

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, December 9, 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  
Paul Thompson, Commissioner

ABSENT: Gary Miller, Commissioner (Absent during evening session only)  
Paul Thompson, Commissioner (Absent during evening session only)

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director  
John Jaquess, City Planner  
Leslie E. Murad II, Assistant City Attorney  
Robert Dalquest, Principal Planner/Project Manager  
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner  
Richard Malacoff, Associate Planner  
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner  
Alicia Heideman, Junior Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chairman Webber called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. All Commissioners were present except Commissioner Cook.

Chairman Webber advised the audience a newspaper article that stated the Fordred project would be heard at the afternoon session was in error. Chairman Webber stated that the project would be heard at the evening session of the Planning Commission.

Chairman Webber stated that the Commission received a letter from Ms. Denise Whisler regarding residential street calming and traffic pedestrian safety. Chairman Webber requested the item be placed on the next Planning Commission agenda for review and discussion.

II. CONSENT ITEMS - NONE

III. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 25 (AMENDMENT NO. 7)** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council for an amendment to Specific Plan No. 25 Section 3. C. 4 to allow exterior lighting to have a height of twenty (20) feet. Request submitted by SEVEN OAKS MEDICAL CENTER, LLC.

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

Mr. Manuel Baeza stated the applicant would like to amend Specific Plan No. 25 to increase the height of exterior lighting from sixteen (16) feet to twenty (20) feet. Mr. Baeza stated that staff is recommending approval of the amendment to Specific Plan No. 25.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Ms. Katy Belknap, representing the applicant, stated that currently there are sixteen (16) foot and (20) foot poles in the area.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

## **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 5-0 vote (Commissioner Miller recused) that the Planning Commission adopt R.P.C. No. 1013 and recommend that the City Council approve Amendment No. 7 to Specific Plan No. 25.

Commissioner Cook arrived at 2:16 p.m.

- B. **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 58** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Specific Plan to develop 5.01 gross acres into a seventy-two (72) unit condominium development located at the southwest corner of Orange Avenue and Kansas Street. Request submitted by ABCO REALTY AND INVESTMENTS.
- C. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16548** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide 5.01 gross acres into a seventy-two (72) unit condominium development in the 2500 RM Multiple Family Residential District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan (proposed Specific Plan No. 58) located at the southwest corner of Orange Avenue and Kansas Street. Request submitted by ABCO REALTY AND INVESTMENTS.

Mr. Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project and stated that staff is recommending approval of the project with additional conditions of approval.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ali Mozayeni, applicant, thanked staff for its assistance.

Commissioner Macdonald commended Mr. Mozayeni on the changes made to the project based on staff's recommendations received from staff and during discussion at a study session. Commissioner Macdonald noted that the applicant did not eliminate the tandem parking.

Mr. Mozayeni stated the tandem parking was not eliminated in order to bring the density up to where it needed to be.

Mr. Hal Woods, project architect, stated they could have met the parking requirements with a redesign of the project however, it would have resulted in 20% more asphalt or concrete in the project, garages closer to each other, and no canopy trees.

Mr. Woods stated that a member of the planning staff visited another project developed by the applicant in Orange County. Mr. Woods stated that tandem parking is widely accepted in California, particularly with this type of project. Mr. Woods stated they considered the comments made by the Planning Commission during the study session; the project was reduced by eight (8) units, more open space was allowed in the entry area, a tot lot was added, and the plan included open space with a tree canopied area.

Chairman Webber asked if the parking for residents would be limited to two (2) vehicles.

Mr. Woods stated that the number of vehicles would be limited by the number of spaces allocated to the unit. Mr.

Woods stated that it would be up to the homeowners association to enforce the parking limitation.

Mr. Tom Munoz, landscape architect, stated that he was available to answer questions.

Chairman Webber asked Mr. Munoz why he included the glossy privet in the landscape plan. Mr. Munoz responded by saying that it was chosen for its growth habits, pattern, and characteristics.

Chairman Webber noted that the fruit of the glossy privet is known for staining sidewalks and cars. Chairman Webber requested the applicant consider replacing the glossy privet.

Chairman Webber stated that he would like the landscape plan to return to the Planning Commission for final approval because it is one of the first condominium projects in the City.

Mr. Woods requested clarification on whether the entire project would return to the Commission, or if the landscape plan would return to the Commission. Chairman Webber responded by saying the landscape plan will return to the Commission not the project.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne noted that a condominium project was denied at a previous Planning Commission meeting due to its density. Commissioner Osborne stated that the Commission should determine if the requirements of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan will be met by the project.

Chairman Webber prefaced his discussion by asking the Commissioners if they had an opportunity to look at other condominium projects in the City. Chairman Webber stated he felt the Dearborn Grove project was a nice project with much open space, however he did not ask how much private space there is in the project. Chairman Webber stated Carefree Village also appeared to have much open space with shade trees. Chairman Webber stated the Fernwood project has underground parking under each of its three (3) units. Chairman Webber stated the Lugonia-Church project has much open space, however there is a ten-foot square area of private space per unit.

Chairman Webber asked the Commissioners if they felt there was an issue relative to open space versus private space for the project. Commissioners Macdonald, Miller, and Thompson stated they were comfortable with the ratios.

Commissioner Laymon expressed her concern that maintenance of the private space would not be enforced by the CC & Rs. Commissioner Laymon stated that most people who move into condominiums want to get away from maintenance of outdoor space. Commissioner Laymon stated she was happy with the project.

Chairman Webber reopened the public hearing.

Chairman Webber asked if there will be anything in the CC & Rs that will address the maintenance of open space.

Mr. Woods stated that most CC & Rs are very strong on homeowner maintenance. Mr. Woods stated that outdoor storage sheds will be prohibited and items such as patio covers and spas will be reviewed by an architectural review committee. Mr. Woods stated that common open space will be maintained by a management company.

Mr. Shaw suggested establishing criteria that would address private open space issues.

Commissioner Miller requested the spacing between the pilasters (on Orange Avenue) be reduced from 50 feet to 24-28 feet. Mr. Woods agreed to Commissioner Miller's request. Commissioner Miller requested that any private open space that is visible to a public street be enclosed with block walls rather than wrought iron. Mr. Baeza stated that the project has been conditioned to include the block walls. Commissioner Miller asked if the Commissioners were concerned with the wood fences separating the private residences.

Mr. Woods stated that the wood fences will be painted, adding to their longevity, however they will probably need to be replaced in 10-12 years. Mr. Woods stated that the fence replacement would be covered under the association's budget and would be maintained by the association.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Macdonald expressed his concern relative to the tandem parking for the project. Commissioner Macdonald stated this is the first project to have tandem parking and it will be followed by others. Commissioner Macdonald stated there were comments made that tandem parking is widely accepted throughout California, but Redlands is a city that they would like to keep different from the rest of California. Commissioner Macdonald stated that residents will be parking in the guest parking spaces, in front of the garages, and in the driveways. Commissioner Macdonald continued by saying if tandem parking is allowed on the project, it will come back to haunt the Commission with future projects. Commissioner Macdonald stated that he could not support the project with tandem parking.

Commissioner Cook stated that she lived with tandem parking for a long time and it was not an issue.

Chairman Weber closed the public hearing.

### **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Specific Plan No. 58 and Tentative Tract No. 16548, 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 Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Specific Plan No. 58 and Tentative Tract No. 16548. It is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or over burden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

### **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that a reduced LOS be approved at the intersection of Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

### **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1001 recommending to the City Council approval of Specific Plan No. 58 subject to modifying the items identified in the staff report and **to include a Condition of Approval No. to read:**

**The Specific Plan shall include provisions regulating the placement, size, and architectural design of any proposed accessory structure.**

### **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on Tentative Tract No. 16548, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the proposed map is consistent with the policies, land use designation, and density

- prescribed by the General Plan;
2. That the design and improvements of the proposed subdivision are consistent with proposed Specific Plan No. 58;
3. That the site is physically suitable for the type of development;
4. That 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;
5. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements will not cause any serious public health problems;
6. That 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,
7. That pursuant to California Government Code Section 66474.6, the discharge of waste from this subdivision apparently 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 and the addition of Conditions of Approval to read:

40. **The pilasters shall be spaced every twenty-four (24) to twenty-eight (28) feet for the masonry wall facing Orange Avenue.**

41. **The CC & Rs shall include a provision for the upkeep and maintenance of interior wood fencing between private yards.**

42. **The CC & Rs shall limit the number of vehicles owned by the tenants to the number of parking spaces allocated to the dwelling unit.**

43. **The Final Landscape Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission prior to the recordation of the map.**

D. **VARIANCE NO. 648** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider Variance requests from Municipal Code Section 18.52.130.A, to allow a reduction in the required setback along Grove Street from twenty-five feet (25') to fourteen feet (14') and a request for a variance from Municipal Code Section 18.140.360 requiring not less than 3,000 square feet of open space recreation area or 400 square feet for each mobile home space within an existing mobile home park located at 1251 E. Lugonia Avenue within the R-2 Multi-Family Residential Zone. Request submitted by LUGONIA FOUNTAINS MOBILE HOME ESTATES.

E. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 172 (Revision No. 1)** PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a Conditional Use Permit to create 18 additional mobile home spaces on approximately 3.43 acres of vacant land on property to the east of an existing mobile home park, located at 1251 E. Lugonia Avenue within the R-2 Multi-Family Residential Zone. Request submitted by LUGONIA FOUNTAINS MOBILE HOME ESTATES.

Mr. Baeza stated the project was withdrawn by the applicant, who will resubmit plans after a revision of the project has been completed. No action was taken.

F. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 799 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Conditional Use Permit for the development of two (2) 3.9 million gallon water reservoirs on approximately 18.7 acres located on the east side of Texas Street, north of San Bernardino Avenue and west of Webster Street in the A-1, Agriculture District. Request submitted by CITY OF REDLANDS MUNICIPAL UTILITIES

DEPARTMENT.

Mr. Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Laymon suggested that taller trees be placed around the reservoir, as seventeen (17) foot high orange trees cannot screen a reservoir that is thirty-five (35) feet tall. In addition, Commissioner Laymon stated she is not happy with the metal-sided shed.

Commissioner Macdonald stated the orange trees cannot provide adequate screening for the water tank, and he asked if a flag test was conducted to determine if the water tank would be seen from the resident's backyards. Commissioner Macdonald asked what kind of safety precautions have been taken in case the tank ruptures.

Mr. Hartel stated that a flag test was not conducted for the project. Mr. Hartel stated that the Environmental Review Committee discussed the use of trees to screen the tank, however it was determined that the tank was at a sufficient distance from roads and homes and the visual impact was not a concern.

Mr. Shaw stated that staff recommended vines on the fencing, in addition to the curved driveway at the Texas Street driveway, so that you would not have a clear view of the tanks.

Mr. Hartel stated that Mr. Lonny Young, Municipal Utilities Department, could best address the safety issues.

Mr. Lonny Young, Municipal Utilities Department, stated that two (2) 3.9 million gallon reservoirs are proposed for this location. Mr. Young stated the reservoirs are designed to Uniform Building Code requirements for Seismic Zone 4. Mr. Young stated the reservoir is equipped with a 24-inch drain line which assists in draining the tank for maintenance and ensures that the roof is not pushed off the top of the tank in the case of a system failure.

Ms. Leonora Sims, 701 Baldwin Avenue, stated her home is located behind the proposed reservoir site. Ms. Sims thanked Commissioners Laymon and Macdonald for their concern of the resident's safety in case of an earthquake. Ms. Sims distributed photos she took of the location, and stated she was disturbed that a beautiful grove of grapefruit trees was destroyed. Ms. Sims requested a brick wall be constructed between her house and the reservoirs to prevent her from seeing them. In addition, Ms. Sims requested a sound barrier to prevent her from hearing the sound of the reservoirs being flushed. Ms. Sims complained that construction occurs on the weekends, commencing early in the morning and continuing until late in the night and she asked the Commission to ensure that there is some type of sound proofing for the residents.

Mr. Young apologized for the work being conducted on the weekends, and stated that there are restrictions prohibiting work on the weekends. Mr. Young assured the Commission that it would not happen again. Mr. Young stated that maintenance on the reservoirs, which is periodic, would occur every 20-30 years and the sound of draining the reservoirs probably could not be heard.

Commissioner Thompson left the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

Mr. Young stated a booster station will be constructed in the future, probably within the next 2-5 years. Mr. Young stated currently there is a booster station located close to Texonia Park, in a similarly designed building, and the decibel level is very low.

Commissioner Macdonald asked Mr. Young if a block wall could be constructed that would separate the residents from the City property. Mr. Young stated that it was not an option that was investigated. Mr. Young stated in the event of an emergency, the 24-inch drain line would discharge water onto Texas Street and carry it away from the reservoir site.

Commissioner Laymon stated that the property at the Sunset tower has been leased and structures have been built to house cell towers and she asked if it would be possible at this site.

Mr. Shaw stated that the City is proactively trying to utilize City facilities, as opposed to private facilities. Mr. Shaw

continued by saying they have found City facilities to be well-screened from public view and they welcome the additional revenue that comes from these sources.

Commissioner Miller suggested sound insulation be used on the booster pump building rather than fiberglass insulation. Commissioner Miller suggested adding a condition of approval that would require the doors and louver windows be sound-sealed. Mr. Young concurred with Mr. Miller's suggestion.

Ms. Sims stated originally the property was purchased to build a park for the north side. Ms. Sims thanked the Commission for its time.

Mr. Shaw stated the portion of the grove that surrounds the reservoirs was purchased with open space funds, and the portion that is being utilized by the Municipal Utilities Department (M. U. D.) was purchased with M. U. D. funds.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Miller stated a Seismic Zone 4 design could withstand an 8.0 earthquake. Commissioner Osborne corrected Commissioner Miller and stated it could withstand an 8.5 earthquake.

Chairman Miller stated in the event that both reservoirs were to rupture, it would result in less than one (1) foot of water over the entire site.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he would like to see trees, such as citridoras, planted around the reservoirs.

Chairman Webber questioned whether citridoras could screen the reservoirs.

Commissioner Osborne suggested a condition of approval requiring that missing citrus trees be filled in with new trees. Chairman Webber concurred and suggested a bushy sycamore tree be planted that would block the view of the reservoir.

Chairman Webber reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Young stated they would be happy to fill in missing trees with citrus, however there is a 20 foot diamond set pattern of planting citrus, and a variation might result in issues with irrigation and discing.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

## **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit No. 799 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined 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 Miller, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 799, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the use applied for at the location set forth in the application is properly one for which a conditional use permit is authorized by this title;
2. That the use is necessary or desirable for the development of the community, is in harmony with the various elements or objectives of the General Plan, and is not detrimental to existing uses or to uses specifically permitted in the zone in which the

proposed use is to be located;

3. That the site for the intended use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use, and all the yards, setbacks, walls or fences, landscaping, and other features required in order to adjust the use to those existing or permitted future uses on land in the neighborhood;
  4. That the site for the proposed use relates to streets and highways properly designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic generated or to be generated by the proposed use;
  5. That the conditions set forth in the permit and shown on the approved site plan are necessary to protect the public health, safety or general welfare; and,
  6. That Conditional Use Permit No. 799 therefore be approved, subject to all department recommendations, and revision of Condition of Approval 11 to read:
11. Noise producing equipment shall be acoustically insulated to prevent impacts on adjacent residential uses and/or sensitive receptors. **The pump station building shall be provided with sound sealing of doors and louvers;**
- and the addition of Condition of Approval 13 to read:**
13. **The applicant shall replace any missing citrus trees along the northerly boundary of the site between the reservoirs and homes to the north.**

Chairman Webber recessed the meeting for a seven minute break.

Chairman Webber reconvened the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Commissioner Miller recused himself due to a possible conflict of interest at 4:41 p.m.

- G. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 762 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Socio-Economic Cost /Benefit Study for a Commission Review and Approval to construct two office buildings with an area of 8,145 and 8,350 square feet on 1.4 acres located on the north side of Plum Lane approximately six-hundred (600) feet east of Idaho Street in the Office Industrial District of Specific Plan No. 25. Request submitted by JAMES DIDION.

Mr. Hartel stated a 6/7 vote of approval from the Commission is required for this project due to the fact that it would add traffic to the intersection of Redlands Boulevard and Alabama Street. Mr. Shaw stated the project could not proceed without the presence of Commissioner Thompson, however he suggested that Mr. Hartel continue with his presentation so that any issues that need to be resolved could be discussed.

Mr. Hartel gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Hartel stated the landscape architect would like to have flowering plum trees at the front driveways, however the plum trees are not on the approved Planning Commission List of Recommended Shade trees. Mr Hartel stated that the landscape architect would like to have flowering plum trees because the building will be located on Plum Lane.

Chairman Webber stated that he did not have a problem with the flowering plum trees due to the fact that they will be located along the street scape, not the parking lot. Chairman Webber noted that there a number of trees lacking in the parking area, which requires a specific number of trees per parking space.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.



Mr. James Didion, applicant, agreed to the additional trees in the parking area and stated he was available to answer questions.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber directed staff to make the appropriate changes, and indicated the project would return to the Commission at the next meeting.

Mr. Shaw indicated the next meeting is scheduled for January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2004, and he suggested a motion be made to continue to that date.

Commissioner Macdonald made a motion to continue the meeting to January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2004, however the applicant requested an opportunity to speak.

Chairman Webber reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Didion asked if there was a way to take action on the project at this time and avoid a one month delay of his project.

Chairman Webber explained that the project requires a 6/7 vote of the Commission, and there were not enough Commissioners to vote on the project.

Mr. Shaw stated there were three options available to the applicant:

1. Schedule a special meeting
2. Deny the project, which would result in the project being forwarded to the City Council in January
3. Continue the project to the evening session

The Commission decided to continue the proposed project to the evening session in order to consult with Commissioner Thompson on his availability for a special meeting.

Commissioner Macdonald withdrew his motion. The proposed project was tabled.

Mr. Didion expressed his appreciation to the Commission.

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

- H. **VARIANCE NO. 669** - Public Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a Variance from the minimum lot area and dimension requirements for a residential lot in the R-R-A (Rural Residential - Animal) District located at 12487 Gold Hill Grade. Request Submitted by ROCKY VISAN.

Ms. Alicia Heideman gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project. Ms. Heideman stated currently, one of the property lines runs through an existing home owned by the Crotinger family. The applicant, Mr. Rocky Visan, is requesting a variance from the minimum lot area required in the zone due to the fact that the minimum lot size for this zone is one acre, however neither lot meets the requirement.

Ms. Heideman stated that the land was incorrectly surveyed in the 60's, which resulted in the property line running through the Crotinger residence.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Chester Walston, representing the applicant, stated he was completing a land survey for Mr. Visan when the error was discovered. Mr. Walston stated the problem was inherited from San Bernardino County, which

approved the permits for the house to be built.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

## **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 669 based on the following findings, and subject to the attached conditions of approval:

1. That the request for the variance has exceptional or extraordinary circumstances because of the unusual situation with the shared lot line between the property in question and the applicant's property which runs through an existing home, and coupled with the existing nonconforming area and width of the property in question;
  2. That the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same vicinity and zone district, but which is denied to the property in question;
  3. That the granting of the variance from the lot area and dimensions of the R-R-A District will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements of others in the vicinity; and,
  4. That the property in question would remain consistent with the intent and guidelines of the General Plan of the City of Redlands.
- I. **ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 298 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an Ordinance Text Amendment to amend Chapters 18.92 and 18.96 of the Redlands Municipal Code relating to uses within the C-3 and C-4 Districts, and adding Article IX entitled "Automobile Sales Development Standards" to Chapter 18.156 of the Redlands Municipal Code. Request submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.

Mr. Robert Dalquest stated the proposed amendment stems from recommendations from the Ad Hoc Zoning Committee, as well as the City Attorney, and staff. Mr. Dalquest stated the Ordinance Text Amendment focuses on the permitted/conditionally permitted uses in the C-3 and C-4 Districts and establishes development standards for automobile sales.

Mr. Dalquest reviewed the revisions made to Chapters 18.92 and 18.96.

Mr. Dalquest noted by taking the personal services out of the C-3 District and allowing it in the C-4 District, it would affect tattoo parlors and massage therapists. Mr. Dalquest advised the Commission that a massage therapist seated in the audience wanted to address the Commission on this matter.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Ms. Ronda McMurry, 5880 Fair Isle Drive, Riverside, stated she is a medical massage therapist however, due to state and federal law she is not allowed to use the word medical in her title and must refer to herself as a clinical massage therapist. Ms. McMurry stated a great percentage of her referrals come from chiropractors, physical therapists, physicians, dentists, and psychotherapists. Ms. McMurry asked the Commission to consider allowing her to work as a clinical massage therapist in the Administrative Professional District.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Mr. Shaw requested the project be tabled, along with items IV(J) and IV(K) to allow him an opportunity to discuss

the proposed project with his staff.

- J. **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 45 AMENDMENT NO. 8** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an amendment to the Downtown Specific Plan No. 45 to amend Section III(B)(3) relating to uses within the Town Center District, Town Center-Historic District, and the Service Commercial District, and adding Subsection 11 entitled "Automobile Sales Development Standards" to Section VI(A) of the Specific Plan. Request submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.
- K. **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 40 AMENDMENT NO. 26** - Public Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an amendment to the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan to amend Chapter 7 and Chapter 9 relating to uses within the General Commercial District and Commercial Industrial District, and adding Subsection "H" entitled "Automobile Sales Development Standards" to Chapter 7 of the Specific Plan. Request submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.
- L. **CANCELLATION OF DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 3** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on the cancellation of a Development Agreement that locked-in the development and performance standards of the land use regulations for property located between Mountain View Avenue, Lugonia Avenue, San Bernardino Avenue, and California Street in Concept Plan No. One of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by BIXBY LAND COMPANY.

Mr. Richard Malacoff stated the applicant, Bixby Land Company, owns the property and would like to proceed with a project that is not consistent with Development Agreement No. 3, therefore they are requesting cancellation of Development Agreement No. 3.

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 that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1019 recommending that the City Council cancel Development Agreement No. 3.

## **V. ADDENDA**

- A. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16408** - Response to comments by David Waters

Mr. Jaquess stated that staff met with Mr. Waters after the last meeting and explained the circumstances regarding the grading issues of which he expressed concern. Mr. Jaquess stated the grading plan is consistent with the approved tentative tract map and was designed to facilitate the retention of the first few rows of orange trees, particularly along Wabash Avenue.

- B. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 15469** - Time Extension

Mr. Malacoff stated this is the third of seven one year extensions that are allowed on the project, which was formerly known as the Van Weren and/or Rosskamp subdivision. Mr. Malacoff stated the time extension would extend the map to January 18, 2005.

## **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission determine that no subsequent environmental documents are necessary for the Planning Commission's one year extension of Tentative Tract No. 15469 which is consistent with the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted by the City of Redlands on January 18, 2000, based on the following findings:

- A. No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previously approved Mitigated Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- B. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to circumstances under which the project was undertaken which will require major revisions of the previously approved Mitigated Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- C. No 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 Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract No. 15469 was approved, has been identified.

#### **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a one year time extension for Tentative Tract No. 15469 extending approval for one (1) year until January 18, 2005.

Agenda items IV(I) was heard at this time.

Mr. Dalquest stated he spoke with Mr. Shaw and due to the urgency to remove personal uses out of the C-3 zone it is their recommendation to insert massage therapy as a permitted use in the C-3 zone. Mr. Dalquest stated that staff would work with the City Attorney's office to come up with a delineation between the two uses, prior to the project being heard at City Council.

Mr. Dalquest suggested the addition of subsection (J) Clinical Massage Therapy to Section 18.92.040.

#### **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. 1016 recommending that the City Council adopt Ordinance Text Amendment No. 298 with a addition of Section 18.92.040 (J) to include **Clinical Massage Therapy**.

Commissioner Miller advised the Commission that he would have to leave the meeting due to a previous commitment. Commissioner Miller agreed to stay until items IV(J) and (K) were heard.

Agenda Item IV(J) was heard at this time.

- J. **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 45 AMENDMENT NO. 8 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an amendment to the Downtown Specific Plan No. 45 to amend Section III(B)(3) relating to uses within the Town Center District, Town Center-Historic District, and the Service Commercial District, and adding Subsection 11 entitled "Automobile Sales Development Standards" to Section VI(A) of the Specific Plan. Request submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.

Mr. Dalquest gave a brief presentation on the proposed amendment and stated the amendment incorporates the applicable changes to Specific Plan No. 45 that are proposed in Ordinance Text Amendment No. 298.

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 Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1018, recommending that the City Council adopt Amendment No. 8 to Specific Plan No. 45.

Agenda Item IV(K) was heard at this time.

- K. **SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 40 AMENDMENT NO. 26** - Public Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an amendment to the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan to amend Chapter 7 and Chapter 9 relating to uses within the General Commercial District and Commercial Industrial District, and adding Subsection "H" entitled "Automobile Sales Development Standards" to Chapter 7 of the Specific Plan. Request submitted by the CITY OF REDLANDS.

Mr. Dalquest stated that Amendment No. 26 incorporates one change to the Specific Plan that is proposed in Ordinance Text Amendment No. 298 relative to establishing new development standards for automobile sales facilities.

Mr. Dalquest stated they anticipate an auto mall in the near future, which would be located close to the interchange, however without the amendment to Specific Plan No. 40, the new automobile dealers would be subject to a 20% landscape coverage. Mr. Dalquest stated that this might prove to be a significant hindrance to new automobile dealers in the mall.

Mr. Dalquest stated that the amendment would take mini storage facilities out of the General Commercial District.

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

## **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1017, recommending that the City Council adopt Amendment No. 26 to Specific Plan No. 40.

## **VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. November 25, 2003

## **MOTION**

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote to approved the minutes of November 25, 2003, as submitted.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT TO EVENING SESSION**

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to the evening session at 6:03 p.m.

**7:00 P.M.**

## VIII. MEETING RECONVENED

Chairman Webber reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. All commissioners were present except Commissioners Miller and Thompson.

Chairman Webber requested that all speaker sign up slips be turned in to the Clerk at the start of the meeting, and he reminded the members of the audience that there is a three minute time limit for anyone wishing to speak. Chairman Webber requested that speakers be concise and address the project at hand, and he advised the audience that he would not tolerate personal attacks on City staff or the applicant.

- A. **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 90** - PUBLIC HEARING for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential and Office to Commercial on 13.89 acres located west of Patricia Drive, east of Ford Street, and south of the Interstate 10 Freeway. Request submitted by FORDRED DEVELOPMENT, LLC.
- B. **AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 23** - PUBLIC HEARING for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and an Amendment to Specific Plan No. 23 to change the land use designation from Administrative and Professional Office and Residential District to Commercial District with new development standards on 13.89 acres located west of Patricia Drive, east of Ford Street, and south of the Interstate 10 Freeway. Request submitted by FORDRED DEVELOPMENT, LLC.
- C. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 793** - PUBLIC HEARING for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a 85,369 square foot shopping center on 13.89 acres in the Residential and Administrative Professional District of Specific Plan No. 23 which is proposed for a change in land use to Commercial located west of Patricia Drive, east of Ford Street, and south of the Interstate 10 Freeway. Request submitted by FORDRED DEVELOPMENT, LLC.

Mr. Malacoff reviewed the project process prior to beginning his presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Malacoff stated that normally public hearing notices are sent to residents within a 300 foot radius of the proposed project, however, for this specific project public hearing notices were sent out to residents within a 700 foot radius. Mr. Malacoff stated as of today's date, staff received 30 letters in support of, and 35 in opposition to the project.

Mr. Malacoff stated the General Plan Amendment would change the land use from medium density residential to commercial, and from office to commercial.

Mr. Malacoff stated the amendment to Specific Plan No. 23 would change the land use from administrative professional office and residential to commercial and would have specific development standards for the uses proposed.

Mr. Malacoff stated the Conditional Use Permit would allow five (5) buildings, which include a grocery store, drug store, two (2) restaurants and retail space.

Mr. Malacoff stated that staff looked at an alternative project that included residential, office buildings, and retail. Mr. Malacoff stated there would be two accesses for this project, one on Patricia Drive and one on Ford Street. In this alternative, the residential area would have to be screened from the freeway in order to comply with a 60 CNEL, which is the maximum noise rating allowed by the General Plan.

Mr. Malacoff stated a traffic study was conducted for the alternative (Mixed Use) project and the proposed project. Mr. Malacoff stated the analysis indicated in all cases, impacted intersections will be more negatively impacted by the alternative (Mixed Use) project than by the proposed shopping center project.

Mr. Malacoff stated the specific plan prohibits access to the shopping center on Patricia Drive and would require a

specific plan amendment to change the site plan. Mr. Malacoff stated that staff reviewed the list of allowed uses and compiled a list of recommendations:

1. No drive-thrus would be allowed (including fast food restaurants, bank and pharmacies)
2. A daycare center would require a conditional use permit
3. Clarification on the medical uses that would be allowed
4. Tattoo parlors, piercing parlors, massage services, mortuaries and funeral parlors, animal hospitals and kennels would be prohibited under all circumstances
5. The buildings will be required to have a 25 foot landscaping setback from the freeway and all streets
6. The signage will be consistent with Specific Plan 41 (Albertsons Shopping Center) and the applicant would be allowed one freestanding sign
7. The public hearing requirement for notification of impacted property owners would be expanded to 1,000 feet.
8. The hours be limited so that there would be no operation of stores/businesses between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m., and no deliveries would occur between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m.

Mr. Malacoff stated that staff is recommending the Specific Plan be continued so that these issues can be addressed before going to City Council. Mr. Malacoff stated the applicant concurred.

Mr. Malacoff stated the applicant would have to meet requirements for Specific Plan No. 23 which allows setbacks of twenty-five (25) feet and a building height of twenty-five (25) feet. Mr. Malacoff stated the buildings proposed show a building height of thirty-six (36) feet which conflict with the maximum building height proposed by the Specific Plan. Mr. Malacoff stated the applicant would need to change the standard or the architectural elevations.

Mr. Malacoff indicated the parking calculation for restaurants is one parking space per fifty (50) square feet of serving area. Mr. Malacoff stated that staff is concerned that there may not be enough parking spaces on site and wants to ensure that parking is implemented correctly.

Mr. Malacoff stated that there was a minor issue involving landscaping and the type of trees used. The applicant agreed to revise the plan.

Mr. Malacoff stated staff is recommending the Conditional Use Permit be continued in order to rectify these issues.

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, thanked Mr. Malacoff for a very thorough report. Mr. Meyer focused his comments on the General Plan Amendment and agreed to a continuance to work out the issues involving parking spaces and landscaping. Mr. Meyer gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project.

Ms. Laura Paiz, Real Estate Manager, Ralph's Supermarket, read a letter from E. John Burgon, President of Ralph's Supermarket, reiterating Ralph's strong desire to be at a location in Redlands.

Mr. Wes Pringle, Traffic Consultant, stated there have been two (2) extensive studies conducted on the site. Mr. Pringle stated they look at two scenarios for development, mixed use and commercial. Mr. Pringle stated the mixed use project generates more traffic than the commercial use due to the fact that there is more square footage involved and the 25 dwelling units, which would generate more traffic.

Mr. Pringle stated that signals could be set to ensure that traffic on Ford Street is not delayed.

Chairman Webber asked who was responsible for setting priorities for traffic signals.

Mr. Ron Mutter, Director, Public Works Department, stated Public Works is responsible for setting city owned traffic signals and Cal Trans sets state owned signals. Mr. Mutter stated that Cal Trans would be responsible for setting the signal at Redlands Boulevard/Ford Street because it is part of the freeway ramp.

Commissioner Laymon expressed her concern on future development of the vacant land across the street from the proposed Ralph's Supermarket. Mr. Shaw stated that staff believes there may be an error on our zoning map and the property may not be in Specific Plan No. 23. Mr. Shaw stated that staff will be return with clarification after we have contacted the property owner for more information.

Ms. Karen A. Grozak, 648 E. Sunset Drive North, expressed her support of the project.

Ms. Joanne Singer, 1519 Lynne Court, expressed her support of the project. Ms. Singer stated she lives within walking distance and she looks forward to walking to the market and not having to drive. Ms. Singer stated she feels it is a good use of the land, which is an eyesore.

Mr. Paul Douglas, 390 Cynthia Crest Drive, stated that the citizens have only received the latest traffic studies, and have not had an opportunity to get a traffic report from their traffic consultant, Mr. Creeper. Mr. Douglas stated the center is geared for people traveling on the freeway to Yucaipa, Banning and beyond.

Mr. Orville McElmurry, 519 Golden West Drive, stated he has come to the conclusion that the proposed project will be more useful to the community than the alternative.

Ms. Gloria McKeegan, 1544 Lynne Court, expressed her support and stated she feels it will enhance the hill which is currently filled with trash and trees and make a nice entrance to our city.

Mr. Bill Cunningham, Redlands Association, stated he felt the alternative project is being used to frighten residents into supporting the proposed project.

Chairman Webber interjected and stated that the Commission requested information on an alternative project so that it could better understand and assess the proposed project.

Mr. Cunningham stated there has been no assessment of sound levels. Mr. Cunningham stated that SANBAG authorized and encouraged the City to coordinate the signalization of Redlands Boulevard in order to create a safety valve for I-10. Mr. Cunningham stated a letter was filed with the Commission requesting either the proposed project be denied or a full Environmental Impact Report be completed.

Ms. Vickie Smith, 508 Golden West Drive, stated she is in favor of the proposed project because the alternative project would have two (2) entrances onto Patricia Drive which would greatly impact the residential area.

Mr. Chuck Ehrlich, 506 E. Mariposa, expressed his support of the proposed project stating he would no longer have to drive to the downtown area.

Mr. Jeff Ablinger, 1460 Marshall St. #3, expressed his support of the proposed project stating there is a need for the residents in the area.

Ms. Esther Ringer, 610 11<sup>th</sup> Street, stated she likes shopping at Ralph's Supermarket. Ms. Ringer stated she lives close to Stater Bros. on Colton and she is seldom impacted by delivery trucks.

Mr. George Minter, 500 S. Grand, Los Angeles, stated he is here on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Minter stated the project is a well thought out and highly desired project. Mr. Minter submitted 350 cards voicing their support of the Redlands Neighborhood Center.

Mr. Robert White, 2 Summit Avenue, stated he received one of the cards and there was no place to say "No" on



the card. Mr. White stated a change to the General Plan is a significant action and he cited the loss of property values and the traffic as major concerns.

Ms. Maureen McIntyre, 1402 Garden, stated she felt the center is not needed as there are 10 grocery stores in the city.

Dr. Stephen Morrow, 242 Candy Lane, expressed his opposition to the project citing issues of traffic, lighting, smell, and people getting lost in the neighborhood. Dr. Morrow stated Redlands should not change into Chino Hills or Anaheim Hills.

Ms. Joan Jensen, 313 Marcia Street, expressed her opposition to the project stating the traffic they deal with is awesome. Ms. Jensen stated, "This is my neighborhood and my home and I do not want this."

Ms. Teddy Banta, 30443 E. Sunset Drive South, stated this area is one of the entrances to the city and it should not be crowded with cars and trucks.

Mr. Robert M. Macey, 387 Los Robles Crest, stated the problem with the proposed project is traffic. Mr. Macey asked how many of the Ralph's Supermarkets have one (1) entrance. Mr. Macey expressed his opposition to the project.

Cheryl Joiner, 30812 Miradero Drive, stated she is in favor of the proposed project. Ms. Joiner stated it would be nice to have a store where you would not have to leave the area to go shopping.

Mr. Brad Williams, 385 Cynthia Crest, read a letter from his neighbor, who was ill, stating the area was not intended for commercial use.

Ms. Lorraine Boatman, 1425 Patricia Drive, expressed her opposition to the project. Ms. Boatman stated every effort should be made to protect what is good and right. Ms. Boatman stated the shopping center is not needed and she referred to statements made from representatives from Albertson's and Von's stating they are "one supermarket away from closing down." Ms. Boatman urged the Commission to protect the current zoning.

Mr. Irwin Spitzer, 306 Marcia Street, expressed his opposition to the project and stated there are two schools in the vicinity that will receive a considerable amount of traffic.

Mr. Jack Vanderwoude, 803 Buckingham Drive, expressed his support of the project. Mr. Vanderwoude stated this type of development is seen in areas such as La Jolla and Carlsbad. Mr. Vanderwoude stated he felt the project is a quality, well-designed and well-screened commercial center in a high quality neighborhood.

Mr. Kevin Morningstar, 625 Golden West Drive, raised three issues: (1) What is the compelling interest for the project?, (2) Respect the existing plan and the neighbors, (3) Three traffic lights are not an improvement. Mr. Morningstar requested that the Commission take action tonight.

Ms. Kim Munkres, 1406 Garden, stated she believes amendments to the General Plan should be for projects that benefit the community in a meaningful way. Ms. Munkres stated this is not an upscale center. Ms. Munkres expressed her opposition to the proposed project and she asked that it be decided tonight.

Mr. Al Spigner, 149 E. Hilton Drive, expressed his opposition to the proposed project due to the traffic. Mr. Spigner stated he felt the area should be developed as residential or a park.

Mr. Ken Scofield, 1355 Paige Lane, expressed his opposition to the project and stated the view of the back of the Ralph's Supermarket looking in from Patricia Drive is not attractive. Mr. Scofield stated the side of the building which faces the freeway is a straight, unadorned elevation that would not be attractive to the freeway.

Mr. Steven Mohr, 532 Golden West Drive, stated his family is concerned with the change in zoning. Mr. Mohr stated he felt his quality of life and property values would be impacted. Mr. Mohr stated a modification of zoning would signal a shift of Redlands City strategy that would negatively impact homeowners in the Ford and Sunset areas and beyond.

Mr. Ralph Megna, Economic Development Advisor, Redlands Chamber of Commerce, stated very rarely do retail centers themselves generate traffic; it's "rooftops" that generate traffic. Mr. Megna stated there is traffic in the neighborhood because there are "rooftops", not because there's a Ralph's shopping center. Mr. Megna stated that Ralph's is generally regarded as one of the most expensive supermarkets and gets its market loyalty from the service it offers, the quality of the stores it builds, and the range of products it offers. Mr. Megna stated they are trying to bring high quality lifestyle retailers, particularly into the downtown area, and it is difficult to do so when your chief supermarkets are Stater Bros. and Food-4-Less.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber asked the Commission whether it supports a change from its present designation to commercial.

Commissioner Laymon stated the city could use the revenue from a project such as this, but not at the risk of the neighbors who live in close proximity and are not supportive. Commissioner Laymon stated she could not support the general plan amendment at this time.

Commissioner Cook stated she did not feel the site was an appropriate place for high density. Commissioner Cook stated the residential development that could be built on the site will generate as much traffic or more than the proposed project. Commissioner Cook stated she supports the general plan amendment.

Commissioner Osborne stated the site is not a good area for administrative professional development. Commissioner Osborne stated the proposed project creates a buffer between the houses and the neighborhood shopping area. Commissioner Osborne stated he supports the general plan amendment.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he did not feel it was appropriate to change the zoning in that area. Commissioner Macdonald stated the City is adequately served by supermarkets. Commissioner Macdonald stated he could not support the general plan amendment.

Chairman Webber stated traditionally when there is a controversial project, he prefers to have at least six (6) if not all of the Commissioners present to make major decisions. Chairman Webber stated he would request a continuance in order to allow Commissioners Miller and Thompson an opportunity to state their position.

Chairman Webber stated he did not think the area should have been zoned with its current designation. Chairman Webber stated the site is not a good place for a high volume, active project such as this and he felt the area should be developed as residential. Chairman Webber stated he could not support the General Plan Amendment.

Chairman Webber stated he would read a motion for continuance to allow Commissioners Miller and Thompson to state their position.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he felt the votes of Commissioners Miller and Thompson would be questionable in his mind because they have not had an opportunity to participate in the discussion for the past two-and-a-half hours.

Mr. Shaw stated it was important to have the votes of the two commissioners who are not present at the meeting.

Commissioner Laymon requested that consideration be given to the other available parcels in the area. Mr. Shaw stated he would identify other land area in the vicinity of the project that are designated AP.

## MOTION

It was moved by Chairman Webber, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue General Plan Amendment No. 90, Amendment No. 4 to Specific Plan No. 23 and Conditional Use Permit No. 793 to the Planning Commission meeting of January 13, 2004.

### IX. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMUNICATIONS

#### A. City Council Report

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of December 2<sup>nd</sup>.

#### B. Status of Major Projects

Mr. Shaw stated he would be glad to answer questions on the updated Status of Major Projects list.

#### G. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 762 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Socio-Economic Cost /Benefit Study for a Commission Review and Approval to construct two office buildings with an area of 8,145 and 8,350 square feet on 1.4 acres located on the north side of Plum Lane approximately six-hundred (600) feet east of Idaho Street in the Office Industrial District of Specific Plan No. 25. Request submitted by JAMES DIDION.

Chairman Webber stated Item IV(G) was tabled earlier in the meeting, however due to the fact that Commissioner Thompson is not present, a special meeting will be scheduled for December 23<sup>rd</sup> so that the project may be heard at that time.

## MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Commission Review and Approval No. 762 to the special Planning Commission meeting on December 23<sup>rd</sup> at 2:00 p.m.

For the benefit of the public, Chairman Webber noted that the Planning Commissioners are not paid.

### X. ADJOURNMENT TO JANUARY 13, 2004

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to the special meeting on December 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Patricia Ortiz, Senior Admin. Assistant  
Community Development Department

---

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director  
Community Development Department

