



SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

CAPITOLA PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, November 3, 2016 – 6:00 PM

Chairperson T.J. Welch
Commissioners Ed Newman
 Gayle Ortiz
 Linda Smith
 Susan Westman

1. ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

A. Additions and Deletions to Agenda

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Planning Commission - Special Meeting - Oct 6, 2016 6:00 PM

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings are intended to provide an opportunity for public discussion of each item listed as a Public Hearing. The following procedure is as follows: 1) Staff Presentation; 2) Public Discussion; 3) Planning Commission Comments; 4) Close public portion of the Hearing; 5) Planning Commission Discussion; and 6) Decision.

A. Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance Update

Amendment to the City of Capitola Municipal Code Chapter 17.98 Wireless Communication Facilities updating the regulations, development standards, and permit procedures in compliance with state and federal law.

Chapter 17.98 is not part of the Implementation Plan of the City's Local Coastal Program and therefore does not have to be certified by the Coastal Commission.

Environmental Determination: Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR

Property: The update to Municipal Code Chapter 17.98 affects all properties within the City of Capitola.

Representative: City of Capitola

5. ADJOURNMENT

APPEALS: The following decisions of the Planning Commission can be appealed to the City Council within the (10) calendar days following the date of the Commission action: Conditional Use Permit, Variance, and Coastal Permit. The decision of the Planning Commission pertaining to an Architectural and Site Review can be appealed to the City Council within the (10) working days following the date of the Commission action. If the tenth day falls on a weekend or holiday, the appeal period is extended to the next business day.

All appeals must be in writing, setting forth the nature of the action and the basis upon which the action is considered to be in error, and addressed to the City Council in care of the City Clerk. An appeal must be accompanied by a one hundred forty two dollar (\$142.00) filing fee, unless the item involves a Coastal Permit that is appealable to the Coastal Commission, in which case there is no fee. If you challenge a decision of the Planning Commission in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the City at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Notice regarding Planning Commission meetings: The Planning Commission meets regularly on the 1st Thursday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers located at 420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola.

Agenda and Agenda Packet Materials: The Planning Commission Agenda and complete Agenda Packet are available on the Internet at the City's website: www.cityofcapitola.org. Agendas are also available at the Capitola Branch Library, 2005 Wharf Road, Capitola, on the Monday prior to the Thursday meeting. Need more information? Contact the Community Development Department at (831) 475-7300.

Agenda Materials Distributed after Distribution of the Agenda Packet: Materials that are a public record under Government Code § 54957.5(A) and that relate to an agenda item of a regular meeting of the Planning Commission that are distributed to a majority of all the members of the Planning Commission more than 72 hours prior to that meeting shall be available for public inspection at City Hall located at 420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola, during normal business hours.

Americans with Disabilities Act: Disability-related aids or services are available to enable persons with a disability to participate in this meeting consistent with the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Assisted listening devices are available for individuals with hearing impairments at the meeting in the City Council Chambers. Should you require special accommodations to participate in the meeting due to a disability, please contact the Community Development Department at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting at (831) 475-7300. In an effort to accommodate individuals with environmental sensitivities, attendees are requested to refrain from wearing perfumes and other scented products.

Televised Meetings: Planning Commission meetings are cablecast "Live" on Charter Communications Cable TV Channel 8 and are recorded to be replayed on the following Monday and Friday at 1:00 p.m. on Charter Channel 71 and Comcast Channel 25. Meetings can also be viewed from the City's website: www.cityofcapitola.org.



**DRAFT MINUTES
CAPITOLA PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2016
6 P.M. – CAPITOLA CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

1. ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Linda Smith: Present, Commissioner Gayle Ortiz: Present, Commissioner Edward Newman: Present, Chairperson TJ Welch: Present, Commissioner Susan Westman: Present.

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

A. Additions and Deletions to Agenda

Staff announced the decision to continue the discussion of the wireless facilities portion of the zoning code to the next month's meeting. This change is due to a request from Verizon, which will also grant the City an extension on the legal settlement timeline requiring passage of an update.

B. Staff Comments

Community Development Director Rich Grunow reported in response to commissioners' questions that the city attorney had no concerns with adding parcels to the vacation rental overlay since the ordinance itself has been in place for decades.

Another question regarded requiring a business license for homes rented for 30 days or more. The attorney said that while the City can require one, our policy has not been to require these, in part because it is difficult to enforce and determine what homes are being rented and for what purpose. Commissioners asked how this is different from apartment complexes, but those are easily identified as ongoing businesses. Commissioners also asked about requiring a second business license for transient properties that advertise both separately and through a property manager. It is hard to determine who has posted the listing.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Planning Commission Minutes for the Special Meeting of Sept. 1, 2016

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Linda Smith, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Gayle Ortiz, Commissioner
AYES:	Smith, Ortiz, Newman, Welch, Westman

B. Planning Commission Minutes for the Special Meeting of Sept. 19, 2016

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Linda Smith, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Gayle Ortiz, Commissioner
AYES:	Smith, Ortiz, Newman, Welch, Westman

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Zoning Code Update All Properties within Capitola

Continuation of Comprehensive Update to the City of Capitola Zoning Code (Municipal Code Chapter 17).

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Oct 6, 2016 6:00 PM (Approval of Minutes)

The Zoning Code serves as the Implementation Plan of the City's Local Coastal Program and therefore must be certified by the Coastal Commission.

Environmental Determination: Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR

Property: The Zoning Code update affects all properties within the City of Capitola.

Representative: Katie Cattan, Senior Planner, City of Capitola

Molly Ording, resident, spoke to a letter she sent requesting a slower review process of the update in a format that is easily understood by the general public. She also addressed vacation rental concerns, noting her family rents its Depot Hill home for two to three months in the summer and she would not object to being required to have a business license. Commissioner Smith asked if she would feel the same if using a property management company, and in that instance Ms. Ording feels the company should hold the license.

An attorney for Verizon addressed the wireless components. He said the company is generally pleased with the proposed changes and has provided comments related to state and federal law. He also asked staff and the commission to consider how to permit temporary facilities brought in following an emergency, often called "Cell on Wheels."

The commission supported continuing this discussion until November.

Director Grunow updated the commission on recent City Council review of the code update, which is moving well following a special meeting October 1. Staff does not expect adoption this year. The best option would be to get final recommendation and direction from the current commission and council, with a polished draft release and final vote in early 2017.

Commissioner Westman asked that when the public sees the draft, there is a way to highlight changes. She confirmed with Director Grunow that only items that the commission has not considered are required to come back to it for review after council action.

Commissioner Ortiz noted that extending the public discussion into 2017 may overlap with public meetings regarding the new library.

Chairperson Welch prefers getting a full draft to review at this point rather than having a lot of separate discussion come back to new commissioners and council members that have not been part of the process.

Commissioner Westman also wants maps included when referenced. Senior Planner Katie Cattan explained that most areas are covered by the local coastal program and the Coastal Commission has exerted its control over those maps. There are no digital copies available, only those created in the 1970s, and reproduction is difficult.

Commissioner Newman expressed concern about losing a lot of ground by holding several additional public hearings.

RESULT:	CONTINUED [UNANIMOUS]	Next: 11/3/2016 6:00 PM
MOVER:	Susan Westman, Commissioner	
SECONDER:	Linda Smith, Commissioner	
AYES:	Smith, Ortiz, Newman, Welch, Westman	

5. ADJOURNMENT

Approved by the Planning Commission at the special meeting of November 3, 2016.

Linda Fridy, Minutes Clerk

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Oct 6, 2016 6:00 PM (Approval of Minutes)



STAFF REPORT

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
 FROM: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
 DATE: NOVEMBER 3, 2016
 SUBJECT: **Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance Update**

Amendment to the City of Capitola Municipal Code Chapter 17.98 Wireless Communication Facilities updating the regulations, development standards, and permit procedures in compliance with state and federal law.

Chapter 17.98 is not part of the Implementation Plan of the City's Local Coastal Program and therefore does not have to be certified by the Coastal Commission.

Environmental Determination: Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR

Property: The update to Municipal Code Chapter 17.98 affects all properties within the City of Capitola.

Representative: City of Capitola

BACKGROUND: The City of Capitola initiated an effort in 2014 to comprehensively update its 1975 Zoning Code. The Zoning Code update process is ongoing and public hearings to review the draft code will resume in January, 2017. The City's Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance resides in chapter 17.98 of the Zoning Code. In 2016, Verizon Wireless filed a lawsuit in federal court which challenged the City Council's decision to deny a wireless facility application and alleged that the City's ordinance was inconsistent with federal law. Verizon and the City subsequently reached a settlement agreement which, in part, requires the City to adopt an updated wireless ordinance no later than February 28, 2017. Consequently, the proposed updated Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance is scheduled to be adopted prior to the Zoning Code update.

DISCUSSION: The proposed Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance would bring the City's wireless regulations into compliance with state and federal law while preserving the City's ability to regulate siting and design of wireless facilities. The proposed ordinance would also streamline the permitting process for wireless facilities which are sensitively located, comply with prescribed development standards, and provide a stealth design. Key changes included in the draft ordinance include the following:

Compliance with State and Federal Law

The proposed ordinance includes revised definitions which mirror those found in federal law and Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations to ensure consistent application. The proposed ordinance would also eliminate coastal and residential setback regulations which were alleged to effectively prohibit wireless facilities in most of Capitola in the aforementioned lawsuit. In addition, the proposed ordinance would increase the standard length of permit approvals from five to ten years and provides a permitting process for "section 6409" existing facility permits

pursuant to federal law.

Concealment (stealth design) Requirement

Under the proposed ordinance, all wireless facilities would be required to incorporate concealment features unless the Planning Commission makes a finding of infeasibility (for example, it would likely be infeasible to fully conceal an 80-foot tall tower).

Preferred Sites and Locations

The draft ordinance establishes preferred sites and locations for wireless telecommunications facilities. As drafted, facilities located in non-residential zones and within public rights-of-way are preferred. The Planning Commission may consider modifying the preferred sites and locations which are sequentially ranked in the table below:

Preferred Sites	Preferred Locations: Non-Residential Zones	Preferred Locations Residential Zones
Sites on a City owned parcel	Parcels in Industrial (I) Zone	Parcels with approved non-residential uses and do not contain residential uses
Collocations within ROW	Parcels in Commercial (C-R and C-C) Zones	Parcels with approved non-residential uses and also contain residential uses
Collocations outside ROW	Parcels in all other non-residential zones (P/OS, PF, etc.)	All other parcels
New Base Stations in ROW	N/A	
New Base Stations outside ROW		
New Towers in ROW		
New Towers outside ROW		

Four Tier Permit Review Process

The proposed ordinance establishes a four tier permit review process which provides a streamlined process for fully concealed facilities which meet development standards and are located in preferred locations. Facilities which do not meet specified standards would require a Conditional Use Permit and a Planning Commission hearing. The proposed permit tiers are shown in the table below:

	Types of Facilities	Zoning	Permit
Tier 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modifications to an existing facility 	All	6409(a) Permit

Tier 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building- and facade-mounted facilities which are concealed and comply with height and noise regulations • Pole-mounted facilities in ROW which are concealed and do not extend more than 2-ft horizontally and 5-ft vertically from pole. • A collocation or modification that does not qualify for a 6409 permit. 	CC, CR, I	Admin Permit
Tier 3	• Building- and facade-mounted facilities that are not Tier 2 facilities.	CC, CR, I	Minor Use Permit
	• Building- and facade-mounted facilities	MU-V, MU-N, VA, P/OS, CF	
Tier 4	• Pole-mounted facilities in ROW that are not Tier 2 facilities	All	CUP
	• New towers in any zoning district	All	
	• Any facility in the R-1, RM, or MH zoning district	R-1, RM, MH	
	• Any facility that is not a Tier 1, 2, or 3 facility	All	

Standard Public Notice Procedures

The draft ordinance applies standard public notice procedures for wireless facilities based on noticing requirements of the associated permit. For example, wireless facilities which require a conditional use permit would include public notices to be mailed to property owners within 300-feet of the project site, as opposed to the current expanded noticing requirement which includes all property owners within 600-feet.

Height Exception Process

The current wireless ordinance does not include a provision for the City to grant additional height for a wireless facility. Although the City has granted variances for additional height in the past, variance findings can be very difficult to support unless the project site is unusual in terms of its size, shape, topography, or other physical characteristics. Accordingly, the proposed ordinance establishes an exception process to allow additional height if necessary to meet demonstrated coverage objectives.

CEQA

An Addendum to the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the comprehensive Zoning Code update which includes the proposed updated Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR and adopt the updated Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft Capitola Wireless Ordinance
2. Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR

Prepared By: Katie Cattan
Senior Planner

Chapter 17.104 – WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

Sections:

- 17.104.010 Purpose and Intent
- 17.104.020 Definitions
- 17.104.030 Applicability and Exemptions
- 17.104.040 Permit Requirements
- 17.104.050 Standard Conditions of Approval
- 17.104.060 Preferred Siting and Location
- 17.104.070 Development Standards
- 17.104.080 Operation and Maintenance Requirements
- 17.104.090 Temporary Wireless Communications Facilities
- 17.140.100 Limited Exemption from Standards
- 17.104.110 Severability

17.104.010 Purpose and Intent

- A. Purpose.** This chapter establishes requirements for the development, siting, collocation, installation, modification, relocation, development, and operation of wireless communications facilities consistent with applicable state and federal laws. These requirements aim to protect public health, safety, and welfare while balancing the benefits of robust wireless services with the unique community character, aesthetics, and local values of Capitola.
- B. Intent.** This chapter does not intend to, and shall not be interpreted or applied to:
1. Prohibit or effectively prohibit personal wireless services;
 2. Unreasonably discriminate among wireless communications providers of functionally equivalent personal wireless services;
 3. Regulate the installation, operation, collocation, modification, or removal of wireless facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency (RF) emissions to the extent that such emissions comply with all applicable Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations;
 4. Prohibit or effectively prohibit any collocation or modification that the City may not deny under state or federal law; or
 5. Preempt any applicable state or federal law.

17.104.020 Definitions

- A. Terms Defined.** Terms used in this chapter are defined as follows:
1. “Amateur radio facilities” are antennas and related equipment for the purpose of self-training, intercommunication, or technical investigations carried out by an

amateur radio operator who operates without commercial interest, and who holds a written authorization from the Federal Communications Commission to operate an amateur radio facility.

2. “Antenna” means a device or system of wires, poles, rods, dishes, discs, or similar devices used to transmit and/or receive radio or electromagnetic waves.
3. “Applicable FCC decisions” means the same as defined by California Government Code Section 65964.1(d)(1), as may be amended, which defines that term as “In re Petition for Declaratory Ruling, 24 FCC Rcd. 13994 (2009) and In the Matter of Acceleration of Broadband Deployment by Improving Wireless Facilities Siting Policies, Report and Order, 29 FCC Rcd. 12865 (2014).”
4. “Array” means one or more antennas mounted at approximately the same level above ground on tower or base station.
5. “Base station” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(1), as may be amended, which defines that term as follows:
 - a. A structure or equipment at a fixed location that enables FCC-licensed or authorized wireless communications between user equipment and a communications network. The term does not encompass a tower as defined in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(9) or any equipment associated with a tower.
 - b. “Base station” includes, but is not limited to, equipment associated with wireless communications services such as private, broadcast, and public safety services, as well as unlicensed wireless services and fixed wireless services such as microwave backhaul.
 - c. “Base station” includes, but is not limited to, radio transceivers, antennas, coaxial or fiber-optic cable, regular and backup power supplies, and comparable equipment, regardless of technological configuration (including Distributed Antenna Systems and small-cell networks).
 - d. “Base station” includes any structure other than a tower that, at the time the relevant application is filed with the State or local government under 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001, supports or houses equipment described in paragraphs (b)(1)(i) through (ii) of 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001 that has been reviewed and approved under the applicable zoning or siting process, or under another state or local regulatory review process, even if the structure was not built for the sole or primary purpose of providing such support.
 - e. “Base station” excludes any structure that, at the time the relevant application is filed with the State or local government under 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001, does not support or house equipment described in paragraphs (b)(1)(i)-(ii) of 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001.
6. “Collocation” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(2), as may be amended, which defines that term as “[t]he mounting or

installation of transmission equipment on an eligible support structure for the purpose of transmitting and/or receiving radio frequency signals for communications purposes.” As an illustration and not a limitation, the FCC’s definition effectively means “to add” new equipment to an existing facility and does not necessarily refer to more than one wireless facility installed at a single site.

7. “Eligible facilities request” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(3), as may be amended, which defines that term as “[a]ny request for modification of an existing tower or base station that does not substantially change the physical dimensions of such tower or base station, involving: (i) Collocation of new transmission equipment; (ii) Removal of transmission equipment; or (iii) Replacement of transmission equipment.”
8. “Eligible support structure” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(4), as may be amended, which defines that term as “[a]ny tower or base station as defined in [47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001], provided that it is existing at the time the relevant application is filed with the State or local government under [47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001].”
9. “Existing” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(5), as may be amended, which provides that “[a] constructed tower or base station is existing for purposes of the [FCC rules implementing Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act] if it has been reviewed and approved under the applicable zoning or siting process, or under another State or local regulatory review process, provided that a tower that has not been reviewed and approved because it was not in a zoned area when it was built, but was lawfully constructed, is existing for purposes of this definition.”
10. “FCC” means the Federal Communications Commission or its successor agency.
11. “Personal wireless services” has the same meaning as provided in 47 U.S.C. Section 332(c)(7)(C)(i), as may be amended, which defines the term as “commercial mobile services, unlicensed wireless services, and common carrier wireless exchange access services.”
12. “Section 6409(a)” means Section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-96, 126 Stat. 156, codified as 47 U.S.C. Section 1455(a), as may be amended.
13. “Service provider” means a wireless communications provider, company or organization, or the agent of a company or organization that provides wireless communications services.
14. “Significant gap” is a gap in the service provider’s own wireless telecommunications facilities, as defined in federal case law interpretations of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

15. “Site” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(6), as may be amended, which provides that “[f]or towers other than towers in the public rights-of-way, the current boundaries of the leased or owned property surrounding the tower and any access or utility easements currently related to the site, and, for other eligible support structures, further restricted to that area in proximity to the structure and to other transmission equipment already deployed on the ground.”
16. “Stealth facility” is any facility designed to blend into the surrounding environment, and is visually unobtrusive. Examples of stealth facilities may include architecturally screened roof-mounted antennas, facade mounted antennas painted and treated as architectural elements to blend with the existing building, or elements designed to appear as vegetation or trees. Also referred to as concealed communications facilities.
17. “Substantial change” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(7), as may be amended, which defines that term differently based on the particular facility type and location. For clarity, the definition in this chapter organizes the FCC’s criteria and thresholds for a substantial change according to the facility type and location.
 - a. For towers outside the public right-of-way, a substantial change occurs when:
 - (1) The proposed collocation or modification increases the overall height more than 10 percent or the height of one additional antenna array not to exceed 20 feet (whichever is greater); or
 - (2) The proposed collocation or modification involves adding an appurtenance to the body of the tower that would protrude from the edge of the tower more than 20 feet, or more than the width of the tower structure at the level of the appurtenance (whichever is greater); or
 - (3) The proposed collocation or modification involves the installation of more than the standard number of equipment cabinets for the technology involved, not to exceed four cabinets; or
 - (4) The proposed collocation or modification involves excavation outside the current boundaries of the leased or owned property surrounding the wireless tower, including any access or utility easements currently related to the site.
 - b. For towers in the public right-of-way and for all base stations, a substantial change occurs when:
 - (1) The proposed collocation or modification increases the overall height more than 10 percent or 10 feet (whichever is greater); or
 - (2) The proposed collocation or modification involves adding an appurtenance to the body of the structure that would protrude from the edge of the structure by more than 6 feet; or

- (3) the proposed collocation or modification involves the installation of more than the standard number of equipment cabinets for the technology involved, not to exceed four 4cabinets; or
 - (4) The proposed collocation or modification involves the installation of any new equipment cabinets on the ground when there are no pre-existing ground cabinets associated with the structure; or
 - (5) The proposed collocation or modification involves the installation of any ground cabinets that are more than ten percent larger in height or overall volume than any other ground cabinets associated with the structure; or
 - (6) The proposed collocation or modification involves excavation outside the area in proximity to the structure and other transmission equipment already deployed on the ground.
- c. In addition, for all towers and base stations wherever located, a substantial change occurs when:
- (1) The proposed collocation or modification would defeat the existing concealment elements of the support structure as determined by the Community Development Director; or
 - (2) The proposed collocation or modification violates a prior condition of approval, provided however that the collocation need not comply with any prior condition of approval related to height, width, equipment cabinets, or excavation that is inconsistent with the thresholds for a substantial change described in this section.
- d. Interpretation of Thresholds.
- (1) The thresholds for a substantial change described above are disjunctive. The failure to meet any one or more of the applicable thresholds means that a substantial change would occur.
 - (2) The thresholds for height increases are cumulative limits. For sites with horizontally separated deployments, the cumulative limit is measured from the originally-permitted support structure without regard to any increases in size due to wireless equipment not included in the original design. For sites with vertically separated deployments, the cumulative limit is measured from the permitted site dimensions as they existed on February 22, 2012—the date that Congress passed Section 6409(a).
18. “Temporary wireless communications facility” means a wireless communications facility located on a parcel of land and consisting of a vehicle-mounted facility, a building mounted antenna, or a similar facility, and associated equipment, that is used to provide temporary coverage for a large-scale event or an emergency, or to provide temporary replacement coverage due to the removal of an existing permitted,

permanent wireless communications facility necessitated by the demolition or major alteration of a nearby property.

19. “Tower” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 1.40001(b)(9), as may be amended, which defines that term as “[a]ny structure built for the sole or primary purpose of supporting any [FCC]-licensed or authorized antennas and their associated facilities, including structures that are constructed for wireless communications services including, but not limited to, private, broadcast, and public safety services, as well as unlicensed wireless services and fixed wireless services such as microwave backhaul, and the associated site.” Examples include, but are not limited to, monopoles, mono-trees, and lattice towers.
 20. “Transmission equipment” means the same as defined by the FCC in 47 C.F.R. Section 140001(b)(8), as may be amended, which defines that term as “[e]quipment that facilitates transmission for any [FCC]-licensed or authorized wireless communication service, including, but not limited to, radio transceivers, antennas, coaxial or fiber-optic cable, and regular and backup power supply. The term includes equipment associated with wireless communications services including, but not limited to, private, broadcast, and public safety services, as well as unlicensed wireless services and fixed wireless services such as microwave backhaul.”
 21. “Wireless” means any FCC-licensed or authorized wireless communications service transmitted over frequencies in the electromagnetic spectrum.
 22. “Wireless communications facility” is a facility that sends and/or receives radio frequency signals, AM/FM, microwave, and/or electromagnetic waves for the purpose of providing voice, data, images or other information, including, but not limited to, cellular and/or digital telephone service, personal communications services, and paging services. Wireless communications facilities include antennas and all other types of equipment for the transmission or receipt of such signals; towers or similar structures built to support such equipment; equipment cabinets, base stations, and other accessory development; and screening and concealment elements. (Also referred to as “facility”).
 23. “Wireless communications provider” is any company or organization that provides or who represents a company or organization that provides wireless communications services. (Also referred to as “service provider”).
 24. “Zoning Code” means the City of Capitola Zoning Code.
- B. Terms Not Defined.** Terms not defined in this section shall be interpreted to give this chapter its most reasonable meaning and application, consistent with applicable state and federal law.

17.104.030 Applicability and Exemptions

- A. Applicability.** This chapter applies to all new facilities and all modifications to existing facilities proposed after the effective date of this chapter unless exempted by Subsection B (Exemptions) below.
- B. Exemptions.** This chapter does not apply to:
 1. Amateur radio facilities;
 2. Direct-to-home satellite dishes, TV antennas, wireless cable antennas, and other OTARD antennas covered by the Over-the-Air Reception Devices rule in 47 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) Section 1.4000 et seq.;
 3. Non-commercial wireless communications facilities owned and operated by a public agency, including but not limited to the City of Capitola; and
 4. All antennas and wireless facilities identified by the FCC or the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) as exempt from local regulations.

17.104.040 Permit Requirements

- A. Required Permits.** Wireless communications facilities are grouped into four tiers, each with its own permit requirement as shown in Table 17.104-1.

TABLE 17.104-1: WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY TIERS AND REQUIRED PERMITS

	Types of Facilities	Permit Required
Tier 1	Modifications to an existing facility that qualify as an “eligible facility request” as defined in Section 17.104.020.A.7	Section 6409(a) Permit
Tier 2	<p>Building- and facade-mounted facilities in the C-C, C-R, or I zoning district when the proposed facility (1) is a stealth facility, (2) does not generate noise in excess of the City’s noise regulations and (3) does not exceed the applicable height limit in the applicable zoning district.</p> <p>Pole-mounted facilities in the public right-of-way consistent with Section 17.104.070.D when the facility is either (1) incorporated into a steel pole with all antennas, equipment, and cabling entirely concealed from view, or (2) mounted to a wood pole with all equipment other than antennas located substantially underground and pole-mounted equipment, where necessary, extends no more than 2 feet horizontally and 5 feet vertically from the pole.</p> <p>A collocation that is not a Tier 1 Facility.</p> <p>A modification to an eligible support structure that is not a Tier 1 Facility.</p>	Administrative Permit
Tier 3	Building- and facade-mounted facilities in the C-C, C-R, or I zoning district that are not Tier 2 facilities.	Minor Use Permit

	Building- and facade-mounted facilities in the MU-V, MU-N, VA, P/OS, or CF zoning district. Pole-mounted facilities in the public right-of-way consistent with Section 17.104.070.D that are not Tier 2 facilities.	
Tier 4	New towers in any zoning district Any facility in the R-1, RM, or MH zoning district Any facility that is not a Tier 1, 2, or 3 facility	Conditional Use Permit

B. Conflicting Provisions. Administrative Permits, Minor Use Permits, and Conditional Use Permits required for a wireless communications facility shall be processed in compliance with Chapter 17.116 (Administrative Permits) and Chapter 17.124 (Use Permits), respectively, and in compliance with this chapter. In the event of any conflict between this chapter and Chapter 17.116 (Administrative Permits) or Chapter 17.124 (Use Permits), this chapter shall govern and control.

C. Application. All permits granted under this chapter shall require an application. An application for a wireless communications facility shall be filed and reviewed in compliance with Chapter 17.112 (Permit Application and Review), as may be amended from time-to-time, unless otherwise specified in this chapter. All applications shall include the following:

1. A fully completed and executed application using an official City application form.
2. The application must state what approval is being sought (i.e., Conditional Use Permit, Minor Use Permit, Administrative Permit, or Section 6409(a) Permit). If the applicant believes the application is for a Section 6409(a) Permit, the applicant must provide a detailed explanation as to why the applicant believes that the application qualifies as an eligible facilities request subject to a Section 6409(a) Permit;
3. A completed and signed application checklist available from the City, including all the information, materials, and fees specified in the City’s application checklist for proposed wireless communications facilities;
4. If the proposed facility is to be located on a City-owned building or structure, the application must be signed by an authorized representative of the City;
5. For Section 6409(a) Permits and Administrative Permits involving a collocation or modification to an eligible support structure, the application must be accompanied by all prior approvals for the existing facility (including but not limited to all conditions associated with the siting approval of the construction or modification of the eligible support structure or base station equipment), as well as all permit applications with required application materials for each separate permit required by the City for the proposed facility, including but not limited to a building permit and an encroachment permit (if applicable); and

- 6. All other materials and information required by the Community Development Director as publicly stated in the application checklist(s).

D. Public Notice and Hearing.

- 1. **When Required.** Public notice and hearing for wireless communications facilities shall be given as shown in Table 17.104-2.

TABLE 17.104-2: FACILITY HEARING AND NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

	Hearing Required	Notice Requirements
Tier 1	No	See Section 17.148.040 (Notice for Administrative Permits and Section 6409(a) Permits)
Tier 2	No	
Tier 3	If requested by the public after receiving notice of pending decision	See Section 17.148.030 (Notice for Minor Use and Administrative Design Permits)
Tier 4	Yes	See Section 17.148.020 (Notice of Hearing)

- 2. **Notice Contents for Tier 1 Facilities.** In addition to notice required by Section 17.148.040, before the Community Development Director may approve a Tier 1 Facility application, the applicant shall provide notice of the application in accordance with this section and as follows:
 - a. Notice shall be posted on the project site.
 - b. The notice shall include the following information:
 - (1) A general explanation of the proposed modification or collocation;
 - (2) The following statement: “Federal law may require approval of this application. Further, Federal Communications Commission Regulations may deem this application granted by the operation of law unless the City timely approves or denies the application, or the City and applicant reach a mutual tolling agreement.”; and
 - (3) A general description, in text or by diagram, of the location of the real property that is the subject of the application.

- E. Applicant Notifications for Deemed Granted Remedies.** Under state and/or federal law, the City’s failure to act on a wireless communications facility permit application within a reasonable period of time in accordance with the time periods and procedures established by applicable FCC decision, accounting for tolling, may result in the permit being deemed granted by operation of law. To the extent federal or state law provides a “deemed granted” remedy for wireless communications facility applications not timely

acted upon by the City, no such application shall be deemed granted unless and until the applicant satisfies the following requirements:

1. For all Tier 2, Tier 3 and Tier 4 Facility applications:
 - a. Completes all public noticing required pursuant to Section 17.148.040 (Notice for Administrative Permits and Section 6409(a) Permits) to the Community Development Director's satisfaction.
 - b. No more than 30 days before the date by which the City must take final action on the application (as determined in accordance with the time periods and procedures established by applicable FCC decisions and accounting for tolling), the applicant must provide the following written notice to all recipients identified in Section 17.148.020.B.2 (Mailing) and to the City:
 - (1) The notice shall be delivered to the City in person or by certified United States mail.
 - (2) The notice must state that the applicant has submitted an application to the City, describe the location and general characteristics of the proposed facility, and include the following statement: "Pursuant to California Government Code Section 65964.1, state law may deem the application approved in 30 days unless the City approves or denies the application, or the City and applicant reach a mutual tolling agreement."
2. For all facility applications:
 - a. Submits a complete application package consistent with the application procedures specified in this chapter and applicable federal and state laws and regulations.
 - b. Following the date by which the City must take final action on the application (as determined in accordance with the time periods and procedures established by applicable FCC decisions and accounting for tolling), the applicant must provide notice to the City that the application is deemed granted by operation of law.

F. Basis for Approval – Tier 1 Facilities.

1. This subsection shall be interpreted and applied so as to be consistent with the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Section 6409(a), and the applicable FCC and court decisions and determinations relating to the same. In the event that a court of competent jurisdiction invalidates all or any portion of Section 6409(a) or a FCC rule or regulation that interprets Section 6409(a), such that federal law would not mandate approval for any eligible facilities request, then all proposed modifications to existing facilities subject to this section must be approved by an Administrative Permit, Minor Use Permit, or Conditional Use Permit, as applicable, and subject to the discretion of the Community Development Director.

2. The Community Development Director shall approve a Section 6409(a) Permit for a Tier 1 facility upon finding that the proposed facility qualifies as an eligible facilities request and does not cause a substantial change as defined in Section 17.104.020 (Definitions).
3. In addition to any other alternative recourse permitted under federal law, the Community Development Director may deny a Section 6409(a) Permit upon finding that the proposed facility:
 - a. Defeats the effect of existing concealment elements of the support structure;
 - b. Violates any legally enforceable standard or permit condition related to compliance with generally applicable building, structural, electrical and/or safety codes;
 - c. Violates any legally enforceable standard or permit condition reasonably related to public health and/or safety; or
 - d. Otherwise does not qualify for mandatory approval under Section 6409(a) for any lawful reason.

G. Basis for Approval – Tier 2 Facilities. To approve an Administrative Permit for a Tier 2 facility, the Community Development Director must find that the proposed facility complies with the requirements of this chapter and all other applicable requirements of the Zoning Code.

H. Basis for Approval – Tier 3 and 4 Facilities. To approve a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit for a proposed Tier 3 or Tier 4 facility, the review authority must find that:

1. The facility is consistent with the requirements of this chapter; and
2. All the findings required for the Conditional Use or Minor Use Permit as specified in Chapter 17.124 (Use Permits) can be made for the proposed facility.

I. Appeals.

1. **Tier 1 Facilities:** Community Development Director decisions on a Section 6409(a) Permit are final and may not be appealed.
2. **Tier 2 and 3 Facilities.** Community Development Director decisions on an Administrative Permit for a Tier 2 Facility and a Minor Use Permit for a Tier 3 Facility may be appealed to the Planning Commission in accordance with Chapter 18.112 (Appeals). Planning Commission decisions of an appeal may be appealed to the City Council.
3. **Tier 4 Facilities.** Planning Commission decisions on a Conditional Use Permit for a Tier 4 facility may be appealed to the City Council in accordance with Section 18.112 (Appeals).

J. Permit Revocation.

1. **Basis for Revocation.** The City may revoke a permit for a wireless communications facility for noncompliance with any enforceable permit, permit condition, or law applicable to the facility.
2. **Revocation Procedures.**
 - a. When the Community Development Director finds reason to believe that grounds for permit revocation exist, the Director shall send written notice to the permit holder that states the nature of the violation or non-compliance and a means to correct the violation or non-compliance. The permit holder shall have a reasonable time from the date of the notice (not to exceed 60 calendar days from the date of the notice or a lesser period if warranted by a public emergency) to correct the violation or cure the noncompliance, or show that the violation has not occurred or the facility is in full compliance.
 - b. If after receipt of the notice and opportunity to cure described in Section 17.104.040(K)(2)(a) above, the permit holder does not correct the violation or cure the noncompliance (or demonstrate full compliance), the Community Development Director may schedule a public hearing before the Planning Commission at which the Planning Commission may modify or revoke the permit.
 - c. For permits issued by the Community Development Director, the Community Development Director may revoke the permit without such public hearing. The Community Development Director decision to revoke may be appealed to the Planning Commission.
 - d. The Planning Commission may revoke the permit upon making one or more of the following findings:
 - (1) The permit holder has not complied with any enforceable permit, permit condition, or law applicable to the facility.
 - (2) The wireless communications provider has failed to comply with the conditions of approval imposed.
 - (3) The permit holder and/or wireless communications provider has failed to submit evidence that the wireless communications facility complies with the current FCC radio frequency standards.
 - (4) The wireless communications facility fails to comply with the requirements of this chapter.
 - e. The Planning Commission's decision may be appealed to the City Council in accordance with Chapter 18.112 (Appeals).
 - f. Upon revocation, the City may take any legally permissible action or combination of actions necessary to protect public health, safety and welfare.

K. Cessation of Operations

1. **Notice to City.** Wireless communications providers shall provide the City with a notice of intent to vacate a site a minimum of 30 days prior to the vacation.
2. **New Permit Required.** A new permit shall be required if a site is to be used again for the same purpose as permitted under the original permit if a consecutive period of six months have lapsed since cessation of operations.
3. **Removal of Equipment.** The service provider or property owner shall remove all obsolete and/or unused facilities and associated equipment from the site within 180 days of the earlier of:
 - a. Termination of the lease with the property owner; or
 - b. Cessation of operations.

L. Abandonment

1. To promote the public health, safety and welfare, the Community Development Director may declare a facility abandoned or discontinued when:
 - a. The permit holder or service provider abandoned or discontinued the use of a facility for a continuous period of 90 days; or
 - b. The permit holder or service provider fails to respond within 30 days to a written notice from the Community Development Director that states the basis for the Community Development Director's belief that the facility has been abandoned or discontinued for a continuous period of 90 days; or
 - c. The permit expires and the permit holder or service provider has failed to file a timely application for renewal.
2. After the Community Development Director declares a facility abandoned or discontinued, the permit holder or service provider shall have 60 days from the date of the declaration (or longer time as the Community Development Director may approve in writing as reasonably necessary) to:
 - a. Reactivate the use of the abandoned or discontinued facility subject to the provisions of this chapter and all conditions of approval; or
 - b. Remove the facility and all improvements installed in connection with the facility (unless directed otherwise by the Community Development Director), and restore the site to its original pre-construction condition in compliance with all applicable codes and consistent with the previously-existing surrounding area.
3. If the permit holder and/or service provider fail to act as required in Section 17.104.040(L)(2) within the prescribed time period, the following shall apply:
 - a. City may but is not obligated to remove the abandoned facility, restore the site to its original pre-construction condition, and repair any and all damages that occurred in connection with such removal and restoration work.

- b. The City may but is not obligated to store the removed facility or any part thereof, and may use, sell or otherwise dispose of it in any manner the City deems appropriate.
 - c. The last-known permit holder (or its successor-in-interest), the service provider (or its successor-in-interest), and, if on private property, the real property owner shall be jointly liable for all costs and expenses incurred by the City in connection with its removal, restoration, repair and storage, and shall promptly reimburse the City upon receipt of a written demand, including, without limitation, any interest on the balance owing at the maximum lawful rate.
 - d. The City may but is not obligated to use any financial security required in connection with the granting of the facility permit to recover its costs and interest.
 - e. Until the costs are paid in full, a lien shall be placed on the facility, all related personal property in connection with the facility and, if applicable, the real private property on which the facility was located for the full amount of all costs for removal, restoration, repair and storage (plus applicable interest). The City Clerk shall cause the lien to be recorded with the County of Santa Cruz Recorder's Office. Within 60 days after the lien amount is fully satisfied including costs and interest, the City Clerk shall cause the lien to be released with the County of Santa Cruz Recorder's Office.
4. If a permit holder, service provider, and/or private property owner fails to comply with any provisions of this Section 17.104.040(L) (Abandonment), the City may elect to treat the facility as a nuisance to be abated as provided in Municipal Code Title 4 (General Municipal Code Enforcement).

M. Relocation for Facilities in the Right-of-Way.

- 1. The Public Works Director may require a permit holder to relocate and/or remove a facility in the public right-of-way as the City deems necessary to:
 - a. Change, maintain, repair, protect, operate, improve, use, and/or reconfigure the right-of-way for other public projects; or
 - b. Take any actions necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare.
- 2. The Public Works Director shall provide the permit holder with adequate written notice identifying a specified date by which the facility must be relocated and/or removed.
- 3. The relocation and/or removal of the facility shall be at the permit holder's sole cost and expense and in accordance with the standards in this chapter applicable to the facility.

N. Transfer of Ownership.

- 1. **Notice.** Any wireless communications provider that is buying, leasing, or is considering a transfer of ownership of a previously approved facility shall submit a

letter of notification of intent to the Community Development Director a minimum of 30 days prior to the transfer.

2. **Responsibilities.** In the event that the original permit holder sells its interest in a wireless communications facility, the succeeding carrier shall assume all facility responsibilities and liabilities and shall be held responsible for maintaining consistency with all permit requirements and conditions of approval.
3. **Contact Information.** A new contact name for the facility shall be provided by the succeeding provider to the Community Development Department within 30 days of transfer of interest of the facility.

17.104.050 Standard Conditions of Approval

All wireless communications facilities approved through a City permit or deemed granted by operation of law shall comply with the following standard conditions of approval. Standard conditions of approval shall apply in addition to other conditions of approval attached to the project by the review authority in compliance with the Zoning Code and as allowed by state and federal law.

- A. **All Facilities.** The following standard conditions of approval apply to all facilities and shall be included in all Administrative Permits, Minor Use Permits, and Conditional Use Permits:
 1. **Compliance with Chapter.** The facility shall comply with the requirements of this chapter, including but not limited to requirements in Section 17.104.070 (Development Standards) and Section 17.104.080 (Operation and Maintenance Requirements).
 2. **Compliance with Applicable Laws.** The permit holder and service provider shall at all times comply with all applicable provisions of the Zoning Code, any permit issued under the Zoning Code, and all other applicable federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations. Failure by the City to enforce compliance with applicable laws shall not relieve any applicant of its obligations under the Municipal Code (including, but not limited to, the Zoning Code), any permit issued under the Zoning Code, or any other applicable laws, rules, and regulations.
 3. **Compliance with Approved Plans.** The facility shall be built in compliance with the approved plans on file with the Community Development Department.
 4. **Approval Term.** The validly issued Administrative Permit, Minor Use Permit, or Conditional Use Permit for the wireless communications facility shall be valid for an initial maximum term of ten years, except when California Government Code Section 65964(b), as may be amended, authorizes the City to issue a permit with a shorter term. The approval may be administratively extended by the Community Development Director from the initial approval date for a subsequent five years and may be extended by the Director every five years thereafter upon verification that the facility continues to comply with this chapter and conditions of approval under

which the facility was originally approved. Costs associated with the review process shall be borne by the service provider, permit holder, and/or property owner.

5. **Inspections; Emergencies.** The City or its designee may enter onto the facility area to inspect the facility upon reasonable notice to the permit holder. The permit holder and service provider shall cooperate with all inspections. The City reserves the right to enter or direct its designee the facility and support, repair, disable, or remove any elements of the facility in emergencies or when the facility threatens imminent harm to persons or property.
6. **Contact Information for Responsible Parties.** The permit holder and service provider shall at all times maintain accurate contact information for all parties responsible for the facility, which shall include a phone number, street mailing address, and email address for at least one person. All such contact information for responsible parties shall be provided to the Community Development Director upon request.
7. **Graffiti Removal.** All graffiti on facilities must be removed at the sole expense of the permit holder within 48 hours after notification from the City.
8. **FCC (including RF Exposure and Interference) Compliance.** All facilities must comply with all standards and regulations (including, but not limited to, those relating to RF exposure and interference) of the FCC and any other state or federal government agency with the authority to regulate such facilities. The City may require submission on an ongoing basis of documentation prepared by a qualified radio frequency engineer demonstrating that the facility and any collocated facilities complies with applicable RF exposure and interference standards and exposure limits.
9. **Implementation and Monitoring Costs.** The permit holder and service provider (or their respective successors) shall be responsible for the payment of all reasonable costs associated with the monitoring of the conditions of approval, including, without limitation, costs incurred by the Community Development Department, the Public Works Department, the City Manager's Department, the office of the City Attorney and/or any other appropriate City department or agency. The Community Development Department shall collect costs on behalf of the City
10. **Indemnities.** The permit holder, service provider, and, if applicable, the non-government owner of the private property upon which the facility, tower and/or base station is installed (or is to be installed) shall defend (with counsel satisfactory to the City), indemnify and hold harmless the City of Capitola, its officers, officials, directors, agents, representatives, and employees (i) from and against any and all damages, liabilities, injuries, losses, costs and expenses and from and against any and all claims, demands, lawsuits, judgments, writs of mandamus and other actions or proceedings brought against the City or its officers, officials, directors, agents, representatives, or employees to challenge, attack, seek to modify, set aside, void or annul the City's approval of the permit, and (ii) from and against any and all damages,

liabilities, injuries, losses, costs and expenses and any and all claims, demands, lawsuits, judgments, or causes of action and other actions or proceedings of any kind or form, whether for personal injury, death or property damage, arising out of, in connection with or relating to the acts, omissions, negligence, or performance of the permit holder, the service provider, and/or, if applicable, the private property owner, or any of each one's agents, representatives, employees, officers, directors, licensees, contractors, subcontractors or independent contractors. It is expressly agreed that the City shall have the right to approve (which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld) the legal counsel providing the City's defense, and the property owner, service provider, and/or permit holder (as applicable) shall reimburse City for any and all costs and expenses incurred by the City in the course of the defense.

B. Tier 1 Facilities. In addition to the applicable conditions in Subsection A (All Facilities), all Tier 1 facilities shall comply with and all Section 6409(a) Permits shall include the following standard conditions of approval:

1. **No Permit Term Extension.** The City's grant or grant by operation of law of a Section 6409(a) Permit constitutes a federally-mandated modification to the underlying permit or approval for the subject tower or base station. The City's grant or grant by operation of law of a Section 6409(a) Permit will not extend the permit term for any Conditional Use Permit, Minor Use Permit, Administrative Permit or other underlying regulatory approval and its term shall be coterminous with the underlying permit or other regulatory approval for the subject tower or base station. If requested in writing by the applicant at the time of application submittal, the permit term for the underlying Conditional Use Permit, Minor Use Permit, Administrative Permit or other underlying regulatory approval may be administratively extended by the Community Development Director (at his/her discretion) from the initial approval date upon verification that the facility continues to comply with this chapter and conditions of approval under which the facility was originally approved.
2. **Submittal Following Invalidation.** If a court of competent jurisdiction invalidates all or any portion of Section 6409(a) or any FCC rule or regulation that interprets Section 6409(a) such that federal law would not mandate approval for an eligible facilities request, the permit holder shall, within one year from the effective date of the judicial order, submit an application for either a Conditional Use Permit, Minor Use Permit, or Administrative Permit in compliance with this chapter for those improvements. The Community Development Director may extend this period upon a written request from the permit holder that shows good cause for an extension.
3. **No Waiver of Standing.** The approval of a Section 6409(a) Permit (either by express approval or grant by operation of law) does not waive, and shall not be construed to waive, any standing by the City to challenge Section 6409(a), any FCC rules that interpret Section 6409(a), or any eligible facilities request.

17.104.060 Preferred Siting and Location

The following siting and location preferences apply to all proposed new facilities and substantial changes to existing facilities.

- A. Preferred Siting.** To the extent feasible, all proposed facilities should be sited according to the following preferences, ordered from most preferred to least preferred:
1. Sites on a City owned or controlled parcel; then
 2. Collocations on eligible support structures in the public right-of-way; then
 3. Collocations on eligible support structures outside of the public right-of-way; then
 4. New base stations in the public right-of-way; then
 5. New base stations outside of the public right-of-way; then
 6. New towers in the public right-of-way.
 7. New towers outside the public right-of-way.
- B. Preferred Locations – General.** All applicants should, to the extent feasible, locate proposed facilities in non-residential zoning districts.
- C. Preferred Locations – Non-Residential Zoning Districts.** To the extent feasible, all proposed facilities in non-residential zoning districts should be located according to the following preferences, ordered from most preferred to least preferred:
1. Parcels in the industrial (I) zoning district; then
 2. Parcels in the commercial (C-R and C-C) zoning districts; then
 3. Parcels in all other non-residential zoning districts.
- D. Preferred Locations – Residential Zoning Districts.** If a facility is proposed in a residential (R-1, RM, MH) zoning district, all facilities should be located according to the following preferences, ordered from most preferred to least preferred:
1. Parcels that contain approved non-residential uses and do not contain residential uses; then
 2. Parcels that contain approved non-residential uses and also contain residential uses; then
 3. All other parcels.
- E. Additional Alternative Sites Analysis.** If an applicant proposes to locate a new facility or substantial change to an existing facility on a parcel that contains a single-family or multi-family residence, the applicant shall provide an additional alternative sites analysis that at a minimum shall include a meaningful comparative analysis of all the alternative sites in the more preferred locations that the applicant considered and states the underlying factual basis for concluding why each alternative in a more preferred location was (i) technically infeasible, (ii) not potentially available and/or (iii) more intrusive.

17.104.070 Development Standards

A. General Design Standards. All new facilities and substantial changes to existing facilities shall conform to the following design standards:

1. **Concealment.** To the maximum extent feasible, all facilities shall incorporate concealment measures and/or techniques appropriate for the proposed location and design. All ground-mounted equipment on private property shall be completely concealed to the maximum extent feasible according to the following preferences, ordered from most preferred to least preferred:
 - a. Within an existing structure including, but not limited to, an interior equipment room, mechanical penthouse or dumpster corral; then
 - b. Within a new structure designed to integrate with or mimic the adjacent existing structure; then
 - c. Within an underground equipment vault if no other feasible above-ground design that complies with subsections (a) or (b) exists.
2. **Height.**
 - a. All facilities may not exceed the height limit in the applicable zoning district except as allowed in subsections (b) or (c) below.
 - b. The review authority may approve a height exception up to 8 feet above the height limit when a proposed facility is:
 - (1) Mounted on the rooftop of an existing building;
 - (2) Completely concealed; and
 - (3) Architecturally integrated into the underlying building.
 - c. The review authority may approve a height exception for towers or utility poles when:
 - (1) The proposed facility is no taller than the minimum necessary to meet service objectives;
 - (2) The height exception is necessary to address a significant gap in the applicant's existing service coverage;
 - (3) The applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that no alternative location, siting technique, or type of facility is feasible to meet service objectives; and
 - (4) The proposed facility complies with design standards and preferences in Section D (Tower-Mounted Facilities) below to the maximum extent feasible.
3. **Setbacks.** All facilities shall comply with all setback requirements in the applicable zoning district.

4. **Collocation.** Facilities shall be designed, installed, and maintained to accommodate future collocated facilities to the extent feasible.
5. **Landscaping.** Landscaping shall be installed and maintained as necessary to conceal or screen the facility from public view. All landscaping shall be installed, irrigated, and maintained consistent with Chapter 17.72 (Landscaping) for the life of the permit.
6. **Lights.** Security lighting shall be down-shielded and controlled to minimize glare or light levels directed at adjacent properties.
7. **Noise.** All transmission equipment and other equipment (including but not limited to air conditioners, generators, and sump pumps) associated with the facility must not emit sound that exceeds the applicable limit established in Municipal Code Chapter 8.28 (Noise).
8. **Public Right-of-Way.** Facilities located within or extending over the public right-of-way require City approval of an encroachment permit.
9. **Signage.**
 - a. A facility may not display any signage or advertisements unless expressly allowed by the City in a written approval, recommended under FCC regulations, or required by law or permit condition.
 - b. Every facility shall at all times display signage that accurately identifies the facility owner and provides the facility owner's unique site number, and also provides a local or toll-free telephone number to contact the facility owner's operations center.
10. **Advertising.** No advertising signage or identifying logos shall be displayed on wireless communications facilities, except for small identification plates used for emergency notification or hazardous or toxic materials warning, unless expressly allowed by the City in a written approval, recommended under FCC regulations, or required by law or permit condition.
11. **Historic Resources.** A facility which modifies the exterior of a historic resource as defined in Section 17.84.020 (Types of Historic Resources) shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 17.84 (Historic Preservation).

B. Tower-Mounted Facilities.

1. **General Design Preferences.** To the extent feasible and appropriate for the proposed location, all new towers should be designed according to the following preferences, ordered from most preferred to least preferred:
 - a. Faux architectural features (examples include, but are not limited to, bell towers, clock towers, lighthouses, obelisks and water tanks); then
 - b. Faux trees; then
 - c. Monopoles that do not conceal the antennas within a concealment device.

2. **Tower-mounted Equipment.** All tower-mounted equipment shall be mounted as close to the vertical support structure as possible to reduce its visual profile. Applicants should mount non-antenna, tower-mounted equipment (including, but not limited to, remote radio units/heads, surge suppressors, and utility demarcation boxes) directly behind the antennas to the maximum extent feasible.
3. **Ground-mounted Equipment.** Ground-mounted equipment shall be concealed with opaque fences or other opaque enclosures. The City may require additional design and/or landscape features to blend the equipment or enclosure into the surrounding environment.
4. **Concealment Standards for Faux Trees.** All faux tree facilities shall comply with the following standards:
 - a. The canopy shall completely envelop all tower-mounted equipment and extend beyond the tower-mounted equipment at least 18 inches.
 - b. The canopy shall be naturally tapered to mimic the particular tree species.
 - c. All tower-mounted equipment, including antennas, equipment cabinets, cables, mounts and brackets, shall be painted flat natural colors to mimic the particular tree species.
 - d. All antennas and other tower-mounted equipment cabinets shall be covered with broadleaf or pine needle “socks” to blend in with the faux foliage.
 - e. The entire vertical structure shall be covered with permanently-affixed three-dimensional faux bark cladding to mimic the particular tree species.

C. Building and Facade Mounted Facilities.

1. **General Design Preferences.** To the extent feasible and appropriate for the proposed location, all new building and facade mounted facilities should be designed according to the following preferences, ordered from most preferred to least preferred:
 - a. Completely concealed and architecturally integrated facade or rooftop mounted base stations which are not visible from any publicly accessible areas at ground level (examples include, but are not limited to, antennas behind existing parapet walls or facades replaced with RF-transparent material and finished to mimic the replaced materials); then
 - b. Completely concealed new structures or appurtenances designed to mimic the support structure’s original architecture and proportions (examples include, but are not limited to, cupolas, steeples, and chimneys); then
 - c. Facade-mounted facilities incorporated into “pop-out” screen boxes designed to be architecturally consistent with the original support structure.
2. **Ground-mounted Equipment.** Outdoor ground-mounted equipment associated with base stations must be avoided whenever feasible. In locations visible or

accessible to the public, outdoor ground-mounted equipment shall be concealed with opaque fences or landscape features that mimic the adjacent structures (including, but not limited to, dumpster corrals and other accessory structures).

D. Pole-Mounted Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way.

1. **All Facilities.** All facilities mounted to steel light poles and wood utility poles in the public right-of-way shall comply with the following design standards:
 - a. Antennas, brackets, and cabling shall all be painted a single color that matches the pole color.
 - b. Unnecessary equipment manufacturer decals shall be removed or painted over.
 - c. The facility shall not alter vehicular circulation or parking within the public right-of-way or impede vehicular or pedestrian access or visibility along the public right-of-way.
 - d. All pole-mounted transmission equipment (including, but not limited to, antennas) shall be installed as close to the pole as technically and legally feasible to minimize impacts to the visual profile.
 - e. Colors and materials for facilities shall be chosen to minimize visibility. All visible exterior surfaces shall be constructed with non-reflective materials and painted and/or textured to match the support pole. All conduits, conduit attachments, cables, wires and other connectors must be concealed from public view to the maximum extent feasible.
 - f. An applicant may request an exemption from one or more standards in this Section 17.104.070(D) (Pole-Mounted Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way) on the basis that such exemption is necessary to comply with Public Utilities Commission General Order 95. The applicant bears the burden to demonstrate why such exemption should be granted.
2. **Steel Pole Facilities.** Facilities mounted to a steel light pole in the public right-of-way shall comply with the following design standards:
 - a. All equipment and cabling shall be located in the pole and concealed from view.
 - b. Antennas shall be located on the top of the pole as a vertical extension of the pole. Antennas and equipment may not be mounted onto the side of the pole.
 - c. To the extent technically feasible, antennas shall be contained within a maximum 14-inch wide enclosure on the top of the pole.
3. **Wood Pole Facilities.** Facilities mounted to a wood utility pole in the public right-of-way shall comply with the following design standards:
 - a. Equipment enclosures shall be as narrow as feasible with a vertical orientation to minimize its visibility when attached to the pole. The equipment mounting base plates may be no wider than the pole.

- b. Side-mounted equipment may extend no more than five feet horizontally from the side of the pole.
- c. Equipment shall be stacked close together on the same side of the pole.
- d. A line drop (no electric meter enclosure) shall be used if allowed by the utility company.
- e. Shrouds, risers, or conduit shall be used to reduce the appearance of cluttered or tangled cabling.
- f. Side-mounted antennas shall be attached to the pole using an arm with flanges/channels that reduces the visibility of cabling and passive RF gear.
- g. To the extent technically feasible, top-mounted antennas may be no wider than the width of the pole top.

17.104.080 Operation and Maintenance Requirements

All wireless communications facilities approved through a City permit or deemed granted by operation of law shall comply with the following operation and maintenance requirements.

- A. **General Compliance.** All facilities shall comply with all applicable goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan/Local Coastal Program, area plans, zoning regulations and development standards; the California Coastal Act; and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- B. **Access Control.** All facilities shall be designed to be resistant to and minimize opportunities for unauthorized access, climbing, vandalism, graffiti, and other conditions that would result in hazardous conditions, visual blight, or attractive nuisances. The Community Development Director may require the provision of warning signs, fencing, anti-climbing devices, or other techniques to prevent unauthorized access and vandalism when, because of their location and/or accessibility, antenna facilities have the potential to become an attractive nuisance.
- C. **Noise.** All facilities shall be constructed and operated in such a manner as to minimize the amount of noise impacts to adjacent uses and activities. At any time, noise attenuation measures may be required by the Community Development Director when deemed necessary. Facilities shall comply with all applicable noise standards in the General Plan and Municipal Code. Testing and maintenance activities of wireless communications facilities which generate audible noise shall occur between the hours of eight a.m. and five p.m., weekdays (Monday through Friday, non-holiday) excluding emergency repairs, unless allowed at other times by the Community Development Director.
- D. **General Maintenance.** The site and the facility, including but not limited to all landscaping, fencing, transmission equipment, antennas, towers, equipment, cabinets, structures, accessory structures, signs, and concealment and/or stealth features and standards shall be maintained in a state of good repair, in a neat and clean manner, and in accordance with all approved permits and conditions of approval. Damage to the site

and the facility shall be repaired promptly. This shall include keeping all wireless communications facilities graffiti free and maintaining security fences in good condition.

- E. Change in Federal or State Regulations.** All facilities shall meet the current standards and regulations of the FCC, the California Public Utilities Commission, and any other agency of the federal or state government with the authority to regulate wireless communications providers. If such standards and/or regulations are changed, the wireless communications provider shall bring its facilities into compliance with such revised standards and regulations within 90 days of the effective date of such standards and regulations, unless a more stringent compliance schedule is mandated by the controlling federal or state agency. Failure to bring a wireless communications facility into compliance with revised standards and regulations shall constitute grounds for the immediate removal of the facility at the wireless communications provider's expense.
- F. Service after Natural Disaster.** All wireless communications facilities providing service to the government or general public shall be designed to survive a natural disaster without interruption in operation.

17.104.090 Temporary Wireless Communications Facilities.

- A.** A temporary wireless communications facility, such as a "cell-on-wheels" (COW), may be used to replace wireless communications facility services during the relocation or rebuilding process of an existing facility, during festivals or other temporary events and activities that otherwise require a permit under this chapter, and during public emergencies.
- B.** A temporary wireless communications facility shall be processed as an administrative use permit under a proposed or existing permit when used during the relocation or rebuilding process of an existing wireless communications facility, or when used for a festival or other temporary event or activity.
- C.** A temporary wireless communications facility to protect public health, safety or welfare during an emergency shall be processed as a Tier 2 administrative use permit. The applicant shall submit an application for a temporary emergency use permit before installation of such temporary wireless communications facility.
- D.** The Community Development Director may approve a temporary wireless communications facility for no more than ninety (90) days.
- E.** A temporary wireless facility may be approved for a period of up to one year if the following requirements are met:
1. The Planning Commission determines that the temporary wireless communications facility shall be sited and constructed so as to:
 - a. Avoid proximity to residential dwellings to the maximum extent feasible;
 - b. Be no taller than needed;

- c. Be screened to the maximum extent feasible; and
 - d. Be erected for no longer than reasonably required, based on the specific circumstances.
- 2. Permits and/or authorizations in excess of ninety (90) days for temporary wireless communications facilities shall be subject to the notice and review procedures required by Section 17.148.040 (Notice for Administrative Permits and Section 6409(a) Permits) and Chapter 17.116 (Administrative Permits).
- F. The property owner and service provider of the temporary wireless communications facility installed pursuant to this section 17.104.090 shall immediately remove such facility from the site at the end of the specified term or the conclusion of the relocation or rebuilding process, temporary event, or emergency, whichever occurs first. The property owner and service provider of the temporary wireless communications facility shall be jointly and severally liable for timely removal of such temporary facility. The City may (but is not obligated to) remove any temporary wireless communications facility installed pursuant to this section 17.140.090 at the owner and provider's cost immediately at the end of the specified term or conclusion of the relocation or rebuilding process, temporary event, or emergency, whichever occurs first.

17.104.100 Limited Exemption from Standards

- A. **Request for Exemption.** An applicant may request an exemption from one or more requirements in this chapter on the basis that a permit denial would effectively prohibit personal wireless services in Capitola.
- B. **Basis for Approval.** For the City to approve such an exemption, the applicant must demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence all of the following:
 - 1. A significant gap in the applicant's service coverage exists;
 - 2. All alternative sites identified in the application review process are either technically infeasible or not potentially available; and
 - 3. Permit denial would effectively prohibit personal wireless services in Capitola.
- C. **Applicant Must Demonstrate Basis for Approval.** The applicant always bears the burden to demonstrate why an exemption should be granted.

17.104.110 Severability

If any section or portion of this chapter is found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such finding shall not affect the validity of the remainder of the chapter, which shall continue in full force and effect.

-This Page Intentionally Left Blank -



**ADDENDUM TO PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
CITY OF CAPITOLA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (SCH #2013072002)
For the
CITY OF CAPITOLA ZONING CODE UPDATE**

INTRODUCTION

This addendum has been prepared to document compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the City of Capitola's proposed Zoning Code update. The proposed Zoning Code update would implement the City of Capitola's 2014 General Plan Update and includes both text and map amendments to reflect the goals, policies, and implementation measures in the 2014 General Plan.

This addendum provides an analysis of whether the adoption of the Zoning Code update would result in any new or more severe adverse environmental effects which were not previously analyzed in the 2014 General Plan Update Program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15164, and 15168.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Capitola proposes a comprehensive update to its Zoning Code (Municipal Code Chapter 17) which includes both text and map amendments to reflect the goals, policies, and implementation measures in the 2014 General Plan update. The existing Zoning Code has not been comprehensively updated since 1975.

The Zoning Code update would establish new and modified land use regulations which will guide future development and design throughout the City of Capitola. The proposed Zoning Code update includes new and revised zoning districts, permitting procedures, and development standards throughout the City of Capitola. Development standards and uses in the Zoning Code update have been modified from the existing code to be consistent with current federal and state regulations, better reflect current conditions, desired development trends, and best planning practices.

The proposed Zoning Code update would also move the City's Green Building and Floodplain District Ordinances from Municipal Code Chapter 17 (Zoning Code) to Chapter 15 (Buildings and Construction). No changes are currently proposed to the Green Building or Floodplain Ordinances other than moving it to another chapter of the Municipal Code.

Changes to the Zoning Code are primarily administrative in nature, including a new and more user-friendly format, improved organization and clarity, revised nomenclature and naming conventions, and previously uncodified procedural requirements. The updated Code presents information and standards in table formats and relies more heavily on graphics to illustrate the meaning and intent of various regulations.

ADDENDUM TO THE CITY OF CAPITOLA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE EIR – ZONING CODE UPDATE

A summary of notable changes included in the proposed Zoning Code update are outlined below:

- Improved organization and format to improve clarity and usability;
- A new user guide to help citizens access, understand, and apply the Zoning Code;
- Revised regulations to comply with federal and state law;
- Streamlined permitting process for routine permits including signs, design permits, rooftop solar systems, and tenant improvements;
- Combined the current Commercial-Residential and Neighborhood-Commercial zoning districts into a new Neighborhood Mixed-Use zoning district to be consistent with the General Plan land use designation;
- Consolidated/eliminated 6 overlay zones which were redundant with other zoning and/or CEQA regulations to simplify the zoning map;
- Updated coastal overlay chapter with significantly improved organization and clarity;
- Improved historic preservation chapter which codifies process to review and modify historic structures and provides incentives and exceptions to promote preservation;
- Simplified legal non-conforming standards which eliminates the existing 80% valuation standard and adds a new replication allowance;
- Revised parking standards for take-out restaurants in the Village to replace the current 6-seat rule with a square-footage allowance;
- Relaxed development standards for secondary dwelling units;
- Planned Developments would no longer be allowed in R-1 zones;
- Better defined community benefits to qualify for a Planned Development or General Plan allowances for increased floor area ratio;
- Simplified formula to calculate Floor Area Ratio;
- New lighting standards to prevent light trespass;
- New regulations to control unattended donation boxes;
- Improved guidance on when post-approval changes to a project trigger review by the Planning Commission;
- New standards to limit the allowable area of outdoor commercial displays;
- Incentives to encourage non-conforming multi-family uses in single-family zones to make needed property improvements. Also reduced allowable extensions from 50 to 25 years.
- New standards to allow parklets and sidewalk dining areas;
- New minor modification process to allow the Planning Commission to authorize minor deviations to certain development standards which don't meet variance findings;
- New standards to regulate the placement of outdoor decks in residential zones;
- Modified Design Review process to allow a second architect to review major projects;

ADDENDUM TO THE CITY OF CAPITOLA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE EIR – ZONING CODE UPDATE

- New requirements for large commercial and residential projects to provide bike and electric vehicle parking.

While some of the above-listed revisions will result in modest changes to existing development standards, none of the revisions would allow increased density, reduced lot size requirements, or substantial changes to lot coverage, floor area ratio, height, or requirements for on-site parking.

Use regulations have also been revised in the proposed code to account for modern use types not contemplated in the current code and to remove outdated and inapplicable use classifications. Like the current code, the updated code would require a discretionary use permit for use types which have the potential to adversely affect existing community character.

CEQA ADDENDUM PROCEDURES

This document has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines sections 15164 and 15168 to explain the rationale for determining that the proposed Capitola Zoning Code update would not create any new or substantially more severe significant effects on the environmental that were not analyzed in the General Plan Update EIR.

In determining whether an Addendum is the appropriate document to analyze modifications to the General Plan EIR, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 states:

- (a) *The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.*
- (b) *An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.*
- (c) *An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.*
- (d) *The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.*
- (e) *A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's required findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.*

Since the General Plan EIR has been certified, the environmental impacts of subsequent activities proposed under the General Plan must be examined in light of the impact analysis in the certified EIR to determine if additional CEQA documentation must be prepared. One of the standards that applies is whether, under Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163, there are new significant effects or other grounds that require preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplemental EIR in support of further agency action on the project. Under these guidelines, a subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be prepared if any of the following criteria are met:

ADDENDUM TO THE CITY OF CAPITOLA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE EIR – ZONING CODE UPDATE

(a) *When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*

- 1) *Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*
- 2) *Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*
- 3) *New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*
 - A. *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;*
 - B. *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;*
 - C. *Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or*
 - D. *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.*

As demonstrated in the environmental analysis contained herein, none of the conditions that had been analyzed in the General Plan EIR would change with adoption of the proposed Zoning Code update. Furthermore, no new information of substantial importance meeting the criteria listed in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 has been identified.

PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

The Capitola City Council adopted the General Plan Update and certified the associated EIR on June 26, 2014. The certified EIR found that adoption of the GPU would have significant, unavoidable effects to air quality, hydrology and water quality, traffic, utilities and service systems, and greenhouse gas emissions. In accordance with CEQA section 15091, the Capitola City Council adopted findings of overriding considerations to certify the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to aesthetic resources including: scenic vistas; scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.; existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or day or nighttime views in the area?

Response: The proposed Zoning Code update would not result in new or increased severity of significant visual and light/glare impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. The amendments to the Zoning Code are consistent with the development assumptions under the adopted General Plan. Housing and commercial uses would be developed in the same locations and within prescribed densities and intensities as contemplated in the General Plan EIR. All future development projects would be subject to applicable City requirements pertaining to visual resources, as well as to further CEQA analyses of project specific impacts.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to agricultural resources including: conflict with zoning for or result in rezoning of forest land; result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; convert Important Farmland and/or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract?

Response: There are no forest lands, farmlands of state or local importance, or agriculturally zoned properties in the City of Capitola. Consequently, the GP EIR concluded that there would be no significant impacts to agriculture or forestry resources. The proposed Zoning Code update would not result in any new impacts not previously considered by the GP EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to air quality including: conflicts with or obstruction of implementation of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violation of any air quality standard or substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation; a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; exposure of sensitive receptors to

substantial pollutant concentrations; or creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan could result in significant, unavoidable impacts to air quality through an increase in mobile and stationary source emissions and cumulative contributions to regional air quality standards. The proposed Zoning Code update would not increase any residential densities or commercial intensities nor does it include new allowances which could facilitate development which could result in direct or indirect air quality impacts. Therefore, there are no project changes or any new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning Code update would exacerbate air quality impacts beyond the analysis and conclusions in the General Plan EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to biological resources including: adverse effects on any sensitive natural community (including riparian habitat) or species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in a local or regional plan, policy, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; adverse effects to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with wildlife corridors, or impeding the use of native wildlife nursery sites; and/or conflicts with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, policies or ordinances?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant impacts to biological resources. The proposed Zoning Code update does not include any policies or actions which would involve new or altered physical changes to the environment which have the potential to adversely affect biological resources. There have been no changes in the project or is there any new information of substantial importance to indicate that the proposed Zoning Code update would result in new or more severe impacts to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to cultural resources including: causing a change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; destroying a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and/or disturbing any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan could result in significant impacts to cultural resources, but that mitigation measures could be applied to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. The proposed Zoning Code update does not include any residential density or commercial intensity increases which could result in additional housing development above what was evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, there have been no changes to the project or new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning Code update could result in new or more severe impacts to cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from geology and soils including: exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, strong seismic ground shaking, or landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; being located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property; and/or having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would have no potential to result in significant impacts to/from geology and soils. There have been no changes to the project or new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning Code update could result in new or more severe impacts to/from geology and soils.

VII. GREENHOUSE GASES

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that show the project may generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would result in significant, unavoidable impacts to greenhouse gases and climate change. The proposed Zoning Code update includes the same residential densities and commercial intensities as what was evaluated by the General Plan EIR, therefore, there have not been any changes to

the project or new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning Code update could result in new or more severe impacts to greenhouse gas emissions.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from hazards and hazardous materials including: creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes; creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; production of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; location on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 creating a hazard to the public or the environment; location within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; within the vicinity of a private airstrip resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and/or exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards and hazardous materials. There have been no changes to the project, or new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning Code update would result in a new or more severe impact to hazards and hazardous materials.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to hydrology and water quality including: violation of any waste discharge requirements; an increase in any listed pollutant to an impaired water body listed under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act ; cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses; substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems; provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;

place housing or other structures which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including City Floodplain Maps; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; and/or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that the implementation of the Plan could result in significant unavoidable impacts to groundwater supply, but found no significant impacts to water quality, drainage, erosion, or flooding. The proposed Zoning code update would not increase residential densities or commercial intensities which would facilitate new water-dependent development. Therefore, there have been no changes to the project or any new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in new or more severe impacts to hydrology or water quality.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to land use and planning including: physically dividing an established community; and/or conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant impacts to land use and planning. There have been no changes in the project or information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in any new or more severe impacts to land use and planning.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to mineral resources including: the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; and/or loss of locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Response: There are no mineral resource deposits in the City of Capitola which could be reasonably extracted given existing non-compatible land uses. Accordingly, the General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any impacts to mineral resources. There have been no changes to the project or new information of substantial

Attachment: Addendum to the General Plan Update EIR (1644 : Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance Update)

importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in new or more severe impacts to mineral resources.

XIII. NOISE

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from noise including: exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for projects located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or for projects within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan could result in significant impacts from noise resulting from construction of future projects authorized by the Plan. Consequently, the General Plan EIR included mitigation measures to reduce impacts from noise to a less than significant level. However, there have been no changes in the project or new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in new or more severe impacts to/from noise.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects to population and housing including displacing substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant impacts to population and housing. There have been no changes to the project or information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in any new or more severe impacts to population and housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant impacts to public services. There have been no changes to the project or information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in any new or more severe impacts to public services.

XVI. RECREATION

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or that include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan would not result in any significant impacts to recreation. There have been no changes to the project or information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in any new or more severe impacts to recreation.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to transportation/traffic including: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in

substantial safety risks; substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); inadequate emergency access; and/or a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan could result in significant, unavoidable impacts to transportation. The proposed Zoning code update does not include any increased residential densities or commercial intensities which would facilitate new development, which could result in additional traffic. Therefore, there have been no changes to the project or information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in any new or more severe impacts to transportation.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to utilities and service systems including: exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; require new or expanded entitlements to water supplies or new water resources to serve the project; result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; and/or noncompliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Response: The General Plan EIR found that implementation of the Plan could result in significant unavoidable impacts to utilities and service systems due to the potential for groundwater overdraft. The proposed Zoning code update would not increase residential densities or commercial intensities which would facilitate new water-dependent development or the need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities or landfills. There have been no changes to the project or information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in any new or more severe impacts to utilities and service systems.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new

information of substantial importance" that result in any mandatory finding of significance listed below?

Does the project degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Response: There have been no changes to the project or any new information of substantial importance which indicate that the proposed Zoning code update would result in any new or more severe impacts to the quality of the environment, including adverse impacts to habitat for sensitive species, cumulative environmental impacts, or adverse direct or cumulative effects on human beings.