCTY-26-0001.](#)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Receive a presentation regarding proposed updates to the Costa Mesa Zoning Code related to emerging commercial uses and zoning implementation issues; and
2. Provide feedback and policy direction regarding the proposed amendments.

If the Planning Commission is supportive of the proposed approach, staff will return with a formal Zoning Code Amendment for consideration at a future public hearing.

Attachments: [Agenda Report](#)

NEW BUSINESS: NONE.**DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS:**

1. PUBLIC WORKS REPORT
2. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT

CITY ATTORNEY REPORTS:**ADJOURNMENT****PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING:**

Costa Mesa Planning Commission meets on the second and fourth Monday of each month at 6:00 p.m.

APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Unless otherwise indicated, the decision of the Planning Commission is final at 5:00 p.m., seven (7) days following the action, unless an affected party files an appeal to the City Council, or a member of City Council requests a review. Applications for appeals are available through the City Clerk's Office; please call (714) 754-5225 for additional information.

CONTACT CITY STAFF:

77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Planning Division (714) 754-5245
planninginfo@costamesaca.gov



CITY OF COSTA MESA

Agenda Report

77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

File #: 26-203

Meeting Date: 3/23/2026

TITLE:

MARCH 9, 2026 UNOFFICIAL MEETING MINUTES

DEPARTMENT: ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES/ PLANNING
DIVISION

RECOMMENDATION:

Planning Commission approve the regular meeting minutes of March 9, 2026.



**REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION
MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2026 - MINUTES**

CALL TO ORDER - The Regular Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Chair Harlan at 6:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG - Vice Chair Zich led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jeffrey Harlan, Vice Chair Jon Zich, Commissioner Angely Andrade, Commissioner Robert Dickson, Commissioner Karen Klepack, Commissioner David Martinez, Commissioner Johnny Rojas

Absent: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS: None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - MATTERS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA: None.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

Commissioner Andrade thanked City staff for organizing the Neighborhoods Where We All Belong session at the Norma Herzog Community Center and noted the strong community turnout. She appreciated the interactive activities and summaries presented, particularly the block-building exercise that helped visually demonstrate potential development concepts. She expressed interest in attending the upcoming sessions and hearing additional community input.

Commissioner Dickson welcomed attendees and provided a brief follow-up from the previous meeting regarding the discussion on security guards and the related Council policy concerning 24-hour security requirements. He noted that he had emailed the Chair and staff and indicated that the matter may be addressed directly by the City Council. He explained that streamlining the process would save time and costs for staff and applicants by avoiding the need for individual applications each time the issue arises.

Commissioner Martinez announced several upcoming community events, including the Spring Bark Bash at TeWinkle Park on March 21, volunteer opportunities at Fairview Park, and upcoming open houses related to the Fairview Developmental Center. He also noted attending the Neighborhoods Where We All Belong community meeting and observing Public Works staff evaluating potential crosswalk improvements at Placentia Avenue and Center Street. Additionally, he informed the public about a Newport-Mesa Unified School District board meeting regarding proposed policies that could restrict student bicycle use and encouraged community members to attend and provide feedback.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. FEBRUARY 23, 2026, UNOFFICIAL MEETING MINUTES

MOVED/SECOND: DICKSON/ MARTINEZ

MOTION: to approve Consent Calendar.

The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Chair Harlan, Vice Chair Zich, Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Dickson, Commissioner Klepack, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Rojas

Nays: None

Absent: None

Recused: None

Motion carried: 7-0

ACTION:

Planning Commission approved consent calendar items.

-----**END OF CONSENT CALENDAR**-----

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MASTER PLAN (PA-22-30) FOR AN EIGHT-UNIT LIVE/WORK DEVELOPMENT AT 1711-1719 POMONA AVENUE

One ex-parte communication reported.

Presentation by Senior Planner, Chris Yeager.

Derick Thelen stated he read and agreed to the conditions if approval.

Public comments: None.

Motion Discussion:

The Planning Commission discussed the appropriate length of a time extension for the applicant to obtain building permits. While Vice Chair Zich supported a one-year extension, noting there was no evidence in the record that delays from Southern California Edison required additional time, staff recommended a full two-year extension to provide flexibility and avoid the possibility of the applicant needing to return and pay another application fee. Some Commissioners expressed concern about limiting the applicant due to potential third-party delays, while others felt the request lacked sufficient justification. After discussion, a substitute motion was made to grant an 18-month extension, which Commissioners noted would result in approximately a two-year total extension when combined with the previously approved 180-day extension. The motion received support as a compromise that would provide adequate time while still encouraging progress on the project.

MOVED/SECOND: ZICH/DICKSON

MOTION: Move to approve a one-year time extension.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION VOTE:

MOVED/SECOND: HARLAN/MARTINEZ

MOTION: Move approve an eighteen-month time extension.

Ayes: Chair Harlan, Vice Chair Zich, Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Dickson, Commissioner Klepack, Commissioner Rojas, Commissioner Martinez

Nays: None

Absent: None

Recused: None

Motion carried: 7-0

ACTION:

The Planning Commission adopted a resolution to:

1. Adopt a Resolution approving a eighteen-month extension of time for PA-22-30, a Master Plan allowing for an eight unit live/work development, and
2. Find that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (Class 32) In-Fill Development.

2. DESIGN REVIEW PDES-25-0003, TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP PTPM-25-0003, AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PDVR-25-0005 FOR A COMMON INTEREST DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF TWO, TWO-STORY TOWNHOME CONDOMINIUMS LOCATED AT 121 CECIL PLACE

Two ex-parte communication reported.

Presentation by Assistant Planner, Gabriel Villalobos.

Josh Martinez stated he read and agreed to the conditions if approval.

Public comments: None.

Motion Discussion:

Commissioners generally expressed support for the project, noting that it is well designed with thoughtful site planning, including privacy between adjacent properties and adequate on-site parking. While some Commissioners shared concerns about the front-facing massing along the street, they acknowledged the design challenges related to the site's frontage and ultimately supported the proposal. Discussion focused on opportunities to improve the pedestrian experience along Cecil Place by increasing tree canopy and shade along the sidewalk. Commissioners discussed relocating some of the proposed olive trees closer to the sidewalk, if feasible, and the motion was amended to require that two replacement olive trees be placed as close to the sidewalk as possible, subject to staff review and site constraints such as utilities and sidewalk integrity. Commissioners also noted that the project would provide ownership housing and add a sidewalk where one does not currently exist, which were viewed as positive improvements.

MOVED/SECOND: DICKSON/ZICH

MOTION: Move staff's recommendation with an amendment to condition of COA 17 that adds the word words "or removed after damaged" in the second sentence as well as noting that the trees "will be placed as close to the sidewalk as feasible".

Ayes: Chair Harlan, Vice Chair Zich, Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Dickson, Commissioner Klepack, Commissioner Rojas, Commissioner Martinez

Nays: None

Absent: None

Recused: None

Motion carried: 7-0

ACTION:

The Planning Commission adopted a resolution to:

1. Find the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15315 (Class 15), Minor Land Divisions, and Class 15303 (Class 3) New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures; and

2. Approve Design Review (PDES-25-0003), Tentative Parcel Map (PTPM-25-0003), and Development Review (PDVR-25-0005), based on the finding of fact and subject to conditions of approval.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

REPORT - PUBLIC WORKS - Mr. Yang reported that Caltrans District 12 is conducting the Reconnecting Our Communities (ROC) Study to evaluate opportunities to reconnect neighborhoods impacted by state highways in Anaheim, Buena Park, Costa Mesa, Garden Grove, and Huntington Beach. The study aims to improve safety, access, and multimodal transportation for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders, as well as enhance conditions near roadways, freeway crossings, and underpasses. Staff announced a virtual community meeting scheduled for March 16, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. and directed interested members of the public to visit reconnectingoc.org for additional information and the meeting link.

REPORT - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - Director Tai reported on recent and upcoming planning activities. Staff thanked the community and City staff for participating in three "Neighborhoods Where We All Belong" workshops, where attendees reviewed outreach results and provided feedback on proposed development and design standards. Staff noted that Housing Element-related items previously recommended by the Planning Commission, including sites inventory amendments and rezoning changes, will be considered by the City Council on March 17, along with the City's General Plan and Housing Element Annual Progress Report. Additional items going to Council include the award of HOME funds for affordable housing and a funding request for the Jamboree Senior Housing project. Staff also reported that the Ohio House sober living home and Step House recovery facility will be heard by the City Council in April. Lastly, staff announced upcoming outreach meetings for the Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan scheduled for March 24, March 26, and March 30.

REPORT - ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY - None.

ADJOURNMENT AT 7:15 p.m.

Submitted by:

CARRIE TAI, SECRETARY
COSTA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION



CITY OF COSTA MESA

Agenda Report

77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

File #: 26-201

Meeting Date: 3/23/2026

TITLE:

CALL TO REVIEW (PAPL-25-0004) ZONING ADMINISTRATOR APPROVAL OF A MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (PMCP-24-0029) FOR A NEW WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY AT 2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE

DEPARTMENT: ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT / PLANNING DIVISION

PRESENTED BY: JUSTIN ARIOS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

CONTACT INFORMATION: JUSTIN ARIOS, 714-754-5667; Justin.Arios@costamesaca.gov

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Find that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3) New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures; and
2. Approve Minor Conditional Use Permit (PMCP-24-0029) for a new wireless communication facility at 2065 Placentia Avenue by adopting the attached Resolution.



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: MARCH 23, 2026

ITEM NUMBER: PH-1

SUBJECT: CALL TO REVIEW (PAPL-25-0004) ZONING ADMINISTRATOR APPROVAL OF A MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (PMCP-24-0029) FOR A NEW WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY AT 2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE

FROM: ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT / PLANNING DIVISION

PRESENTATION BY: JUSTIN ARIOS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: JUSTIN ARIOS
714-754-5667
Justin.Arios@costamesaca.gov**

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Find that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3) New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures; and
2. Approve Minor Conditional Use Permit (PMCP-24-0029) for a new wireless communication facility at 2065 Placentia Avenue by adopting the attached Resolution.

APPLICANT OR AUTHORIZED AGENT

The authorized agent is John McDonald (Eukon Group), representing the property owner, Public Storage Partners LTD.

PLANNING APPLICATION SUMMARY

Location	2065 Placentia Avenue	Application Number	PAPL-25-0004 & PMCP-24-0029
Request	Request for a Minor Conditional Use Permit (MCUP) to allow for a new 60-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a eucalyptus tree (mono-eucalyptus) on a combined property with an existing 55-foot tall mono-pine. The support facility for the mono-eucalyptus is proposed to be located behind a proposed 8-foot CMU enclosure which would also include the proposed mono-eucalyptus. (This revised submittal now includes a mono-eucalyptus tree and no longer proposes a new mono-pine)		
CEQA	Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures)		
Final Action	Planning Commission		

SUBJECT PROPERTY

Zoning District	MG (General Industrial)
General Plan Land Use Designation	Light Industrial
Lot Dimensions	Lot Width: 173.30' Lot Depth: 464.92'
Lot Area	Approximately 80,570-square-feet (approximately 1.85-acres)
List of Approved Plans / Land Use Entitlements	ZE-76-154 - Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a public storage facility with manager's apartment with variances from parking, landscaping, and sign requirements. DR-84-42 - Development Review to add to the existing mini-warehouse project. ZA-07-67 - MCUP for a 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine.
Existing Development	Public Storage mini-warehouse use and existing mono-pine facility (to remain).

SURROUNDING PROPERTY

	Zoning District	General Plan Land Use Designation	Existing Development
North	MG (General Industrial)	Light Industrial	Live / Work Residential Development (Brickyard West)
East (across Placentia Ave)	MG (General Industrial)	Light Industrial	Automotive Uses
South	MG (General Industrial)	Light Industrial	Public Storage
West	R1 (Single-Family Residential District)	Low Density Residential	Single-Family Residential Uses

ANTENNA DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS COMPARISON

Development Standard	Required / Allowed Antenna Dev. Standard	Proposed / Provided	Meets Code
Max Height	30 FT	60 FT ¹	No, MCUP Requested
Setbacks:			
Front	20 FT	35 FT 4 IN	Yes
Side (left)	20 FT	70 FT	Yes
Rear	5	425 FT 1 IN	Yes
Number of Support Structures (separate underlying parcels)	1	1 (constructed enclosure)	Yes
Roof Mounted Location	Allowed but not mandatory	Ground mounted	Yes


¹ Pursuant to Costa Mesa Municipal Code Section 13-142, an MCUP approval is required when an antenna is not in compliance with adopted standards or is not roof-mounted.

PROJECT LOCATION

The subject property is located at 2065 Placentia Avenue (see Figure 1 on the next page). The "site" consists of two adjacent underlying parcels (422-291-04 and 422-291-05) but are under single ownership and development with the contiguous Public Storage development. It is an approximately 1.85-acre rectangular-shaped site located along Placentia Avenue between West 20th Street and Hamilton Street. There is one driveway that provides site access from Placentia Avenue.

The property has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Light Industrial (LI) and a Zoning Designation of General Industrial (MG). The Light Industrial General Plan Land Use Designation applies to areas intended for a variety of light and general industrial uses. Uses are limited to small manufacturing and service industries, as well as larger industrial operations that can demonstrate design features or restricted operations that limit disruptions to surrounding uses. The proposed wireless communication facility is compatible with the existing site improvements and is an allowable use pursuant to the City's Zoning Code.

Figure 1. Vicinity Map



Properties to the north, south, and east (across Placentia Avenue) have Light Industrial (LI) Land Use designations and General Industrial (MG) zoning designations. The property to the north is developed with a 14-unit live/work residential development

(Brickyard West); the property to the south is developed with an extension of the existing Public Storage use; and the properties to the east (across Placentia Avenue) are developed with various automotive uses. Properties to the west have a Low Density Residential (LDR) Land Use Designation and Single-Family Residential District (R1) zoning and are developed with single-family residential homes.

BACKGROUND

On October 4, 1976, the City Council approved a CUP (ZE-76-154) to allow the construction of a 39,400 sq. ft. building for public storage garages and a manager's unit (Public Storage) with variances from parking, landscaping, and sign requirements.

On September 9, 1984, the Planning Division approved a Development Review (DR-84-42) to add approximately 45,000 sq. ft. of storage area to the existing mini-warehouse storage facility.

On January 10, 2008, the Zoning Administrator approved an MCUP (ZA-07-67) to allow for the construction of an existing 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine on the project site (Figure 2). For this request, four public comments were received in opposition of the request, from adjacent industrial property owners and tenants.

Zoning Administrator Decision

On July 17, 2025, the City's Zoning Administrator approved the project, with conditions. The decision concluded that the wireless facility would provide coverage to AT&T customers in the immediate area, and would be consistent with federal law, which does not allow local jurisdictions to preclude the reasonable provision of wireless services. Given the project's aesthetic design considerations, placement of supporting equipment, and adherence to federal health and safety regulations, the proposed wireless facility would be compatible with its surroundings, would not injure nearby properties, and would not present any health and safety concerns. A thorough description and analysis of the project request is included in the July 17, 2025, Zoning Administrator Report and is linked below. The public comments received for the Zoning Administrator decision is provided as Attachment 9.

<https://www.costamesaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/60769/638883650985730000>

Planning Commission Hearings

On July 24, 2025, Council Member Reynolds submitted an "application for review" of the approval to be considered by the Planning Commission. The Council Member was concerned that "many residents have raised a variety of concerns about the potential impacts, [...] especially on this mixed-use corridor". (Attachment 2).

On September 8, 2025, the Planning Commission reviewed the “application for review”. During the public hearing the Commission expressed concern with the project proposed. The project was continued to the December 8th Planning Commission hearing, allowing the applicant time to explore relocating the tower on the site and to provide additional coverage data at different heights. In discussion, Commissioners clarified the standard of review and emphasized the importance of addressing residents' concerns, including noise, aesthetics, and maintenance of existing facilities. The Commission encouraged the applicant to engage directly with neighbors before returning, consider locating the tower closer to Placentia Avenue within the industrial area, and potentially modifying or extending the existing tower rather than adding a new one (Attachment 3). The public comment received for the Planning Commission meeting is provided as Attachment 10. <https://costamesa.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7648737&GUID=27CAE017-642B-4C47-8111-320C7F2910DC>

In response to the Planning Commission’s comments, the applicant worked to explore additional site locations prior to the December 8th hearing. The applicant discussed with staff that the onsite location could be modified, but additional time was needed to revise plans and the application package, so the applicant submitted a request for the item to be continued from the December 8, 2025, hearing to March 23, 2026. The Planning Commission approved this request on December 8, 2025. <https://costamesa.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7773716&GUID=DF02966E-5D56-4797-96C9-E36A4877FB73>

Standard of Review

Pursuant to Section 13-144, wireless communication facilities are evaluated against the findings for an MCUP application contained in Section 13-29(g)(2) and the additional antenna findings located at Section 13-144(b). The findings require that the project be compatible with nearby development; not be detrimental to nearby properties or the public, health, safety, or welfare; be consistent with the General Plan; and represent the minimum height needed to achieve reasonable signal transmission.

In addition, Costa Mesa Municipal Code (CMMC) Section 13-144 (a)(2) requires that applications for proposed antennas that do not conform with the applicable development standards demonstrate why strict conformance with the development standards will unreasonably limit, or restrict, the proposed installation and would result in excessive expense considering the cost of the proposed installation. The CMMC also states that conditions of approval may be applied to the development or its operations to ensure that the required findings can be met. An assessment of the project’s relationship to the findings and General Plan is provided later in this report.

Lastly, all planning applications must comply with review criteria that address neighborhood compatibility, safety and compatibility of design, compliance with applicable performance standards, and consistency with the General Plan.

Limitations on Decisions

Jurisdictions are highly regulated as to when and how they can deny wireless communications facility applications. Jurisdictions may not impose an “effective prohibition” of wireless communication facilities. An effective prohibition is one that prevents a wireless carrier from closing a “significant” gap in service coverage provided by that carrier. As such, wireless carriers must submit gap coverage analyses with their applications, demonstrating that the subject location in their application is needed to close service gaps. This gap coverage analysis must demonstrate the extent to which the gap will be closed.

Wireless carriers must also submit any alternative locations, systems, and placement to justify that the proposed location is the least intrusive location while providing the gap closure needed. Jurisdictions then review these analyses to verify the findings for gap coverage.

Jurisdictions are not permitted to consider radio-frequency (RF) emissions for the purpose of evaluating a wireless communication facility. Setting the safety standards for RF emissions is exclusively the responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”). Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv) of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 prohibits the City from denying a wireless facility application based on concerns about RF emissions when the applicant has demonstrated that its facilities will comply with FCC standards.

Appeal and Call to Review Procedures

CMMC Title 2, Chapter IX, stipulates the City’s appeal and review procedures. The CMMC allows any affected or interested person to appeal a project within specified periods, and also allows City Council members to call projects up for review. In this case, the project approval included a seven-day appeal period. Since the Zoning Administrator approved the project, pursuant to the CMMC, the call to review shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

The CMMC further indicates that the Planning Commission hearing is a ‘de novo’ hearing in which the Planning Commission may consider the project in its entirety. The Planning Commission may consider all aspects of the proposed project and is not required to limit the discussion to the issues in the “call to review” application. The CMMC also stipulates that the review hearing shall be based on any relevant evidence, submitted at the time of the prior decision and at the call for review hearing. The

Zoning Administrator decision letter and public comments submitted have been included as an attachment to the report for ease of review (Attachments 3 and 9, respectively).

Pursuant to CMMC Chapter IX, Section 2-303(6), the applicant for the original decision shall have the burden of proof to support the granting of the approval action at the appeal.

REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project proposes to install a new wireless AT&T communication facility camouflaged as a mono-eucalyptus. The proposed mono-eucalyptus is located at the eastern end of the existing mini-warehouse site, closer to Placentia Avenue. The proposed mono-eucalyptus is approximately 420 feet from the shared property lines with the single-family residences along Federal Avenue and approximately 65 feet from the nearest industrial use to the south (Figure 2; blue dot is the existing facility location, the red dot was the previous proposed facility location the green dot is the proposed facility location, and green box for proposed closure area). The wireless facility is approximately 470 feet from the nearest residential structure located along Federal Avenue; and approximately 400 feet from the other mono-eucalyptus existing onsite. The support facility for the mono-eucalyptus is proposed to be located behind a proposed 8-foot CMU enclosure which would also include the proposed mono-eucalyptus. This area is located internal to the project site and is not visible to adjacent properties or the public right-of-way. Figures 2 and 3 show the previously proposed and revised location.


Figure 2. Aerial



As part of the application, an Alternative Site Analysis (Attachment 7) was conducted in which seven other property sites were evaluated. Based on the analysis submitted, there were several candidates that were reviewed and determined to not be viable to close the gap in coverage. These locations were determined to not be viable because the location

either 1) would not satisfy the needed gap coverage, 2) is a unpreferred location for the carrier (AT&T installations typically avoid being placed on elementary school properties), 3) has existing site obstructions (i.e. existing trees) that would interfere with propagation, and 4) existing cell towers are not suitable for co-location. Additionally, as part of the application, an Electromagnetic Energy (EME) Report (Attachment 8) was submitted, demonstrating the proposed project will comply with the applicable Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) standards. An EME Report, also referred to as a Radio Frequency (RF) Compliance Report, is a technical analysis prepared by a qualified radio frequency engineer that evaluates the expected levels of radiofrequency emissions from a proposed wireless communication facility.

Figure 3. Elevation View



The revised mono-eucalyptus is proposed to be 60 feet tall, as measured to the highest point of the structure (55 feet to the top of the antennas) and includes four antenna sectors, each containing three antennas and a total of 48 remote radio units. The plans show that the faux mono-eucalyptus will have branches starting approximately 20 feet above ground level and continuing to a height of 60 feet (see Figure 3). The branches will have an approximately 20-foot diameter. The plans clearly show that no antenna will extend past the faux branches to screen the wireless communication facility, and the antennas will also be painted/textured to match the mono-eucalyptus disguise. The mono-eucalyptus was chosen to blend in better with the existing eucalyptus trees at the front of the property. The support facility for the mono-eucalyptus is proposed to be located behind a proposed 8-foot CMU enclosure which would also include the proposed mono-eucalyptus. This area is located internal to the project site and is not visible to adjacent properties or the public right-of-way.

FINDINGS

Pursuant to the CMMC, the approval of an MCUP requires five findings related to neighborhood compatibility, health and safety, land use compatibility, and unreasonable limitations. The revised project is consistent with the required MCUP findings as indicated below:

MCUP Finding No. 1: *“The proposed development or use is substantially compatible with developments in the same general area and would not be materially detrimental to other properties within the area.”*

Finding: Consistent. The proposed use is compatible and harmonious with developments in the same general area and would not be materially detrimental to other properties within the area. The use will be conducted on a combined site with an existing facility and at a height that is necessary to provide coverage and will not generate substantial noise, excessive traffic or otherwise have detrimental effects on the surrounding uses.

MCUP Finding No. 2: *“Granting the conditional use permit or minor conditional use permit will not be materially detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public or otherwise injurious to property or improvements within the immediate neighborhood.”*

Finding: Consistent. The project will not be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public or otherwise injurious to property or improvements within the immediate neighborhood in that the FCC has jurisdictional authority with regard to the health and safety of telecommunications facility. Additional conditions have been added to ensure that antenna frequency does not interfere with the frequency used for public safety communications and that all equipment remain in good working condition. The installation of the new antennas and equipment area will comply with all applicable Building and Fire Codes.

MCUP Finding No. 3: *“Granting the conditional use permit or minor conditional use permit will not allow a use, density or intensity which is not in accordance with the general plan designation and any applicable specific plan for the property.”*

Finding: Consistent. The proposed antennas and equipment area are located in an existing mini-storage facility with an existing mono-pine. With the approval of a minor conditional use permit for structure height above standard, the antennas and equipment area comply with all zoning requirements and is consistent with the General Plan land use designation in that the equipment will be screened from view from other surrounding developments. In addition, the location of the equipment area is camouflaged from offsite areas. Granting the

minor conditional use permit will provide improved wireless services to residents and visitors to the City, on a combined site that has an existing facility for another carrier (Verizon), disguised as a mono-pine tree. The proposed antenna will be compatible with the existing uses located in the surrounding area and will not generate noise or parking impacts.

MCUP Finding No. 4: *“Strict conformance with the development standards specified will unreasonably limit, or prevent, reception or transmission of signals, or result in excessive expense in light of the cost of purchase, installation and operation of the antenna(s).”*

Finding: Consistent. Adhering to a 30-foot height limit for the proposed wireless communication facility will unreasonably limit reception or transmission of signals or result in additional expense. Wireless communication facilities function based on line-of-sight technology, which means that in order to send and receive a signal one antenna must “see” the other. Standard heights for wireless facilities in typical suburban environments are often 55-60 feet above ground. This height is usually adequate to avoid signal interference caused by other buildings and trees and is sufficient to be seen by other antennae on the same network. Restricting the wireless communication facility to a height of 30 feet would diminish the antennas ability to send or receive signals and would necessitate placing more antennas in order to provide roughly the same coverage for the same geographic area as one antenna located at 60-foot high. This will result in additional expenses to acquire property leases and then to purchase, install, and operate the additional antennas. Additionally, the combined site contains an existing 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine tree located toward the rear of the adjacent parcel.

MCUP Finding No. 5: *“The deviation from applicable development standards represents the minimum adjustment necessary to prevent unreasonable limitations on the reception or transmission of signals.”*

Finding: Consistent. Strict compliance with all development standards (e.g., setbacks, height) would severely limit the functionality and coverage of the facility. The height and placement of the proposed mono-eucalyptus are essential to ensure effective signal propagation and service. Additionally, as mentioned in their applicant letter, the proposed height does not allow AT&T to close the entire gap in coverage, however, is a minimum necessary to make this site effective while matching the existing on-site facility being camouflaged as a tree. The letter also states that any further reduction in height would compromise service and coverage quality. The proposed deviations represent the minimum necessary to maintain reliable signal transmission while achieving stealthing objectives.

REVIEW CRITERIA AND GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

All planning applications are reviewed pursuant to CMMC Section 13-29(e) 1-8 to ensure the proposal is compatible with the surrounding area, and in compliance with applicable zoning standards and General Plan policies. The Zoning Administrator made similar findings pursuant to the Zoning Code for the previously submitted application. The attached Planning Commission Resolution includes these findings.

The following are the applicable Review Criteria pursuant to CMMC Zoning Code Section 13-29(e):

(1) Compatible and harmonious relationship between the proposed building and site development, and use(s), and the building and site developments, and uses that exist or have been approved for the general neighborhood.

Consistent. The proposed new wireless facility, disguised as a mono-eucalyptus, is compatible with the existing building and site development because the antennas will be installed disguised as a mono-eucalyptus tree and the facility enclosure will be screened and painted to match the existing on-site building color scheme. The combined site has an existing mono-pine facility and equipment area. The existing mono-pine facility is not able to support the additional facility; although the new mono-eucalyptus facility will be proposed on the same site, the property is large enough to support the proposed facility and equipment area without interfering with the existing use and development. The facility enclosure will not be located in required parking areas, will be screened from all areas off-site by the new screen walls and will therefore be compatible with the existing site development and general neighborhood. The height and disguise of the new facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property being camouflaged as a tree, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact.

(2) Safety and compatibility of the design of buildings, parking area, landscaping, luminaries and other site features which may include functional aspects of the site development such as automobile and pedestrian circulation.

Consistent. The FCC has jurisdictional authority over wireless antennas with regard to the health and safety of telecommunications facility and the City of Costa Mesa is preempted by Federal regulations on this issue. Conditions have been included to ensure that antenna frequency does not interfere with the frequency used for public safety communications (Condition #16). The antenna's frequencies comply with all federal standards for radio frequency emissions in accordance with the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and subsequent amendments, as well as any other applicable requirements imposed by the State and Federal Agencies. The equipment area and new antennas will comply with all applicable building and fire codes. The applicant also commissioned an RF Emissions report for the proposed

facility. This report determined the facility will operate in compliance with the Federal Communications Commission's exposure standards for both the general and occupational populations.

(3) Compliance with any performance standards as prescribed in the Zoning Code.

Consistent. Pursuant to the development standards table, the project complies with all applicable development standards with the exception of maximum height which can be exceeded with the issuance of a minor conditional use permit. The antennas and equipment area will comply with required setbacks and number of support structures. The additional height for the proposed antennas can be supported because the antennas and facility will be disguised as a mono-eucalyptus tree and will be camouflaged from view off-site and will provide the necessary coverage. Additionally, the combined site contains an existing, 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine tree which will remain. Adhering to a 30-foot height limit for the proposed wireless communication facility will unreasonably limit reception or transmission of signals or result in additional expense. Wireless communication facilities function based on line-of-sight technology, which means that in order to send and receive a signal one antenna must "see" the other. Standard heights for wireless facilities in typical suburban environments are often 55-60 feet above ground. This height is usually adequate to avoid signal interference caused by other buildings and trees and is sufficient to be seen by other antennae on the same network. Restricting the wireless communication facility to a height of 30 feet would diminish the antennas ability to send or receive signals and would necessitate placing more antennas in order to provide roughly the same coverage for the same geographic area as one antenna located at 60-foot high. This will result in additional expenses to acquire property leases and then to purchase, install, and operate the additional antennas. Conditions of approval have been included to ensure that the new facility and proposed equipment area, wiring, cables, and conduit be screened from view off site and that they remain in good condition.

(4) Consistency with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan.

Consistent. The proposed project is in conformance with the City's General Plan in that the General Plan establishes the long-range planning and policy direction that guides change and preserves the qualities that define the community. The 2015-2035 General Plan sets forth the vision for Costa Mesa. This vision focuses on protecting and enhancing Costa Mesa's diverse residential neighborhoods, accommodating an array of businesses that both serve local needs and attract regional and international spending, and continuing to provide cultural, educational, social, and recreational amenities that contribute to the quality of life in the community. Over the long term, General Plan implementation will ensure that development decisions and

improvements to public and private infrastructure are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies contained in this Plan.

The following analysis evaluates proposed project consistency with applicable policies and objectives of the 2015-2035 General Plan:

- **Policy LU-3.1:** Protect existing stabilized residential neighborhoods including mobile home parks (and manufactured housing parks) from the encroachment of incompatible or potentially disruptive land uses and/or activities.

Consistent. The new antennas will have a compatible and harmonious relationship between the proposed devices and the site development and use, and the buildings and site developments and uses that are in the general neighborhood. The height and disguise for the new facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property being camouflaged as a tree, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact. By proposing the facility camouflaged as a mono-eucalyptus tree, it will hide the new antennas and radio units from view, and by complying with all State and Federal regulations for radio frequencies, the project will protect the surrounding area from potentially incompatible land uses.

- **Objective CD-8.F:** Require that areas for outside equipment, trash receptacles, storage, and loading areas be located in the least conspicuous part of the site. Utility and mechanical equipment (e.g. electric and gas meters, electrical panels, and junction boxes) should be concealed from the view of public streets, neighborhood properties, and nearby higher buildings.

Consistent. The new antennas and support equipment will be screened and from views off-site. The antennas will be installed disguised as a mono-eucalyptus tree, and the facility enclosure will be painted to match the existing building.

The property has a General Plan Land Use designation of Light Industrial (LI). This General Plan Land Use Designation applies to areas intended for a variety of light and general industrial uses. The existing development provides long-term storage opportunities, and the proposed wireless facility provides a utility service to the public and therefore meets the intent of the General Plan to support commercial uses.

(5) The planning application is for a project-specific case and is not to be construed to be setting a precedent for future development.

Consistent. The project proposed is for the specific location at 2065 Placentia Avenue. Every project is reviewed on its own merits and will not set a precedent for other developments in the area.

(6) When more than one (1) planning application is proposed for a single development, the cumulative effect of all the planning applications shall be considered.

Consistent. One application is being proposed for this specific project. The new wireless facility disguised as a mono-eucalyptus will have minimal visual impact because the height and disguise of the new facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property being camouflaged as a tree, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact. The antennas will comply with all local, state, and federal regulations.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 for New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures. This project proposes the construction of a new wireless facility disguised as a eucalyptus tree (mono-eucalyptus), with the support facility for the mono-eucalyptus is proposed to be located behind a proposed 8-foot CMU enclosure which would also include the proposed mono-eucalyptus. The project is consistent with the applicable General Plan land use designation and policies as well as with the applicable zoning designation and regulations. Furthermore, none of the exceptions that bar the application of a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply. The Project would not result in a cumulative impact; would not have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances; would not result in damage to scenic resources; is not located on a hazardous site or location and would not impact any historic resources.

ALTERNATIVES

The Planning Commission may take the following actions:

1. Approve the revised project;
2. Approve the revised project, subject to modified conditions of approval; or
3. Deny the revised project. If the Planning Commission believes that there are insufficient facts to support the findings for approval, the Planning Commission must deny the application, provide facts in support of denial, and direct staff to incorporate the findings into a Resolution for denial. If the project is denied, the applicant could not submit substantially the same type of application for six months.

PUBLIC NOTICE

Section 2-308 of the CMMC requires that the notice of the hearing for an appeal or review shall be given in the same manner as any required notice for the hearing at which the decision subject to the appeal or review was made. In all cases for the hearing for an appeal or review, written notice of the date, time, and place shall be given to the original applicant, if any, any prior applicant for appeal regarding the same matter, and for appeals the person requesting the current appeal.

Pursuant to CMMC Section 13-29(d) three types of public notification have been completed no less than 10 days prior to the date of the initial public hearing:

1. **Mailed notice.** A public notice was mailed to all property owners and occupants within a 500-foot radius of the project site on August 27, 2025. The required notice radius is measured from the external boundaries of the property.
2. **On-site posting.** A public notice was posted on each street frontage of the project site on August 28, 2025.
3. **Newspaper publication.** A public notice was published once in the Daily Pilot newspaper on August 29, 2025.

At the September 8, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting, the project was continued to the December 8, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting. At the December 8, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting, the project was continued to the March 23, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting and no additional noticing is required.

On February 25, 2026, the applicant held their own outreach to the adjacent residential neighborhood to present the revised project location/plans prior to this continued hearing. As of the date of this report, no written public comment has been received.

LEGAL REVIEW

The draft Resolution and this report been approved as to form by the City Attorney's Office.

CONCLUSION

The Zoning Administrator previously determined that the previously proposed project was consistent with the City's Municipal Code, the Zoning Code and the General Plan. In response to the September 8, 2025, Planning Commission hearing, and Commission comments, the proposed location of the facility was revised to be located further away from the adjacent residential areas and as a different tree species for additional camouflage. The wireless facility will provide coverage to AT&T customers in the immediate area and is consistent with federal law which does not allow local jurisdictions to preclude the reasonable provision of wireless services. Given the project's aesthetic design considerations, placement of supporting equipment, and adherence to federal

health and safety regulations, the proposed wireless facility will be compatible with its surroundings, does not injure nearby properties, and will not present any health and safety concerns. Therefore, staff recommends the Planning Commission uphold the Zoning Administrator's approval.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Planning Commission Resolution
2. Filed Application for Review
3. September 8, 2025 Planning Commission Staff Report
4. Applicant Letter
5. Photo simulations
6. Plans
7. Alternative Sites Analysis
8. Electromagnetic Energy (EME) Report
9. July 17, 2025 Zoning Administrator Public Comments
10. September 8, 2025 Planning Commission Public Comments

RESOLUTION NO. PC-2026-

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA APPROVING A MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (PMCP-24-0029) FOR A NEW WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY IN THE MG ZONE FOR PROPERTY AT 2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA FINDS AND DECLARES AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, Planning Application PMCP-24-0029 was filed by John McDonald (Eukon Group), authorized agent for the property owner, Public Storage Partners LTD requesting approval of Planning Application PMCP-24-0029 is a request for a Minor Conditional Use Permit (MCUP) to allow for a new 60-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a eucalyptus tree (mono-eucalyptus) on a combined property with an existing 55-foot tall mono-pine, with the support facility for the mono-eucalyptus is proposed to be located behind a proposed 8-foot CMU enclosure which would also include the proposed mono-eucalyptus;

WHEREAS, a duly noticed decision was made by the Zoning Administrator on July 17, 2025, with all persons having the opportunity to submit written comments for and against the proposal;

WHEREAS, on July 24, 2025, Council Member Reynolds submitted a “Call to Review” Application (PAPL-25-0004) for the Zoning Administrator’s approval of PMCP-24-0009;

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was held by the Planning Commission on September 8, 2025, with all persons having the opportunity to speak for and against the proposal and was continued to the December 8, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting;

WHEREAS, at the Planning Commission hearing on December 8, 2025, the project was continued at applicant’s request to the March 23, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting, in order to allow the applicant to revise the project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the project is exempt from the provisions of the CEQA per Section 15303 (Class 3) New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures; and

WHEREAS, the CEQA categorical exemption for this project reflects the independent judgement of the City of Costa Mesa.

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the evidence in the record and the findings contained in Exhibit A, and subject to the conditions of approval contained within Exhibit B, the Planning Commission hereby **APPROVES** Planning Application PMCP-24-0029 as modified following the Zoning Administrator's approval thereof and the filing of Call to Review Application PAPL-25-0004, with respect to the property described above.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Costa Mesa Planning Commission does hereby find and determine that adoption of this Resolution is expressly predicated upon the activity as described in the staff report for Call to Review PAPL-25-0004 and upon the applicant's compliance with each and all of the conditions in Exhibit B, and compliance of all applicable federal, state, and local laws. Any approval granted by this resolution shall be subject to review, modification, or revocation if there is a material change that occurs in the operation, or if the applicant fails to comply with any of the conditions of approval.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any section, division, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this resolution, or the document in the record in support of this resolution, are for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 23rd day of March, 2026.

Jeffrey Harlan, Chair
Costa Mesa Planning Commission

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF ORANGE)ss
CITY OF COSTA MESA)

I, Carrie Tai, Secretary to the Planning Commission of the City of Costa Mesa, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. PC-2026-____ was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City of Costa Mesa Planning Commission held on March 23, 2026 by the following votes:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

Carrie Tai, Secretary
Costa Mesa Planning Commission

Resolution No. PC-2026-__

EXHIBIT A

FINDINGS

- A. The proposed project complies with Costa Mesa Municipal Code Section 13-29(g)(2) & 13-144(b) because:

Finding: *“The proposed development or use is substantially compatible with developments in the same general area and would not be materially detrimental to other properties within the area.”*

Facts in Support of Findings: The proposed use is compatible and harmonious with developments in the same general area and would not be materially detrimental to other properties within the area. The use will be conducted on a combined site with an existing facility and at a height that is necessary to provide coverage and will not generate substantial noise, excessive traffic or otherwise have detrimental effects on the surrounding uses.

Finding: *“Granting the conditional use permit or minor conditional use permit will not be materially detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public or otherwise injurious to property or improvements within the immediate neighborhood.”*

Facts in Support of Finding: The project will not be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public or otherwise injurious to property or improvements within the immediate neighborhood in that the FCC has jurisdictional authority with regard to the health and safety of telecommunications facility. Additional conditions have been added to ensure that antenna frequency does not interfere with the frequency used for public safety communications and that all equipment remain in good working condition. The installation of the new antennas and equipment area will comply with all applicable Building and Fire Codes.

Finding: *“Granting the conditional use permit or minor conditional use permit will not allow a use, density or intensity which is not in accordance with the general plan designation and any applicable specific plan for the property.”*

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed antennas and equipment area are located in an existing mini-storage facility with an existing mono-pine. With the approval of a minor conditional use permit for structure height above standard, the antennas and equipment area comply with all zoning requirements and is consistent with the General Plan land use designation in that the equipment will be screened from view from other surrounding developments. In addition, the location of the equipment area is camouflaged from offsite areas. Granting the minor conditional use permit will provide improved wireless services to residents and visitors to the City, on a combined site that has an existing facility for another carrier (Verizon), disguised as a

mono-pine tree. The proposed antenna will be compatible with the existing uses located in the surrounding area and will not generate noise or parking impacts.

Finding: *“Strict conformance with the development standards specified will unreasonably limit, or prevent, reception or transmission of signals, or result in excessive expense in light of the cost of purchase, installation and operation of the antenna(s).”*

Facts in Support of Finding: Consistent. Adhering to a 30-foot height limit for the proposed wireless communication facility will unreasonably limit reception or transmission of signals or result in additional expense. Wireless communication facilities function based on line-of-sight technology, which means that in order to send and receive a signal one antenna must “see” the other. Standard heights for wireless facilities in typical suburban environments are often 55-60 feet above ground. This height is usually adequate to avoid signal interference caused by other buildings and trees and is sufficient to be seen by other antennae on the same network. Restricting the wireless communication facility to a height of 30 feet would diminish the antennas ability to send or receive signals and would necessitate placing more antennas in order to provide roughly the same coverage for the same geographic area as one antenna located at 60-foot high. This will result in additional expenses to acquire property leases and then to purchase, install, and operate the additional antennas. Additionally, the combined site contains an existing 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine tree located toward the rear of the adjacent parcel.

Finding: *“The deviation from applicable development standards represents the minimum adjustment necessary to prevent unreasonable limitations on the reception or transmission of signals.”*

Facts in Support of Finding: Strict compliance with all development standards (e.g., setbacks, height) would severely limit the functionality and coverage of the facility. The height and placement of the proposed mono-eucalyptus are essential to ensure effective signal propagation and service. Additionally, as mentioned in their applicant letter, the proposed height does not allow AT&T to close the entire gap in coverage, however, is a minimum necessary to make this site effective while matching the existing on-site facility being camouflaged as a tree. The letter also states that any further reduction in height would compromise service and coverage quality. The proposed deviations represent the minimum necessary to maintain reliable signal transmission while achieving stealthing objectives.

- B. The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 for New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures. This project proposes the construction of a new wireless facility disguised as a eucalyptus tree (mono-eucalyptus), with the support facility for the mono-eucalyptus is proposed to be located behind a proposed 8-foot CMU enclosure which would also include the proposed mono-eucalyptus. The project is consistent with the applicable General Plan land use designation and policies as well as with the applicable zoning designation and regulations. Furthermore, none of the exceptions that bar the application of a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply. The Project would not result in a cumulative impact; would not have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances; would not result in damage to scenic resources; is not located on a hazardous site or location, and would not impact any historic resources.

EXHIBIT B

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (PMCP-24-0029 & PAPL-25-0004)

- Plng.
1. The use of this combined property as a mini-warehouse storage development with two wireless facilities, one disguised as a mono-pine and the other disguised as a mono-eucalyptus, shall comply with the approved plans and these conditions of approval.
 2. The applicant shall contact the Planning Division to arrange a Planning inspection of the site prior to final building inspection. This inspection is to confirm that the conditions of approval and code requirements have been satisfied.
 3. Any change in the design or operational characteristics of the wireless communication facility shall be subject to Planning Division review and may require an amendment to the conditional use permit, subject to either Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission approval, depending on the nature of the proposed change.
 4. At all times, the applicant shall not prevent City of Costa Mesa from having adequate spectrum capacity on City's 800 MHz radio frequency.
 5. The applicant shall provide a 24-hour phone number to which interference problems may be reported.
 6. The applicant shall provide a "single point of contact" in its Engineering and Maintenance Departments to ensure continuity on all interference issues. The name, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address of that person shall be provided to City's designated representative upon activation of the facility.
 7. The applicant shall ensure that lessee or other user(s) shall comply with the terms and conditions of this permit and shall be responsible for the failure of any lessee or other users under the control of applicant to comply.
 8. All antennas shall be mounted as shown on the plans with appropriate screening to minimize visual impacts to surrounding properties and uses. Antennas shall be painted to match the foliage of the mono-pine. Supports shall be painted to match branches.

9. The proposed mono-pine tree shall be maintained such that it will resemble a pine tree for the life of the project, free from fading and loss of limbs. Branching shall be a minimum of 25 feet in diameter at the lower branches and tapering up to shorter branches toward to top, but in all cases branching shall extend forward of all antenna panels in order to provide adequate screening; minimum vertical spacing shall be provided to ensure the appearance of a tree while not interfering with the proposed facility. The equipment enclosure shall be painted to match the existing facility.
10. Maximum height of the antennas shall not exceed 60-feet of height as measured from existing grade.
11. All proposed equipment cabinets, antennas, wiring, cables, and conduit shall be well maintained and kept in good condition at all times. Any broken, damaged, faded, and exposed material shall be replaced and approved by Planning staff prior to installation.
12. Any future modifications to the equipment or antennas shall be done with prior approval of Planning staff and may require filing and approval of a minor conditional use permit to ensure compliance with applicable zoning codes.
13. Antenna frequencies shall not interfere with the frequency used for public safety communications.
14. The conditions of approval and code requirements of Zoning Application PMCP-24-0029 & PAPL-25-0004 shall be blueprinted on the face of the site plan sheet of the plan check submittal package.
15. The applicant shall defend, with attorneys of City's choosing, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, agents, officers and employees from any claim, legal action, or proceeding (collectively referred to as "proceeding") brought against the City, its elected and appointed officials, agents, officers or employees arising out of City's approval of the project, including but not limited to any proceeding under the California Environmental Quality Act. The indemnification shall include, but not be limited to, damages, fees and/or costs awarded against the City, if any, and cost of suit, attorney's fees, and other costs, liabilities and expenses incurred in connection with such proceeding whether incurred by the applicant, the City and/or the parties initiating or bringing such proceeding. This indemnity provision shall include the applicant's obligation to indemnify the City for all the City's costs, fees, and damages that the City incurs in enforcing the indemnification provisions set forth in this section.

16. No transmitting antenna or facility, except as categorically excluded by the Federal Communication Commission, shall exceed the radiofrequency (RF) radiation and maximum permissible exposure (MPE) limits for electrical and magnetic field strength and power density established by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) and the 1992 ANSI/IEEE for an "uncontrolled environment." It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to provide evidence of compliance with applicable standards.

CODE REQUIREMENTS

The following list of State and local laws applicable to the project has been compiled by staff for the applicant's reference. Any reference to "City" pertains to the City of Costa Mesa. The applicant is also required to comply with any other applicable State and local laws not provided below.

- | | |
|-------|--|
| Plng. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Approval of the planning / zoning application is valid for two years from the effective date of this approval and will expire at the end of that period unless applicant establishes the use by one of the following actions: 1) a building permit has been issued and construction has commenced, and has continued to maintain a valid building permit by making satisfactory progress as determined by the Building Official, 2) a certificate of occupancy has been issued, or 3) the use is established and a business license has been issued. A time extension can be requested no less than 30 days or more than sixty (60) days before the expiration date of the permit and submitted with the appropriate fee for review to the Planning Division. The Director of Development Services may extend the time for an approved permit or approval to be exercised up to 180-days subject to specific findings listed in Title 13, Section 13-29 (k) (6). Only one request for an extension of 180 days may be approved by the Director. Any subsequent extension requests shall be considered by the original approval authority.2. Hours of construction shall comply with Section 13-279, Title 13, of the Costa Mesa Municipal Code.3. Antennas shall comply with the Antenna Development Standards in Section 13-142 of the Costa Mesa Zoning Code. |
| Bldg. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Comply with the requirements of the applicable adopted California Building Code, California Electrical Code, California Mechanical Code, California Plumbing Code, California Green Building Standards, California Energy Code, and California Code of Regulations also known as the California Building Standards Code, as amended by the City of Costa Mesa at the time of plan submittal or permit issuance. |

5. Plans shall be prepared by a California licensed Architect or Engineer. Plans shall be wet stamped and signed by the licensed Architect or Engineer prior to the issuance of building permits.
6. Construction / improvements that encroach within Public Utility Easements shall require written approvals from the utility companies associated with that easement.
- Bus. Lic. 7. All contractors and subcontractors must have valid business licenses to do business in the City of Costa Mesa. Final inspections, final occupancy and utility releases will not be granted until all such licenses have been obtained.



City of Costa Mesa

RESERVE FOR FILING STAMP
RECEIVED
ATTACHMENT 2
CITY CLERK
25 JUL 24 PM 4:48

- Appeal of Planning Commission Decision: \$1,220.00 (Tier 1), \$3,825.00 (Tier 2)
Appeal of Non-Planning Commission Decision: \$690.00 (Tier 1), \$3,825.00 (Tier 2)

File with: City Clerk, City of Costa Mesa, 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA 92626, 714-754-5225

APPLICATION FOR APPEAL OR REVIEW

Applicant Name* Council Member Arlis Reynolds
Address
Phone

REQUEST FOR: [] APPEAL [X] REVIEW**

Decision of which appeal or review is requested: (give application number, if applicable, and the date of the decision, if known.)

pmcp-24-0029, 2065 Placentia Ave. regarding a new wireless facility.

Decision by: Zoning Administrator

Reasons for requesting appeal or review:

Many residents have raised a variety of concerns about the potential impacts that council should take the opportunity to consider, especially on this mixed-use corridor

Date: 7/24/2025 Signature: B. Green for Arlis Reynolds

*If you are serving as the agent for another person, please identify the person you represent and provide proof of authorization.
**Review may be requested only by Planning Commission, Planning Commission Member, City Council, or City Council Member

For office use only - do not write below this line

SCHEDULED FOR THE CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF:
If appeal or review is for a person or body other than City Council/Planning Commission, date of hearing of appeal or review

Updated September 2023

1 Includes owners and/or occupants of a property located within 500 feet of project site (excluding owners and/or occupants of the project site).

2 Includes the project applicant, owners and/or occupants of the project site, and owners and/or occupants of a property located greater than 500 feet from the project site. 41



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: SEPTEMBER 8, 2025

ITEM NUMBER: PH-1

SUBJECT: CALL TO REVIEW (PAPL-25-0004) ZONING ADMINISTRATOR APPROVAL OF A MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (PMCP-24-0029) FOR A NEW WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY AT 2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE

FROM: ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT / PLANNING DIVISION

PRESENTATION BY: JUSTIN ARIOS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: JUSTIN ARIOS
714-754-5667
Justin.Arios@costamesaca.gov**

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Find that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3) New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures; and
2. Uphold the Zoning Administrator conditional approval of Minor Conditional Use Permit (PMCP-24-0029) for a new wireless communication facility at 2065 Placentia Avenue by adopting the attached Resolution.

APPLICANT OR AUTHORIZED AGENT:

The authorized agent is John McDonald (Eukon Group), representing the property owner, Public Storage Partners LTD.

PLANNING APPLICATION SUMMARY

Location	2065 Placentia Avenue	Application Number	PAPL-25-0004 & PMCP-24-0029
Request	Planning Application PMCP-24-0029 is a request for a Minor Conditional Use Permit (MCUP) to allow for a new 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a pine tree (mono-pine) on a property with an existing, similar 55-foot tall mono-pine. The support facility for the mono-pine is proposed to be located inside three existing storage units adjacent to the proposed mono-pine.		
CEQA	Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures)		
Final Action	Planning Commission		

SUBJECT PROPERTY

Zoning District	MG (General Industrial)
General Plan Land Use Designation	Light Industrial
Lot Dimensions	Lot Width: 173.30' Lot Depth: 464.92'
Lot Area	Approximately 80,570-square-feet (approximately 1.85-acres)
List of Approved Plans / Land Use Entitlements	ZE-76-154 - Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a public storage facility with manager's apartment with variances from parking, landscaping, and sign requirements. DR-84-42 - Development Review to add to the existing mini-warehouse project. ZA-07-67 - MCUP for a 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine.
Existing Development	Public Storage mini-warehouse use and existing mono-pine facility (to remain).

SURROUNDING PROPERTY

	Zoning District	General Plan Land Use Designation	Existing Development
North	MG (General Industrial)	Light Industrial	Live / Work Residential Development (Brickyard West)
East (across Placentia Ave)	MG (General Industrial)	Light Industrial	Automotive Uses
South	MG (General Industrial)	Light Industrial	Public Storage
West	R1 (Single-Family Residential District)	Low Density Residential	Single-Family Residential Uses

ANTENNA DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS COMPARISON

Development Standard	Required / Allowed Antenna Dev. Standard	Proposed / Provided	Meets Code
Max Height	30 FT	55 FT ¹	No, MCUP Requested
Setbacks:			
Front	20 FT	Approx. 60 FT	Yes
Side (left)	20 FT	Approx. 420 FT	Yes
Rear	5	Approx. 27 FT	Yes
Number of Support Structures	1	1 (converted storage units)	Yes
Roof Mounted Location	Allowed but not mandatory	Ground mounted	Yes

¹ Pursuant to Costa Mesa Municipal Code Section 13-142, an MCUP approval is required when an antenna is not in compliance with adopted standards, or is not roof-mounted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 17, 2025, the City's Zoning Administrator approved a Minor Conditional Use Permit (MCUP) to allow for a new 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a pine tree (mono-pine) on a property with an existing, similar 55-foot tall mono-pine. A support facility for the mono-pine is proposed to be located inside three existing storage units adjacent to the proposed mono-pine. A thorough description and analysis of the project request is included in the attached July 17, 2025, Zoning Administrator Report (Attachment 3).

On July 24, 2025, Council Member Reynolds submitted an "application for review" of the approval to be considered by the Planning Commission. The Council Member was concerned that "many residents have raised a variety of concerns about the potential impacts, [...] especially on this mixed-use corridor". (See Attachment 2).

The subject review is intended to provide the Planning Commission with an opportunity to review the requested MCUP to allow for a new 55-foot tall wireless facility. The Planning Commission hearing is a 'de novo' hearing in which the Planning Commission may consider the project in its entirety. The Planning Commission may consider all aspects of the proposed project and is not required to limit the discussion to the issues in the "call to review" application.

Figure 1. Vicinity Map



SETTING

The subject property is located at 2065 Placentia Avenue (see Figure 1 on the previous page). It is an approximately 1.85-acre rectangular-shaped site located along Placentia Avenue between West 20th Street and Hamilton Street. There is one driveway that provides site access from Placentia Avenue.

Background

On October 4, 1976, the City Council approved a CUP (ZE-76-154) to allow the construction of a 39,400 sq. ft. building for public storage garages and a manager's unit (Public Storage) with variances from parking, landscaping, and sign requirements.

On September 9, 1984, the Planning Division approved a Development Review (DR-84-42) to add approximately 45,000 sq. ft. of storage area to the existing mini-warehouse storage facility.

On January 10, 2008, the Zoning Administrator approved an MCUP (ZA-07-67) to allow for the construction of an existing 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine on the project site (Figure 2). For this request, four public comments were received in opposition of the request, from adjacent industrial property owners and tenants.

Figure 2. Existing Installation



The property has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Light Industrial (LI) and a Zoning Designation of General Industrial (MG). The Light Industrial General Plan Land Use Designation applies to areas intended for a variety of light and general industrial uses. Uses are limited to small manufacturing and service industries, as well as larger industrial operations that can demonstrate design features or restricted operations that limit disruptions to surrounding uses. The proposed wireless communication facility is compatible with the existing site improvements and is an allowable use pursuant to the City's Zoning Code.

Properties to the north, south, and east (across Placentia Avenue) have Light Industrial (LI) Land Use designations and General Industrial (MG) zoning designations. The property to the north is developed with a 14-unit live/work residential development (Brickyard West); the property to the south is developed with an extension of the existing Public Storage use; and the properties to the east (across Placentia Avenue) are developed with various automotive uses. Properties to the west have a Low Density Residential (LDR) Land Use Designation and Single-Family Residential District (R1) zoning and are developed with single-family residential homes.

Standard of Review

Pursuant to Section 13-144, wireless communication facilities are evaluated against the findings for an MCUP application contained in Section 13-29(g)(2) and the additional antenna findings located at Section 13-144(b). The findings require that the project be compatible with nearby development; not be detrimental to nearby properties or the public, health, safety, or welfare; be consistent with the General Plan; and represent the minimum height needed to achieve reasonable signal transmission.

In addition, Costa Mesa Municipal Code (CMMC) Section 13-144 (a)(2) requires that applications for proposed antennas that do not conform with the applicable development standards demonstrate why strict conformance with the development standards will unreasonably limit, or restrict, the proposed installation and would result in excessive expense considering the cost of the proposed installation. The CMMC also states that conditions of approval may be applied to the development or its operations to ensure that the required findings can be met. An assessment of the project's relationship to the findings and General Plan is provided later in this report.

Lastly, all planning applications must comply with review criteria that address neighborhood compatibility, safety and compatibility of design, compliance with applicable performance standards, and consistency with the General Plan.

Limitations on Decisions

Jurisdictions are highly regulated as to when and how they can deny wireless communications facility applications. Jurisdictions may not impose an “effective prohibition” of wireless communication facilities. An effective prohibition is one that prevents a wireless carrier from closing a “significant” gap in service coverage provided by that carrier. As such, wireless carriers must submit gap coverage analyses with their applications, demonstrating that the subject location in their application is needed to close service gaps. This gap coverage analysis must demonstrate the extent to which the gap will be closed.

Wireless carriers must also submit any alternative locations, systems, and placement to justify that the proposed location is the least intrusive location while providing the gap closure needed. Jurisdictions then review these analyses to verify the findings for gap coverage.

Jurisdictions are not permitted to consider radio-frequency (RF) emissions for the purpose of evaluating a wireless communication facility. Setting the safety standards for RF emissions is exclusively the responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”). Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv) of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 prohibits the City from denying a wireless facility application based on concerns about RF emissions when the applicant has demonstrated that its facilities will comply with FCC standards.

Appeal and Call to Review Procedures

CMMC Title 2, Chapter IX, stipulates the City’s appeal and review procedures. The CMMC allows any affected or interested person to appeal a project within specified periods, and also allows City Council members to call projects up for review. In this case, the project approval included a seven-day appeal period. Since the Zoning Administrator approved the project, pursuant to the CMMC, the call to review decision shall be made by the Planning Commission.


The CMMC further indicates that the Planning Commission hearing is a ‘de novo’ hearing in which the Planning Commission may consider the project in its entirety. The Planning Commission may consider all aspects of the proposed project and is not required to limit the discussion to the issues in the “call to review” application. The CMMC also stipulates that the review hearing shall be based on any relevant evidence, submitted at the time of the prior decision and at the call for review hearing. The Zoning Administrator decision letter and public comments submitted have been included as an attachment to the report for ease of review (Attachments 3 and 9, respectively).

Pursuant to CMMC Chapter IX, Section 2-303(6), the applicant for the original decision shall have the burden of proof to support the granting of the approval action at the appeal.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION


The project proposes to install a new wireless AT&T communication facility camouflaged as a mono-pine. The proposed mono-pine is located at the western end of an existing mini-warehouse site with another existing mono-pine for a different carrier, Verizon, located to the south of the proposed location. The proposed mono-pine is approximately 27 feet from the common property line, with the single-family residences along Federal Avenue and approximately 60 feet from the nearest industrial use to the north (Figure 3; blue dot is the existing facility location and the green dot is the proposed facility location). The wireless facility is approximately 80 feet from the nearest residential structure located along Federal Avenue; and approximately 55 feet from the other monopine existing onsite. The proposed project designates an area at the rear of the property for outdoor equipment and a backup generator. The equipment will be installed within an existing storage unit adjacent to the mono-pine. This area is located internal to the project site and is not visible to adjacent properties or the public right-of-way.

Figure 3. Partial Site Plan



As part of the application, an Alternative Site Analysis (Attachment 7) was conducted in which seven other sites were evaluated. Based on the analysis submitted, there were several candidates that were reviewed and determined to not be viable to close the gap in coverage. These locations were determined to not be viable because the location either 1) would not satisfy the needed gap coverage, 2) is a unpreferred location for the carrier (AT&T installations typically avoid being placed on elementary school properties), 3) has existing site obstructions (i.e. existing trees) that would interfere with propagation, and 4) existing cell towers are not suitable for co-location. Additionally, as part of the application, an Electromagnetic Energy (EME) Report (Attachment 8) was submitted, demonstrating the proposed project will comply with the applicable Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") standards. An EME Report, also referred to as a Radio Frequency (RF) Compliance Report, is a technical analysis prepared by a qualified radio frequency engineer that evaluates the expected levels of radiofrequency emissions from a proposed wireless communication facility.

Figure 4. Elevation View



The mono-pine is proposed to be 55-feet tall, as measured to the highest point of the structure and includes four antenna sectors, each containing three antennas and a total of 48 remote radio units. The plans show that the faux mono-pine will have branches starting approximately 15 feet above ground level and continuing to a height of 55 feet (see Figure 4). The lower branches will have a 25-foot diameter at its base and will taper to shorter branches at the top to mimic a natural growing pine tree. Notwithstanding this taper, the plans clearly show that no antenna will extend past the faux branches so as to reasonably screen the wireless communication facility and the antennas will also be painted/textured to match the mono-pine disguise.

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR DECISION

On July 17, 2025, the City’s Zoning Administrator approved the project, with conditions. The staff report provided for the application concluded that the wireless facility would provide coverage to AT&T customers in the immediate area, and would be consistent with federal law, which does not allow local jurisdictions to preclude the reasonable provision of wireless services. Given the project’s aesthetic design considerations, placement of supporting equipment, and adherence to federal health and safety regulations, the proposed wireless facility would be compatible with its surroundings, would not injure nearby properties, and would not present any health and safety concerns. The Staff Report is attached (Attachment 3) and is linked below:
<https://www.costamesaca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/60769/638883650985730000>

Public Comments - Zoning Administrator Decision

In response to the public notice sent out for the Zoning Administrator decision, a total of 14 public comments (all in opposition of the project) were received, including a public comment with “92 signatures against a new cell tower”. The main points raised were:

1. Concerns with noise associated with construction and maintenance.

Any proposed work requiring a building permit, whether the construction of the facility or proposed maintenance of the facility, would also be subject to the requirements of Chapter XIII related to Noise Control. Specifically, per Section 13-279(b) *Exceptions for Construction*, construction work between the below hours/days are exempt from the City’s exterior noise standards.

HOURS FOR CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES	
7 AM through 7 PM	Mondays through Fridays
9 AM through 6 PM	Saturdays
Prohibited all hours	Sundays and the following specified federal holidays: New Year’s Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day

2. Concerns with a third facility in the area and being too close to the residential neighborhood.

The proposed mono-pine is approximately 27 feet from the common property line with the single-family residences along Federal Avenue and approximately 80 feet from the nearest residential structure located along Federal Avenue. The required rear and side setbacks (which apply to antenna support structures and to arrays and projections attached), is 5 feet. There is another facility, also located on a Public Storage mini-warehouse site, located at 2099 Placentia Avenue. The facility at 2099 Placentia was approved by an MCUP (ZA-98-21), allowing a 50-foot tall mono-pine that is currently operated by T-Mobile (originally approved for Pacific Bell). Jurisdictions may not impose an “effective prohibition” of wireless communication facilities, and may not deny an application solely based on community opposition and/or the number of existing facilities in the area. The antennas and equipment area will comply with required setbacks and applicable development standards. The proposed facility will be disguised as a mono-pine tree and will be screened from view off-site and will provide the necessary coverage.

3. Concerns with RF emissions and health.

Jurisdictions are not permitted to consider radiofrequency (RF) emissions for the purpose of evaluating a wireless communication facility. Setting the safety standards for RF emissions is exclusively the responsibility of the FCC. Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv) of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 prohibits the City from denying a wireless facility application based on concerns about RF emissions when the applicant has demonstrated that its facilities will comply with FCC standards. An EME Report (Attachment 8) was submitted, demonstrating the proposed project will comply with the applicable Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) standards. Furthermore, as part of the plan check process for the proposed installation, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that the installation complies with the applicable FCC standards (Post-Installation RF Report).

4. Concerns with cell towers negatively affecting home values.

Local jurisdictions are not authorized under federal or state law to deny wireless facility applications solely on the basis of perceived or speculative impacts to property values. Courts have generally held that such concerns, without substantial supporting evidence, do not constitute sufficient grounds for denial. Although the facility will be visibility from residential properties, the goal is to minimize the visual impact of the structure. The structure will be disguised as a mono-pine tree and the storage facility property has, what appears to be, 36” box-sized trees along the rear property line, both assisting to minimizing the visual impact of the proposed project.

5. Concerns with the proposed facility not being aesthetically appealing and being an eyesore.

The proposed facility is disguised as a mono-pine tree and the facility enclosure will be screened and painted to match the existing on-site building color scheme. The height and disguise of the new facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact. Additionally, Conditions Nos. 5-13 are included to ensure the continued aesthetic maintenance of the mono-pine will be provided.

FINDINGS

Pursuant to the CMMC, the approval of an MCUP requires that the Zoning Administrator make five findings related to neighborhood compatibility, health and safety, land use compatibility, and unreasonable limitations. The Zoning Administrator made the required MCUP findings as indicated below:

MCUP Finding No. 1: *“The proposed development or use is substantially compatible with developments in the same general area and would not be materially detrimental to other properties within the area.”*

Zoning Administrator Finding: Consistent. The proposed use is compatible and harmonious with developments in the same general area and would not be materially detrimental to other properties within the area. The height and disguise of the new facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact. The use will be conducted on a proposed mono-pine on a site with an existing mono-pine facility and at a height that is necessary to provide coverage and will not generate substantial noise, excessive traffic or otherwise have detrimental effects on the surrounding uses.

MCUP Finding No. 2: *“Granting the conditional use permit or minor conditional use permit will not be materially detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public or otherwise injurious to property or improvements within the immediate neighborhood.”*

Zoning Administrator Finding: Consistent. The project will not be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public or otherwise injurious to property or improvements within the immediate neighborhood in that the FCC has jurisdictional authority with regard to the health and safety of telecommunications facility. Additional conditions have been added to ensure that antenna frequency does not interfere with the frequency used for public safety communications and that all equipment remain in good working

condition. The installation of the new antennas and equipment area will comply with all applicable Building and Fire Codes.

MCUP Finding No. 3: *“Granting the conditional use permit or minor conditional use permit will not allow a use, density or intensity which is not in accordance with the general plan designation and any applicable specific plan for the property.”*

Zoning Administrator Finding: Consistent. The proposed antennas and equipment area are located in an existing mini-storage facility mono-pine. With the approval of a minor conditional use permit for structure height above standard, the antennas and equipment area comply with all zoning requirements and is consistent with the General Plan land use designation in that the equipment will be screened from view from other surrounding developments. In addition, the location of the equipment area is not visible from offsite areas. Granting the minor conditional use permit will provide improved wireless services to residents and visitors to the City, on a site that has an existing facility for another carrier (Verizon), also disguised as a mono-pine tree. The proposed antenna will be compatible with the existing uses located in the surrounding area and will not generate noise or parking impacts.

MCUP Finding No. 4: *“Strict conformance with the development standards specified will unreasonably limit, or prevent, reception or transmission of signals, or result in excessive expense in light of the cost of purchase, installation and operation of the antenna(s).”*

Zoning Administrator Finding: Consistent. Adhering to a 30-foot height limit for the proposed wireless communication facility will unreasonably limit reception or transmission of signals or result in additional expense. Wireless communication facilities function based on line-of-sight technology, which means that in order to send and receive a signal one antenna must “see” the other. Standard heights for wireless facilities in typical suburban environments are often 55 feet above ground. This height is usually adequate to avoid signal interference caused by other buildings and trees and is sufficient to be seen by other antennae on the same network. Restricting the wireless communication facility to a height of 30 feet would diminish the antennas ability to send or receive signals and would necessitate placing more antennas in order to provide roughly the same coverage for the same geographic area as one antenna located at 55-foot high. This will result in additional expenses to acquire property leases and then to purchase, install, and operate the additional antennas. Additionally, the site contains an existing, another 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine tree.

MCUP Finding No. 5: *“The deviation from applicable development standards represents the minimum adjustment necessary to prevent unreasonable limitations on the reception or transmission of signals.”*

Zoning Administrator Finding: Consistent. Strict compliance with all development standards (e.g., setbacks, height) would severely limit the functionality and coverage of the facility. The height and placement of the proposed mono-pine are essential to ensure effective signal propagation and service and mimic the existing facility on site. Additionally, as mentioned in their applicant letter, the proposed height does not allow AT&T to close the entire gap in coverage, however, is a minimum necessary to make this site effective while matching the existing on-site facility. The letter also states that any further reduction in height would compromise service and coverage quality. The proposed deviations represent the minimum necessary to maintain reliable signal transmission while achieving stealthing objectives.

REVIEW CRITERIA AND GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

All planning applications are reviewed pursuant to CMMC Section 13-29(e) 1-8 to ensure the proposal is compatible with the surrounding area, and in compliance with applicable zoning standards and General Plan policies. The Zoning Administrator made the following findings pursuant to the Zoning Code. The attached Planning Commission Resolution includes these findings.

The following are the applicable Review Criteria pursuant to CMMC Zoning Code Section 13-29(e):

(1) Compatible and harmonious relationship between the proposed building and site development, and use(s), and the building and site developments, and uses that exist or have been approved for the general neighborhood.

Consistent. The proposed new wireless facility, disguised as a mono-pine, is compatible with the existing building and site development because the antennas will be installed disguised as a mono-pine tree and the facility enclosure will be screened and painted to match the existing on-site building color scheme. The site has a similar existing mono-pine facility and equipment area, located on the same property. The existing mono-pine facility is not able to support the additional facility; although the new mono-pine facility will be proposed on the same site, the property is large enough to support the proposed facility and equipment area without interfering with the existing use and development. The facility enclosure will not be located in required parking areas, will be screened from all areas off-site by the new screen walls and will therefore be compatible with the existing site development and general neighborhood. The height and disguise of the new

facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact.

(2) *Safety and compatibility of the design of buildings, parking area, landscaping, luminaries and other site features which may include functional aspects of the site development such as automobile and pedestrian circulation.*

Consistent. The FCC has jurisdictional authority over wireless antennas with regard to the health and safety of telecommunications facility and the City of Costa Mesa is preempted by Federal regulations on this issue. Conditions have been included to ensure that antenna frequency does not interfere with the frequency used for public safety communications (Condition #16). The antenna's frequencies comply with all federal standards for radio frequency emissions in accordance with the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and subsequent amendments, as well as any other applicable requirements imposed by the State and Federal Agencies. The equipment area and new antennas will comply with all applicable building and fire codes. The applicant also commissioned an RF Emissions report for the proposed facility. This report determined the facility will operate in compliance with the Federal Communications Commission's exposure standards for both the general and occupational populations.

(3) *Compliance with any performance standards as prescribed in the Zoning Code.*

Consistent. Pursuant to the development standards table (provided previously), the project complies with all applicable development standards with the exception of maximum height which can be exceeded with the issuance of a minor conditional use permit. The antennas and equipment area will comply with required setbacks and number of support structures. The additional height for the proposed antennas can be supported because the antennas and facility will be disguised is proposed disguised as a mono-pine tree and will be screened from view off-site and will provide the necessary coverage. Additionally, the site contains an existing, 55-foot tall wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine tree which will remain. Adhering to a 30-foot height limit for the proposed wireless communication facility will unreasonably limit reception or transmission of signals or result in additional expense. Wireless communication facilities function based on line-of-sight technology, which means that in order to send and receive a signal one antenna must "see" the other. Standard heights for wireless facilities in typical suburban environments are often 55 feet above ground. This height is usually adequate to avoid signal interference caused by other buildings and trees and is sufficient to be seen by other antennae on the same network. Restricting the wireless communication facility to a height of 30 feet would diminish the antennas ability to send or receive signals and would necessitate placing more antennas in order to provide roughly the same coverage for the same geographic area as one antenna located at 55-foot high. This will result in additional expenses to acquire property

leases and then to purchase, install, and operate the additional antennas. Conditions of approval have been included to ensure that the new facility and proposed equipment area, wiring, cables, and conduit be screened from view off site and that they remain in good condition.

(4) Consistency with the General Plan and any applicable specific plan.

Consistent. The proposed project is in conformance with the City's General Plan in that the General Plan establishes the long-range planning and policy direction that guides change and preserves the qualities that define the community. The 2015-2035 General Plan sets forth the vision for Costa Mesa. This vision focuses on protecting and enhancing Costa Mesa's diverse residential neighborhoods, accommodating an array of businesses that both serve local needs and attract regional and international spending, and continuing to provide cultural, educational, social, and recreational amenities that contribute to the quality of life in the community. Over the long term, General Plan implementation will ensure that development decisions and improvements to public and private infrastructure are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies contained in this Plan.

The following analysis evaluates proposed project consistency with applicable policies and objectives of the 2015-2035 General Plan:

- **Policy LU-3.1:** Protect existing stabilized residential neighborhoods including mobile home parks (and manufactured housing parks) from the encroachment of incompatible or potentially disruptive land uses and/or activities.

Consistent. The new antennas will have a compatible and harmonious relationship between the proposed devices and the site development and use, and the buildings and site developments and uses that are in the general neighborhood. The height and disguise of the new facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact. By proposing the facility camouflaged as a mono-pine tree, it will hide the new antennas and radio units from view, and by complying with all State and Federal regulations for radio frequencies, the project will protect the surrounding area from potentially incompatible land uses.

- **Objective CD-8.F:** Require that areas for outside equipment, trash receptacles, storage, and loading areas be located in the least conspicuous part of the site. Utility and mechanical equipment (e.g. electric and gas meters, electrical panels, and junction boxes) should be concealed from the view of public streets, neighborhood properties, and nearby higher buildings.

Consistent. The new antennas and support equipment will be screened and from views off-site. The antennas will be installed disguised as a mono-pine tree, and the facility enclosure will be painted to match the existing building.

The property has a General Plan Land Use designation of Light Industrial (LI). This General Plan Land Use Designation applies to areas intended for a variety of light and general industrial uses. The existing development provides long-term storage opportunities, and the proposed wireless facility provides a utility service to the public and therefore meets the intent of the General Plan to support commercial uses.

(5) The planning application is for a project-specific case and is not to be construed to be setting a precedent for future development.

Consistent. The project proposed is for the specific location at 2065 Placentia Avenue. Every project is reviewed on its own merits and will not set a precedent for other developments in the area.

(6) When more than one (1) planning application is proposed for a single development, the cumulative effect of all the planning applications shall be considered.

Consistent. One application is being proposed for this specific project. The new wireless facility disguised as a mono-pine will have minimal visual impact because the height and disguise of the new facility will match the existing wireless facility on the property, ensuring visual consistency and minimizing aesthetic impact. The antennas will comply with all local, state, and federal regulations.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 for New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures. This project proposes the construction of a new wireless facility disguised as a pine tree (mono-pine), with the support facility for the mono-pine proposed to be located inside three existing storage units adjacent to the mono-pine. The project is consistent with the applicable General Plan land use designation and policies as well as with the applicable zoning designation and regulations. Furthermore, none of the exceptions that bar the application of a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply. The Project would not result in a cumulative impact; would not have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances; would not result in damage to scenic resources; is not located on a hazardous site or location, and would not impact any historic resources.

ALTERNATIVES

The Planning Commission may take the following actions:

1. Uphold the Zoning Administrator's decision and approve the project;
2. Approve the project, subject to modified conditions of approval; or
3. Reverse the Zoning Administrator's decision and deny the project; if the Planning Commission believes that there are insufficient facts to support the findings for approval, the Planning Commission must deny the application, provide facts in support of denial, and direct staff to incorporate the findings into a Resolution for denial. If the project is denied, the applicant could not submit substantially the same type of application for six months.

LEGAL REVIEW

The draft Resolution and this report has been approved as to form by the City Attorney's Office.

PUBLIC NOTICE

Section 2-308 of the CMMC requires that the notice of the hearing for an appeal or review shall be given in the same manner as any required notice for the hearing at which the decision subject to the appeal or review was made. In all cases for the hearing for an appeal or review, written notice of the date, time, and place shall be given to the original applicant, if any, any prior applicant for appeal regarding the same matter, and for appeals the person requesting the current appeal.

Pursuant to CMMC Section 13-29(d) three types of public notification have been completed no less than 10 days prior to the date of the public hearing:

1. **Mailed notice.** A public notice was mailed to all property owners and occupants within a 500-foot radius of the project site on August 27, 2025. The required notice radius is measured from the external boundaries of the property.
2. **On-site posting.** A public notice was posted on each street frontage of the project site on August 28, 2025.
3. **Newspaper publication.** A public notice was published once in the Daily Pilot newspaper on August 29, 2025.

As of the date of this report, one written public comment has been received. See Attachment 9 for the Zoning Administrator public comments received and attachment 10 for the Planning Commission public comment received prior to the publishing of this report. Any additional Planning Commission public comments received prior to the September 8, 2025, Planning Commission meeting will be provided separately.

CONCLUSION

The Zoning Administrator has determined that the project is consistent with the City's Municipal Code, the Zoning Code and the General Plan. The wireless facility will provide coverage to AT&T customers in the immediate area and is consistent with federal law which does not allow local jurisdictions to preclude the reasonable provision of wireless services. Given the project's aesthetic design considerations, placement of supporting equipment, and adherence to federal health and safety regulations, the proposed wireless facility will be compatible with its surroundings, does not injure nearby properties, and will not present any health and safety concerns. Therefore, staff recommends the Planning Commission uphold the Zoning Administrator's approval.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Planning Commission Resolution
2. Filed Application for Review
3. July 17, 2025, Zoning Administrator decision letter
4. Applicant Letter
5. Photo simulations
6. Plans
7. Alternative Sites Analysis
8. Electromagnetic Energy (EME) Report
9. Zoning Administrator Public Comments
10. Planning Commission Public Comments

John McDonald – EukonGroup (Agent for AT&T)
65 Post Suite 1000
Irvine, CA 92618
3/16/2026

Justin Arios
Associate Planner
Economic and Development Services Department
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Subject: Applicant Letter for Proposed Project Approval

Dear Justin,

I am writing to formally submit the application for the proposed AT&T wireless telecommunications facility at 2065 Placentia Avenue. This letter provides a general description of the project, details on proposed equipment and screening, and justifications for the required Minor Conditional Use Permit (MCUP), including responses to the findings required for approval as specified in the Costa Mesa Municipal Code (CMMC).

General Description of the Proposed Project

The proposed project involves the construction of an AT&T wireless telecommunications facility occupying approximately 725 square feet. The facility includes a 60-foot tall faux eucalyptus (monoec) designed to match the appearance and height of an existing eucalyptus tree located near the front of the property, helping to maintain visual consistency with the surrounding landscape and minimize aesthetic impacts.

The project designates an area for the outdoor equipment and backup generator near the front of the property. During the initial Planning Commission hearing, public comment was received requesting that the facility be located as far away from the adjacent residential properties as possible. In response to these concerns, the equipment area has been relocated toward the street frontage of the site, placing the facility at the greatest feasible distance from nearby residences while still complying with the required 25-foot setback. This revised placement helps reduce potential visual and acoustic impacts to the neighboring residential properties.

Proposed Equipment and Screening

The facility will include:

- (1) PROPOSED 60'-0" HIGH FAUX EUCALYPTUS
- (16) PROPOSED AT&T PANEL ANTENNAS
- (12) PROPOSED AT&T RRUS
- (4) PROPOSED AT&T DC9 SURGE SUPPRESSORS
- (1) PROPOSED CMU EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE
- (1) PROPOSED AT&T DC50 SURGE SUPPRESSOR
- (1) PROPOSED AT&T GPS ANTENNA

- (1) PROPOSED AT&T WALK-UP CABINET (W.U.C.)
- (1) PROPOSED AT&T 30KW / 145 GAL. TANK DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATOR
- (2) PROPOSED AT&T UTILITY TRENCHES
- (1) PROPOSED AT&T CIENA PANEL
- (1) PROPOSED AT&T TELCO BOX
- (1) PROPOSED AT&T ELECTRICAL PANEL
- (1) PROPOSED AT&T ELECTRICAL METER

To mitigate any potential visual or noise impact, appropriate screening measures will be implemented. This includes:

- **Sound Barriers:** The backup generator will be located within the proposed equipment enclosure near the front of the property and screened by an 8-foot CMU wall designed to match the adjacent building. A noise study prepared for the project demonstrates that the facility will comply with the City of Costa Mesa’s exterior noise standards at the nearest residential property line.
- **Architectural Design Elements:** The proposed faux eucalyptus will replicate the form and appearance of nearby mature eucalyptus trees to blend with the surrounding landscape and minimize visual impacts. AT&T evaluated several siting options on the property, including placement near the front of the site, toward the rear of the property, and colocation with the existing wireless facility. Due to existing tenants and equipment occupying the current structure, colocation is not feasible. During the initial Planning Commission hearing, public comment requested that the facility be located as far away from the adjacent residential properties as possible. In response, the project was redesigned and relocated toward the front of the property along Placentia Avenue, positioning the facility at the greatest feasible distance from nearby residences while still complying with the required 25-foot setback.

Justification of Compatibility with Surrounding Developments

The proposed project has been designed with careful consideration of its compatibility with the surrounding developments, particularly the adjacent residential zones. The following factors support this compatibility:

- **Aesthetics:** The architectural style and materials will be consistent with or complementary to neighboring properties by stealthing the facility as a monoec.
- **Zoning Compliance:** The facility has been positioned as far as feasible from the adjacent residential property lines while complying with the required 25-foot front setback along Placentia Avenue. This location places the facility closer to the street and maximizes the separation from nearby residences in response to public comment received during the initial Planning Commission hearing. All ancillary equipment will be screened from off-site views within the proposed equipment enclosure.

- **Community Benefit:** This project addresses a documented wireless service gap in the area, contributing positively to local telecommunications infrastructure. Please refer to the attached propagation maps.

As required by CMMC Title 13, Section 13-29(g)(2), the following findings support the approval of the MCUP:

1. Substantial Compatibility:

The proposed facility is compatible with the surrounding commercial development on the property. The project incorporates a stealth faux eucalyptus (monoec) design intended to reduce visual prominence by resembling nearby trees and blending with the existing landscape. The proposed design represents the least visually intrusive option feasible to provide the necessary wireless coverage while minimizing potential aesthetic impacts to the surrounding area.

2. No Detriment to Health, Safety, or Welfare:

The proposed facility complies with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations related to public health and safety, including standards governing radiofrequency (RF) emissions and operational noise. The backup generator and equipment are enclosed and designed to limit potential acoustic impacts to surrounding properties. An EME report demonstrating compliance with FCC RF exposure standards and a noise study confirming compliance with the City's exterior noise limits have been prepared and are included with this application. The proposed installation will not create conditions detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

3. Consistency with the General Plan and Applicable Specific Plans:

The proposed use aligns with the site's General Plan designation and applicable zoning. Wireless facilities are conditionally permitted, and the proposal conforms to the intent of the City's policies regarding infrastructure development on commercial properties.

4. Strict Conformance Would Unreasonably Limit Signal Transmission:

The proposed facility has been designed in full compliance with the City of Costa Mesa's development standards, including applicable height and setback requirements. The height and placement of the proposed faux eucalyptus (monoec) are necessary to allow the antennas to function effectively and address the existing gap in AT&T's wireless coverage within the surrounding area. The selected design and location represent the least visually intrusive means of providing the needed service while remaining consistent with the City's zoning requirements and the operational needs of the wireless network.

5. Minimum Necessary Adjustment:

While the proposed facility will not fully eliminate the existing coverage gap, the proposed antenna height represents the minimum height necessary for the facility to operate effectively and provide meaningful improvement in wireless service to the surrounding area. Propagation modeling demonstrates that reducing the antenna height would result in a measurable loss of

coverage and signal reliability for nearby homes, businesses, and roadway users. As shown in the attached propagation maps, the proposed antenna centerline height provides improved in-building and in-vehicle coverage compared to a lower installation height.

Accordingly, the proposed height has been selected as the minimum height necessary to maintain reliable signal transmission while incorporating a stealth faux eucalyptus design intended to reduce the visual prominence of the facility. The proposed height has therefore been selected as the minimum height necessary to allow the facility to function effectively while incorporating a stealth faux eucalyptus design that minimizes visual impacts.

This proposal adheres to the standards set forth in CMMC Title 19, Telecommunications Regulations, ensuring compliance with local ordinances and design guidelines.

Project Revisions Following the Initial Planning Commission Hearing.

Following the initial Planning Commission hearing, AT&T carefully reviewed the public comments received from nearby residents and worked with City staff to evaluate modifications that could further reduce potential impacts to surrounding homes. Several revisions were incorporated into the project design and location in response to these concerns.

Relocation of the Proposed Facility

A primary concern expressed by residents during the initial hearing related to the proximity of the proposed wireless telecommunications facility to the residential properties located west and north of the project site. In response to these comments, the facility was relocated significantly closer to the Placentia Avenue frontage of the property while maintaining compliance with the required 25-foot setback from the public right-of-way.

This relocation increased the separation between the facility and the residential properties to the west and north and positioned the equipment enclosure along the street frontage of the site. As shown on the revised plans, the proposed equipment enclosure is now located approximately 420'-1" from the property line adjacent to the existing building and approximately 418'-7" from the existing building wall, resulting in substantially greater separation from the residential properties than the previously proposed location.

By relocating the facility toward the front of the property, the project now maximizes the distance from nearby residences and addresses one of the primary concerns raised by the community during the first hearing.

Visual Design and Maintenance

Some residents also raised concerns regarding the appearance and maintenance of the existing faux tree facility currently located on the property. While AT&T does not own or control the existing wireless facility, the City has included conditions of approval that require the proposed facility to be properly maintained. These conditions ensure that the stealth design will be

maintained over time and provide the City with the ability to enforce compliance should the facility fall into disrepair.

Privacy Considerations

Residents also expressed concern that technicians working on the existing facility could potentially see into neighboring yards while conducting maintenance activities. Because the revised facility location is positioned significantly farther from the residential properties and closer to Placentia Avenue, technicians performing routine maintenance will no longer be located near the rear property line adjacent to residential homes. This revised placement substantially reduces the potential for any privacy concerns during maintenance activities.

Noise Concerns

Another concern raised by residents related to perceived noise associated with the existing wireless facility. The revised equipment location places the generator and equipment enclosure farther away from residential properties and closer to the street frontage. In addition, a third-party acoustic study has been prepared demonstrating that operational noise from the generator will comply with the City of Costa Mesa's exterior noise standards and will not be audible at the nearest residential property lines.

Radiofrequency Safety

Several residents also raised concerns regarding potential health and safety impacts associated with radiofrequency emissions. To address these concerns, AT&T commissioned an independent third-party Electromagnetic Energy (EME) study evaluating the proposed facility. The study confirmed that the proposed installation will operate well within all Federal Communications Commission (FCC) exposure limits and fully complies with all applicable federal safety standards.

Community Outreach

In addition to revising the project design, AT&T also conducted additional outreach with nearby residents by organizing a community meeting at a local business to discuss the revised facility location and hear additional feedback. While some residents continue to express a preference that the facility be located outside of the Public Storage property entirely, participants in the meeting generally indicated that the revised location closer to Placentia Avenue was significantly preferable to the originally proposed location and better addressed many of the concerns raised during the initial Planning Commission hearing.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this application. Should you have any questions or need additional materials, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
John McDonald
Site Acquisition, EukonGroup
john.mcdonald@eukongroup.com
(949)-994-0363

EukonGroup

an SFC Communications, Inc. company

65 Post, Suite #1000
Irvine, CA 92618
(949) 553-8566



Site Justification Coverage Maps

Market Name : Southern California Market

Site ID : CLL03466

FA: 10154133

USID: 331013

Site Address : 2065 Placentia Ave. Costa Mesa, CA 92627


ATOLL Completion Date: March 10, 2026

Coverage analysis 35' vs 51'

Assumptions


- ❖ Propagation of the Site Coverage Plots are based on our current Atoll RF Design Tool that shows the preferred design of AT&T 4G-LTE Network Coverage.
- ❖ The propagation referenced in this package is based on Existing and Proposed 4G-LTE Coverage of AT&T users in buildings, in vehicles, and outdoors. The threshold for reliable in-building coverage is based on a signal strength necessary to reliably and consistently make voice calls and use applications indoors, taking into consideration the built and natural environment. The threshold for reliable in-vehicle coverage is based on known signal attenuation from an outdoor signal to the inside of a vehicle. The threshold for reliable outdoor coverage is based on a signal strength necessary to reliably and consistently make voice calls and use applications outdoors taking into consideration the built and natural environment.
- ❖ For your reference, the scale shown ranges from Reliable to Unreliable Coverage for AT&T users in buildings, in vehicles, and outdoors.
- ❖ The Coverage Plots shown in the following slides are based on the following criteria:
 - Existing 4G-LTE Coverage: Assuming all other existing neighboring sites are On-Air and the Proposed Site is Off-Air, the propagation is displayed with the legends provided.
 - Planned 4G-LTE Coverage With the Proposed Site On-Air: Assuming all other existing neighboring sites along with the Proposed Site are On-Air, the propagation is displayed with the legends provided.
 - Standalone 4G-LTE Coverage of the Proposed Site: Assuming all other existing neighboring sites are Off-Air and only the Proposed Site is On-Air, the propagation is displayed with the legends provided.

Proposed Site CLL03466 (Terrain Map)




- Proposed Macro Site
- Existing Macro Sites

Proposed Site CLL03466 (Road Map)



- Proposed Macro Site
- Existing Macro Sites

Existing 4G-LTE Coverage – Without CLL03466




Coverage levels:

- Reliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor / Reliable in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor and in-vehicle / Reliable outdoor
- Unreliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor

- Proposed Macro Site
- Existing Macro Sites

Existing 4G-LTE Coverage – With CLL03466 (at 35' Rad Center)




Coverage levels:

- Reliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor / Reliable in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor and in-vehicle / Reliable outdoor
- Unreliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor

- Proposed Macro Site
- Existing Macro Sites

Existing 4G-LTE Coverage – With CLL03466 (at 51' Rad Center)




Coverage levels:

- Reliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor / Reliable in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor and in-vehicle / Reliable outdoor
- Unreliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor

- Proposed Macro Site
- Existing Macro Sites

Single Site Coverage 4G-LTE – CLL03466 (35' Rad center)




Coverage levels:

- Reliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor / Reliable in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor and in-vehicle / Reliable outdoor
- Unreliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor

- Proposed Macro Site
- Existing Macro Sites

Single Site Coverage 4G-LTE – CLL03466 (51' Rad center)



Coverage levels:

- Reliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor / Reliable in-vehicle and outdoor
- Unreliable indoor and in-vehicle / Reliable outdoor
- Unreliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor

- Proposed Macro Site
- Existing Macro Sites

Coverage Legend

Reliable indoor, in-vehicle and outdoor coverage: In general, the areas shown in green should have the most coverage and the strongest signal strength and be sufficient for reliable in-building service and connection to the AT&T wireless network. However, in-building coverage can and will be adversely affected by the thickness/construction type of walls, and the user's location in the building (i.e., in the basement, in the middle of the building with multiple walls, etc.)

Unreliable indoor / Reliable in-vehicle and outdoor: The areas shown in yellow should have sufficient coverage and signal strength for reliable device usage in vehicles and outdoors but will not have adequate coverage or signal strength for reliable in-building usage.

Unreliable indoor and in-vehicle / Reliable outdoor: The areas shown in purple should have sufficient coverage and signal strength for reliable device usage outdoors only and will not have adequate coverage or signal strength for reliable in-building or in-vehicle usage.



CODE COMPLIANCE

ALL WORK AND MATERIALS SHALL BE PERFORMED AND INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT EDITIONS OF THE FOLLOWING CODES AS ADOPTED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNING AUTHORITIES. NOTHING IN THESE PLANS IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED TO PERMIT WORK NOT CONFORMING TO THESE CODES.

1. 2025 CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE	6. 2025 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE
2. 2025 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE	7. ANY LOCAL BUILDING CODE AMENDMENTS
3. 2025 CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC CODE	8. CITY/COUNTY ORDINANCES
4. 2025 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE	9. ANSI / TIA-222 STRUCTURAL CODE
5. 2025 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE	10. NFPA 780 - LIGHTING PROTECTION CODE

HANDICAP REQUIREMENTS:
FACILITY IS UNMANNED AND NOT FOR HUMAN HABITATION, AND IS EXEMPTED FROM ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH 2025 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE SECTION 11B-203.5.

THIS FACILITY IS UNMANNED AND NOT FOR HUMAN HABITATION. A TECHNICIAN WILL VISIT THE SITE AS REQUIRED FOR ROUTINE MAINTENANCE. THE PROJECT WILL NOT RESULT IN ANY SIGNIFICANT DISTURBANCE OR EFFECT ON DRAINAGE. NO SANITARY SEWER SERVICE, POTABLE WATER, OR TRASH DISPOSAL IS REQUIRED AND NO COMMERCIAL SIGNAGE IS NEW.

GENERAL NOTES

THIS FACILITY IS UNMANNED AND NOT FOR HUMAN HABITATION. A TECHNICIAN WILL VISIT THE SITE AS REQUIRED FOR ROUTINE MAINTENANCE. THE PROJECT WILL NOT RESULT IN ANY SIGNIFICANT DISTURBANCE OR EFFECT ON DRAINAGE. NO SANITARY SEWER SERVICE, POTABLE WATER, OR TRASH DISPOSAL IS REQUIRED AND NO COMMERCIAL SIGNAGE IS NEW.

IF CONTRACTOR ENCOUNTERS CONDITIONS IN FIELD, EITHER UNFORESEEN OR IN SOME MANNER IN CONFLICT WITH THESE DRAWINGS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE REGISTERED DESIGN PROFESSIONAL OF SUCH CONDITIONS IN WRITING AND SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE ANY WORK DONE OUTSIDE OF JURISDICTIONAL PERMITTED PLANS IS DONE AT CONTRACTORS OWN RISK.

FOR "SPECIAL INSPECTIONS" SPECIFIC TO THIS PROJECT PURSUANT TO CBC SECTION 1704.3, SEE SHEET T-4, "STATEMENT OF SPECIAL INSPECTIONS"

SUBCONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PLANS & EXISTING DIMENSIONS & CONDITIONS ON THE JOB SITE & SHALL IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IN WRITING OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK OR BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SAME.

FULL SIZE = 24"x36". ANY OTHER SIZE PRINT IS NOT ORIGINAL SCALE.

ALL INDICATED DIMENSIONS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENT OVER SCALED DIMENSIONS.

UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT
UTILITY NOTIFICATION CENTER OF CALIFORNIA
(800) 422-4133
WWW.CALIFORNIA811.ORG

CALL 2-14 WORKING DAYS UTILITY NOTIFICATION PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION

SITE NUMBER: CLL03466

IWM JOB#: WSLOS0019397

FA#: 10154133

USID#: 331013

at&t

PROJECT: NSB

SITE TYPE: FAUX EUCALYPTUS

SITE ADDRESS: 2065 PLACENTIA AVE.

COSTA MESA, CA 92627

UMA: 2065 PLACENTIA AVE. EM

COSTA MESA, CA 92627

APPROVALS

THE FOLLOWING PARTIES HEREBY APPROVE AND ACCEPT THESE DOCUMENTS & AUTHORIZE THE SUBCONTRACTOR TO PROCEED WITH THE ZONING DESCRIBED HEREIN. ALL DOCUMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY THE LOCAL BUILDING DEPARTMENT & MAY IMPOSE CHANGES OR MODIFICATIONS.

APPROVED BY:	DATE:
AT&T RF ENGINEER:	
AT&T OPERATIONS:	
SAQ MANAGER:	
PROJECT MANAGER:	
ZONING VENDOR:	
LEASING VENDOR:	
ZONING MANAGER:	
PROPERTY OWNER:	

at&t

1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780

Eukon
an SFC Communications, Inc. Company

65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

AT&T WIRELESS PROPOSES TO INSTALL A WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY. THE SCOPE WILL CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING:


- PROPOSED 60'-0" HIGH FAUX EUCALYPTUS
- PROPOSED AT&T PANEL ANTENNAS
- PROPOSED AT&T RRUS
- PROPOSED AT&T DC3 SURGE SUPPRESSORS
- PROPOSED GMI EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURE
- PROPOSED AT&T DC50 SURGE SUPPRESSOR
- PROPOSED AT&T GPS ANTENNA
- PROPOSED AT&T WALK-UP CABINET (W.U.C.)
- PROPOSED AT&T 30KW 145 GAL. TANK DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATOR
- PROPOSED AT&T UTILITY TRENCHES
- PROPOSED AT&T CIENA PANEL
- PROPOSED AT&T TELCO BOX
- PROPOSED AT&T ELECTRICAL PANEL
- PROPOSED AT&T ELECTRICAL METER

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

SITE INFORMATION

PROPERTY OWNER:	KINDRA ROBERTS	TOWER OWNER:	N/A
ADDRESS:	N/A	ADDRESS:	--
	kroberts@publicstorage.com		--
	818-294-9660		
COUNTY:	ORANGE COUNTY	TOWER CO SITE ID:	N/A
ZONING JURISDICTION:	CITY OF COSTA MESA	TOWER APP NUMBER:	N/A
ZONING DISTRICT:	MG- GENERAL INDUSTRIAL	LATITUDE (NAD 83):	33° 38' 57.04" N
PARCEL NUMBER:	422-291-05	LONGITUDE (NAD 83):	117° 55' 56.29" W
OCCUPANCY GROUP:	U		-117.932303°
CONSTRUCTION TYPE:	II-B	LEASE AREA:	725 S.F.
POWER COMPANY:	SCE		
TELEPHONE COMPANY:	EXTENET		



SHEET INDEX

SHEET	DESCRIPTION	REV
T-1	TITLE SHEET	5
LS-1	SITE SURVEY	1
LS-2	SURVEY DETAIL	1
LS-3	NOTES	1
A-1	SITE PLAN	5
A-1.1	ENLARGED SITE PLAN	5
A-2	EQUIPMENT PLAN	5
A-3	ANTENNA PLAN AND SCHEDULE	5
A-4	ELEVATIONS	5
A-4.1	ELEVATIONS	5
E-1	ELECTRICAL SITE PLAN	5
E-2	SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM & PANEL SCHEDULE	5

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS		
REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466

2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

TITLE SHEET

SHEET NUMBER

T-1


PROJECT TEAM

<p>PROJECT MANAGER: AT&T 1452 EDINGER AVE, 3RD FL. TUSTIN, CA 92780 CONTACT: TY LOGAN-BURKS PHONE: (925) 549-4671 EMAIL: tl784a@att.com</p>	<p>SITE ACQUISITION: EUKON GROUP 65 POST, SUITE 1000 IRVINE, CA 92618 CONTACT: JOHN MCDONALD PHONE: (949) 994-0363 EMAIL: john.mcdonald@eukongroup.com</p>	<p>A&E CONTACT: EUKON GROUP 65 POST, SUITE 1000 IRVINE, CA 92618 CONTACT: RICH BRUNET PHONE: (949) 899-5597 EMAIL: rich.brunet@eukongroup.com</p>
<p>RF ENGINEER: AT&T 1452 EDINGER AVE, 3RD FL. TUSTIN, CA 92780 CONTACT: MAHESH KOLUR PHONE: (562) 412-7679 EMAIL: mk5852@att.com</p>	<p>ZONING: EUKON GROUP 65 POST, SUITE 1000 IRVINE, CA 92618 CONTACT: JOHN MCDONALD PHONE: (949) 994-0363 EMAIL: john.mcdonald@eukongroup.com</p>	<p>CONSTRUCTION: AMENTUM CONTACT: ROBERT SERRANO PHONE: (310) 766-2762 EMAIL: roberto.serrano@us.amentum.com</p>

DRIVING DIRECTIONS

DIRECTIONS FROM AT&T OFFICE AT 1452 EDINGER AVE, TUSTIN, CA 92780

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DEPART 1452 EDINGER AVE AND HEAD SOUTHWEST TOWARD AT&T. 2. TURN RIGHT ONTO AT&T. 3. TURN LEFT ONTO EDINGER AVE. 4. USE THE LEFT 2 LANES TO TURN LEFT TO MERGE ONTO CA-55 S. 5. MERGE ONTO CA-55 S. 6. USE THE RIGHT LANE TO TAKE EXIT 3 TOWARD 22ND ST/VICTORIA ST. 7. USE THE RIGHT LANE TO MERGE ONTO NEWPORT BLVD. 8. TURN RIGHT ONTO VICTORIA ST. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. TURN LEFT ONTO PLACENTIA AVE. 10. TURN RIGHT. 11. TURN RIGHT. 12. DESTINATION WILL BE ON THE RIGHT.
---	---



VICINITY MAP
N.T.S.

SURVEY DATE
09/24/2025 AND 12/12/2025

BASIS OF BEARING
BEARINGS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON THE CALIFORNIA ZONE SIX STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM BASED ON THE NORTH AMERICAN DATUM OF 1983(2011) (EPOCH 2019.25), DETERMINED BY GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM EQUIPMENT ON THE SMARTNET REFERENCE NETWORK.

BENCHMARK
PROJECT ELEVATIONS ESTABLISHED FROM GPS DERIVED ORTHOMETRIC HEIGHTS BY APPLICATION OF NGS 'GEOID 18' MODELED SEPARATIONS TO ELLIPSOID HEIGHTS DETERMINED BY OBSERVATIONS OF THE 'SMARTNET' REAL TIME NETWORK. ALL ELEVATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE REFERENCED TO NAVD88.

GRID-TO-GROUND SCALE FACTOR NOTE
ALL BEARINGS AND DISTANCES ARE BASED ON THE CALIFORNIA SIX STATE PLANE COORDINATE ZONE GRID. TO DERIVE GROUND DISTANCES DIVIDE BY 0.99996184

FLOOD_ZONE
THIS PROJECT APPEARS TO BE LOCATED WITHIN FLOOD ZONE "X". ACCORDING TO FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP(S), MAP ID #06059C0268J, DATED 12/3/2009

UTILITY NOTES
SURVEYOR DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT ALL UTILITIES ARE SHOWN OR THEIR LOCATIONS ARE DEFINITE. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR AND DEVELOPER TO CONTACT 811 AND ANY OTHER INVOLVED AGENCIES TO LOCATE ALL UTILITIES PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. REMOVAL, RELOCATION AND/OR REPLACEMENT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR.

SURVEYOR'S NOTES
CONTOURS DERIVED FROM DIRECT FIELD OBSERVATIONS AND FOLLOW THE CURRENT NATIONAL MAP STANDARDS FOR VERTICAL ACCURACY.

THE BOUNDARY LINES SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED ON MAPS OF RECORD AND DEED INFORMATION AS PROVIDED BY A TITLE REPORT AND A SEARCH OF THE COUNTY RECORDER AND SURVEYOR ONLINE DATABASE. A FIELD SURVEY HAS BEEN PERFORMED AND MONUMENTATION HAS BEEN RECOVERED TO PLACE THE RECORD INFORMATION. RECORD BEARINGS HAVE BEEN ADJUSTED TO THE BASIS OF BEARING STATEMENT SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY. THIS SURVEY DOES NOT MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO RECONCILE ANY ERRORS IN THE RECORD MAPS OR DEEDS OF RECORD.


ALL DISTANCES SHOWN HEREON ARE GRID DISTANCES.

SURVEYOR HAS NOT PERFORMED A SEARCH OF PUBLIC RECORDS TO DETERMINE ANY DEFECT IN TITLE ISSUED.

LEGEND

AP	ASPHALT	XXXX	UTILITY METER
BLDG	TOP OF BUILDING	⊗	FIRE HYDRANT
CMU	CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT	⊕	LIGHT POLE
CONC	CONCRETE	⊙	POSITION OF GEODETIC COORDINATES
LP	LIGHT POLE	⊗	SPOT ELEVATION
WALL	TOP OF WALL	⊕	WATER CONTROL VALVE
WF	TOP WROUGHT IRON FENCE	⊗	TREES
P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT	⊕	
P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING	⊗	

—	CMU WALLS
—	WROUGHT IRON FENCE
—	TREE LINE
—	CURLINES
—	STREET CENTERLINES
—	SUBJECT PROPERTY LINE
—	LEASE AREA LIMITS
—	MAJOR CONTOUR INTERVAL
—	MINOR CONTOUR INTERVAL



NORTH
SCALE: 1" = 20'
OVERALL DETAIL

APPLICANT:

1452 EDINGER AVENUE
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780

ENGINEER:

an SFC Communications, Inc. Company
65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

DRAWN BY: IJ
CHECKED BY: MF(1)

REVISIONS:

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	01/19/26	TITLE/DESIGN (C) (CK)
0	12/17/25	NEW LOCATION (C) (CK)
A	10/03/25	PRELIMINARY/TITLE (IJ)

428 MAIN STREET
SUITE 206
HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA 92648
PH. (480) 659-4072
www.ambitconsulting.us

PROJECT INFORMATION:
CLL03466
2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE
COSTA MESA, CA 92627
ORANGE COUNTY

SHEET TITLE:
SITE SURVEY

SHEET NUMBER:
LS-1

SCHEDULE "B" NOTE (APN 422-291-04)

REFERENCE IS MADE TO THE TITLE REPORT ORDER #92024095-920-CMM-CMB, ISSUED BY COMMONWEALTH LAND TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, DATED MARCH 5, 2024. ALL EASEMENTS CONTAINED WITHIN SAID TITLE REPORT AFFECTING THE IMMEDIATE AREA SURROUNDING THE LEASE HAVE BEEN PLOTTED.

ITEMIZED NOTES:

1. WATER RIGHTS, CLAIMS OR TITLE TO WATER, WHETHER OR NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

2. COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BUT OMITTING ANY COVENANTS OR RESTRICTIONS, IF ANY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THOSE BASED UPON AGE, RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, GENDER, GENDER IDENTITY, GENDER EXPRESSION, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, MARITAL STATUS, NATIONAL ORIGIN, ANCESTRY, FAMILIAL STATUS, SOURCE OF INCOME, DISABILITY, VETERAN OR MILITARY STATUS, GENETIC INFORMATION, MEDICAL CONDITION, CITIZENSHIP, PRIMARY LANGUAGE, AND IMMIGRATION STATUS, AS SET FORTH IN APPLICABLE STATE OR FEDERAL LAWS, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THAT SAID COVENANT OR RESTRICTION IS PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW, AS SET FORTH IN THE DOCUMENT
RECORDING DATE: DECEMBER 18, 1924
RECORDING NO: BOOK 549, PAGE 232 OF DEEDS
SAID COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS PROVIDE THAT A VIOLATION THEREOF SHALL NOT DEFEAT THE LIEN OF ANY MORTGAGE OR DEED OF TRUST MADE IN GOOD FAITH AND FOR VALUE. (DOES NOT AFFECT PARENT PARCEL)

③ EASEMENT(S) FOR THE PURPOSE(S) SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT: GRANTED TO: CHARLIE EDITH HUMPERT, AN UNMARRIED WOMEN
PURPOSE: DRIVEWAY PURPOSES
RECORDING DATE: MARCH 7, 1956
RECORDING NO: BOOK 3429, PAGE 180 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: A PORTION OF SAID LAND
AFFECTS: LOT 5 (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

④ EASEMENT(S) FOR THE PURPOSE(S) SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT: GRANTED TO: W.T.B CAMPBELL AND ISABELLA F. CAMPBELL, HUSBAND AND WIFE
PURPOSE: DRIVEWAY PURPOSES
RECORDING DATE: MARCH 7, 1956
RECORDING NO: BOOK 3429, PAGE 181 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: A PORTION OF SAID LAND
AFFECTS: LOT 6 (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑤ EASEMENT(S) FOR THE PURPOSE(S) SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT: GRANTED TO: CITY OF COSTA MESA
PURPOSE: STREET AND HIGHWAY
RECORDING DATE: DECEMBER 6, 1967
RECORDING NO: BOOK 8457, PAGE 139 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: A PORTION OF SAID LAND
AFFECTS: LOT 5 (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑥ EASEMENT(S) FOR THE PURPOSE(S) SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT: GRANTED TO: CITY OF COSTA MESA
PURPOSE: STREET AND HIGHWAY
RECORDING DATE: DECEMBER 6, 1967
RECORDING NO: BOOK 8457, PAGE 142 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: A PORTION OF SAID LAND
AFFECTS: LOT 6 (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

7. THE LAND DESCRIBED HEREIN IS INCLUDED WITHIN A PROJECT AREA OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY SHOWN BELOW, AND THAT PROCEEDINGS FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF SAID PROJECT HAVE BEEN INSTITUTED UNDER THE REDEVELOPMENT LAW (SUCH REDEVELOPMENT TO PROCEED ONLY AFTER THE ADOPTION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN) AS DISCLOSED BY A DOCUMENT.
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY: REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA NO. 2
RECORDING DATE: DECEMBER 10, 1979
RECORDING NO: 11557, BOOK 13427, PAGE 402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS (BLANKET IN NATURE)

8. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: LAND USE RESTRICTION
DATED: JANUARY 7, 1985
EXECUTED BY: PUBLIC STORAGE, INC.
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 21, 1985
RECORDING NO: 85-21962 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (BLANKET IN NATURE)

9. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: LAND USE RESTRICTION
DATED: MAY 22, 1985
EXECUTED BY: PUBLIC STORAGE, INC.
RECORDING DATE: MAY 23, 1985
RECORDING NO: 85-188184 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (BLANKET IN NATURE)

10. A DEED OF TRUST TO SECURE AN INDEBTEDNESS IN THE AMOUNT SHOWN BELOW,
AMOUNT: \$8,261,282.41
DATED: OCTOBER 11, 1995
TRUSTOR/GRANTOR PUBLIC STORAGE PARTNERS, LTD., A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
TRUSTEE: CHICAGO TITLE COMPANY
BENEFICIARY: STORAGE EQUITIES, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION
LOAN NO.: NONE SHOWN
RECORDING DATE: NOVEMBER 9, 1995
RECORDING NO: 95-500917 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS (BLANKET IN NATURE)

SCHEDULE "B" NOTE (APN 422-291-04)

(CONTINUED)

11. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: MEMORANDUM OF SITE LEASE ACKNOWLEDGMENT (MOA)
DATED: JULY 14, 2008
EXECUTED BY: GTP TOWERS I, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY AND ROYAL STREET COMMUNICATIONS CALIFORNIA, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
RECORDING DATE: AUGUST 27, 2008
RECORDING NO: 2008-408566 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (LEASE UNDEFINED - NOT PLOTTED)

⑫ AN UNRECORDED LEASE WITH CERTAIN TERMS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS SET FORTH THEREIN AS DISCLOSED BY THE DOCUMENT
ENTITLED: MEMORANDUM OF LEASE
LESSOR: PUBLIC STORAGE, A MARYLAND REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST
LESSEE: GTP TOWERS I, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
RECORDING DATE: MAY 12, 2009
RECORDING NO: 2009-235871 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE PRESENT OWNERSHIP OF THE LEASEHOLD CREATED BY SAID LEASE AND OTHER MATTERS AFFECTING THE INTEREST OF THE LESSEE ARE NOT SHOWN HEREIN.

AFFECTS: LOT 6
THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT"
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND.
AND RE-RECORDING DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2009
AND RE-RECORDING NO.: 2009-559082 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REASON: RECORDED TO CORRECT SEQUENCE
AND RE-RECORDING DATE: FEBRUARY 18, 2010
AND RE-RECORDING NO: 2010-78480 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REASON: RECORDED TO CORRECT SEQUENCE
THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT"
RECORDING DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-559081 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND.
THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "FOURTH AMENDMENT TO COMMUNICATION FACILITY LEASE"
RECORDING DATE: NOVEMBER 6, 2009
RECORDING NO: 2009-605833 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

13. A DEED OF TRUST TO SECURE AN INDEBTEDNESS IN THE AMOUNT SHOWN BELOW,
AMOUNT: \$1,999,999,999.00
DATED: MAY 29, 2015
TRUSTOR/GRANTOR GTP TOWERS I, LLC, WHETHER ONE OR MORE, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
TRUSTEE: LAWYERS TITLE COMPANY
BENEFICIARY: THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON
LOAN NO.: NONE SHOWN
RECORDING DATE: JUNE 15, 2015
RECORDING NO: 2015-308462 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (BLANKET IN NATURE)

14. AN UNRECORDED LEASE WITH CERTAIN TERMS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS SET FORTH THEREIN AS DISCLOSED BY THE DOCUMENT
ENTITLED: MEMORANDUM OF LEASE
LESSOR: PUBLIC STORAGE PARTNERS, LTD., AS TO PARENT PARCEL 1 AND PUBLIC STORAGE, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, AS TO PARENT PARCEL 2
LESSEE: GTP TOWERS I, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
RECORDING DATE: MAY 31, 2023
RECORDING NO: 2023-127817 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE PRESENT OWNERSHIP OF THE LEASEHOLD CREATED BY SAID LEASE AND OTHER MATTERS AFFECTING THE INTEREST OF THE LESSEE ARE NOT SHOWN HEREIN.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

15. THE EFFECT OF ANY FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS OF THE LEASE DESCRIBED OR REFERRED TO IN SCHEDULE A. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

16. ANY RIGHTS, INTERESTS OR CLAIMS WHICH ARE NOT SHOWN BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS BUT WHICH COULD BE ASCERTAINED BY MAKING INQUIRY OF THE LESSORS AND THEIR SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST, IN THE LEASE DESCRIBED OR REFERRED TO IN SCHEDULE A. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

17. ANY DEFECT IN OR INVALIDITY OF, OR OTHER MATTERS RELATING TO THE LEASEHOLD ESTATE REFERRED TO HEREIN, WHICH WOULD BE DISCLOSED BY AN EXAMINATION OF THE UNRECORDED LEASE. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

18. ANY RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES IN POSSESSION OF A PORTION OF, OR ALL OF, SAID LAND, WHICH RIGHTS ARE NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS.
THE COMPANY WILL REQUIRE, FOR REVIEW, A FULL AND COMPLETE COPY OF ANY UNRECORDED AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, LICENSE AND/OR LEASE, TOGETHER WITH ALL SUPPLEMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO, BEFORE ISSUING ANY POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE WITHOUT EXCEPTING THIS ITEM FROM COVERAGE.
THE COMPANY RESERVES THE RIGHT TO EXCEPT ADDITIONAL ITEMS AND/OR MAKE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AFTER REVIEWING SAID DOCUMENTS. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

19. ANY RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES IN POSSESSION OF A PORTION OF, OR ALL OF, SAID LAND, WHICH RIGHTS ARE NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS.
THE COMPANY WILL REQUIRE, FOR REVIEW, A FULL AND COMPLETE COPY OF ANY UNRECORDED AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, LICENSE AND/OR LEASE, TOGETHER WITH ALL SUPPLEMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO, BEFORE ISSUING ANY POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE WITHOUT EXCEPTING THIS ITEM FROM COVERAGE.
THE COMPANY RESERVES THE RIGHT TO EXCEPT ADDITIONAL ITEMS AND/OR MAKE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AFTER REVIEWING SAID DOCUMENTS. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

20. ANY RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES IN POSSESSION OF A PORTION OF, OR ALL OF, SAID LAND, WHICH RIGHTS ARE NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS.
THE COMPANY WILL REQUIRE, FOR REVIEW, A FULL AND COMPLETE COPY OF ANY UNRECORDED AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, LICENSE AND/OR LEASE, TOGETHER WITH ALL SUPPLEMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO, BEFORE ISSUING ANY POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE WITHOUT EXCEPTING THIS ITEM FROM COVERAGE.
THE COMPANY RESERVES THE RIGHT TO EXCEPT ADDITIONAL ITEMS AND/OR MAKE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AFTER REVIEWING SAID DOCUMENTS. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

SCHEDULE "B" NOTE (APN 422-291-05)

REFERENCE IS MADE TO THE TITLE REPORT ORDER #932508655, ISSUED BY COMMONWEALTH LAND TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2025. ALL EASEMENTS CONTAINED WITHIN SAID TITLE REPORT AFFECTING THE IMMEDIATE AREA SURROUNDING THE LEASE HAVE BEEN PLOTTED.

ITEMIZED NOTES:

1. PROPERTY TAXES, INCLUDING ANY PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES AND ANY ASSESSMENTS COLLECTED WITH TAXES, ARE AS FOLLOWS:
TAX IDENTIFICATION NO.: 422-291-05
FISCAL YEAR: 2025-2026
1ST INSTALLMENT: \$13,939.22 PAID
2ND INSTALLMENT: \$13,939.22 OPEN (DELINQUENT AFTER APRIL 10)
PENALTY AND COST: \$1,416.92
HOMEOWNERS EXEMPTION: \$0.00
CODE AREA: 15-039 (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

2. ANY LIENS OR OTHER ASSESSMENTS, BONDS, OR SPECIAL DISTRICT LIENS INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICTS, THAT ARISE BY REASON OF ANY LOCAL, CITY, MUNICIPAL OR COUNTY PROJECT OR SPECIAL DISTRICT. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

3. THE LIEN OF SUPPLEMENTAL OR ESCAPED ASSESSMENTS OF PROPERTY TAXES, IF ANY, MADE PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 3.5 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 75) OR PART 2, CHAPTER 3, ARTICLES 3 AND 4, RESPECTIVELY, OF THE REVENUE AND TAXATION CODE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AS A RESULT OF THE TRANSFER OF TITLE TO THE VESTEE NAMED IN SCHEDULE A OR AS A RESULT OF CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP OR NEW CONSTRUCTION OCCURRING PRIOR TO DATE OF POLICY. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

4. WATER RIGHTS, CLAIMS OR TITLE TO WATER, WHETHER OR NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

5. COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS BUT OMITTING ANY COVENANTS OR RESTRICTIONS, IF ANY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THOSE BASED UPON AGE, RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, GENDER, GENDER IDENTITY, GENDER EXPRESSION, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, MARITAL STATUS, NATIONAL ORIGIN, ANCESTRY, FAMILIAL STATUS, SOURCE OF INCOME, DISABILITY, VETERAN OR MILITARY STATUS, GENETIC INFORMATION, MEDICAL CONDITION, CITIZENSHIP, PRIMARY LANGUAGE, AND IMMIGRATION STATUS, AS SET FORTH IN APPLICABLE STATE OR FEDERAL LAWS, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THAT SAID COVENANT OR RESTRICTION IS PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW, AS SET FORTH IN THE DOCUMENT
RECORDING DATE: SEPTEMBER 20, 1927
RECORDING NO.: BOOK 88, PAGE 100 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
SAID COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS PROVIDE THAT A VIOLATION THEREOF SHALL NOT DEFEAT THE LIEN OF ANY MORTGAGE OR DEED OF TRUST MADE IN GOOD FAITH AND FOR VALUE.
SAID INSTRUTOR PROVIDES OR ESTABLISHES: CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR AND OPERATE THEREON OF PIPES MODIFICATION(S) OF SAID COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS
RECORDING DATE: JULY 24, 2024
RECORDING NO.: 2024-188065 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS (DOES NOT AFFECT PARENT PARCEL)

6. ANY RESTRICTIONS COVERING THE FUTURE USE OF SAID LAND AS DISCLOSED BY A "STATEMENT FOR A REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT" RECORDED IN BOOK 13427, PAGE 402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS COVERING THE HEREIN DESCRIBED AND OTHER LAND. (BLANKET IN NATURE)

⑦ EASEMENT(S) FOR THE PURPOSE(S) SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT: GRANTED TO: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, A CORPORATION, ITS SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS
PURPOSE: UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL SUPPLY SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS
RECORDING DATE: AUGUST 11, 1970
RECORDING NO.: 6067, BOOK 9371, PAGE 894 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AFFECTS: A PORTION OF SAID LAND (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

8. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: LAND USE RESTRICTION
DATED: DECEMBER 27, 1984
EXECUTED BY: PUBLIC STORAGE, INC.
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 21, 1985
RECORDING NO.: 85-21962 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (LEASE UNDEFINED - NOT PLOTTED)

⑬ MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑭ MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 5, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GTP TOWERS I, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-559081 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑮ MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-559082 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

SCHEDULE "B" NOTE (APN 422-291-05)

(CONTINUED)

⑩ A DEED OF TRUST TO SECURE AN INDEBTEDNESS IN THE AMOUNT SHOWN BELOW,
AMOUNT: \$600,000.00
DATED: JULY 26, 1990
TRUSTOR/GRANTOR PUBLIC STORAGE, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION
TRUSTEE: COMMONWEALTH LAND TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY
BENEFICIARY: PS CAPITAL CORP., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION
LOAN NO.: NONE SHOWN
RECORDING DATE: JULY 27, 1990
RECORDING NO.: 90-395724 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
A COLLATERAL ASSIGNMENT OF THE BENEFICIAL INTEREST, WHICH NAMES
ASSIGNEE: CAISSE NATIONALE DE CREDIT AGRICOLE
RECORDING DATE: JULY 27, 1990
RECORDING NO.: 90-395725 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "ASSIGNMENT AND RELEASE OF COLLATERAL ASSIGNMENT OF FIRST DEED OF TRUST"
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 25, 1993
RECORDING NO.: 93-52531 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AN ASSIGNMENT OF THE BENEFICIAL INTEREST UNDER SAID DEED OF TRUST WHICH NAMES:
ASSIGNEE: CAISSE NATIONALE DE CREDIT AGRICOLE
LOAN NO.: NONE SHOWN
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 25, 1993
RECORDING NO.: 93-52532 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "AMENDED AND RESTATED FIRST DEED OF TRUST, ASSIGNMENT OF LEASES AND RENTS, SECURITY AGREEMENT AND FUTURE FILING"
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 25, 1993
RECORDING NO.: 93-52533 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑪ A DEED OF TRUST TO SECURE AN INDEBTEDNESS IN THE AMOUNT SHOWN BELOW,
AMOUNT: \$2,550,000.00
DATED: JULY 26, 1990
TRUSTOR/GRANTOR PUBLIC STORAGE, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION
TRUSTEE: COMMONWEALTH LAND TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY
BENEFICIARY: PS CAPITAL CORP., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION
LOAN NO.: NONE SHOWN
RECORDING DATE: JULY 27, 1990
RECORDING NO.: 90-395726 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
A COLLATERAL ASSIGNMENT OF THE BENEFICIAL INTEREST, WHICH NAMES
ASSIGNEE: CAISSE NATIONALE DE CREDIT AGRICOLE
RECORDING DATE: JULY 27, 1990
RECORDING NO.: 90-395727 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "ASSIGNMENT AND RELEASE OF COLLATERAL ASSIGNMENT OF SECOND DEED OF TRUST"
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 25, 1993
RECORDING NO.: 93-52534 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
AN ASSIGNMENT OF THE BENEFICIAL INTEREST UNDER SAID DEED OF TRUST WHICH NAMES:
ASSIGNEE: CAISSE NATIONALE DE CREDIT AGRICOLE
LOAN NO.: NONE SHOWN
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 25, 1993
RECORDING NO.: 93-52535 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "AMENDED AND RESTATED SECOND DEED OF TRUST, ASSIGNMENT OF LEASES AND RENTS, SECURITY AGREEMENT AND FUTURE FILING"
RECORDING DATE: JANUARY 25, 1993
RECORDING NO.: 93-52536 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

12. AN UNRECORDED LEASE WITH CERTAIN TERMS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS SET FORTH THEREIN AS DISCLOSED BY THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED: MEMORANDUM OF SITE LEASE ACKNOWLEDGMENT (MOA)
LESSOR: GTP TOWERS I, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
LESSEE: ROYAL STREET COMMUNICATIONS CALIFORNIA, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
RECORDING DATE: AUGUST 27, 2008
RECORDING NO.: 2008-408566 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE PRESENT OWNERSHIP OF THE LEASEHOLD CREATED BY SAID LEASE AND OTHER MATTERS AFFECTING THE INTEREST OF THE LESSEE ARE NOT SHOWN HEREIN.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (LEASE UNDEFINED - NOT PLOTTED)

⑬ MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑭ MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 5, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GTP TOWERS I, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-559081 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑮ MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: OCTOBER 14, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-559082 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

13. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

14. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

15. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

16. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

17. MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, ET AL
RECORDING DATE: JULY 21, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-389402 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

18. ANY RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES IN POSSESSION OF A PORTION OF, OR ALL OF, SAID LAND, WHICH RIGHTS ARE NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS.
THE COMPANY WILL REQUIRE, FOR REVIEW, A FULL AND COMPLETE COPY OF ANY UNRECORDED AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, LICENSE AND/OR LEASE, TOGETHER WITH ALL SUPPLEMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO, BEFORE ISSUING ANY POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE WITHOUT EXCEPTING THIS ITEM FROM COVERAGE.
THE COMPANY RESERVES THE RIGHT TO EXCEPT ADDITIONAL ITEMS AND/OR MAKE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AFTER REVIEWING SAID DOCUMENTS. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

SCHEDULE "B" NOTE (APN 422-291-05)

(CONTINUED)

⑯ AN UNRECORDED LEASE WITH CERTAIN TERMS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS SET FORTH THEREIN AS DISCLOSED BY THE DOCUMENT
ENTITLED: FOURTH AMENDMENT TO COMMUNICATION FACILITY LEASE
LESSOR: PUBLIC STORAGE
LESSEE: GTP TOWERS I, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
RECORDING DATE: NOVEMBER 6, 2009
RECORDING NO.: 2009-605833 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
THE PRESENT OWNERSHIP OF THE LEASEHOLD CREATED BY SAID LEASE AND OTHER MATTERS AFFECTING THE INTEREST OF THE LESSEE ARE NOT SHOWN HEREIN.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

⑰ MATTERS CONTAINED IN THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED: ASSIGNMENT AND ASSUMPTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT
DATED: MAY 26, 2009
EXECUTED BY: GLOBAL TOWER ASSETS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
RECORDING DATE: FEBRUARY 18, 2010
RECORDING NO.: 2010-78480 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS
REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO SAID DOCUMENT FOR FULL PARTICULARS.
AFFECTS: THE HEREIN DESCRIBED LAND AND OTHER LAND. (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

18. ANY RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES IN POSSESSION OF A PORTION OF, OR ALL OF, SAID LAND, WHICH RIGHTS ARE NOT DISCLOSED BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS.
THE COMPANY WILL REQUIRE, FOR REVIEW, A FULL AND COMPLETE COPY OF ANY UNRECORDED AGREEMENT, CONTRACT, LICENSE AND/OR LEASE, TOGETHER WITH ALL SUPPLEMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS AND AMENDMENTS THERETO, BEFORE ISSUING ANY POLICY OF TITLE INSURANCE WITHOUT EXCEPTING THIS ITEM FROM COVERAGE.
THE COMPANY RESERVES THE RIGHT TO EXCEPT ADDITIONAL ITEMS AND/OR MAKE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AFTER REVIEWING SAID DOCUMENTS. (EXCEPTION IS A STANDARD EXCEPTION AND NOT THE TYPE TO BE SHOWN HEREON)

LESSOR'S LEGAL DESCRIPTION (PER TITLE)

(APN 422-291-04)

ALL THAT CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY SITUATED IN THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
LOTS 5 AND LOT 6, IN BLOCK "A" OF TRACT MAP NO. 612, IN THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 20, PAGES 1 AND 2 OF MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

LESSOR'S LEGAL DESCRIPTION (PER TITLE)

(APN 422-291-05)

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
LOT SEVEN IN BLOCK "A" OF TRACT NO. 612, COSTA MESA TERRACE, IN THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 20, PAGES 1 AND 2 OF MISCELLANEOUS MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

LEASE AREA LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A PORTION OF LOT 7, IN BLOCK "A" OF TRACT MAP NO. 612, IN THE CITY OF COSTA MESA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 20, PAGES 1 AND 2 OF MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT A SPIKE AND WASHER STAMPED LS 8639 AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE EASTERLY PROLONGATION OF THE NORTH LINE OF LOT FIVE OF SAID TRACT MAP AND THE CENTERLINE OF PLACENTIA AVENUE AS SHOWN ON TRACT NO. 17707, RECORDED AS BOOK 935, PAGES 26 THRU 28 INCLUSIVE; FROM WHICH THE CALCULATED CENTERLINE INTERSECTION OF PLACENTIA AVENUE AND 20TH STREET VIA FOUR FOUR FOUND NAILS AND WASHERS STAMPED LS 6970, BEARS SOUTH 00°20'56" WEST, 968.93 FEET; THENCE FROM SAID POINT OF COMMENCEMENT SOUTH 00°20'56" WEST ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF PLACENTIA AVENUE 173.41 FEET; THENCE DEPARTING SAID CENTERLINE NORTH 89°39'04" WEST, 60.88 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE SOUTH 00°18'59" WEST, 25.81 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89°40'47" WEST, 28.12 FEET; THENCE NORTH 00°18'59" EAST, 25.81 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 89°40'47" EAST, 28.12 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 776 SQUARE FEET (0.018 ACRES) OF LAND, MORE OR LESS.

ACCESS NOTE

RESERVING NONEXCLUSIVE RIGHT OF USE ACROSS LESSOR'S PROPERTY FOR NECESSARY APPURTENANCES TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN A COMMUNICATION FACILITY FOR ITEMS SUCH AS, BUT NOT LIMITED TO INGRESS, EGRESS, PARKING, VEHICULAR MANEUVERING, EQUIPMENT, AND UTILITIES.



APPLICANT:

1452 EDINGER AVENUE
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780

ENGINEER:

an SFC Communications, Inc. Company
65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

DRAWN BY: J
CHECKED BY: MF(1)

REVISIONS:

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	01/19/26	TITLE/DESIGN (C) (CK)
0	12/17/25	NEW LOCATION (C) (CK)
A	10/03/25	PRELIMINARY/TITLE (U)

428 MAIN STREET
SUITE 206
HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA 92648
PH. (480) 659-4072
www.ambitconsulting.us


PROJECT INFORMATION:
CLLO3466
2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE
COSTA MESA, CA 92627
ORANGE COUNTY

SHEET TITLE:
NOTES

SHEET NUMBER:
LS-3

NOTES:

1. IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.
3. UTILITY DESIGNS AND ROUTES ARE PRELIMINARY PENDING FINAL DESIGN BY UTILITY PROVIDER.
4. THIS SITE PLAN IS NOT INTENDED TO BE A LAND SURVEY.



1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS		
REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466


2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER

A-1



NOTES:

- 1. IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.
- 2. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.
- 3. THIS SITE PLAN IS NOT INTENDED TO BE A LAND SURVEY.



1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR
CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON,
UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION
OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER,
TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING
DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466



2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

ENLARGED SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER

A-1.1




EUKON AT&T_90CD_MONOPOLE_TEMPLATE_V2_11-18-22

ENLARGED SITE PLAN

NOTE:

- 1. IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.
- 2. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.



1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



an SFC Communications, Inc. Company
65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466



2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

EQUIPMENT PLAN

SHEET NUMBER

A-2





1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR
CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS		
REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466

2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE
ANTENNA PLAN AND SCHEDULE

SHEET NUMBER

A-3




- NOTES TO CONTRACTOR:**
- CONTRACTOR IS TO REFER TO AT&T'S MOST CURRENT RADIO FREQUENCY DATA SHEET (RFDS) PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
 - CABLE LENGTHS WERE DETERMINED BASED ON A VISUAL INSPECTION DURING SITE WALK. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ACTUAL LENGTH DURING PRE-CONSTRUCTION WALK.
 - CONTRACTOR TO USE ROSENBERGER FIBER LINE HANGER COMPONENTS (OR ENGINEER APPROVED EQUAL).
 - CONTRACTOR TO USE CABLES SPECIFIED (OR ENGINEER APPROVED EQUAL).

- NOTE:**
- IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.
 - CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.
 - ANTENNA AND MW AT&T SPECIFICATIONS REFER TO ANTENNA SCHEDULE AND TO FINAL CONSTRUCTION RFDS FOR ALL RF DETAILS.

ANTENNA SCHEDULE (VERIFY WITH CURRENT RFDS)								
SECTOR	TECHNOLOGY	ANTENNA MODEL	ANTENNA SIZE	ANTENNA AZIMUTH	RAD CENTER	TRANSMISSION CABLE		
						LENGTH	QTY.	
ALPHA SECTOR	A1	LTE	OPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	40°	51'-0"	65'	2 FIBER + 6 DC POWER
	A2	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	40°	53'-6"		
	A3	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	40°	49'-6"		
	A4	LTE	TPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	40°	51'-0"		
BETA SECTOR	B1	LTE	OPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	130°	51'-0"	65'	2 FIBER + 6 DC POWER
	A2	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	130°	53'-6"		
	B3	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	130°	49'-6"		
	B4	LTE	TPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	130°	51'-0"		
GAMMA SECTOR	C1	LTE	OPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	220°	51'-0"	65'	2 FIBER + 6 DC POWER
	C2	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	220°	53'-6"		
	C3	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	220°	49'-6"		
	C4	LTE	TPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	220°	51'-0"		
DELTA SECTOR	D1	LTE	OPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	310°	51'-0"	65'	2 FIBER + 6 DC POWER
	D2	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	310°	53'-6"		
	D3	C-BAND	ERICSSON AIR6419	28.2"x16"x7.2"	310°	49'-6"		
	D4	LTE	TPA65R-BU8D	96"x21"x7.8"	310°	51'-0"		

REMOTE RADIO UNIT SCHEDULE						
SECTOR	RRU TYPE	RRU LOCATION (DISTANCE FROM ANTENNA)	MINIMUM CLEARANCES			
			ABOVE	BELOW	SIDES	
ALPHA SECTOR	A1	ERICSSON 4490 B5/B12A	±15'	16"	8"	0"
	A2					
	A3					
	A4	ERICSSON 4890 B25/B66	±15'	16"	8"	0"
BETA SECTOR	B1	ERICSSON 4490 B5/B12A	±15'	16"	8"	0"
	B2					
	B3	ERICSSON 4890 B25/B66	±15'	16"	8"	0"
	B3	ERICSSON 4494 B14/B29	±15'	16"	8"	0"
GAMMA SECTOR	C1	ERICSSON 4490 B5/B12A	±15'	16"	8"	0"
	C1					
	C2					
	C3	ERICSSON 4890 B25/B66	±15'	16"	8"	0"
DELTA SECTOR	D1	ERICSSON 4490 B5/B12A	±15'	16"	8"	0"
	D1					
	D2					
	D3	ERICSSON 4890 B25/B66	±15'	16"	8"	0"
	D3	ERICSSON 4494 B14/B29	±15'	16"	8"	0"

SURGE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM SCHEDULE				
SYSTEM	MFR.	PART NUMBER	QTY	LOCATION
	RAYCAP	DC50-48-60-96-50F	1	MOUNTED IN PROPOSED LEASE AREA
	RAYCAP	DC9-48-60-24-8C-EV	4	MOUNTED ON PROPOSED FAUX EUCALYPTUS



NOTE:

1. IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.



1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS		
REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466


2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

ELEVATIONS

SHEET NUMBER


A-4



EXISTING WEST ELEVATION



2



PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION



1

EUKON_AT&T_90CD_MONOPOLE_TEMPLATE_V2_11-18-22

NOTE:

- 1. IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.
- 2. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.



1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



an SFC Communications, Inc. Company
65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS		
REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION


CLL03466
2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

ELEVATIONS

SHEET NUMBER


A-4.1



EXISTING EAST ELEVATION



2



PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION



1

EUKON_AT&T_90CD_MONOPOLE_TEMPLATE_V2_11-18-22

NOTES:

- 1. IF DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON PLAN DO NOT SCALE CORRECTLY, CHECK FOR REDUCTION OR ENLARGEMENT FROM ORIGINAL PLANS.
- 2. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.
- 3. THIS SITE PLAN IS NOT INTENDED TO BE A LAND SURVEY.



1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



an SFC Communications, Inc. Company
65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY:	UTILITIES CHECKED BY:	A&E CHECKED BY:
IB	GB	LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466




2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

ELECTRICAL SITE PLAN

SHEET NUMBER

E-1



EUKON AT&T_90CD_MONOPOLE_TEMPLATE_V2_11-18-22

ELECTRICAL SITE PLAN



1452 EDINGER AVE.
3RD FLOOR
TUSTIN, CA 92780



an SFC Communications, Inc. Company
65 POST, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92618
TEL: (949) 553-8566
www.eukongroup.com

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

IT IS A VIOLATION OF LAW FOR ANY PERSON, UNLESS THEY ARE ACTING UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, TO ALTER THIS DOCUMENT.

DRAWN BY: UTILITIES CHECKED BY: A&E CHECKED BY:
IB GB LB

ZONING DRAWINGS

SUBMITTALS		
REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
A	08/22/24	90% ZONING DRAWINGS
0	09/23/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
1	11/26/24	100% ZONING DRAWINGS
2	03/28/25	PLANNING COMMENTS
3	01/09/26	REDESIGN
4	02/10/26	DRM COMMENTS
5	03/17/26	UTILITY COMMENTS

PROJECT INFORMATION

CLL03466


2065 PLACENTIA AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627

SHEET TITLE

SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM & PANEL SCHEDULE

SHEET NUMBER

E-2



NOT USED

2

PANEL AT&T PP1

MOUNTING SURFACE DOUBLE LUG NO VOLTS 120|240 MAIN 200A/2P
PHASE 1 BUS 200A
WIRE 3 A.I.C. 22K SERIES W/ MAIN

WIRE SIZE	LOCATION	A	B	L	C	O	N	V	K	R	M	B	C	I	R	C	A/B	K	R	M	R	K	I	E	S	C	P	T	N	V	L	C	LOCATION	WIRE SIZE
8	RECTIFIER 1	1000	1000	1								30/2	1	A	2	30/2													1	1000		RECTIFIER 7	8	
8												-	3	B	4	-													1	1000		--	8	
8	RECTIFIER 2	1000	1000	1								30/2	5	A	6	30/2													1	1000		RECTIFIER 8	8	
8												-	7	B	8	-													1	1000		--	8	
8	RECTIFIER 3	1000	1000	1								30/2	9	A	10	30/2													1	1000		RECTIFIER 9	8	
8												-	11	B	12	-													1	1000		--	8	
8	RECTIFIER 4	1000	1000	1								30/2	13	A	14	30/2													1	1000		RECTIFIER 10	8	
8												-	15	B	16	-													1	1000		--	8	
8	RECTIFIER 5	1000	1000	1								30/2	17	A	18	30/2													1	1000		RECTIFIER 11	8	
8												-	19	B	20	-													1	1000		--	8	
8	RECTIFIER 6	1000	1000	1								30/2	21	A	22																SPARE	8		
8												-	23	B	24																	SPARE	8	
	SPARE												25	A	26																	SPARE	8	
	SPARE												27	B	28																	SPARE	8	
	SPARE												29	A	30																	SPARE	8	
	SPARE												31	B	32																	SPARE	8	
12	OUTLET	500										20/1	33	A	34																	SPARE	8	
12	OUTLET/LTG		500									20/1	35	B	36																	SPARE	8	
		A= 11500																B= 11500																
		W/LCL A= 14500																W/LCL B= 14000																
TOTAL VA=		23000				W/LCL=28500				W/LCL AMPS= 119				TOTAL LCL= 22000				X .25 = 5500																
HIGH PHASE VA=		11500				W/LCL=14250				HIGH PH AMPS= 119				HIGH PHASE LCL= 11000				X .25 = 2750																

3 PANEL SCHEDULE

1

SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM



EXISTING



PROPOSED LOOKING NORTH FROM PLACENTIA AVENUE



at&t


CLL03466

2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE COSTA MESA CA 92627



AEsims.com
877.9AE.sims

VIEW 2



©2026 Google Maps



EXISTING



PROPOSED FAUX EUCALYPTUS

PROPOSED EQUIPMENT
ENCLOSURE BEYOND

PROPOSED

LOOKING SOUTH FROM PLACENTIA AVENUE



at&t

CLL03466

2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE COSTA MESA CA 92627



AEsims.com
877.9AE.sims

VIEW 3



©2026 Google Maps



EXISTING



PROPOSED FAUX EUCALYPTUS

PROPOSED

LOOKING SOUTHEAST FROM FEDERAL AVENUE

Alternative Sites Analysis



PROPOSED LOOKING NORTH FROM PLACENTIA AVENUE

AT&T Mobility

Wireless Telecommunications Facility
at
2065 Placentia Ave, Costa Mesa, CA
Site ID: CLL03466

Introduction

New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC d/b/a AT&T Mobility (“AT&T”) has a significant gap in its service coverage in the City of Costa Mesa. AT&T proposes to install a 60-foot tall wireless communications facility (“WCF”) disguised as a eucalyptus tree (“monoec”) (“Proposed Facility”) as a means to fill this gap in coverage. The Proposed Facility consists of sixteen panel antennas (four sets of four antennas) with a top height of 55 feet above ground, with the lowest part of the antenna located at 47’ and topped with an additional five feet of eucalyptus branches. The associated equipment will be installed within a 24-foot by 18-foot enclosure, secured by an 8-foot-tall concrete wall and finished to match the existing property walls. This design serves to restrict unauthorized access to AT&T’s equipment area. As detailed below, the proposed facility represents the least intrusive option among the alternatives evaluated by AT&T to address the significant coverage gap.

Objective

AT&T Mobility has identified a significant gap in its service coverage in the City of Costa Mesa, in an area roughly bordered by West 19th Street in the south, Senate St in the north, Pomona Ave in the east, and past Canyon Drive to the West. This portion of Costa Mesa includes hundreds of homes in several neighborhoods, parks, schools, commercial and industrial districts, and other points of interest in the immediate vicinity. The Proposed Facility will help provide coverage to both Victoria St and Placentia Ave, which handles heavy vehicle traffic. The service coverage in this portion of Costa Mesa is described in the accompanying Radio Frequency Statement.

Methodology and Zoning Criteria

Wireless telecommunications is essentially a line-of-sight technology, and AT&T’s antennas need to be high enough to propagate an effective signal throughout the gap area. Denial of this proposed facility or a reduction in height would materially inhibit AT&T’s ability to provide and improve wireless services in this portion of the city.

AT&T followed a systematic methodology to identify and evaluate alternative sites for the proposed facility, taking into account both the technical requirements for coverage and the land use/zoning constraints in the City of Costa Mesa. In general, AT&T’s site selection process begins by defining a search area (or “search ring”) where a new facility could effectively address the coverage gap, along with determining the minimum antenna height needed to meet the coverage objectives. Concurrently, the site acquisition team reviews local codes and policies to understand community preferences and any location or design criteria for wireless facilities. For this project, the process was conducted in coordination with RF engineers, land use planners, and real estate specialists to ensure that any potential alternative would both satisfy AT&T’s network needs and align with the City of Costa Mesa’s zoning standards.

Analysis

After applying the above methodology and criteria, AT&T identified and examined a total of ____ alternative candidate sites (in addition to the subject site) within the search area. Each of these candidates is discussed in the subsequent section of this report, with analysis of why they were ultimately deemed less suitable or infeasible compared to the 2065 Placentia Ave location. In summary, the proposed site emerged as the superior option because it best satisfies the technical coverage requirements while conforming to the City's Industrial zoning context and minimizing proximity to residential properties. This ASA thereby documents that the selected site and design represent the most appropriate and least intrusive means of closing the coverage gap, in accordance with the City of Costa Mesa's guidelines and the project's objectives. The following sections provide detailed comparisons of the alternative sites considered and further justification for the proposed facility's approval.

Location of Candidate Sites

Proposed Facility – Monoeuc, 2065 Placentia Ave, Costa Mesa, CA 92627



Conclusion: Based upon location, a willing landlord and the superior coverage as shown in the proposed coverage map included in AT&T's Radio Frequency Statement, the Proposed Facility is the least intrusive means for AT&T to meet its service coverage objective.

The project site is a fully developed industrial property located at 2065 Placentia Avenue in the City of Costa Mesa. The property is zoned General Industrial (MG), a zoning classification intended to accommodate industrial, manufacturing, and other employment-generating uses, as well as supporting infrastructure such as wireless telecommunications facilities. Surrounding land uses consist primarily of commercial and industrial developments along Placentia Avenue, with residential neighborhoods located to the east and southeast of the site.

The proposed facility is designed as a 60-foot faux eucalyptus (monoeuc) to resemble nearby mature eucalyptus trees and reduce the visual prominence of the installation. The selected location on the property places the facility as far from adjacent residential properties as feasible while complying with the required setbacks and responding to public comment requesting the facility be located farther from nearby homes. The site also benefits from direct access from Placentia Avenue, as well as existing utility infrastructure necessary to support power and fiber

backhaul. Additionally, the property provides sufficient area to accommodate the proposed monoec and associated equipment enclosure without displacing existing uses or operations on the site.

Taken together, these factors establish that the proposed facility at 2065 Placentia Ave is the most suitable and least intrusive location within the identified search area. It provides the required height and placement to close AT&T's coverage gap, while meeting City zoning objectives by siting the facility in a heavy industrial district and utilizing stealth design to minimize aesthetic impacts.

Alternative Site 1 – Mesa Water District Rooftop, 1965 Placentia Ave, Costa Mesa, CA 92627



Conclusion: Unavailable.

This candidate location considered installation of a wireless telecommunications facility on the rooftop of the Mesa Water District building located at 1965 Placentia Avenue in Costa Mesa. However, after discussions with the Mesa Water District, the property owner indicated that they were not interested in accommodating a wireless telecommunications facility at this location and would not allow AT&T the access necessary to install, operate, and maintain the equipment. Without the property owner's consent and the required site access, the candidate location could not be secured for development and is therefore unavailable for AT&T's use.

Alternative Site 2 – Public Storage Monopalm, 2099 Placentia Ave, Costa Mesa, CA 92627



Conclusion: Infeasible.

This alternative considered co-location on the existing monopalm wireless facility located at 2099 Placentia Avenue in Costa Mesa. However, the existing monopalm was designed as a single-carrier stealth installation, and the structure does not allow for additional carriers to be accommodated without substantially altering the appearance of the facility. Installation of additional antennas and associated equipment necessary to support a second wireless provider would compromise the stealth design of the monopalm and defeat the visual concealment features of the structure.

Due to these structural and stealthing limitations, co-location of AT&T's equipment on the existing monopalm is not feasible. As a result, this candidate location cannot accommodate AT&T's facility and is therefore unavailable for meeting AT&T's coverage objectives.

Alternative Site 3 – Monopalm, 2038 Placentia Ave, Costa Mesa, CA 92627




Conclusion: Infeasible.

This alternative considered co-location on the existing monopalm wireless facility located at 2038 Placentia Avenue in Costa Mesa. However, the existing monopalm was designed as a single-carrier stealth installation, and the structure does not accommodate additional wireless providers without significantly altering the appearance of the facility. Installation of the antennas, mounting frames, and associated equipment necessary to support AT&T would extend beyond the concealment elements of the monopalm and compromise the intended stealth design.

Because the existing structure was not designed to accommodate multiple carriers while maintaining its concealment features, co-location of AT&T's equipment is not feasible. As a result, this candidate location cannot accommodate AT&T's facility and is therefore unavailable for meeting AT&T's coverage objectives.

Alternative Site 4 – Canyon Park, Costa Mesa, 92627



Conclusion: Infeasible.

This alternative considered placement of a wireless telecommunications facility within Canyon Park in Costa Mesa, CA 92627. However, this location is situated to the west of the identified coverage gap and is outside the area where a new facility would effectively improve AT&T's wireless service. As a result, a facility located at this site would not meaningfully address the significant gap in coverage that the proposed project is intended to remedy.

Additionally, Canyon Park contains a substantial number of mature trees and dense vegetation that would obstruct signal propagation toward the areas experiencing poor service. These conditions would further limit the ability of a facility at this location to provide reliable wireless coverage to the affected surrounding neighborhoods and roadways.

Due to its distance from the coverage gap and the presence of significant vegetation that would impede signal propagation, this candidate location is technically infeasible for meeting AT&T's coverage objectives.

Alternative Sites Other Commercial / Industrial Properties along Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, CA 92627



Conclusion: Unavailable / Technically Infeasible

AT&T evaluated additional commercial and industrial properties located along Placentia Avenue within the search area for potential installation of a wireless telecommunications facility. These parcels were considered due to their proximity to the identified coverage gap and their location along a major corridor that could potentially support the necessary infrastructure.

However, the remaining commercial and industrial properties along Placentia Avenue were determined to be unsuitable for development. Many parcels did not have sufficient space available to accommodate a wireless facility and associated equipment enclosure without removing required parking or interfering with existing site operations. In other cases, property owners indicated that they were not interested in leasing space for a wireless telecommunications facility.

Additionally, some properties located further south along Placentia Avenue were determined to be technically unsuitable because their proximity to existing AT&T facilities would not provide the necessary RF separation to effectively address the identified coverage gap. As a result, facilities located at these properties would not provide meaningful improvement to wireless service in the target coverage area.

Because these properties either lacked adequate space, did not have willing property owners, or would not provide the necessary RF coverage improvements, they could not be secured for development and are therefore unavailable for AT&T's use.

Radio Frequency Safety Survey Report Predictive (RFSSRP)

Jurisdictional Report



Site Name: CLL03466
FA#: 10154133
USID: 331013
Site ID: SICA024613 / CLL03466
Address: 2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE, COSTA MESA, CA 92627
County: ORANGE
Latitude: 33.64916
Longitude: -117.93233
Structure Type: STEALTH POLE-EXTRNL ARRAY
Property Owner: KINDRA ROBERTS
IWM Job#: WSLOS0019397; WSLOS0028725; WSLOS0027866; WSLOS0027865; WSLOS0028736
RFDS ID: 25063
Desktop Modeler: IXUS VERSION 4.18(0)

Report Information

Report Writer: Rahul Gurjar

Report Generated Date: 02-26-2026

Compliance Statement

AT&T Mobility Compliance Statement: Based on the information collected, AT&T Mobility will be compliant when the remediation recommended in [Section 2.0](#) or appropriate remediation determined by AT&T is implemented



Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	3
2.0 Compliance Measures.....	4
3.0 Site Scale Map	5
4.0 Summary	6
5.0 FCC Rules and Regulations and Guidelines from OET 65.....	7
6.0 Safety Recommendations	10
7.0 FCC Limits.....	11
8.0 Certification	12

1.0 Introduction

MobileComm Professionals, Inc. has been contracted by AT&T Mobility LLC to produce a theoretical assessment of the potential radio frequency emissions at the proposed AT&T “STEALTH POLE-EXTRNL ARRAY” site. FCC OET Bulletin 65 – Edition 97-01 recommends that theoretical calculations should be done to yield a worst-case scenario. This theoretical analysis will provide a worst-case assessment of potential emissions and will assume all transmitters are operating at highest capacity and power. This will provide AT&T with a guideline of how to proceed with mitigating the site to ensure the site will be compliant with FCC regulations at any instance.

For this MPE theoretical analysis, MobileComm considered the accessible areas of site to determine approximate field strength levels and to identify any areas with higher levels exceeding FCC MPE limits and then determined spatially averaged field levels in areas with highest fields.

MobileComm has utilized computer generated model(s) in this Site Compliance Report. The modeling software that MobileComm used to create this report is IXUS.

General Model Assumptions

In this Site Compliance Report, it is assumed that all antennas are operating at full power at all times. MobileComm has further assumed 75% duty cycle of maximum radiated power for all TDD carriers & consider 100% duty cycle for all FDD carriers. Obstructions (trees, buildings etc.) that would normally attenuate the signal are not taken into account.

MobileComm obtained information used in this Site Compliance Report from AT&T (or approved vendors) which is considered reliable and believes them to be true and correct.

Due to the complexity of some wireless sites, MobileComm performed this analysis and created this report utilizing best industry practices and due diligence.

2.0 Compliance Measures

The compliance determination is based on theoretical modeling, RF signage placement recommendations and the level of restricted access to the antennas at the site. At the time of our analysis, AT&T will be compliant with the FCC rules and regulations, as described in OET Bulletin 65 upon implementation of below remediation(s).

Recommendations

AT&T Mobility Alpha Sector:

- No actions required.

AT&T Mobility Beta Sector:

- No actions required.

AT&T Mobility Gamma Sector:

- No actions required.


AT&T Mobility Delta Sector:

- No actions required.

FAUX EUCALYPTUS:

- One Caution 2B Sign to be posted on the FAUX EUCALYPTUS at the climbing access, facing outwards so approaching people can see. (1 Total Sign)

3.0 Site Scale Map



Proposed	Proposed Signage												Grid Scale = 10 ft	
Barrier	Safety Instructions	Notice 2	Notice 2D Adjacent	Caution 2	Caution 2A	Caution 2B	Caution 2C	Caution 2D Adjacent	Caution 7"x7"	Warning 1B	Warning 2A	RF Exposure Map		Lock
Posts														

4.0 Summary

All calculations performed for this analysis yielded results that were within the allowable limits for exposure to RF Emissions. Based on theoretical modeling, and upon implementation of recommendations in [Section 2](#), there will be no modeled exposures on any accessible walking/working surface related to AT&T's equipment in the area that exceed the FCC's Occupational or General Population exposure limits at this site.

The anticipated maximum theoretical RF-EME at Ground level will be **21.97%** of the FCC's General Population. This was determined through calculations along a radial from each sector taking full power values into account as well as actual vertical plane antenna gain values per the manufacturer-supplied specifications for gain. Based on worst-case theoretical modeling, there are no areas at ground level related to the proposed antennas that exceed the FCC's occupational or General Population exposure limits at this site.


A site is considered out of compliance with FCC regulations if there are areas that exceed the FCC exposure limits and there are no RF hazard mitigation measures in place. Any carrier which has an installation that contributes more than 5% of the applicable MPE must participate in mitigating these RF hazards.

Modeling indicates that there will be no accessible areas on the walking/working surfaces in front of the AT&T antennas that may exceed the FCC standards for general population and/or occupational exposure after implementation of mitigation measures. To reduce the risk of exposure and/or injury, MobileComm recommends that access to the areas associated with the active antenna installation or mitigation measures to be restricted and secured wherever possible.

5.0 FCC Rules and Regulations and Guidelines from OET 65

When considering the contributions to field strength or power density from other RF sources, care should be taken to ensure that such variables as reflection and re-radiation are considered. In cases involving very complex sites predictions of RF fields may not be possible, and a measurement survey may be necessary. The process for determining compliance for other situations can be similarly accomplished using the techniques described in this section and in Supplement A to this bulletin that deals with radio and television broadcast operations. However, as mentioned above, at very complex sites measurements may be necessary.

In the simple example shown in the below diagram, it is desired to determine the power density at a given location X meters from the base of a tower on which are mounted two antennas. One antenna is a CMRS antenna with several channels, and the other is an FM broadcast antenna. The system parameters that must be known are the total ERP for each antenna and the operating frequencies (to determine which MPE limits apply). The heights above ground level for each antenna, $H1$ and $H2$, must be known in order to calculate the distances, $R1$ and $R2$, from the antennas to the point of interest.



This summarizes the policies, guidelines and requirements that were adopted by the FCC on August 1, 1996, amending Part 1 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and further amended by action of the Commission on August 25, 1997 (see 47 CFR Sections 1.1307(b), 1.1310, 2.1091 and 2.1093, as amended from FCC "OET Bulletin 65"). Commission actions granting construction permits, licenses to transmit or renewals thereof, equipment authorizations or modifications in existing facilities, require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA), as described in 47 CFR Section 1.1311, if the particular facility, operation or transmitter would cause human exposure to levels of radiofrequency (RF) electromagnetic fields in excess of these limits. For exact language, see the relevant FCC rule sections.

The FCC-adopted limits for Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) are generally based on recommended exposure guidelines published by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) in "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields," NCRP Report No. 86, Sections 17.4.1, 17.4.1.1, 17.4.2 and 17.4.3. Copyright NCRP, 1986, Bethesda, Maryland 20814. In the frequency range from 100 MHz to 1500 MHz, exposure limits for field strength and power density are also generally based on the MPE limits found in Section 4.1 of, "IEEE Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz," ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992, Copyright 1992 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., New York, New York 10017, and approved for use as an American National Standard by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). The exposure guidelines are based on thresholds for known adverse effects and they incorporate a significant margin of safety. The federal health and safety agencies such as: the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA"), the National Institute on Occupational Safety and Health ("NIOSH") and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") have also been actively involved in monitoring and investigating issues related to RF exposure.

FCC regulations define two separate tiers of exposure limits: Occupational or "Controlled environment" and General Population or "Uncontrolled environment". The General Population limits are generally five times more conservative or restrictive than the Occupational limit. These limits apply to accessible areas where workers or the General Population may be exposed to Radio Frequency (RF) electromagnetic fields.

Occupational or Controlled limits apply in situations in which persons are exposed as a consequence of their employment and where those persons exposed have been made fully aware of the potential for exposure and can exercise control over their exposure.


An area is considered a Controlled environment when access is limited to these aware personnel. Typical criteria are restricted access (i.e. locked or alarmed doors, barriers, etc.) to the areas where antennas are located coupled with proper RF warning signage. A site with Controlled environments is evaluated with Occupational limits.

All other areas are considered Uncontrolled environments. If a site has no access controls or no RF warning signage it is evaluated with General Population limits.

The formulas used in IXUS for calculating Power density is based on FCC "OET Bulletin 65", Section 2: PREDICTION METHODS, August 1997, Edition 97-01. Power density is converted to Maximum Permissible Exposure Limits (MPE Limits) based on Limits of General population/Uncontrolled Exposure and Limits of Occupational/Controlled Exposure presented in the following table generated from Appendix A of "OET Bulletin 65".

Limits for Occupational/Controlled Exposure		
Frequency Range (MHz)	Power Density (S) (mW/cm ²)	Averaging Time E ² , H ² , or S (minutes)
300-1500	f/300	6
1500-100,000	5	6

Limits for General Population/Uncontrolled Exposure		
Frequency Range (MHz)	Power Density (S) (mW/cm ²)	Averaging Time E ² , H ² , or S (minutes)
300-1500	f/1500	30
1500-100,000	1	30



6.0 Safety Recommendations

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Requirements


OSHA requires that those in the Occupational classification must complete training in RF Safety, RF Awareness, and Utilization of Personal Protective Equipment. OSHA also provides options for Hazard Prevention and Control:

Hazard Prevention	Control
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilization of good equipment Enact control of hazard areas Limit exposures Employ medical surveillance and accident response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employ Lockout/Tag out Utilize personal alarms & protective clothing Prevent access to hazardous locations Develop or operate an administrative control program

RF Signage and Barriers

All RF signs should be obeyed by at all times.

Post the appropriate NOTICE, CAUTION & WARNING sign at the main site access point(s) and other locations as required. The signs below are examples of signs meeting FCC guidelines



If there are workers in an area with a sign that they do not understand, they can call the NOC Number at 800-638-2822 for guidance.

All persons (arborist, landscapers, construction/utility workers, etc.) that are accessing adjacent elevated surfaces that exceed the General Public (GP) limits MPE must be made aware of these potential exceedances and their fields, where applicable.

7.0 FCC Limits

Occupational limits

Apply in situations in which persons are exposed as a consequence of their employment provided those persons are fully aware of the potential for exposure and can exercise control over their exposure. Limits for occupational/controlled exposure also apply in situations when an individual is transient through a location where occupational/controlled limits apply provided he or she is made aware of the potential for exposure.

General population limits

Apply in situations in which the General Population may be exposed, or in which persons that are exposed as a consequence of their employment may not be fully aware of the potential for exposure or cannot exercise control over their exposure.

Controlled Environment

Applies to environments that are restricted or “controlled” in order to prevent access from members of the General Population classification.

Uncontrolled Environment

Applies to environments that are unrestricted or “uncontrolled” that allow access from members of the General Population classification.

Contribution to Co-Located areas

Any wireless operator that contributes 5% or greater of the MPE limit in an area that is identified to be greater than 100% of the MPE limit is responsible for taking corrective actions to bring the site into compliance.

Generic Values

The use of “Unknown” for an operator means the information with regard to the carrier, their FCC license and / or antenna information was not available. Generic values are used as estimation for Effective Radiated Power (ERP) and antenna characteristics for unknown antennas.

8.0 Certification

This report has been prepared by or under the direction of the following Registered Professional Engineer:

I, Michael McGuire P.E. State: California on date: 3/9/2026 hereby certify that:

I am registered as a Professional Engineer with License number: E18898 and that I am thoroughly familiar with the Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), both in general and specifically as they apply to FCC guidelines for human exposure to Radio-frequency electromagnetic radiation and that EME theoretical analysis for site identified as 10154133 located at 2065 PLACENTIA AVENUE, COSTA MESA, CA 92627 has been performed on 02-26-2026 in order to determine where there might be electromagnetic energy that is in excess of both the Controlled Environment and Uncontrolled Environment levels; and that I have thoroughly reviewed this Site Compliance Report and believe it to be true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.



Refer to Mobile Comm Report 10154133
sealed 09mar2026

ARIOS, JUSTIN

From: ARIOS, JUSTIN
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 3:20 PM
To: ARIOS, JUSTIN
Subject: FW: Application PMCP-24-0029

-----Original Message-----

From: Janae Muzzy <janaej7@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:53 PM
To: CASTORELA, EVELYN <EVELYN.CASTORELA@costamesaca.gov>; COLGAN, JULIE <JULIE.COLGAN@costamesaca.gov>; DRAPKIN, SCOTT <SCOTT.DRAPKIN@costamesaca.gov>; OOSTERHOF, NAOMI <NAOMI.OOSTERHOF@costamesaca.gov>; PARTIDA, ANNA <ANNA.PARTIDA@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: Application PMCP-24-0029

Attention: Planning Dept
Re: Application PMCP-24-0029
Address: 2065 Placentia Ave

I'm writing to adamantly OPPOSE the pending application for a new 55 foot tall wireless facility to be installed at the above mentioned address. Not only is it an eye sore, the location in which the permit is requested is located too close to a residential neighborhood, exposing those residents to long term hazardous frequencies emitted. There are many studies coming out linking several negative health effects to high level exposure to wireless frequencies, and it is irresponsible to install such a system in such close proximity to homes until long term studies have proven it to be safe.

As a Costa Mesa homeowner with a home virtually adjacent to the property in question (with the ability to see the existing mono-pine from our front and back yards) I can tell you that there was a significant change in the functions of all wireless items within our house when that particular unit was upgraded/installed. This clearly shows that it directly affects people in a notable radius of the unit. I can't imagine the impact of installing yet another mono-pine, doubling the amount of frequency exposure emitted. I beg you to reconsider and deny this application.

Thank you,
Janae Muzzy
Homeowner: 2100 Federal Ave, Costa Mesa 92627
714.715.2225

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

ARIOS, JUSTIN

From: Audrey Bonafede <audreybonafede@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 10:43 AM
To: ZA Public Comments; ARIOS, JUSTIN
Cc: Vince Bonafede
Subject: Application PMCP-24-0029 - Opposing Permit

Attention: Planning Department

Re: [Application PMCP-24-0029](#)

Address: 2065 Placentia Ave

I am writing to formally contest the pending permit for the proposed 55-foot wireless tower installation at **2065 Placentia Avenue** (“the Project”).

I wish to outline five key reasons for my opposition and urge the City of Costa Mesa to reconsider approval:

1. Incomplete Information and Lack of Cumulative Impact Analysis

- The current application and [Staff Report](#) omits critical technical details, such as the specific network type (e.g., 4G or 5G), and does not easily provide the “RF Emissions Report” for public review
- The Staff Report fails to advise if additional improvements in the future that are not required to go through the Condition Use Permit process could increase radiation or emissions. How would this be assessed?
- It does not assess cumulative health or environmental impacts from nearby wireless facilities. Approval of the Project plans to use the California Environmental Quality Action (CEQA) Article 19 – Categorical Exemptions, Section 15311 (Class 11) Accessory Structures which gives consensus of “construction, or placement of minor structures accessory to (appurtenant to) existing commercial, industrial, or institutional facilities...” however per [The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s CEQA 101 PDF](#), categorical examples generally will not apply if “significant cumulative impacts from projects of the same type will result...”
- The City of Costa Mesa’s Staff Report suggests that “Cumulative effect of all the planning applications shall be considered” which is an obligation under CEQA however the public has not received any information that the installation of yet another cell phone tower will not cause harm to human health.

2. Unresolved Health and Legal Concerns

- The long-term health effects of cell phone tower radiation remain inconclusive, and litigation is ongoing in multiple jurisdictions.

- The [American Cancer Society](#) notes: “At this time, there’s no strong evidence that exposure to RF waves from cell phone towers causes any noticeable health effects. **However, this does not mean that the RF waves from cell phone towers have been proven to be absolutely safe. Most expert organizations agree that more research is needed to help clarify this, especially for any possible long-term effects”**
- In [Pittsfield, Massachusetts](#) in 2020, residents living near a Verizon tower filed a lawsuit citing cancer and other serious health impacts. The Board of Health even issued an emergency cease-and-desist order (later rescinded after Verizon sued), but the case is still active and may set legal precedent for health claims based on proximity to cell phone towers

3. Lack of Oversight for Future Upgrades

- In 2022 the existing mono pine tower located at 2099 Placentia Ave was completing an upgrade which was NOT communicated to the local residence. The upgrade was noticed after multiple neighbors complained about Wi-Fi and baby monitor issues. I met with a city planner on July 15, 2022 and was told that any upgrades to existing towers would not require public notices and therefore there was nothing that the existing residence could do besides inquire with the permit holder.
- I continued to request information from the leasee, permit holder and operator to confirm what upgrades were being conducted. I never received a call back from any of the parties but it is assumed an upgrade was done to support a 5G network. This information was not available in the details provided from the City of Costa Mesa’s Planning Department’s public records request
- Future upgrades seem to be grandfathered into the existing Condition Use Permit, however technology is ever evolving. Long term impacts are constantly being assessed as radio frequency and cell phone usage technology changes.

4. Other Cities and Counties Have Adopted Reasonable Setbacks

- Costa Mesa should follow the lead of other jurisdictions that have successfully implemented wireless tower setbacks to protect residents while remaining in compliance with CEQA and federal law. A response suggesting that unrestricted installation of cell phone towers is acceptable per Federal Aviation Administration is no longer a reasonable “cop out” since other cities have been capable of creating reasonable setbacks for telecommunications and residential zoning.

a. Case Study - The City of Calabasas

i. The City of Calabasas has adopted a [Wireless Telecommunications Facility Ordinance](#), Ordinance No. 2021-391

ii. Under Section 17.31.010, the Calabasas Municipal Code states that “The city recognizes that the unrestricted installation of redundant personal wireless telecommunication facilities is contrary to the city's efforts to

stabilize economic and social aspects of neighborhood environments, and to promote safety and aesthetic considerations, family environments and a basic residential character within the city.”


iii. Per section 17.31.050 – “All new wireless telecommunication facilities subject to a **Tier 2 wireless telecommunication facility permit, shall be set back at least one thousand (1,000) feet from schools, dwelling units, and parks, as measured from the closest point of the personal wireless telecommunication facility (including accessory equipment) to the applicable property line**, unless an applicant establishes that a lesser setback is necessary to close a significant gap in the applicant's personal communication service, and the proposed wireless telecommunication facility is the least intrusive means to do so. An applicant who seeks to increase the height of an existing personal wireless telecommunication facility, or of its antennas, located less than one thousand (1,000) feet from a school, dwelling unit or park and who is subject to the approval of a wireless facility permit for the proposed height increase must establish that such increase is necessary to close a significant gap in the applicant's personal communication service, and the proposed increase is the least intrusive means to do so.”

b. Case Study – County of San Diego

i. Under [Section 9-1255.d – Use Standards](#), Communication, of the County of San Diego’s Land Development Ordinance requires freestanding towers greater than 50’ have setbacks from Residential Zoning Districts - “The minimum required side and rear setback from a property line for the freestanding telecommunication tower adjoining developed and/or residential zoned property shall be 500 feet measured from the base (finished grade) of the tower to the property line.”

5. The Project Primarily Benefits a Private Party, Not the Public

- The primary beneficiary of this tower appears to be the Public Storage facility, which will receive lease compensation while nearby Freedom Homes residents and apartments face increased EMF exposure.
- The Staff Report emphasizes aesthetic consistency and screening from public view, but does not address health concerns. Staff suggests that “the Project “is consistent with the General Plan land use designation in that the equipment will be screened from view from other surrounding developments. In addition, the location of the equipment area is not visible from offsite areas”.
- According to [celltowermaps.com](#), Westside Costa Mesa already has a higher concentration of towers than the Eastside. This disparity, whether intentional or incidental, raises concerns about equity in zoning and health protection.



Personal Concern as a Parent and Resident

While I use AT&T and appreciate reliable service, placing a tower directly adjacent to a residential neighborhood, particularly when long-term health effects remain uncertain, is deeply troubling. I'm a mother of two small children who play outdoors near our home which is already close to an existing tower.

It is disappointing that Costa Mesa seems more concerned with the appearance of a mono-pine than with the well-being of its residents. Cities like Calabasas and San Diego County have demonstrated that reasonable setbacks are feasible and enforceable.

Conclusion

I urge the Planning Department to deny the permit or require relocation of the proposed wireless facility to a site that provides safe distance from homes and schools. At a minimum, the City should reconsider its standards, adopt reasonable residential setbacks, and mandate transparency for all future upgrades to existing wireless facilities.

Sincerely,

Audrey Bonafede

Homeowner - 837 Pine Pl, Costa Mesa, CA

661-706-6866

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Briana Addison](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: NO to new 55-ft wireless facility in Costa Mesa
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:55:06 PM

We, the neighborhood residents, do NOT consent or approve of new 55-ft wireless facility in Costa Mesa.

- Briana Addison

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Kenton Remmey](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: No to tower
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:48:55 PM

My name is Kenton and I am a resident in Costa Mesa. I live right where you want to put in the tower and I do not want that. I know others here don't as well.

Thank you,
Kenton

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: kimcasas@icloud.com
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: PMCP-24-0029
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 1:50:59 PM

To Whom This May Concern,

Please find a different place, somewhere that is not so close to people's living spaces, for the new 55 foot-tall wireless facility disguised as a pine tree on 2065 Placentia Avenue. That address backs up to a residential area, which already has two tall wireless facilities within view of our homes. Please look into alternative areas that are industrial for these mono-pines structures.

Thank you for your time,

Kim Casas (resident on Federal Ave)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Jocelyn Shell](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Date: Thursday, July 10, 2025 9:08:05 PM

Hello, my name is Jocelyn Harrington and I live at 2053 Federal Ave.


I am reaching out to oppose the new Cell Phone tower that is to be placed at 2065 Placentia Ave.

I oppose the cell phone tower due to the fact that I already have two right in front of my house (this is the view from my driveway) and we do not need a third. (ITS EXCESSIVE.). They're extremely ugly and I am forced to look at two of them every day out my bedroom window-no need for a third. (the carrier can find another neighborhood to plant their towers next to.)

Also, it is known to bring the property values down at least 10 to 20%, and we already have two of them, plus as a pain resident Of Costa Mesa. I am asking you to fight for my rights as a neighbor and a patron and stop this.

Thank you for your consideration

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.





Jocelyn Harrington
949.433.1876

From: [Allimann949](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: Cell Phone Towers in Freedom Homes Area
Date: Friday, July 11, 2025 5:29:12 PM

Hello,

I'm a resident at 919 Arbor St. in Costa Mesa. We have lived in this part of Costa Mesa since 2013. We love the canyon, and this area.. PLEASE DO NOT PIT CELL PHONE TOWERS UP HERE...!! We finally renovated our home.. and we don't want to take any chances of any 5G, RF or whatever affecting our health. We plan on spending the rest of our lives here and then giving our home to our children (of which we have 3)... Also, it would be a complete eyesore and possibly devalue what we've just built. I hope you'll take my comments into consideration.

Best,

Allison Mann

Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [GREEN, BRENDA](#)
To: [PC Public Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Cell Phone Tower Placentia and Federal
Date: Monday, July 14, 2025 10:10:27 AM
Attachments: [image001.wmz](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Respectfully,

Brenda Green

City Clerk

City Clerk's Office | (714) 754-5221

77 Fair Drive | Costa Mesa | CA 92626



As City Hall has reopened, we encourage the public to take advantage of our appointment system. Appointments can be made at www.costamesaca.gov/appointments. Please note that It is required that all guests check in with our Concierge Staff, located on the 1st Floor Lobby, upon arrival at City Hall.

From: Dana Croyle <danacroyle@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 10:07 AM
To: CITY CLERK <CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: Cell Phone Tower Placentia and Federal

Dear Members of the City Planning Department,

I am writing as a homeowner and resident of Costa Mesa to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed installation of a cell phone tower near my property on Placentia Ave./Federal Ave.

I have serious concerns about the impact this would have on our community. Specifically:

- Numerous studies have shown that proximity to cell towers can negatively affect home values. As a homeowner who has invested significantly in my property, this is extremely concerning.
- A cell tower would be visually intrusive and detract from the character

and beauty of our residential neighborhood.

- While the scientific community continues to evaluate the long-term health impacts of living near such towers, many residents are understandably wary of any possible risks
- There has been no meaningful community engagement or outreach to gather feedback from affected residents, which I believe should be a requirement before moving forward with any installation in a residential area.

I respectfully urge the City to reject this proposal or consider alternative locations away from homes, schools, and community spaces. Our neighborhood should not bear the burden of infrastructure that benefits broader service areas at the expense of our local environment, home values, and peace of mind.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for considering the concerns of the residents you serve.

Sincerely,

Dana Kalionzes

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Kelly Couzens](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: NO on cell tower
Date: Monday, July 14, 2025 8:09:05 AM

To whom it may concern:

This email is to inform you that the residents and public say NO to a proposed new cell phone tower in the freedom Homes (specifically close to Federal and Continental Avenue.) located at 2065 Placentia Ave.

It'll be aesthetically non appealing, and bring the land values down.
Also, I will add the health effects on persons could be affected.

Kelly Couzens
kellycouzens@yahoo.com

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [celine miller](#)
To: [PC Public Comments](#)
Subject: PMCP-24-0029
Date: Monday, July 14, 2025 4:03:13 PM

Attachments available until Aug 13, 2025

To whom it may concern,

Since the ZAPublicComments@costamesaca.gov address does not accept attachments, please find herewith **92 signatures against a new cell tower on 2065 Placentia Avenue**. I am still receiving and collecting feedback and I may send an update on Wednesday 16th. Thank you.

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Petition Page 1 : 4 .pdf
6.7 MB

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Petition Page 2 : 4 .pdf
3.6 MB

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Petition Page 3 : 4 .pdf
3.6 MB

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Petition Page 4 : 4 .pdf
3.1 MB

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Flyer 1:5.pdf
211 KB


[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Flyer 2:5.pdf
189 KB

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Flyer 3:5.pdf
4.1 MB

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Flyer (Nextdoor) 4:5.pdf
124 KB

[Click to Download](#)
Cell Tower Flyer (Nextdoor) 5:5.pdf
3.4 MB

Also, here is a picture shot on Continental Avenue showing the 2 existing towers in red. The proposed tower would be erected in between which is too close.



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

PAGE 1 → 10

13

4

NOT ANOTHER CELL TOWER ON PLACENTIA / FEDERAL AVENUES

We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

	NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
	C. Miller	2060 FEDERAL AVE COSTA MESA 92627	
	K. Drenwall	2054 Federal ave	
3	Kim Casas	2049 Federal Ave	Kim Casas
	Mary Cottrell	2080 Federal Ave	
	DUSTIN GINN	2084 FEDERAL AVE	
6	Paul Messner	2100 Federal Ave	
	Lana Kalionzes	2044 Federal Ave	
	Maria Rawson	2039 Federal Ave	
9	Tarweil Holt	2064 CONTINENTAL AVE	
	Brian Anderson	854 OAK ST	
	Jamie Muller	854 OAK ST Unit B	
12	Renee Klemm	859 Oak St.	Renee Klemm
	June Hilbert	2080 Continental Ave	
	David Heil	2080 Continental Ave.	
15	Shannon Elsten	2063 Continental Ave	
	Tom Elliott	2060 Continental Ave	Tom Elliott
	Carol Ann Elliott	2060 Continental Ave	
18	Steve Peltz	2094 Continental Ave	
19	Anaury Bonafede	837 Pine Pl	

PAGE 2 / 4

NOT ANOTHER CELL TOWER ON PLACENTIA / FEDERAL AVENUES

We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

	NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
20	Mikyla Lux	2050 Federal Ave, CM	Mikyla Lux
	Marine Kirakosian	2040 Federal Ave, CM	Marine Kirakosian
	Robert Kirakosian	2040 Federal Ave. CM	Robert Kirakosian
23	Mary Maurer	2034 Federal Ave CM	Mary Maurer
	EUGENE Milburn	2030 FEDERAL AVE CM	Eugene Milburn
	Soulynn Harrington	2053 Federal Ave. CM	Soulynn Harrington
26	Nichole Avila	2013 Federal Ave CM	Nichole Avila
	Kim BERKEY	2010 FEDERAL AVE CM	Kim Berkey
	Joost Rochelle	2001 Federal Ave CM	Joost Rochelle
29	Scott Ali	2124 Monrovia Ave, CM	Scott Ali
	PAUL ADDISON	850 W 20 TH ST, CM	Paul Addison
	Bri Addison	850 W 20 th St CM	Bri Addison
32	Alex Koutzoukis	1979 Federal Ave, CM	Alex Koutzoukis
	Stephanie Koutzoukis	1979 Federal Ave, CM	Stephanie Koutzoukis
	Cecilia J	2010 Continental av	Cecilia J
35	Adam Ohlig	305 Morning Star lane	Adam Ohlig
	Tom Elstey	2063 Continental Ave	Tom Elstey
37	James De La O	2083 Continental Ave	James De La O

NOT ANOTHER CELL TOWER ON PLACENTIA / FEDERAL AVENUES







We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

	NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
	Lesli De la O	2083 Continental Ave.	Lesli De la O
	Jason De La O	2083 Continental Ave., CM	Jason De La O
40	Lena De La O	2083 Continental Ave. CM	Lena De La O
	Harrison Jones	1777 Hummingbird Drive CM	Harrison Jones
	Thomas Kadar	2063 Federal Ave., CM	Thomas Kadar
43	TIFFANY DANIELS	2033 Federal ave COSTA MESA 92627	Tiffany Daniels
	Honey Jimenez Schindt	2004 Federal Ave ^{Costa Mesa CA 92627}	Honey Jimenez Schindt
	Matt Schindt	2004 Federal Ave ^{Costa Mesa CA 92627}	Matt Schindt
46	Bill Spaulding	2000 Federal Ave. ^{Costa Mesa CA 92627}	Bill Spaulding
	Andrea Mumma	2043 Continental Ave ^{Costa Mesa CA 92627}	Andrea Mumma
	Tyler Mumma	2043 Continental Ave, CM	Tyler Mumma
49	Olga Zepeda Reynolds	2040 Continental Ave CM	Olga Zepeda Reynolds
	Paul Paul	2069 Continental Ave	Paul Paul
	Missy Merges	2069 Avenue	Missy Merges
52	Heather White	2094 Continental Ave	Heather White

7A6310
4
4

NOT ANOTHER CELL TOWER ON PLACENTIA / FEDERAL AVENUES

We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

	NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
53	Vince Barafede	837 Pine Place	
	Pamela Simmons ^{Single}	838 Pine Place	
	DIANE LUKINS	834 Pine Pl.	
54	Erica Norgaard	2103 Federal Ave.	
	Emily Norgaard	2103 Federal Ave	
	Peter Norgaard	2103 Federal Ave	
59	Kilee Alexander	2109 Federal Ave	
	Rey Madiedo	2109 Federal Ave	
	Bonnie Harrison	850 Oak St	
62	Diane Sorenson	854 Oak St	

We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a new cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

CHRISTINA RENNICK 1989 CONTINENTAL AVE C. Rennick

NAME ADDRESS COSTA MESA CA SIGNATURE
92627

NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE

Jeff Lawson 2014 Federal Ave [Signature]

NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE

Gina Lawson 2014 Federal Ave [Signature]

NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE
843 Plum Pl. 7/11/25

Homer Miles Watterson

phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Tyler Elliott 1970 Continental Ave
NAME ADDRESS COSTA MESA CA SIGNATURE

phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Christa Elliott 1970 Continental Ave
NAME ADDRESS COSTA MESA CA SIGNATURE

phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Paul Ryan Diemwald 2054 FEDERAL AVE
NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE

PAUL RYAN DIEMWALD

phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Michael Keegan Smith 2059 Federal Ave
NAME ADDRESS COSTA MESA CA 92627 SIGNATURE

NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE

Lara Maxinoski 2020 Federal Ave. CM 92627

John Evans 2020 Federal Ave. CM 92627

[Signature] 7/11/25

phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Adrian Vazquez 2054 continental ave costa mesa 92627
NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE

NAME ADDRESS SIGNATURE

Alma Delia Vazquez 2054 Continental ave.
Costa mesa Ca. 92627

[Signature]

Cell towers lower land value
They have a negative impact on our health

They are an eyesore

We do not want to live in a forest of "Mono Pines" as they call them... When will it stop?

We have a week to tell the city "NO", please do not delay. (They vote on July 17th).

You can either send your comments to : ZAPublicComments@costamesaca.gov.

You can sign below and drop the coupon in my black mailbox : 2060 Federal Avenue

I encourage you to do both.


We will knock on doors this week to try and gather as many signatures as possible!

If you need more details, please message me (Celine) at Cmiller52371@gmail.com.

We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a new cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Jamie Nien

923 Arbor St 92627



NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

Karen Johnson

2059 Continental Ave

NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE


Kyle Blackman

1944 Continental



Randi Martz

924 Arbor Street, Costa Mesa CA 92627



NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

Clayton Elster

2063 Continental Ave
92627 Costa Mesa
CA




NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

ANDREIA

S. PAUN



NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

Kyle Blackman

1944 Continental Ave



We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a new cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Joel Harding

1979 Continental



NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

Cassidy Harding

1979 Continental Ave



NAME

ADDRESS COSTA MESA

SIGNATURE

Wendy Blackman

1944 Continental Ave



NAME

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

We, the undersigned residents, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a new cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

Susan Blomgren

2079 Federal Ave
92627



NAME

ADDRESS 92627

SIGNATURE

7/09/25 (NEX DOOR APP) PINE CIRCLE - JANAEE MUZZY



Janae M. **JANAEE MUZZY** 8:53 pm

Hi Celine, I saw your post regarding the cell towers and would like to sign your petition. I no longer live in it, but I still own a home on Federal Ave. and am beside myself that they have one tower, let alone want to add to it. Please lmk what information you need from me. Thank you.
Janae Muzzy



Janae M. 8:53 pm

(I also already submitted an email to the city opposing it)



ANITA ROUELLE
HERNANDEZ.

(/notifications/)

(/inbox/)

NO TO ANOTHER CELL PHONE TOWER ON PLACENTIA FEDERAL

There are 2 existing cell phone towers on Placentia Federal Ave. and they want to add another. The new tower would be erected a couple of feet from the existing ones.

- Cell towers are an eyesore
- They have a negative impact on the health
- They are an eyesore
- We do not want to have a tower of 150 feet tall in the middle of the street. When will it stop?

We have a week to tell the city "NO", please do not delay. They vote on July 17th.

- You can take your comments to: ZAP10656@cityofplacentia.com
- You can also bring and drop the copies in my black mailbox - 2020 Federal Avenue
- Let's get up to 1000 from
- We will make it done this week to try and gather as many signatures as possible!

If you need more info, please message me: Celine523139@icloud.com

We will make signed petitions, respectfully oppose the proposed construction of a new cell phone tower in our neighborhood and urge the City to consider other locations.

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE

" 2023 REPUBLIC AVE.
COSTA MESA, CA 92627
Anita Hernandez "

C celine miller (/profile/
Canyon Park/Fairview
(/profile/01fFy2TTGBWZsMrTR/?
is=detail_author) 71 day ago (/p/zN28BI
Edited

Do you live in the Freedom Homes on Federal, Continental or on Placentia Avenue? The City permit application for MORE CELL TOWERS are to be erected right next to the existing one. Other than being an eyesore, they are making land value go down. Please contact me to sign petition. We only have 1 week to react, the City on July 17th!

♥
3 reactions
👉
...

Comments (12)


T Tara Elliott (/prof
Please send tri
(/profile/017cng27Sxpcxp3R-/?
is=feed_commenter) 2
👉 Reply

C celine miller (/c
Tara (/profile/c
(/profile/01fFy2TTGBWZsMrTR/?
is=feed_commenter) Like
👉 Reply

Brittany Nevins (/i
send please
(/profile/01_pPKBJWY7d6Sq-
2/?is=feed_commenter) 2
👉 Reply

C celine miller (/i
Brittany (/pro
(/profile/01fFy2TTGBWZsMrTR/?
is=feed_commenter) Like
👉 Reply

Chats



2074

From: [Erica N](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: Strong Opposition to Proposed Cell Tower at 2065 Placentia Avenue
Date: Tuesday, July 15, 2025 5:39:32 PM

Dear Costa Mesa Zoning Administrator,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed installation of a 55-foot-tall wireless facility, disguised as a pine tree, at 2065 Placentia Avenue.

I would like to begin by reminding the City that there are already two existing cell towers within approximately 500 feet of each other: 2065 Placentia Ave and 2099 Placentia Ave. When the second tower was proposed in 2019, many residents voiced their disapproval — a clear indication of the community’s ongoing concerns. Now, in 2025, a third tower is being proposed within that same 500-foot radius, which is not only excessive but, frankly, unacceptable.

This repeated approval of additional towers demonstrates a disregard for resident input. City decisions should reflect the interests and well-being of the community — not those of private entities.

Furthermore, I am deeply concerned that the notice regarding this proposal was distributed only in English. Our neighborhood is home to many Spanish-speaking residents, and this lack of language accessibility creates a serious barrier to participation. It is the City's responsibility to ensure all residents are informed and able to engage with decisions that directly affect their community. Promoting inclusivity is not just an ideal — it’s a necessity for equitable local governance.

I urge you to reconsider this proposal and take meaningful steps to engage all voices in our community.

Sincerely,
Erica Norgaard, resident and property owner on Federal Ave for 26 years.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Christopher DeSurra](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: Permit Application Denial Request
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 3:07:04 AM

To: ZAPublicComments@costamesaca.gov
Date: July 15, 2025

Dear Zoning Administrator,

We, the undersigned residents of 2064 Federal Avenue bordering 2065 Placentia Avenue, and our 100 neighbors who recently signed and submitted a petition, strenuously oppose the approval of Minor Conditional Use Permit (MCUP) Application PMCP-24-0029 for a new 55-foot wireless facility. The application violates multiple provisions of the Costa Mesa Municipal Code (CMMC), fails to justify critical deviations from development standards, and threatens the welfare of nearby residential properties. We urge denial for the following reasons:

1. Insufficient Justification for Proximity to Residential Property Line

The proposed monopine is only 27 feet from the western residential property line (Page 6, Staff Report). This violates CMMC §13-142, which mandates antennas adjacent to residential zones be located "as far as possible from the residential property line" and requires a *minimum 5-foot setback*.

The lot spans 80,570 sq ft, yet the applicant provides no evidence that positioning the tower farther from homes is infeasible. This proximity guarantees intrusive views into residential backyards and violates §13-142's intent to minimize impacts on residential zones.

2. Height Deviation Lacks Technical or Cost Justification

The tower's 55-foot height violates §13-142's 30-foot maximum for communication antennas in non-residential zones. While §13-144 allows exceptions, the application fails to prove strict compliance would:

"Unreasonably limit reception/transmission" or

"Result in excessive expense" (§13-144(a)(2)).

The applicant's claim that a 30-foot height would require "more antennas" (Page 10) is a cost concern, that is not sufficiently explained as required by §13-144(a)(2).

3. Existing Monopine Compounds Nuisances, Not Precedent

The existing monopine has caused documented disturbances: loud construction, maintenance with workers overlooking backyards. Crews on the existing tower have played loud, inappropriate music while loudly laughing and singing/rapping. Neighbors on both

sides of Federal Avenue yelled at them to turn down the music, work more quietly and were laughed at by the crew until threats of calling the police were made. Adding a second tower:

Doubles these nuisances, violating §13-29(g)(2) (prohibiting uses "detrimental to nearby properties").

Ignores CMMC §13-29(e)(5): "The planning application... shall not set a precedent." Relying on the existing monopine as justification is legally invalid.

4. Inadequate Screening & Privacy Protections

§13-142 requires antennas visible off-site to be screened to lessen visual impacts. The "faux pine" design is insufficient to screen a 55-foot structure 27 feet from residences.

Maintenance crews scaling the tower will directly overlook residential yards, creating ongoing privacy invasions. No conditions address this.

5. Inconsistency with General Plan Policies

Policy LU-3.1 requires protecting residential areas from "incompatible or disruptive uses." A 55-foot industrial tower looming 27 feet from low-density homes is inherently incompatible.

Objective CD-8.F mandates equipment be placed in the "least conspicuous" location. The equipment 27 feet from the residential property line violates this objective.

Notice of Legal Preservation

Per the Public Notice (Page 1), challengers may be "limited to raising only those issues raised prior to the decision date." We formally place the City on notice that all issues herein must be addressed to avoid legal action.

Conclusion

The project violates CMMC development standards, lacks credible justification for deviations, and will materially harm residential quality of life. We demand the Zoning Administrator:

DENY PMCP-24-0029;

Respectfully,

Christopher DeSurra, Orange Coast College Communication Studies Professor and Chair
James McAleer, President and CEO of Alzheimer's Orange County

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any

suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [John Evans](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed cell tower at 2065 Placentia Ave.
Date: Wednesday, July 16, 2025 10:08:35 PM

My name is John Evans, I'm a 17yr resident of Federal Ave. I would like to be on the record stating that I STRONGLY oppose any new cellular/data towers in our area. They are major eyesores with negative effects on community and individual health. This will also decrease the value of our properties. For these reasons I OPPOSE application number PMCP-24-0029.

Thank you.

John Evans
Eversen Performance Products, LLC
949.903.5024

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [lara.maxinoski](#)
To: [ZA Public Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed cell tower at 2065 Placentia Ave.
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 3:03:18 AM

My name is Lara Maxinoski, I'm a 9yr resident of Federal Ave. I would like to be on the record stating that I STRONGLY oppose any new cellular/data towers in our area. They are major eyesores with negative effects on community and individual health. This will also decrease the value of our properties. For these reasons I OPPOSE application number PMCP-24-0029.

Thank you,
Lara Maxinoski

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: [Toni Elliott](#)
To: [PC Public Comments](#)
Subject: Wireless pine
Date: Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:41:01 AM

Sent from my iPhone

To whom it may concern,

We as neighbors to this installation, do not want it in our backyard. It has lowered the value of our home, or even the possibility of selling our home if needed. Whether it does damage to us or not people don't trust them and will not look at our homes for future sales. Please place these in a more work environment further away from neighborhoods.

Thank you, Toni Elliott

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.



CITY OF COSTA MESA

Agenda Report

77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

File #: 26-202

Meeting Date: 3/23/2026

TITLE:

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COSTA MESA MUNICIPAL CODE (TITLE 13 - ZONING CODE) TO UPDATE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR PERSONAL SERVICES, ARTISAN STUDIO AND RETAIL USES, ACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT USES, EVENT CENTERS AND ASSEMBLY USES, SPECIALIZED FITNESS STUDIOS, AND RELATED COMMERCIAL USES - PCTY-26-0001.

DEPARTMENT: ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEPARTMENT/PLANNING DIVISION

PRESENTED BY: AMBER GREGG, CONTRACT PLANNER, AND MARTINA CARON, PLANNING MANAGER

CONTACT INFORMATION: AMBER GREGG AMBER.GREGG@costamesaca.gov

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Receive a presentation regarding proposed updates to the Costa Mesa Zoning Code related to emerging commercial uses and zoning implementation issues; and
2. Provide feedback and policy direction regarding the proposed amendments.

If the Planning Commission is supportive of the proposed approach, staff will return with a formal Zoning Code Amendment for consideration at a future public hearing.



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: March 23, 2026

ITEM NUMBER: OB-1

SUBJECT: OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COSTA MESA MUNICIPAL CODE (TITLE 13 - ZONING CODE) TO UPDATE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR PERSONAL SERVICES, ARTISAN STUDIO AND RETAIL USES, ACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT USES, EVENT CENTERS AND ASSEMBLY USES, SPECIALIZED FITNESS STUDIOS, AND RELATED COMMERCIAL USES - PCTY-26-0001.

**FROM: ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DEPARTMENT/PLANNING DIVISION**

PRESENTATION BY: AMBER GREGG, CONTRACT PLANNER, AND MARTINA CARON, PLANNING MANAGER

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: AMBER GREGG
AMBER.GREGG@costamesaca.gov**

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

1. Receive a presentation regarding proposed updates to the Costa Mesa Zoning Code related to emerging commercial uses and zoning implementation issues; and
2. Provide feedback and policy direction regarding the proposed amendments.

If the Planning Commission is supportive of the proposed approach, staff will return with a formal Zoning Code Amendment for consideration at a future public hearing.

APPLICANT OR AUTHORIZED AGENT:

City Initiated request for economic development purposes.

INTRODUCTION:

A City's Zoning Code and regulations play an important role in supporting economic development by establishing the framework for where businesses may locate, how commercial properties may be used, and the extent to which sites can adapt to changing market conditions. A clear and functional Zoning Code helps create predictability for property owners, tenants, and investors, while also allowing the City to implement broader land use, design, and compatibility objectives. When zoning regulations are outdated, unclear, or difficult to apply, they can create barriers to tenant occupancy, business investment, and reinvestment in existing commercial areas. Periodic updates to the Zoning Code are therefore important not only to maintain consistency with planning goals, but also to ensure the City's regulatory framework supports a healthy and evolving local economy.

Over time, the City's Zoning Code has evolved to address a wide range of land uses and development patterns. However, staff has identified several areas where existing land use classifications, definitions, and development standards no longer fully reflect current commercial trends, tenant needs, or operational realities. As a result, portions of the Code can be difficult to administer consistently and may create uncertainty for property owners, business operators, and staff.

The Citywide Land Use Matrix, contained within the Zoning Code, serves as the primary tool for identifying which land uses are permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited within each zoning district. While the Matrix has been updated periodically, its overall framework has remained largely unchanged since its original adoption in 1997, when approximately 146 land use categories were introduced. Since that time, commercial business models have evolved significantly, and a growing number of emerging uses—such as wellness services, specialized fitness studios, artisan production spaces, active entertainment venues, and e-sports related facilities are not clearly defined or consistently classified within the existing Zoning Code.

Over the past several years, the commercial real estate market has changed significantly, particularly as property owners and tenants work to reposition existing brick-and-mortar commercial spaces to respond to changing consumer preferences and evolving business models. Additionally, the commercial real estate market has also changed significantly. Many new business types, particularly in the wellness, recreation, entertainment, and creative industries, do not fit squarely within traditional zoning categories developed decades ago. Thereby, businesses seeking to locate in Costa Mesa may encounter regulatory uncertainty or inconsistent land use classifications. One of the primary issues involves the Citywide Land Use Matrix, which identifies uses that are permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited within the City's Zoning Districts.

Uses listed on the Land Use Matrix as permitted are allowed “by-right” and do not require discretionary approval. Uses listed as conditionally permitted require discretionary approval. Both situations create a clear path. When a proposed use is not listed on the Land Use Matrix, the Development Services Director is able to determine whether the use is substantially similar to an existing listed use. If no substantial similarity exists, the use requires approval of a conditional use permit. In practice, this process is subjective and can create uncertainty for applicants and staff, particularly for newer business types that do not fit squarely within older land use categories or parking standards. Applicants have expressed that this can result in unpredictability from increased processing time and added cost when leasing tenant spaces or establishing new businesses in the City.

In addition to land use classification issues, staff has identified challenges associated with certain commercial development standards, particularly commercial height limits and the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) framework. In many commercial zones, building height is generally limited to two stories or 30 feet, with only narrow exceptions, which can make it difficult for existing businesses or property owners to incorporate features such as parapets, varied roof forms, rooftop screening, or usable rooftop amenities that may improve building design and functionality without substantially increasing activity on the site. As a result, relatively modest design enhancements would require variances even when the change would not meaningfully alter the scale or intensity of the use.

Staff has also identified practical issues with the City’s FAR framework, which links allowable building area to traffic generation categories. While this approach was intended to help manage development intensity and traffic impacts, it can create complications when an existing commercial space is re-tenanted or modestly improved. For example, the framework limits tenant improvements for adding small amounts of floor area, reconfigure interior space, or improve building functionality, despite having little or no material effect on overall site intensity. In some cases, the framework requires building areas devoted to mechanical, circulation, or service functions toward FAR to be counted, even though those areas do not generate customer activity nor do they contribute to traffic trip generation analyses.

The proposed future code update is intended to address these issues by modernizing land use classifications, clarifying definitions, and refining select development standards. The purpose of this study session is to provide the Planning Commission with an overview of the proposed Zoning Code updates, describe the problems staff is attempting to resolve, and obtain preliminary feedback before returning with a formal Zoning Code Amendment for consideration.

DISCUSSION:

Staff is proposing approximately eleven targeted Zoning Code updates intended to modernize land use classifications and development standards and improve regulatory clarity. These updates are also intended to support the City’s economic development goals by facilitating reinvestment in commercial properties, reducing uncertainty in the entitlement process, and better accommodating evolving business models. The proposed amendments are intentionally narrow in scope and focus on a limited set of high-priority issues that commonly recur. Although there are additional Code topics that may merit future evaluation, the current effort is designed to advance a manageable package of amendments that can be effectively studied and implemented within existing staffing capacity and current departmental work program constraints. See a summary of the proposed amendments below:

Table 1. Summary of Proposed Zoning Code Updates

PROPOSED UPDATES TO LAND USE MATRIX	
TOPIC	DESCRIPTION
1. Personal Services	Establish a broader Personal Services category for one on one customer-serving grooming, wellness, and similar uses that are currently regulated separately or not clearly identified. Parking requirements and definition will be added.
2. Artisan Studio and Retail	Consolidate small-scale creative production, maker spaces, and related accessory retail uses into one category. This would provide a clearer framework for hybrid businesses that produce and sell goods on-site. Parking requirements and definition will be added.
3. Active Entertainment	Create a new category for indoor, participant-based entertainment uses where customers actively engage in recreation or gaming activities. Examples include escape rooms, virtual reality venues, indoor mini-golf, simulators, and similar uses. Parking requirements and definition will be added.
4. Event Centers and Assembly Uses	Consolidate banquet halls, assembly halls, reception venues, conference facilities, and spectator-oriented e-sports arenas into a single classification. This update would distinguish assembly uses from active entertainment and apply consistent operating standards. Parking requirements and definition will be added.
5. Small Fitness Studios	Establish a category for smaller instructional fitness uses, generally 15,000 square feet or less, such as yoga, Pilates, martial arts, dance, and similar studios. This would distinguish these uses from larger fitness clubs and health clubs that operate at a greater scale and intensity. Parking requirements and definition will be added.

PROPOSED UPDATES TO LAND USE MATRIX	
TOPIC	DESCRIPTION
6. Food Halls and Ghost Kitchens	Add food halls and ghost kitchens to the Food And Beverage Section of the Zoning Code as a specifically identified restaurant-related use to clarify how multi-vendor dining spaces are classified and reviewed. Parking requirements and definition will be added.
7. Electric Vehicle Charging	Clarify that electric vehicle charging stations are a permitted use, whether primary or accessory, consistent with State law.
8. Sports Clubs	Clarify that indoor sports clubs, such as basketball, pickleball, volleyball, and soccer training facilities, are regulated under the existing “physical fitness facilities” uses. These uses would require a Conditional Use Permit consistent with the existing framework for larger fitness and recreation facilities. Parking clarifications and definition may be needed.
9. Commercial Kitchens	Establish a land use classification for commercial kitchens, including catering kitchens, shared kitchens, and similar food preparation facilities without traditional on-site dining. This would provide a clearer framework for evaluating newer food service business models. Parking requirements and definition will be added.
PROPOSED UPDATE TO DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS	
TOPIC	DESCRIPTION
10. Height Deviation	Allow limited height deviations for nonresidential development through Minor Conditional Use Permit review to accommodate architectural features and functional rooftop elements. The amendment is intended to provide flexibility for building modernization while maintaining compatibility with surrounding development.
11. Floor Area Ratio Definition	Clarify how “Gross Floor Area” is measured for FAR implementation by identifying which building areas are included and excluded from the calculation. The amendment is intended to improve consistency and better align FAR with occupiable area and site intensity.

Land Use Matrix Updates

Nine amendments are proposed to consolidate specific uses into general categories, add specified uses, and clarify existing uses. The proposed amendments would modernize several land use categories to reflect emerging commercial trends. The following provides additional detail on the consolidation of specific uses into general categories.

1. Personal Services

The current Zoning Code contains several individual uses such as barber shops, massage establishments, and laundry services that function similarly but are regulated separately. These individual uses make it difficult to consistently classify similar businesses, make it challenging to determine other uses as “similar” when not explicitly permitted, and often require staff to interpret how new or hybrid service models fit within outdated or narrowly defined categories. For example, the Code specifically permits barber shops but is silent on beauty salons and nail salons.

The proposed amendment establishes a comprehensive Personal Services category encompassing personal care, grooming, and wellness-related services provided directly to customers. These individual uses would be combined into one similar “Personal Services” category for regulation purposes. Examples include:

- Barber and beauty salons
- Nail salons
- Day spas
- Wellness centers offering services such as cryotherapy or infrared therapy
- Massage establishments (subject to existing regulations)
- Tattoo and body art establishments (subject to Conditional Use Permit requirements)

One on one services would be permitted by right, and services offering group services or instruction would require a Minor Conditional Update Permit (MCUP) consistent with existing Zoning Code requirements for the existing listed uses. This change improves clarity and aligns the Zoning Code with the regulatory framework used by many Southern California jurisdictions.

2. Artisan Studio and Retail

Several creative and production-related uses are currently listed separately in the Zoning Code, including:

- Artist studios
- Photography studios
- Recording studios
- Furniture repair and refinishing

Regulating these uses as separate categories can create complexity and make it difficult to consistently classify businesses that combine elements of production, design, and retail. In recent years we are seeing more and more of these types of businesses emerging and helping to fill once vacant brick and mortar spaces. These businesses often operate as hybrid spaces, for example, a maker may produce goods

on-site while also selling them directly to customers (i.e. a ceramicist or other small scale production). Under the current structure, these types of uses may not fit neatly into a single category, requiring staff interpretation or additional entitlement review.

The proposed amendment consolidates these uses into a new “Artisan Studio and Retail” Commercial category that allows small-scale creative production with accessory retail sales. Examples include:

- Artist and maker studios
- Custom woodworking
- Photography studios
- Recording studios
- Small-scale craft production

Consolidating these uses into a single category improves clarity and provides greater flexibility for evolving business models by regulating them based on shared operational characteristics rather than narrowly defined activities. For example, a furniture maker who designs, builds, and sells products on-site would be clearly permitted within this category, rather than being split between manufacturing and retail classifications or requiring a use determination.

Staff did examine if this category of uses could fit under personal services. However, while “Personal Services” involve services performed directly on or for a customer (such as grooming, wellness treatments, or body care), Artisan Studio and Retail uses are centered on the creation, fabrication, or production of goods, often with accessory sales. These uses may involve equipment, materials, and operational characteristics more similar to light production or workshop environments than customer-focused service activities. Maintaining a separate classification ensures that these uses can be appropriately regulated based on their operational impacts, including potential noise, equipment, or workspace needs.

This category supports creative industries and aligns with trends in adaptive reuse of commercial spaces. For commercial zones, it does not permit more intense industrial uses such as automotive uses or food manufacturing.

3. Active Entertainment

“Active Entertainment” refers to indoor uses that provide interactive, participant-based recreation where customers are actively engaged in an activity, rather than observing or receiving a service. For example, an escape room or virtual reality gaming venue where customers rotate through timed sessions, or an indoor mini-golf facility where patrons move through a course.

The existing Zoning Code identifies entertainment uses individually, including bowling centers, billiard parlors, and skating rinks, while imposing the same development standards for the uses, for example parking requirements are 10 spaces per 1,000 sf. Staff proposes establishing a broader “Active Entertainment” category that would consolidate these listed uses and would also capture other interactive and participant-based indoor recreation uses. Examples include:

- Escape rooms
- Virtual reality gaming venues
- Indoor mini-golf
- Sports simulators
- Interactive arcades
- E-sports gaming lounges
- Bowling and billiards facilities

4. Event Centers and Assembly Uses

The proposed amendment would also consolidate several assembly-related uses into a single classification. The proposed Event Center / Banquet Facility / Assembly Hall / E-Sports Arena category would include indoor or outdoor venues designed to host organized gatherings such as:

- Banquet halls
- Reception facilities
- Conference venues
- Event centers
- E-sports arenas designed for spectator events

This classification would continue to distinguish these uses from active entertainment uses and ensures consistent parking and operational standards.

5. Small Fitness Studios

Fitness-related uses have evolved significantly in recent years, with many smaller studios focusing on specialized instruction rather than traditional gym facilities. Staff proposes establishing a “Small Fitness Studio” category to address smaller-scale instructional fitness uses and are generally designed for one or two concurrent class oriented uses. Examples include:

- Yoga studios
- Pilates studios
- Martial arts studios
- Dance instruction studios
- High-intensity interval training (HIIT) studios

The proposed definition would include operational characteristics typical of these uses, such as scheduled classes and smaller class sizes. Establishing an operational threshold helps provide a clear objective standard to distinguish Small Fitness Studios from larger fitness facilities and health clubs currently permitted with a CUP under “Physical Fitness Facilities”, which operate at a greater scale and intensity. Small Fitness Studios typically have limited occupancy at any given time, shorter customer durations, and activity patterns that are more predictable. In contrast, larger fitness facilities such as 24 Hour Fitness, often include multiple activity areas, extended hours of operation, and higher membership volumes, which can result in increased parking demand and traffic generation.

6. Food Halls and Ghost Kitchens

The current Zoning Code regulates food and beverage uses under Article IV; however, the Zoning Code does not specifically identify food halls or ghost kitchens as permitted uses. As these business models have become more common, the absence of clear classifications can create uncertainty during project review and make it difficult to consistently regulate these uses under existing restaurant categories.

Staff proposes adding both Food Halls and Ghost Kitchens to the Zoning Code as specifically identified land uses with regulations. Food halls generally consist of multiple food vendors operating within a shared indoor space with common seating and dining areas, and typically generate high levels of customer activity, parking demand, and site circulation. Ghost kitchens also represent a more intensive food service model, often involving multiple kitchen operators within a single facility and generating substantial pick-up and delivery traffic, even where on-site dining is limited or absent.

Because both uses operate at a greater intensity than many traditional food service establishments, clearly identifying them in the Zoning Code will improve regulatory clarity, reduce reliance on staff interpretation, and ensure that they are evaluated and regulated consistent with their operational characteristics and potential impacts.

7. Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

Electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure is an increasingly important component of commercial and mixed-use development. The California Building Code also requires inclusion of EV charging infrastructure in new or remodeled developments. Furthermore, State law (Assembly Bill 1236) requires that EV charging stations be permitted and subject to streamlined, ministerial review. However, EV charging stations and associated equipment are not clearly identified within the Zoning Code, which can create uncertainty for applicants.

The proposed amendment would explicitly identify EV charging stations as a permitted use and clarify that they are allowed as both primary and accessory uses, consistent with State requirements. This update improves clarity, ensures consistency with State law, and supports the continued expansion of EV infrastructure throughout the City by allowing property owners and businesses to readily understand that these facilities are permitted without requiring additional interpretation.

8. Sports Clubs

The existing Zoning Code includes “physical fitness facilities” uses, which requires a CUP, but does not clearly distinguish larger indoor sports facilities or member clubs that are increasingly common in commercial areas. These uses often include specialized courts, training facilities or fields and operating as sports clubs, which are different from traditional gyms or smaller fitness studios.

Sports clubs are indoor recreational facilities focused on organized or league-based activities, often involving larger floor areas and specialized equipment. Examples include indoor soccer facilities, basketball training centers, pickleball courts, volleyball facilities, and similar uses.

The proposed amendment would incorporate sports clubs into the existing “physical fitness facilities” within the Zoning Code clarifying the City permits these uses with a Conditional Use Permit, and would be parked at 10 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

9. Commercial Kitchens

The current Zoning Code does not clearly define or classify commercial kitchens that operate independently of traditional restaurants, for example, a catering company preparing food for off-site events or a shared kitchen used by multiple small food entrepreneurs. Unlike traditional restaurants, these uses do not include on-site dining and have different operational characteristics, such as delivery activity, scheduled food preparation, and limited customer presence. As a result, these uses may be inconsistently categorized as restaurant or unlisted uses. These uses differ from ghost kitchens in that individual direct customer take-out services are not part of the use.

The proposed amendment would establish a classification for commercial kitchens, including catering kitchens and shared kitchen facilities, to align this with the current food manufacturing land use and clearly define how these uses are regulated within the Zoning Code. Establishing a clear classification improves consistency in code administration, ensures that appropriate development and operational standards are applied, and supports the growing demand for flexible, small-scale food production spaces. It also helps distinguish these uses from traditional restaurants and more intensive food manufacturing operations.

10. Non-residential Height Limits

In most non-residential zones, building height is currently limited to two stories or 30 feet, with only a narrow exception allowing up to a five percent increase when necessary to screen existing roof-mounted equipment. Height limits are an important tool for maintaining neighborhood compatibility and consistent building scale; however, when applied too rigidly, they can also limit the ability to incorporate architectural elements, functional rooftop features and may make it more difficult for nonresidential properties to modernize, reposition, and compete for new investment and tenants.

In many cities, commercial height standards allow limited flexibility for features such as parapets, cornices, elevator overruns, stair enclosures, screening elements, roof access structures, and rooftop amenities, provided the additional height does not create a full additional story or materially alter the perceived mass and scale of the building. Flexible standards allow for creativity and functional upgrades to existing buildings.

Staff is proposing to allow a height deviation up to 12 feet or 40%, whichever is less, of the allowable height through the minor conditional use permit process. The Municipal Code already provides a similar discretionary review framework for antenna-related height exceptions. Any request for additional height would be subject to the applicable planning application procedures, review criteria, and required findings. In addition, staff is will develop specific objective standards for eligible architectural features to help ensure that any approved deviations maintain an appropriate building massing and remain consistent with surrounding development patterns.

11. Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the City’s primary tool for regulating the intensity of nonresidential development. FARs are established within the General Plan and are further discussed within the Zoning Code. The FAR establishes the amount of building floor area permitted on a site in relation to the size of the lot and is used to help ensure that development intensity remains consistent with the General Plan and the City’s broader land use objectives. Because FAR is a foundational development standard, its definition must be clear and consistently applied.

The Zoning Code provides the following limited definitions for planning consideration in application review:

Floor area ratio.

The gross floor area of a building or project divided by the project lot area upon which it is located.

Gross floor area.

The area of all floors within the walls of a structure except elevator and other vertical shafts (including stairwells) and elevator equipment areas.

Given these limited definitions, the "Gross Floor Area" definition is the primary basis for implementing Floor Area Ratio (FAR); however, the current definition can result in unintended limitations for development, particularly for building areas devoted to operations or support functions rather than occupancy or site activity, which also do not impact a use's trip generation calculations. The lack of clarity creates confusion for applicants and staff, complicates plan check and entitlement review, and may discourage tenant improvements or reinvestment in existing commercial properties.

To address this issue, staff is proposing to further expand the definitions of "Gross Floor Area" to better identify which building areas should be included in FAR calculations and which areas should be excluded. The intent of the proposed update is to ensure that FAR more accurately reflects occupiable building area and the functional intensity of a site, while excluding certain building service and utility areas that do not generate occupancy or increase operational demand or increase use trip calculations. This proposed clarification is intended to improve consistency in code administration, reduce ambiguity during project review, and better align FAR implementation with the practical way commercial and industrial buildings are designed and operated. By providing greater certainty regarding how floor area is measured, the amendment would help support tenant improvements, building modernization, and reinvestment in existing commercial properties, while maintaining the City's intent to regulate overall development intensity.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Definitions and Regulations

As part of the proposed Zoning Code updates, staff anticipates developing new or revised definitions and regulations for several of the land use classifications discussed in this report. They will be prepared to clearly describe the types of activities included within each use category and to ensure consistent interpretation and administration of the Zoning Code. Clearly defined use categories assist staff, property owners, and business operators in understanding how specific businesses are regulated within the City's zoning framework.

Staff intends to develop draft language following this study session that reflect the policy direction provided by the Planning Commission.

Parking Standards

As part of the proposed Zoning Code updates, staff is also proposing to align certain land use classifications with the City’s existing off-street parking standards contained in Table 13-89 of the Costa Mesa Municipal Code.

The proposed amendments do not introduce new parking ratios. Instead, the updated land use categories are being associated with the most appropriate existing parking standards based on the operational characteristics of each use. This approach maintains consistency with the City’s established parking framework while ensuring that newly defined or consolidated land use classifications are clearly linked to the applicable parking requirements.

For example, uses categorized as Active Entertainment or Specialized Fitness Studios would follow the existing parking requirements currently applied to similar recreation and fitness-related uses. Similarly, Artisan Studio and Retail uses would be aligned with the parking standards that apply to retail and office uses.

Aligning the updated use classifications with existing parking standards helps ensure that parking requirements remain consistent with current City regulations while providing clarity for staff, property owners, and businesses regarding the applicable parking ratios.

The table below summarizes the applicable parking standards associated with the proposed land use classifications.

Table 2: Parking Standards

USE	PARKING STANDARD
Personal Services	6 spaces per 1,000 square feet
Small Fitness Studios	10 spaces per 1,000 square feet
Active Entertainment	10 spaces per 1,000 square feet
Artisan Studio and Retail	4 spaces per 1,000 square feet
Event Centers / Assembly Uses	1 space per 3 seats or 1 space per 35 square feet of seating area

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The Planning Commission study session is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(5), as the activity involves organizational or administrative actions and informational discussion.

Environmental review will be conducted as part of the future Zoning Code Amendment when formal adoption is considered.

PUBLIC NOTICE

There is no public notice requirement for a Planning Commission study session. However, the agenda and supporting materials were made available on the City's website in advance of the meeting.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study session is to provide the Planning Commission with an overview of the proposed Zoning Code updates, describe the problems staff is attempting to resolve, and obtain preliminary feedback before returning with a formal Zoning Code Amendment for consideration. The proposed code update is intended to address these issues by modernizing land use classifications, clarifying definitions, and refining select development standards to better align with current business practices and improve code administration. Overall, the effort is intended to reduce ambiguity, improve consistency in implementation, and support business reinvestment while maintaining the City's ability to evaluate compatibility and potential impacts.