

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, June 22, 2004, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

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

ABSENT: Caroline Laymon, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - 3 MINUTES

Chairman Webber called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. All commissioners were present except Commissioners Laymon and Miller.

Chairman Webber advised the Commission and members of the audience that the Civic Center parking lot was designated a 30 minute and 60 minute parking zone.

Mr. Shaw stated that parking permits can be obtained from the Planning Commission secretary and should be placed on the vehicle dashboard to prevent receiving a parking citation.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

- A. **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 260** - Planning Commission consideration of one (1) pedestal sign with a total face area of twenty-four (24) square feet located at 1189 W. State Street in the M-I, Light Industrial District. Request submitted by TERESA ROGERS.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Sign Review No. 260 subject to the Conditions of Approval.

III. OLD BUSINESS

Assistant Director John Jaquess advised the Commission that the following item requires a 6/7 vote of approval, however they are awaiting the arrival of Commissioner Miller. Mr. Jaquess requested the item be deferred and heard later in the meeting.

Commissioner Miller arrived and Commission Review and Approval No. 778 was heard at this time.

- A. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 778** - Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and consideration of a Commission Review and Approval for the construction of a business park of five single story buildings with 89,640 square feet on 5.5 acres, located on the east side of Alabama Street between Park Avenue and State Street in the Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by WMF DESIGNS.

Project Planner Asher Hartel stated the project was continued from May 11th. Mr. Hartel gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Hartel stated concern was expressed on the building elevations and landscape details.

Mr. Hartel reviewed a revised front building elevation for Building 1 which includes a rounded feature on the parapet at each end of the building and raised featured at the center of the building. Mr. Hartel stated the elevations for Buildings 2 and 3 did not change. Mr. Hartel stated the height of Building 4 increased from 24 to 30 feet with the revision to the parapet that is consistent with Building 1.

Mr. Hartel stated the landscape plan was revised to meet the requirements specified in the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Mr. Hartel stated Pistachio trees have been proposed at the north end of Building 1 and at the ends of all the buildings which may cause a problem due to their close proximity to the buildings (within 2 feet). Mr. Hartel stated the Commission may want to consider planting more compact trees or bushes in these locations.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Wil Fessler, architect, stated the Pistachio trees will be located in five (5) foot planter areas.

Chairman Webber stated a Pistachio tree will not work because it grows wider than five (5) feet. Chairman Webber suggested the Pistachio tree be replaced with a Sweet Shade or a pine tree. Chairman Webber suggested adding a Condition of Approval that requires replacing the Pistachio tree with a Sweet Shade tree or a another tree taken from the Approved Planning Commission List of Trees.

Mr. Hartel stated Planning Division Condition of Approval 22 requires the Landscape Plan to be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Miller stated he believes only an Italian Cypress can grow in the five (5) foot planter. Chairman Webber stated a Sweet Shade tree can grow in a three (3) foot planter. Commissioner Miller suggested possibly shortening the building.

Mr. Fesler indicated that he did not want to reduce the size of the buildings. He stated that the coverage ratio for the project is very low and they have attempted to design a site that is functional with a minimal amount of impact. Mr. Fesler stated he would prefer to change the trees rather than shorten the buildings.

Commissioner Miller stated the reason for the low coverage ratio is the two driveways on both sides of the building which are needed for light industrial use. Commissioner Miller stated he and Chairman Webber met with Mr. Fesler to discuss their concerns on the building elevations. Commissioner Miller stated he felt the applicant was trying to build the most economical project he could, however since it is located on a prominent street, he (Commissioner Miller) does not feel enough effort has been made to address concerns on the building elevations.

Commissioner Miller stated the Commission recently approved two (2) light industrial projects, Essex and R. P. Wages, which he felt were fairly successful. Commissioner Miller stated there was a substantial amount of landscaping for the two projects and he suggested the same be done with this project. Commissioner Miller stated he felt the architectural element in the middle was disproportionately small when compared to the length of the overall building, but can be easily changed. He continued by saying every window across the facade is of almost the exact same width and there is no relief in the major plains. Commissioner Miller stated he cannot support the proposed elevations.

Mr. Fesler stated it was their intent to keep the front uniform in order to facilitate splitting of the suites to accommodate the various tenants.

Mr. Dan Merritt stated he had previous discussions with Mr. Hartel and he is at a loss to understand these comments regarding the elevations.

Commissioner Miller stated he commented to Mr. Hartel that one of the major problems he had with the project was that there is no variety within the standard module. Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Hartel if that comment was passed on to the applicant. Mr. Hartel stated it was.

Mr. Merritt stated he may have misunderstood and did not think the window sizes were an issue.

Mr. Fesler stated many hours were spent on the buildings to provide the most flexibility to prospective tenants. Mr. Fesler stated that different window sizes would change the purpose of the buildings.

Commissioner Miller stated he did not think the modulization has to be thrown out, in order to provide variety for the tenants. Commissioner Miller suggested the use of spandrel glass panels to make the windows appear to be larger.

Commissioner Osborne stated the corners of the buildings protrude out and the windows appear to be set back. Mr. Fesler stated the windows are set back four (4) feet. Commissioner Miller stated the biggest issue for him is the 320-foot long building that is almost completely uniform, with all the windows being the same.

Mr. Bill Cunningham, The Redlands Association, raised General Plan concerns with regard to traffic and the 6/7 vote, and stated he understood the matter was going to be referred to the City Attorneys office for a ruling or a comment.

Chairman Webber stated the Commission received a report from staff and a memo from Mr. Jeff Shaw which satisfied their concerns relative to that provision of Measure U.

Mr. Cunningham asked Chairman Webber if he felt it was consistent with the General Plan.

Chairman Webber stated the Commission believes it is consistent with the General Plan, as detailed by staff's report.

Mr. Cunningham stated he wanted the minutes to reflect his question and he requested a copy of the document (Planning Division report). Mr. Cunningham stated he appreciates the Commission's effort, especially Commissioner Miller's effort, to protect the aesthetics of the major arterials entering the City. Mr. Cunningham stated Alabama Street is one of the major entrances into the city and its protection, in terms of aesthetic character, is a crucial issue.

Commissioner Thompson stated he would like to see the middle parapet expanded, per Commissioner Miller's suggestion. He stated he does not have a problem with the windows as proposed.

Chairman Webber stated the Commission is trying to take its time to ensure that the buildings will be perceived by the public in the future as a good effort. He stated he drove by the R. P. Wages building and was reminded that they will need to pay attention to the architecture of future buildings. Mr. Shaw stated that Commissioner Webber may have been looking at the ends of buildings that will be set back behind a building with a storefront that faces onto Alabama Street.

Commissioner Miller stated he drove by the R. P. Wages buildings that face north toward Park and he reviewed the elevations for the project and he believes the R. P. Wages and Essex projects will benefit by their landscaping, which is substantial.

Commissioner Miller continued by saying the proposed project has a 300 foot long building, and he believes more variety is needed on the facade.

Commissioner Cook stated she felt the middle element is too small. Commissioner Osborne concurred and stated he does not believe additional treatment is needed for the windows. Commissioner Macdonald supported Commissioner Miller's suggestion.

Discussion was held relative to the landscaping plan and the choice of trees to be planted.

Chairman Webber asked the Commission if it was supportive in having the landscaping plan come back to them for review and approval.

Commissioner Osborne stated he supports having the landscape plan come back to the Commission and he asked if there is a requirement that the landscape adjacent to the building have space for mature trees. Chairman Webber stated the Citridora and Brisbane Box trees have been used quite often to break up the facade of long buildings.

Commissioner Osborne stated he concurred with Mr. Shaw that they select a tree that will grow in a five (5) foot planter.

Chairman Webber asked if there was support to break up the repetitive pattern on the facade of the building as suggested by Commissioner Miller. Commissioner Macdonald stated he would defer to Commissioner Miller's expertise and support his opinion as being correct.

Commissioner Miller stated the canopies and columns help to break up the facade.

Commissioner Cook asked Commissioner Miller for clarification on his suggestion to use spandrel glass. Commissioner Miller stated it is "fake glass"; it looks like a window with concrete behind it. Commissioner Miller suggested the applicant widen out the parapet with an arch rather than a peak and introduce additional glass in the center area so that the facade will have a focal point. Commissioner Miller suggested using spandrel glass in the center area.

Commissioner Thompson concurred with the suggestion for additional glass in the center area, but he felt the windows are fine with the treatment proposed. Commissioner Miller agreed with Commissioner Thompson and stated a final action could be taken today if the applicant concurs.

Mr. Merritt concurred with the Commission.

Commissioner Miller asked if a Condition of Approval could be added that would reflect the Commission's request.

Mr. Jaquess suggested the architectural element be brought back to the Commission as an addenda item along with the landscape plan. Mr. Merritt concurred.

Commissioner Miller noted there is a Condition of Approval that requires the air conditioning equipment be screened.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hartel asked if the architectural element that is coming back to the Commission refers only to Building 1. Commissioner Webber stated it did.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval No. 778 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 Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval No. 778 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 Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c and City Council Resolution 6202.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 778 subject to the following findings:

1. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed office buildings.
2. The site properly relates to Alabama Street, which has been designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed office buildings.
3. The conditions proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 778 shown on the site plan are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare of the neighborhood and the City of Redlands.
4. When completed, the project will contribute to the overall development of the neighborhood
5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial Industrial Designation of the General Plan and the Commercial Industrial District of the EVCSP, with a revision to Planning Division Condition of Approval 22 to read:

The Landscape Plans **and architectural elevations for Building 1** shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.

- B. **AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE REMOVAL NO. 102** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for an Agricultural Preserve Removal on 19.6 acres at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, on property located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.
- C. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 394** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Zone Change from A-1, Agricultural District to R-E, Residential Estate District on three (3) contiguous parcels totaling 19.6 gross acres at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.
- D. **VARIANCE NO. 684 - PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission consideration of

a recommendation to the City Council for a Variance from Section 18.144.160 of the Redlands Municipal Code to reduce the requirement for side-yard setbacks from ten (10) feet to five (5) feet on Lots 1 through 12 and Lots 18 through 30 on Tentative Tract Map No. 16747, at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District (Proposed R-E Residential Estate District). Request submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC. **(WITHDRAWN)**

- E. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 806** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Conditional Use Permit for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on 19.6 acres consisting of 52 residential lots and four (4) common lots at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.
- F. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16747** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 19.6 gross acres into 52 residential lots and four (4) common lots at 1205 E. San Bernardino Avenue, located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue approximately 2,000 feet west of Judson Street in the A-1, Agricultural District (Proposed R-E Residential Estate District). Request submitted by REGENCY FARMS, INC.

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Hartel stated a Variance application was filed to allow five (5) foot side yard setbacks on lots abutting the east and west boundaries but it was withdrawn.

Mr. Shaw stated Mr. Hartel had not reviewed the Municipal Utilities Department (M.U.D.) Conditions of Approval that were distributed at the start of the meeting. Mr. Shaw stated staff had an opportunity to review the M.U.D. Conditions of Approval with both the Department and the applicant, and staff is suggesting minor revisions:

CC&R's: In order to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, due to potential risks to persons on the ground related to off-airport aircraft accidents, and serve the public interest, residential structures shall not be permitted for this subdivision in Zone B2 and shall be restricted by covenants, conditions, and restrictions, (CC&R's) to be applied to and recorded for Lot "D", as approved by the City Attorney. The C&R's for the land uses for Lot D shall not included prohibited uses as listed for Zone B2 in Table 2A of the ALUP. The CC&R's for land uses for Lot D, which is for non-residential use only, shall be consistent with low intensity park use and shall not exceed a maximum density of 90 people per acre. ~~Playgrounds~~-Tot lots, and playground equipment, such as swings, climbing devices and slides, shall not be permitted within Lot D. Tennis and basketball courts, open play fields, walkways, jogging paths, picnic tables, gazebos, benches, and RV storage parking area shall be permitted in Lot D, as approved by the Municipal Utilities Department.

Site Improvement and Final Landscaping Plan: Submit the Site Improvement and Final Landscape

Plan for Lot D, prepared and signed by a registered landscape architect, for review and recommendation to the Planning Commission by the Municipal Utilities and Community Development Departments. The Plan shall not include prohibited uses as listed for Zone B2 in Table 2A of the ALUP. The Plan shall be consistent with low intensity park use and not exceed a maximum density of 90 people per acre. ~~Playgrounds and Tot lots, and playground equipment, such as swings, climbing devices and slides, shall not be permitted within Lot D.~~ Tennis and basketball courts, open play fields, walkways, jogging paths, picnic tables, gazebos, benches, and RV storage parking area shall be permitted in Lot D, as approved by the Municipal Utilities Department, subject to inclusion of an open land area complying with Sections 3.2.5 of the ALUP, as required in Item 5 of the Airport Section.

*Avigation Easement: Comply with requirements for avigation easements, for Zone B2 and Zone C, to be recorded on the Final Tract Map, and on the deed for each parcel created by the Final Tract Map, both as approved by the Municipal Utilities Department **and City Attorney**. The noise level within Zone B2 ~~may exceed 60 db, and~~ will be subject to frequent noise intrusion, single event noise levels, operation of aircraft at or below 1,000 feet AGL, and being within areas along principal departure paths overflowed by aircraft, and within standard helicopter approach and departure routes. The noise level within Zone C will be subject to frequent noise intrusion, single event noise levels, operation of aircraft at or below 1,000 feet AGL, and being immediately adjacent to areas along principal departure paths overflowed by aircraft and standard helicopter approach and departure routes.*

*Open Land Requirement: Submit the Site Improvement and Final Landscape Plan for Lot D, prepared and signed by a registered landscape architect, for review and recommendation to the Planning Commission **as reviewed and approved by** the Municipal Utilities and Community Development Departments. The open land shall be designed based on the follow dimensional and other criteria:*

4. comply with the requirements of Section 3.2.5 of the ALUP
5. minimum dimensions of 75' by 300'
6. longitudinally align the open land to bear approximately 25 degrees south of the centerline of Pioneer Street, with the centerline passing through the northeast property corner of Lot D and a point 12 feet north of the northwest corner of Lot 1
7. planned tree planting and other features at both ends of the open land, longitudinally, shall be designed to minimize height

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bud Thatcher, Thatcher Engineering, thanked the Planning Commission for its efforts on the proposed project. Mr. Thatcher wanted it noted on record that he agrees with Planning Division Condition of Approval 13 for Conditional Use Permit No. 806 as proposed by staff. Mr. Thatcher stated he concurs with the changes recommended by Mr. Shaw and it appears there may be minor changes to the conceptual landscaping plan with regard to the 75' by 300' clear area. Mr. Thatcher stated the matter would be clarified when it returns to the Planning Commission for review.

Commissioner Cook stated the Historic Commission is not going to support the demolition of the house and she asked Mr. Thatcher if he has given any thought to reconfiguring the map.

Mr. Thatcher stated he is working with the Historic Commission, however he is not planning to reconfigure the map. Mr. Thatcher stated he might consider moving the building or documenting the structure.

Commissioner Cook stated she feels there should be more attempts to save the buildings, rather than bulldozing them. Commissioner Cook stated she thinks the applicant should listen to the Historic Commission when they say they don't support the demolition of the building.

Mr. Thatcher stated he understood but it doesn't mean the building can't be relocated or used in another way. Mr. Thatcher continued by saying it is not practical to keep the building and make the subdivision work.

Mr. Jaquess stated since the Historic Commission's environmental review of the project, no further action has been taken on the demolition. Mr. Jaquess stated two of the Historic Commissioners toured the house and are willing to consider other options.

Chairman Webber asked how it will be worked out. Mr. Thatcher stated he does not know what the resolution will be.

Mr. Jaquess stated if a resolution cannot be worked out and the Historic Commission holds firm on its position that the house be retained in its current location, the applicant will be obligated to return to the Commission with a revised plan.

Commissioner Miller expressed concern on the chain link fence that separates the park from the RV storage area. Commissioner Miller stated he prefers a wrought iron fence, possibly made of galvanized iron finish, which is easier to maintain.

Mr. Thatcher stated the fence can be changed if it is the wish of the Commission.

Commissioner Macdonald told Mr. Thatcher that he appreciated his withdrawal of the variance request for side yard setbacks.

Chairman Webber asked Mr. Thatcher why developers place fast trees (such as Jacarandas) and slow growing trees (such as Ginkos) on the street scape. Chairman Webber stated he is going to mark points down during the allocation process in this area for these types of things.

Mr. Thatcher responded by saying the intent is to create identity of the streets through the use of different trees in the subdivision. Mr. Thatcher stated he would prefer to see the trees jumbled and mixed throughout the project, providing some variation.

Chairman Webber stated he likes to drive through new subdivisions and see different types of trees. Chairman Webber stated in the older parts of town, you see many different types of trees which

ad interest. Mr. Thatcher concurred with Chairman Webber and stated he would discuss the matter with his consultant. Chairman Webber stated this matter would be brought up again during the allocation process.

Mr. John James, speaking as a longtime Redlands resident stated he is opposed to the zone change. Mr. James stated the airport is an asset to Redlands and its residents as it serves as an economic base for many businesses, which creates hundreds of jobs in the area. Mr. James stated the airspace over Redlands serves to divert the approach and landing of aircraft into and out of San Bernardino Airport.

Mr. James stated a task force was formed at the direction of the City Council, to review airport operations and develop a list of recommendations that would enhance the value of the airport.

Mr. James stated there are areas identified in the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) that define safety zones in and around the airport. Mr. James stated the proposed zone change encroaches upon the safety zone and is not in compliance with the ALUP. He stated he is opposed to the zone change from A-1 to R-E, as he does not believe the change is in the best interest of the residents or the airport.

Mr. Bob Pierce, Redlands Airport Advisory Board, stated there have been a lot of compromises made on this project. Mr. Pierce distributed written material from the California Aeronautics Board and suggested that the overlay of the airport zones be placed on top of plot plans. He stated the present runway will be extended in November from 4,600 ft. to a hard surface runway of 5,006 ft.

Mr. Bill Cunningham, stated PRD ordinances require 20% active landscaped open space. He stated the B2 zone is excluded from development and yet developers are using it for their 20% open space.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne indicated that he wanted to ask Mr. Pierce a question.

Chairman Webber reopened the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Pierce if the open space zones are established by aviation advisors or experts, how can developers be stopped from building adjacent to the open space zone? Mr. Pierce responded by saying according to state law, open space zones can only be changed once a year.

Chairman Cook asked why tot lots and playground equipment such as swings are not permitted, yet tennis and basketball courts, picnic tables, and gazebos are permitted. Commissioner Macdonald stated it may possibly be due to the number of people involved.

Chairman Webber asked if there was anyone available from the Municipal Utilities Department who might be able to answer Commissioner Cook's question.

Director Gary Phelps, Municipal Utilities Department, stated playground equipment and tot lots are associated with residential use, which this area is adjacent to and children would be less able to react to a situation. Mr. Phelps stated the ALUP specifically states playgrounds and tot lots are not a

recommended use.

Mr. Phelps stated new residential structures are prohibited in B2 zones, which implies that residential use is not recommended.

Commissioner Macdonald asked if there is a danger to the established airport facility with additional development in the area designated Zone C. Commissioner Macdonald stated there seemed to be concern on Mr. James' part that going from open space in an A-1 agricultural designation to a residential designation will create a problem for the airport itself.

Mr. Doug Headrick, Municipal Utilities Department, stated there are examples across the country where development, specifically residential development, encroaches upon existing airports and then there is sufficient momentum to close the airport, regardless of how many protections are put in place. Mr. Headrick stated it is more likely that they will find themselves in a position to defend the existing airport as more development occurs.

Commissioner Macdonald asked if it would be appropriate to have more definitive language in the General Plan relative to the airport and its use. Mr. Shaw responded by saying the General Plan has two layers of policies, the land use plan which allows very low density up to Pioneer Avenue and agricultural uses north of Pioneer Avenue, and the ALUP which limits development in proximity to the airport.

Mr. Shaw stated this is the second project that is on the border of the B and C zones, which were changed when the Sports Park was approved. Mr. Shaw stated it may be time to review the land use element and ALUP in conjunction with the General Plan update.

Chairman Webber stated it seems the airport is an asset that many cities do not have, and it is important to protect it for a future use.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Shaw to comment on Mr. Cunningham's concern regarding the use of the property in the B2 area as developable land.

Mr. Shaw stated the a developer must set aside 20% as open space in order to develop a PRD, as permitted within the RE zone. Mr. Shaw stated the applicant is making "dual use" of the land:

- a. In order to develop the PRD, the applicant must set aside 20% of the land as open space
- b. Placing the 20% open space area in the B2 zone, which prohibits housing.

Mr. Shaw stated the applicant is in compliance with the ALUP and the PRD standards.

Commissioner Miller stated as he understood, Mr. Cunningham's concern was the use of unbuildable land for houses to justify a density increase.

Commissioner Thompson stated he attended the City Council meeting when the Airport Board gave a presentation on its vision for the airport. Commissioner Thompson stated he felt the biggest asset provided by the airport is its protection of the City's airspace. Commissioner Thompson stated he would probably vote in favor of the zone change, however he would be reluctant to support any

future zone changes in the area.

Mr. Shaw requested direction from the Commission on whether future single family development is appropriate for the area.

Commissioner Cook stated she is concerned with the high density of the project in a Residential Estate zone.

Commissioner Macdonald stated every time a development is approved, it is the “domino” theory. Commissioner Macdonald stated the development is infringing upon airport territory and needs to be strongly considered because it is a first step.

Commissioner Miller stated they have gone from A-1 designated land to RE (Residential Estate) to a PRD with 7,800 square foot lots. Commissioner Miller stated he feels it changes the character of RE designated lots.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Macdonald questioned whether it is appropriate to make the zone change because of its infringement upon the airport space.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 102, Zone Change No. 394, Tentative Tract No. 16747, and Conditional Use Permit No. 806 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 Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 102, Zone Change No. 394, Tentative Tract No. 16747, and Conditional Use Permit No. 806 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 Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 1029 recommending that the City Council adopt Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 101 based upon the following findings:

1. The applicants are the legal owners of record. Regency Farms and Thatcher Engineering are authorized representatives of the owners;

2. The land requested to be removed from the preserve abuts a developed zone other than agricultural. There is existing or approved planned residential development to the east and south;
3. The application is in conformity with the City of Redlands' General Plan. The General Plan land use designation is Very Low Density Residential and the project is consistent with this designation;
4. The land requested to be removed from the Preserve shall not circumvent land under contract in accordance with the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. The project site is not under Williamson Act Contract;
5. The development will not adjoin lands under Williamson Act Contract and thus will not share a common boundary with contract lands. Development of the project will not impact agricultural uses found on contract land.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 1028, recommending to the City Council adoption of Zone Change No. 394 based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed Zone Change is in conformity with the General Plan of the City. The proposed R-E, Residential Estate zoning is consistent with the project site's General Plan land use designation of Very-Low Density Residential;
2. There is a need in the community for single family residential development which is permitted within the R-E, Residential Estate District;
3. The proposed zone change will not adversely affect the surrounding area or the community in general. The project for which the zone change is requested is a single family residential development which is consistent with adjoining uses in the immediate area.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council the approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 806 based on the following findings:

1. The Planned Residential Development applied for north of San Bernardino Avenue and south of Pioneer Avenue is proper for a Conditional Use Permit; the project meets all requirements of the Planned Residential Development Ordinance;
2. The Planned Residential Development as proposed is a project that is

necessary, essential or desirable for the public welfare as well as the development of the community; the project will provide new housing opportunities for future and current City residents;

3. The Planned Residential Development is not detrimental to existing or permitted uses in the proposed R-E, Residential Estate District where it would be located;
4. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed Planned Residential Development; the site is large enough to accommodate the proposed fifty two (52) lots;
5. The site properly relates to San Bernardino Avenue and Pioneer Avenue which is designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed Planned Residential Development;
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 Very Low Density Residential (0-2.7 units per acre) General Plan Designation.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve Tentative Tract No.16747 subject to the conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Very-Low Density Residential and a proposed zoning of R-E, Residential Estate and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code including the Planned Residential Development Ordinance;
2. The site, which is located to the west of Judson Street, north of San Bernardino Avenue, and south of Pioneer Avenue, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site has a relatively flat grade and is large enough to subdivide into fifty two (52) lots;
3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a fifty two (52) lot subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Very-Low Density allows for up to fifty two (52) dwelling units;
4. 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. The subject site is not identified as being within an area containing biological resources or within a wildlife corridor;
5. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause

serious public health problems. This is a residential project and is not likely to cause any serious public health problems, aside from temporary air quality and noise impacts during construction addressed in the project's Mitigation Measures;

6. 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; public streets and pedestrian access will be provided throughout the project site;
7. That pursuant to California Government Code Section 66474.4, of the Subdivision Map Act the land is not subject to a contract entered into pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. The property is not under Williamson Act Contract.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council that they consider land use changes in this area relative to the airport use conditions to ensure the protection of the airport's future uses.

Chairman Webber recessed the meeting for a short break.

Chairman Webber reconvened the meeting.

- G. **CONCEPT PLAN NO. 1 (AMENDMENT NO. 2)** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on an amendment to Concept Plan No. 1 of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan to: a) revise the Land Use Plan and designate approximately 134 acres north of Almond Avenue as Commercial Industrial and Warehouse Distribution District; b) revise Section III(C) of the Commercial Industrial and Warehouse Distribution District by adding special design standards for industrial buildings over 250,000 square feet in size; and c) revise Figure 7F concerning the landscape design along Mountain View Avenue. Concept Plan No. 1 encompasses 306 acres and is bounded by San Bernardino Avenue to the North, Lugonia Avenue to the south, California Street to the east, and Mountain View Avenue to the west. Request submitted by WESTERN REALCO.
- A. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 781** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and consideration of a Commission Review and Approval for the construction of one (1) warehouse/distribution concrete tilt-up building of 683,269 square feet on approximately 31 acres located on the south side of San Bernardino Avenue, east side of Mountain View Avenue, and north side of Almond Avenue in Concept Plan No. 1 of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by WESTERN

REALCO.

Project Planner Asher Hartel stated the project plans are being revised relative to building elevations and landscaping, therefore the applicant requested a continuance to July 27th.

Commissioner Thompson asked if the item will be placed on the consent calendar if it gets close to reaching the CEQA expiration date.

Mr. Shaw stated the Planning Commission will have to take action at its next meeting, in order to be placed on the City Council agenda for the first meeting in September.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote to continue Concept Plan No. 1 (Amendment 2) and Commission Review and Approval No. 781 to July 27, 2004

- IX. **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 270** - Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a PUBLIC HEARING for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Minor Subdivision (Parcel Map No. 16372) to subdivide 8.22 gross acres into eight (8) commercial parcels located on the northwest corner of Citrus Avenue and Iowa Street in the EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by MKJ IOWA COMMERCE CENTER, LLC.
- J. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 772** - Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and consideration of a Commission Review and Approval to develop an industrial park to include eight buildings with a combined area of 118,260 square feet on an 8.22 gross acre property located on the northwest corner of Citrus Avenue and Iowa Street in the EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by MKJ IOWA COMMERCE CENTER, LLC.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated the applicant is working on revisions to the architectural plans for the buildings and is requesting a continuance to July 27th.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote to continue Minor Subdivision No. 270 and Commission Review and Approval No. 772 to July 27, 2004.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 273 - PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a PUBLIC HEARING for a Minor Subdivision (Tentative

Parcel Map No. 16631) to subdivide approximately 4.86 acres into four residential lots located at 1515 Dwight Street in the R-E, Residential Estate District. Request submitted by CHERYL YOUNGWERTH AND MATT GROSS.

Project Planner Alicia Heideman gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bud Thatcher, Thatcher Engineering, stated he received Conditions of Approval prior to the meeting from the Public Works Department and Municipal Utilities Department. Mr. Thatcher stated he would leave a copy of the conditions for the project file. Mr. Thatcher stated he concurred with the Conditions of Approval.

Chairman Osborne stated they did not receive the conditions. Assistant Director Jaquess noted that staff did not receive a copy.

A copy of the referenced Conditions of Approval was circulated to the Commission for their review.

Mr. Shaw stated the Conditions of Approval would be incorporated in the project file and a copy given to the applicant for reference.

The Commission took a few minutes to read the Conditions of Approval.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Minor Subdivision No. 273 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 Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No. 273 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

6. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Very-Low Density Residential and a zoning of R-E, Residential Estate and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
7. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into four (4) lots;
8. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a four (4) unit

subdivision;

9. 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. The subject site is not identified as being within an area containing biological resources or within a wildlife corridor;
10. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems. This is a residential project and is not likely to cause any serious public health problems;
11. 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;
12. That pursuant to California Government Code Section 66474.4, of the Subdivision Map Act the land is not subject to a contract entered into pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. The property is not in an agricultural preserve.

V. ADDENDA

- A. REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION FOR THE TRANSFER OF AN ON-SALE BEER AND WINE LICENSE FOR LITTLE FISHERMAN'S SEAFOODS LOCATED AT 1175 W. REDLANDS BOULEVARD

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated this is a request to transfer an On-Sale Beer and Wine License from its current location to 1175 W. Redlands Boulevard. Mr. Jaquess stated staff is recommending approval of the transfer.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 6-0 vote to approve the Premises to Premises Transfer of an On-Sale Beer and Wine Alcoholic Beverage License for Little Fisherman's Seafoods. No conditions are recommended to be added as there are no problems associated with this facility.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. June 8, 2004

Commissioner Miller asked that the record note that he was absent for the afternoon session, but was in attendance during the evening session. Commissioner Osborne noted that he was present during the afternoon session and absent at the evening session. Mr. Shaw stated the minutes would be revised to note the corrections.

Assistant City Attorney Les Murad requested a correction in the spelling of his name.

Chairman Webber requested page 7 of the minutes be revised to reflect a comment he made relative to employee parking for the proposed project.

Chairman Webber requested page 24 of the minutes be revised to reflect a question he asked Mr. Kelly and Mr. Kelly's response.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote to approve the Planning Commission minutes of June 8th with corrections noted.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMUNICATIONS

A. City Council Report

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of June 15th. Mr. Shaw stated a budget workshop was held on June 15th. Mr. Shaw stated the Community Development Department submitted several supplemental budget requests, however they were not successful in obtaining approval.

B. Status of Major Projects

Mr. Shaw stated the revised Status of Major Projects List was included in the Planning Commission packet.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT to JULY 13, 2004

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to July 13, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn Pedro, Administrative Assistant II
Community Development Department

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department