

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, April 22, 2003, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: George Webber, Chair
James Macdonald, Vice-Chairman
Ruth Cook, Commissioner
Caroline Laymon, Commissioner
Gary Miller, Commissioner
Thomas Osborne, Commissioner

ABSENT: Paul Thompson, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, City Planner
Bob Dalquest, Senior Planner
Richard Malacoff, Associate Planner
Manuel Baeza, Assistant Planner
Leslie E. Murad II, Assistant City Attorney

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chairman Webber called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

Assistant City Attorney advised Chairman Webber the items on consent calendar could be approved as a whole. Chairman Webber indicated he had questions on Commission Sign Review No. 245 and he wanted it to be pulled from the consent calendar so that discussion could be held on the proposed project.

- A. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 12382-** Planning Commission consideration on an extension of time for the tentative tract map, the subdivision of 41.5 acres into thirty-one (31) residential lots in the RA-A, Residential Estate-Animal district and the A-1, Agricultural district, generally located east of Wabash Avenue and south of Sunset Drive. Request Submitted by WALTER DANIELSON FAMILY TRUST.
- B. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 685 -** Planning Commission consideration on an extension of time for a planned residential development in the RA-A, Residential Estate-Animal district and the A-1, Agricultural district, generally located east of Wabash Avenue and south of Sunset Drive. Request Submitted by WALTER DANIELSON FAMILY TRUST.
- D. **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 248 -** A request for Planning Commission consideration of a Commission Sign Review for a pedestal sign with an area of one hundred and four (104) square feet and a free standing entrance sign with an area of eighty-one (81)square feet both for the Redlands Sports Park located generally on the north side of San Bernardino Avenue between Wabash Avenue and Dearborn Street in the O, Open Land District (proposed). Request Submitted by The CITY OF REDLANDS.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller and carried on a 5-0 vote to approve Tentative Tract No. 12382, Conditional Use Permit No. 685, and Commission Sign Review No. 248.

Commissioner Cook arrived at 2:04 p.m.

- C. **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 245** - A request for Planning Commission consideration of a Commission Sign Review for a monument sign with an area of twenty-four (24) square feet for an auto repair facility located at 524 Texas Street in the Town Center District of Specific Plan No. 45 (Downtown Specific Plan). Request Submitted by ROLMAN A. CALDERON.

Mr. Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber stated that he met with the applicant earlier that day and he (applicant) agreed to the addition of two (2) eucalyptus citradora trees on the northeast and southeast corners of the planter area. Chairman Webber complimented the applicant on the landscape plan.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Sign Review No. 245 subject to the Conditions of Approval and the addition of Condition of Approval 5 to read:

The addition of two (2) eucalyptus citriodora trees on the northeast and southeast corners of the planter area.

III. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 294** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an Ordinance Text Amendment to add Section 18.164.045 and amend Section 18.164.100 of the Redlands Municipal Code regarding residential parking facilities in the C-3 (General Commercial) District. Request Submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.

Mr. Bob Dalquest gave a brief presentation on the proposed project and reviewed the three (3) Code sections to be revised. Mr. Dalquest stated subsequent to the distribution of the agenda, staff determined a discrepancy in the revision to section 18.164.100(B). Mr. Dalquest stated there is a section in the Code for hillside lots exceptions that allows the house or garage to be within the required front yard. Mr. Dalquest stated that staff would prefer to follow what is established in the Code. Mr. Dalquest stated the text in 18.164.100 (B) has been modified to read:

Parking spaces shall not be located in any required front yard, except as to hillside lots as permitted by Section 18.152.020 of the Redlands Municipal Code.

Mr. Dalquest stated staff is recommending approval of Planning Commission Resolution No. 987 recommending the City Council approve Ordinance Text Amendment No. 294.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 987, recommending that the City Council adopt Ordinance Text Amendment No. 294.

- B. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 792** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a Conditional Use Permit to place a 4,000 square foot auto repair facility in an existing building located at 1521 West Redlands Boulevard in the EV/CG District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request Submitted by James F. Dickerson.

- C. **VARIANCE NO. 651** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a Variance from Section EV4.021 of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan to reduce the required parking from twenty-four (24) spaces to twenty-two (22), Section EV4.0205 to reduce the required drive aisle from twenty-six (26) to twenty-two (22) feet in width, EV4.0260 to reduce the required landscaping from twenty (20) percent to nine and one-half (9½) percent, Section EV4.0115 to reduce the required parking setback from fifteen (15) feet to five (5) feet at 1521 West Redlands Boulevard in the EV/CG District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request Submitted by James F. Dickerson.

Mr. Richard Malacoff gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Malacoff stated the applicant met with Commissioner Miller and agreed to paint the building with final approval to be given by the Community Development Director. In addition, Commissioner Miller requested the windows on the front elevation be replaced so that they match in size. Based on Commissioner Miller's recommendation, Mr. Malacoff stated that staff is requesting a modification to Condition of Approval 20 to read:

Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall have the painting plan and windows on the front elevation approved by the Community Development Director and one (1) Planning Commissioner to be appointed by the Chairman. The windows on the front elevation shall match in size.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. James Dickerson, stated that he was confused with Commissioner Miller's recommendation to replace the windows. Mr. Dickerson stated he met with Commissioner Miller and Mr. Bud Thatcher at the site and at that time, Commissioner Miller recommended an awning on one of the three (3) building windows. Mr. Dickerson stated he later received a drawing from Commissioner Miller recommending the replacement of three (3) windows and no mention of the awning.

Commissioner Miller disputed Mr. Dickerson's recollection of the conversation. He stated both Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Dickerson indicated they did not want an awning on the east side of the building because it would conflict with automobiles coming in and out. Commissioner Miller stated that he pointed to the Chevron building across the street citing it as an example of a building that complimented the community and did not have an awning. Commissioner Miller continued by saying he would go back to his office and draw a picture of what he thought would look good. The drawing was then faxed to Mr. Thatcher.

Mr. Dickerson stated he specifically remembered Commissioner Miller talking about awnings and he did not say anything about replacing windows.

Commissioner Miller stated he would stand by his original statement.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber asked Commissioner Miller for clarification on the drawing relative to a window located on the west side of the building. Commissioner Miller stated the other windows and framing were made out of wood and were dilapidated. Commissioner Miller stated he sized the windows so that the existing header could be used. Commissioner Miller estimated the cost of the window replacement to be approximately \$750 each, for a total of \$1,500.

Commissioner Osborne stated it appeared that the window would be screened by the proposed landscaping, and he questioned if the window would be visible after the shrubbery has matured.

Commissioner Miller stated the window would be somewhat screened.

Commissioner Laymon stated she felt Commissioner Miller came up with a good plan, and she felt Mr. Dickerson might be put at ease if he was assured by the Commission that there would not be any more changes. Commissioner Laymon stated she agreed with the conditions of approval as submitted.

Commissioner Macdonald concurred with Commissioner Laymon and stated he felt the appearance of the building would improve, which was the intent of the recommendation. Commissioner Macdonald stated the City was also making a number of concessions, including the reduction in parking spaces.

Commissioner Osborne stated he would agree with the window as depicted by Commissioner Miller.

Chairman Webber asked for a consensus on the proposed paint scheme. The Commissioners found the colors acceptable.

Mr. Jeff Shaw indicated there was no need for Condition of Approval 20 which required approval of the painting design and awnings by the Community Development Director. Mr. Malacoff indicated Condition of Approval 20 would be deleted.

Chairman Webber advised Mr. Dickerson that the landscape plan would return to the Planning Commission for final approval.

Mr. Shaw advised the Commission that Condition of Approval 20 could be amended to reference the revised plan which required the color scheme and additional windows to be in accordance with the submitted elevation.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 651 subject to the following findings:

1. There are exceptional circumstances to this proposal that include that the property was originally developed under a different zoning requirement and could not meet the code requirements without moving or demolishing the building or having to apply for additional variances.
2. The request for a reduction of required landscaping, reduction of parking, and reduction of a drive aisle will enable the applicant to obtain more efficient use of the property and has been granted by the Planning Commission previously to Bakers Burgers and Redlands Country Club or existing conditions such as Dangermonds Nursery and the adjacent apartments and commercial businesses.
3. The request for a reduction of required landscaping, reduction of parking, and reduction of a drive aisle will not harm adjacent landowners or cause a negative impact on aesthetics and the applicant has provided a satisfactory balance between parking and landscaping.
4. The granting of the request variance will not have any conflict with the City's General Plan.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 792 based on the following findings:

1. The auto repair applied for at the 1511 West Redlands Boulevard noted is proper for a

- Conditional Use Permit;
2. The auto repair use as proposed is a project that is necessary, essential, and desirable for the public welfare as well as the development of the community;
 3. The auto repair use is not detrimental to existing or permitted uses in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan where it would be located;
 4. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed auto repair facility;
 5. The site properly relates to Redlands Boulevard which is designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed auto repair facility;
 6. The conditions set forth on this Conditional Use Permit are deemed necessary and reasonable to protect the public health, safety and general welfare; the best interests of the neighborhood;
 7. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial designation of the General Plan with a revision to Condition of Approval 20 to read:

The applicant shall comply with the painting scheme and windows in accordance with submitted elevations.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 797** - Public Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Conditional Use Permit to construct a religious institution consisting of a 20,300 square foot worship center and a 13,278 square foot sanctuary on 4.62 acres located on the southwest corner of Lugonia Avenue and Texas Street in the R-1, Single Family Residential District. Request Submitted by the Second Baptist Church of Redlands.

Mr. Richard Malacoff gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Malacoff stated there are three (3) outstanding issues that will need to be resolved;

1. Redesign of the parking lot to include the replacement of five (5) spaces with standard parking spaces
2. Modification of the driveway to the required thirty (30) foot width
3. Modification of the landscape plan as recommended by staff

Mr. Malacoff stated staff would like to see an updated site plan that addresses the three (3) modifications requested by staff. Mr. Malacoff stated staff recommends a continuance to May 27th.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Malacoff for the disposition of the sanctuary plot prior to building of the sanctuary.

Mr. Malacoff responded by saying a standard condition of approval could be added requiring the planting of wild flowers, which would not require watering.

Commissioner Laymon questioned whether the wild flowers would grow in that area without irrigation.

Mr. Shaw stated the landscape plan would come back to the Commission for final approval. Mr. Shaw stated he had concerns relative to dust control, maintenance, appearance, and aesthetics to the site and he asked the applicant to bring this issue to the attention of the landscape architect.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Robert Terrell (Rubinstein Terrell Architects) stated his firm is sensitive to providing the landscaping necessary to provide privacy to the two (2) property owners adjacent to the property. Regarding the senior housing site, Mr. Terrell indicated he was unsure of its disposition due to zoning.

Commissioner Miller encouraged the applicant to include a more detailed building elevation. Commissioner Miller stated he felt the building was in need of control joints, and additional detailing.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber requested an additional condition of approval to read:

The landscape architect responsible for the design of the proposed landscaping plan shall review and certify that installed landscaping meets the specifications of the landscape plan as submitted except as modified in the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Miller expressed his concern that the future sanctuary site be left unirrigated until such time as the sanctuary is built. Commissioner Miller stated the Municipal Code requires one parking space for every forty (40) feet of floor area, when seating is not fixed. Commissioner Miller continued by saying an additional eighty (80) parking stalls would be required if the balcony area within the sanctuary was included. Commissioner Miller stated he felt 280 parking stalls would not be adequate if the sanctuary is built out.

Chairman Webber suggested staff complete an analysis on this matter.

Mr. Shaw asked the applicant if the balcony area would contain benches or chairs.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Terrel stated there would be fixed seating in the balcony area.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote to continue Conditional Use Permit No. 797 to May 27, 2003.

Chairman Webber requested that Minor Commission Approval No. 30 (IV-C) be heard out of order, so that IV-B and IV-D could be heard at the same time.

- C. **MINOR COMMISSION APPROVAL NO. 30 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Minor Commission Approval to allow a five (5) foot reduction in the required front yard setback from the required twenty-five (25) foot front yard, for a proposed single family residence located at 852 East Riverview Drive in R-1, Single Family Residential District. Request Submitted by BRUCE AND SANDRA BUCKNER.

Mr. Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller and carried on a 6-0 vote to approve Minor Commission Approval No. 30 subject to the attached conditions of approval:

1. That the proposed five (5) foot reduction of the required front yard setback meets the set criteria under Section 18.196.130 of the Redlands Municipal Code and is determined to be in the public interest and proper to accommodate the proposed residence;

2. That the reduction of the required front yard will not impact or be detrimental to the immediate uses or existing uses or uses specifically permitted in the zone in which the proposed yard modification is to be located;
3. That the proposed reduction in the required front yard is necessary and desirable for the proper development of the project site and is in harmony with the goals and policies of the General Plan; and,
4. That the conditions set forth in the permit and shown on the approved plans are necessary to protect the public health, safety, or general welfare.

Commissioner Miller recused himself due to a possible conflict of interest.

- B. **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 266** - Planning Commission consideration of a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study for a tentative parcel map to subdivide 1.66 acres into three (3) commercial/industrial parcels located on the northeast corner of Idaho Street and Plum Lane in the Office/Industrial District of Specific Plan No. 25. Request Submitted by PENCE CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. Richard Malacoff gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Perhach (Pence Construction) noted Condition of Approval 2A (Public Works Department) which requires that all off-site improvements be designed by the owner's Civil Engineer prior to recordation. Mr. Perhach stated the plans were completed when the property was subdivided. Mr. Perhach asked that the records on file be used in lieu of requiring the applicant's Civil Engineer to complete plans.

Mr. Perhach questioned Public Works Department Condition of Approval 4(A-G) which requires the applicant to complete street improvements. Mr. Perhach stated there is no building construction planned at this time, and he questioned why the applicant would be responsible for street improvements. Mr. Shaw stated the Public Works Department may have determined that it was appropriate to install improvements on Idaho Street at this time.

Mr. Perhach asked if the City of Redlands would allow the applicant to bond the improvements. Mr. Shaw stated that typically the bonding requirements pertain to completing the improvements in a specific time frame.

Mr. Jaquess stated that he had spoken with Mr. Perhach earlier in the day and advised him that improvements could be bonded, but they would be subject to an improvement agreement that defined the precise timing of the agreement. Mr. Jaquess stated he advised Mr. Perhach to contact Mr. Ron Mutter for further information.

Mr. Shaw stated the proposed project could be heard later in the meeting so that Mr. Mutter could be present to answer questions.

Chairman Webber suggested the Commission take a short break to await the arrival of Mr. Mutter. Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

Chairman Webber reconvened the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

Mr. Ron Mutter (Director, Department of Public Works) stated that he had an opportunity to discuss bonding requirements with the applicant during the break. Mr. Mutter stated the physical construction of the improvements could be deferred until the first building is constructed.

Mr. Ron Mutter (Director, Department of Public Works) stated the conditions of approval could remain the same.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Revision 7 to Minor Subdivision No. 266 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No. 266 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

- A. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code.
 - B. The design or improvement of the Minor Subdivision No. 266 is consistent with the applicable general plan.
 - C. The site is located at the northeast corner of Idaho Street and Plum Lane is physically suitable for the type of development.
 - D. The site is physically suitable for the development of a three-lot subdivision.
 - E. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.
 - F. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems.
 - G. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision; and
 - H. That pursuant to California Government Code Section 66474.6, the discharge of waste from this subdivision will not result in violation of existing requirements prescribed by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to Division 7 of the California Water Code.
- D. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 756** - Public Hearing for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study and a Commission Review and Approval to construct a one-story 8,360 square foot warehouse/office building on a 0.62 acres vacant property located on the west side of Iowa Street, 280 feet (approximate) south of Park Avenue in the EV/IC Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request Submitted by Pence Construction.

Mr. Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Baeza stated that staff identified two areas where the landscape plan does not meet Code requirements:

- 1. One (1) tree is required for every twenty (20) linear feet of property perimeter adjoining a parking area. For this project, ten (10) trees would be required; only eight (8) trees are proposed.
- 2. The Municipal Code requires that fifty (50) percent of the parking area trees be evergreen. Thirteen trees are required for this project, of which seven (7) must be evergreen trees; only four (4) evergreen trees are proposed.

Mr. Baeza stated that staff contacted the applicant and he was able to revise the landscape plan to meet Code

requirements. The revised plan substitutes an Australian Willow tree (evergreen) for an eastern Redbud and adds four (4) Australian willow trees to the north property line.

Chairman Webber noted that the Australian willow tree may be an approved accent tree in the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan, but it is not an appropriate shade tree for a parking lot. Chairman Webber stated that the Australian willow tree would have to be replaced with an appropriate tree for a parking lot.

Mr. Baeza stated that Condition of Approval 24 f and g, would be revise to reflect the revised landscape plan.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chris Perhach (Pence Construction) concurred with the revised conditions of approval. Mr. Perhach questioned Municipal Utilities Department Condition of Approval 4 which requires the installation of a 6 inch non-potable water main on Iowa Avenue. Chairman Webber stated the item would have to be continued in order to allow the Municipal Utilities Department an opportunity to respond to the question. Mr. Perhach withdrew his question.

Commission Osborne suggested the applicant continue the decorative foam inserts across the building and bring the border across the entire north elevation. Mr. Baeza stated Condition of Approval 26 would be added.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval No. 756 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It is recommended that this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval No. 756. It is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on Commission Review and Approval No. 756, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use.
2. That the site properly relates to Iowa Street which is designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development.
3. That the conditions of approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 756 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare.
4. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community.

5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial/Industrial Designation of the General Plan with the addition of Condition of Approval 24 to read:

- f. Trees with a trunk height of not less than six (6) feet shall be installed in the planters at each end of an aisle, at three (3) space intervals throughout the parking area, and at twenty (20) foot intervals along the periphery of the parking area. Within parking areas, trees may be clustered in groups to achieve a more natural setting provided the total number of trees meets the previous planting requirements. **Evergreen trees located adjacent to parking areas shall be of a variety listed on the Planning Commission List of Recommended Shade Trees.**
- g. **At least fifty (50) percent of the trees shall be an evergreen variety and shall be evenly distributed throughout the parking area, and**

addition of Condition of Approval 26 to read:

The rectangular parapet accents and the lower reveal shall be continued across the north elevation.

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 3:58 p.m.

- E. **ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 293 - ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 293 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council for an Ordinance Text Amending Article VII. Second Dwelling Units, Sections 18.156.430, 18.156.440, 18.156.450, and 18.156.460 and deleting Section 18.156.470 of the Redlands Municipal Code pertaining to the processing and review of second dwelling units. Request submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.

Ms. Cathy Johnson gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber stated that Section 18.156.450 (f) as written was unclear and it appeared that it was meant for all properties listed in the California Register of Historic Places. Chairman Webber suggested revising the section and breaking it up into two (2) sentences.

Assistant City Attorney Les Murad stated the text was drafted by City Attorney Dan McHugh, and was taken directly from the state law statute. Mr. Shaw stated that staff felt it was unclear as written and he requested input from the Commission, so the text might be rewritten.

Commissioner Miller stated he supports adoption of architectural guidelines.

Mr. Shaw noted the first sentence of Section 18.156.460(A) was deleted and he would prefer the text remain. The section reads "The lot upon which the second unit is created shall conform to the minimum area and dimension standards of the zoning district in which the lot is located".

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Mr. Shaw advised the Commission if the City does not have an ordinance in effect, it will be bound by the State law as it currently is written. Mr. Shaw requested input from the Commission.

Commissioner Miller suggested Section 18.156.450 be revised to read:

Application for construction of a second unit shall be made in the form of a site plan **with building elevations.**

Commissioner Miller stated he supports:

1. wording that addresses architectural compatibility with the existing home,
2. wording that would limit the number of people that can be housed in one single bedroom, and
3. wording in Section 18.156.460A, "The lot upon which the second unit is created shall conform to the minimum area and dimensions standards of the zoning district in which the lot is located."

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Laymon, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve RPC No. 990 and recommend that the City Council approve Ordinance Text Amendment.

Mr. Shaw advised the Commission that he would keep them informed on City Council actions relative to this issue.

V. ADDENDA

A. City Council Report

Mr. Shaw advised the Commission of the City Council actions of April 15th.

B. Workshop on Rural Standards

Mr. Shaw stated the Commission reviewed a draft set of Rural Development Standards from the March 25th Planning Commission meeting, at which time recommendations were made by the Commission for revisions to the draft standards. Mr. Shaw stated the recommendations made by the Commission have been incorporated

into the draft standards. Mr. Shaw noted a memorandum received from Mr. Pat Meyer relative to cross lot drainage and pad area, along with a letter from Mr. Eric Blum.

Mr. Shaw stated there was an inquiry from Commissioner Laymon relative to enforceability of standards (resolutions versus ordinances).

Mr. Murad noted that once adopted, the Rural Development Standards would apply to new projects only. It could not be applied to those projects where an application has already been filed.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Cook left the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

Ms. Teresa Kwappenberg (31265 Freya Drive) distributed a letter to the Commission citing her opposition to the revised standards due to open space and resource preservation issues.

Mr. Bob Knight (11464 S. King Street), Friends of Crafton, stated they would like a plan that will ensure the continuity of citrus for the long term. Mr. Knight stated he is delighted that a rural living standard will be defined. Mr. Knight stated they would like the opportunity to extensively contribute their input. Mr. Knight expressed his concern about enforceability of the standards. He expressed concern that the standards appear to increase the density to one (1) unit per acre.

Mr. Shaw stated the Rural Development Standards will not change the density of the different land use descriptions.

Commissioner Macdonald stated the intent is to provide guidelines so that the rural character of specific areas can be maintained.

Ms. Kwappenberg stated the citizens worked with the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino for nine years to develop the Oak Hills Plan.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber asked for comments on the revised draft standards from the Commission.

Regarding *C. Paths and Trails*, Commissioner Osborne suggested staff check with Mr. Richard Pepper (Building and Safety Division) relative to handicap accessibility.

Commissioner Laymon stated the trails' committee's intent was to put trails on significant ridge lines, and leave them in their natural place. Commissioner Laymon requested additional wording on C. Full trails to read:

Trails should either have a destination point such as a lookout, park, **dedicated open space**, or other end point or should be connected to other trails that connect to the regional trail system.

Ms. Laymon stated she would like to see connectivity of the trail system.

Mr. Shaw stated Full Trails 7.11p was added to address the issue of connectivity.

Relative to C. *Grading*, Chairman Webber noted the General Concepts which states, "The pad area beyond the formal building foundation should not exceed 50% of that required for the foundation" and stated it did not make sense. Mr. Shaw concurred and stated the number should be greater than 50%. Mr. Shaw stated he deleted the text ~~not exceed 50% of that required for the foundation~~ and tried to establish general criteria in which it could be evaluated by the Commission.

Chairman Webber asked staff to return to the Commission with a concept based on the Oak Hills Plan building envelope. Commissioner Laymon asked the Commissioners if they had a concern relative to mass grading.

Commissioner Miller asked for clarification on the wording, "the building envelop will not exceed a 20% slope" which was taken from the Oak Hills Plan.

Mr. Shaw stated he was unsure how this is applied; it was his intent to contact the County and talk to them about how the standards are applied.

Commissioner Miller stated the Commission may want to decide if it wants to have a suburban neighborhood with yards, or a resort neighborhood where there are no yards, and you would market to a different group of people. Commissioner Miller stated if it is determined desirable to have a portion of the lot as a level yard, one way to address the issue would be to restrict the elevation change from one lot to the next.

Commissioner Laymon stated she did not want to see another "Cordillera" type development in the canyons.

Mr. Shaw stated he could layout examples of different percentages of pad areas for the Commission to review.

Relative to the *E. Landscaping* section, Chairman Webber stated he would like the wording "Encourage retention of specimen size trees" to be defined.

Relative to *G. Rural Character*, Chairman Miller suggested changing the wording "Large property frontages with significant distances between homes" to "Large distances between homes".

Commissioner Laymon stated she would like a link between "Continuity of Open Space" and trails.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote to approve the March 25th Planning Commission minutes.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMUNICATIONS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT TO MAY 13, 2003

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to May 27th at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Ortiz, Senior Admin. Assistant
Community Development Department

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department