

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, August 10, 2004, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

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

ABSENT: Paul Thompson, Commissioner (Absent during Day session only)

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
City Attorney Dan Mc Hugh
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 opened the public hearing at 2:00 p.m. All commissioners were present except Commissioners Cook and Thompson.

Ms. Margaret Mercado, expressed concern on the impact development has had on the City, specifically, the impact on water resources, electricity, streets, freeways, and schools. Ms. Mercado stated other communities in the state have building moratoriums in place.

Ms. Mercado stated Redlands is a very desirable community and she did not feel we should have to give up agricultural land because of development. Ms. Mercado stated it is up to committees such as the Environmental Review Committee, the Planning Commission, and the City Council to take control of the town. Ms. Mercado asked the Commission to keep agriculturally zoned areas intact and not approve excessive housing.

Chairman Webber advised members of the audience who are parked in the Civic Center parking lot that parking permits may be obtained from the Planning Commission secretary and should be placed on the vehicle dashboard to prevent receiving a parking citation.

II. CONSENT ITEMS- None

III. OLD BUSINESS

- B. **CONCEPT PLAN NO. 1 (AMENDMENT NO. 2) - PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and 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.

- B. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 781 - 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 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 was continued from the July 27th Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Hartel stated the applicant is proposing a 200k square foot limitation on warehouses and the ability to go with a larger building with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Hartel stated staff recommends a 150k square foot warehouse limitation.

Mr. Hartel stated staff recommends treatment at the northwest corner of the building to match the treatment at the northeast corner along San Bernardino Avenue. Mr. Hartel stated staff recommends four (4) additional towers be added to the San Bernardino Avenue elevation and the southeast corner of the building match the southwest corner along Almond Avenue.

Commissioner Laymon asked Mr. Hartel if the project would be subject to Water Quality Management Plan requirements. Mr. Hartel stated that it would.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gary Edwards, Western Realco, stated there is a difference of opinion with staff on the corner building treatments and the pop up elevations. Mr. Edwards stated they are trying to create an office frontage area through the use of glass. Mr. Edwards stated they incorporated five (5) pop-ups on Almond Avenue.

Commissioner Miller stated he would like a more exuberant entrance at Mountain View Avenue because it is a more prominent intersection.

Mr. Edwards stated they would prefer not to have two (2) entrances at the same corner.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Hartel if the number of employees is taken into effect when determining the Socio Economic Cost Benefit Ratio. Mr. Jaquess stated the number is based upon property tax revenue and the potential for sales tax generation. Mr. Shaw stated it is a factor in the Socio Economic Cost Benefit Study, but it is not in the formula for calculating the cost benefit ratio.

Mr. Edwards stated they would like to have the opportunity to bring potential users to the City of Redlands, with the Planning Commission making the final determination.

Chairman Webber stated he has a hard time supporting the language requested by the applicant as

he feels it is general and vague. Chairman Webber stated that if Mr. Edwards were to obtain an employer with numerous employees, the City would work to find an appropriate location within the Concept Plan.

Mr. Edwards stated he felt it would be a lengthy process. Chairman Webber stated he did not feel the process would be difficult.

Mr. Edwards stated when you are in competition with other cities, the developer is wooed very heavily and oftentimes will look to areas where they feel there is a greater possibility of being approved. Mr. Edwards stated most brokers will avoid selling a particular site if they feel that it has issues or hurdles to go through.

Mr. Edwards stated during the Conditional Use Permit process the user will be an identified co-applicant. Mr. Edwards stated over time, warehouses may be torn down or retrofitted for higher end uses that have come in because of market demand.

Commissioner Miller stated the wording is rather open-ended and unspecific and he asked legal counsel who would have the advantage, the Commission or the developer? Commissioner Miller stated he wants to give the developer the opportunity to bring in the best possible tenant or purchaser of the building, however he does not want to make the wording so vague that the Commission no longer has the ability to deny a project.

Mr. Edwards stated he feels the burden is on him to convince the Commission that a user or tenant is worthwhile and will be an asset to the City.

Commissioner Osborne asked if there was any way to correlate the square footage of the building with the number of potential employees. Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Edwards if there was a particular example that could be used to determine what a high employment ratio is.

Mr. Edwards stated he does not have an example of a high employment ratio, however it may be a company with less employees who receive a higher salary.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber asked if there were any comments from the Commission that are contrary to staff's position.

Commissioner Laymon stated she made it clear during processing of the Salton project she would not support any more warehouses south of San Bernardino Avenue.

Commissioner Osborne concurred with Commissioner Miller that the additional towers should not be located at the bay level. Commissioner Osborne stated if the main entry is located at the corner of San Bernardino/Mountain View it does not necessarily have to be duplicated at the northeast elevation.

Mr. Jaquess noted that the application proposes to duplicate the west elevation on the east side. Mr. Jaquess stated that Mr. Hartel expressed concern on the northwest corner and southwest corner elevations.

Chairman Webber stated he supports staff's position and he felt the added parapets make sense.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he likes the idea of the use being conditionally permitted to allow

th applicant speed and flexibility in developing the property, but he cannot accept the wording as proposed, because denial of a project would be subjective.

Commissioner Miller stated it means a lot to him when the developer states on records that his interpretation of the intent of the wording is that it will be up to the Commission. Commissioner Miller stated he was comfortable with the four (4) outlined conditions when it came before the Commission two weeks prior. Commissioner Miller stated he raised a question regarding the condition that stated "only one of the four conditions had to have been met." Commissioner Miller stated if they were to include more than one of the conditions, it would give the Commission the needed criteria to affirm or deny a project.

Mr. Pat Meyer stated the language as written requires every Conditional Use Permit to be subject to findings, the architectural and design standards, the tenant must be a co-applicant, and a high employment generator. Mr. Meyer stated if the Commission would like to require that the applicant provide a significant point of sale, the applicant would agree with the requirement.

Chairman Webber stated he still had a problem with the vague wording and could not support it.

Commissioner Macdonald requested a legal opinion on where it would place the Commission relative to evaluating a project and approving or denying it.

Mr. Shaw suggested the item be tabled to a time later during meeting to allow the City Attorney to evaluate this issue.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing and the proposed project was tabled.

Director Shaw recused himself due to a possible conflict of interest with Zone Change No. 404 and Tentative Tract No. 16907.

- C. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 404** - 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 a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a Zone Change from A-1, Agricultural District to proposed zoning of R-E, Residential Estate District for property with an area of approximately 5.5 acres located on the northeast corner of Fifth Avenue and Dearborn Street. Request submitted by PANDA HOMES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
- D. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16907** - 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 a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 5.5 acres into ten (10) residential lots for property located on the northeast corner of Fifth Avenue and Dearborn Street. In the A-1, Agricultural District (proposed R-E, Residential Estate District). Request submitted by PANDA HOMES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the item was continued from the July 13th Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant sufficient time to redesign the tract so that the Variances would no longer be needed. Mr. Baeza stated the applicant withdrew the two (2) variance requests.

Mr. Baeza stated the request for a Zone Change involves a single parcel with an area of 5.52 acres. Mr. Baeza stated a majority of the site contains citrus trees, which requires that the highest density

allowed for the site pursuant to the General Plan is RE, Residential Estate District. Mr. Baeza stated staff recommends approval of the Zone Change and the Tentative Tract.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Warren Tuttle, Tuttle Engineering, stated he was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Miller noted a twelve (12) foot change in elevation between Lot 9 and Lot 7, and asked Mr. Tuttle to clarify the reason for the difference in elevation.

Mr. Tuttle stated they are trying to drain toward the street; if Lot 7 were to be lowered, they would not be able to make the grade.

Commissioner Miller suggested Lot 9 be made deeper. Mr. Tuttle stated it could be done as long as the area of the two lots to the east is not decreased.

Commissioner Miller stated he would prefer to see the embankment reduced as long as other aspects of the design are not compromised.

Commissioner Osborne asked if the barn will be relocated to Lot 10. Mr. Tuttle responded by saying the barn will probably be torn down.

Mr. Jaquess stated that Public Works agreed to allow Lot 8 to drain westerly across Lot 9 to Dearborn. Commissioner Osborne asked if it was necessary to require an additional Condition of Approval to address this issue or should the applicant and the Public Works Department resolve the matter.

Commissioner Miller suggested a Condition of Approval be added that requires "the applicant to provide a drainage easement across Lot 8 serving Lot 7 for the purpose of lowering the elevation relative to the elevation of Lot 9."

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Zone Change No. 404 and Tentative Tract No. 16907, 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 Miller, and carried on a 5-0

vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Zone Change No. 404 and Tentative Tract No. 16907 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 Miller, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 1035 recommending to the City Council adoption of Zone Change No. 404 changing the Zone from the A-1, Agricultural District to the R-E, Residential Estate District.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve Tentative Tract No. 16907 subject to the following findings and attached conditions of approval:

7. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential and a proposed zoning of R-E, Residential Estate and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
8. The site, which is located on the northeast corner of Dearborn Street and Fifth Avenue, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site has a relatively flat grade and is large enough to subdivide into ten (10) lots;
9. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a ten (10) lot subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Density allows for up to thirty-three (33) dwelling units;
10. 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;
11. 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;
12. 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;
13. 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 with the addition of Condition of Approval 24 to read:

The applicant shall minimize the sloping found on Lot 9 to reduce the grade difference between Lot 7 and Lot 9.

- E. **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 270** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and 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.
- F. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 772** - PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and 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.

Chairman Webber stated that items II-E and II-F, which require a 6/7 vote of approval, would be tabled pending the arrival of Commissioner Cook.

- G. **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 264** - A request for Planning Commission consideration of one (1) pedestal sign with a total face area of twenty-four (24) square feet located at 1680 W. Redlands Blvd. in the EV/CG, East Valley Corridor Specific Plan General Commercial District. Request submitted by FRED G. ZEPEDA.

Project Planner Alicia Heideman stated she had not received revised plans, but she thought they would be brought to the meeting by the applicant.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Fred Zepeda, representing LAACO Limited, stated the Storage USA sign that was discussed at an earlier meeting, is a five (5) foot tall monument sign, on two blocks (adding 16 inches to its height) that sits on a mound (which adds 1- 1½ feet to its height). Mr. Zepeda stated he believes they have a right to have a twelve (12) foot tall sign. Mr. Zepeda stated if he was to amend the proposed twelve (12) foot tall sign, it would be a ten (10) foot tall sign along with the relocation of four (4) trees. Mr. Zepeda stated that anything less than ten (10) feet would not be an efficient sign.

Chairman Webber advised Mr. Zepeda that the landscape plan would have to come back to the Commission if it is revised. Chairman Webber asked Mr. Zepeda if the site for the sign would remain the same. Mr. Zepeda stated it would.

Commissioner Miller requested clarification on which sign is to be considered by the Commission; the original sign as proposed or the sign before them. Chairman Webber stated it is the same sign but it has been lowered by two (2) feet.

Mr. Zepeda stated if he is to amend the sign, he would like to have a sense that it is a “done deal” as opposed to having to return to the Commission and be told that there is an issue with the landscaping.

Mr. Shaw stated the Commission has flexibility if it is the desire of the applicant to approve a modification of the landscape plan in conjunction with the proposed project.

Mr. Zepeda distributed computer generated photos along with copies of the landscape plan that show the four (4) trees that are to be relocated.

Discussion was held on the location of the pedestal sign and the trees.

Chairman Webber stated he would support a ten (10) foot sign. Commissioner Miller stated he would not support a ten (10) foot tall pedestal sign. Chairman Webber stated the Code states the Commission does not have any latitude when dealing with a pedestal sign.

Mr. Shaw stated a pedestal sign has to be approved, but there is some discretion on the height, size, and architectural elements of the sign. Mr. Shaw stated a pedestal sign lower than twelve (12) feet can be approved.

Mr. Michael Lewin, attorney representing the applicant, stated the maximum size of a sign allowed in the C-4 zone is referred to in terms of a square foot definition. Mr. Lewis stated the Code states the sign should have a height “not exceeding twelve (12) feet.” Mr. Lewin stated size is a discretionary approval but height is separately defined in the Code.

Mr. Bill Cunningham stated that a ten foot tall sign with the relocation of trees is no compromise at all; he would rather see the twelve (12) foot tall sign and keep the trees. Mr. Cunningham stated if Mr. Zepeda’s sign cannot be seen, it is his problem.

Chairman Webber stated the size of the sign only refers to the face of the sign.

Discussion was held relative to the relocation of the trees. Mr. Shaw stated if the Commission agrees with the applicant’s proposal, the exhibit provided by the applicant would be used to determine the revised location of the trees.

Chairman Webber stated he supports the applicant’s position. Commissioner Macdonald asked Mr. Shaw if the Assistant City Attorney has had an opportunity to review the Sign Code relative to this issue because there are always two sides in any legal interpretation and they have only heard one side. Mr. Shaw stated there was a presentation given at the last meeting and he felt there was latitude on the Commission’s ability to approve the height of the sign.

Commissioner Miller stated he is not voting for a ten (10) foot or twelve (12) foot pedestal sign and he felt there was sufficient justification to deny the pedestal sign at that height. Commissioner Macdonald concurred, stating he felt it was a matter of interpretation and his interpretation is that the site calls for a monument sign. Commissioner Macdonald stated he is recommending denial of the project.

Chairman Webber read from the minutes of the previous meeting, stating “City Attorney Les Murad stated the Code is clear; the Commission has the discretion to look at the location, size, and architectural design of the freestanding sign and the freestanding signs allowed in the zone are monument and pedestal. Assistant City Attorney Murad stated if the Commission should decide to

deny the sign, they will have to show substantial evidence as to why it should be denied because it is an allowed use in the zone”.

Commissioner Miller stated he feels the Commission has discretion relative to size, location, and design; he feels the location is inappropriate because the sign will soon be obscured by the trees that are conditioned to be planted on the site. Commissioner Miller stated he did not feel the applicant had a right to be at the site; the Commission compromised and made it possible for the applicant to be there. Commissioner Osborne interjected that the City Council made it possible for the applicant to be there; the project was denied by the Commission.

Commissioner Miller stated the owner is going to be tempted to “butcher” the trees to preserve the visibility of his sign. Commissioner Miller continued by stating the design of the sign is not compatible with the architecture of the building.

Chairman Webber stated the location is an issue because there may be a better place to have the sign. Commissioner Miller stated he believes the Commission has to vote on what is being presented not redesign it. Mr. Shaw stated the Commission should consider what is before them, a ten (10) foot tall sign with the relocation of trees.

Chairman Webber stated if the Commission does not like the location, it can be a basis for denial. Commissioner Osborne stated he felt that was “stretching it, because the applicant could be asked to return to the Commission time and time again.

Commissioner Miller stated the pedestal sign is inconsistent with the massive base of the architecture of the building; it is a skinny pole that comes out of the ground with no base to it.

Mr. Zepeda stated he would change the architecture. Commissioner Miller stated a change would have to go through the proper channels.

Commissioner Laymon stated she understood Commissioner Miller’s frustration because she felt she was being cornered by the language and the applicant, to some extent.

Commissioner Webber stated he would like to see a decision made today. Mr. Shaw stated the Commission has until September 14th to make a final decision. Mr. Shaw stated some of the frustration he has heard from the Commission is that they are unsure what the applicant is submitting, because they have been given other renderings (by the applicant) that have not been a part of the application.

Mr. Zepeda stated he could make things easier by withdrawing the second application and go back to the original application. Mr. Zepeda stated he needs direction from the Commission. He asked the Commission to deny or approve the project; he did not feel a continuance was justified.

Chairman Webber stated he does not normally like to continue a project, but if something is thrown on his desk at the last minute and the applicant wants him to decide, he will make a decision. Chairman Webber stated he would like to see the project continued to give the applicant an opportunity to have closure on something that may be acceptable to everyone. Commissioner Osborne stated the Commission could act on the proposal for a ten (10) foot tall sign with the relocation of four (4) trees.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 3-2 vote (Commissioners Webber and Osborne voting no) that the Planning Commission deny Commission Sign Review No. 264 based on the following findings:

1. The City of Redlands prefers monument sign compared to pedestal signs.
2. The sign will be located on Redlands Boulevard which currently has a mixture of both types of signs.
3. Placing a monument at this location will improve the visibility of both existing signs and the applicant's proposed sign.
4. The existing land use (a storage facility) does not rely upon drawing customers from the street such as a retail use, but more so the sign identifies the location of the business for customer who are already intending on patronizing the business.
5. Pedestal sign does not meet the intent and purpose of Section 15.26.020 of the Sign Code as it allows excessive sign displays and distracts from the positive appearance of the community thereby no promoting the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community and the addition of
6. **Movement of the four (4) trees will change the approved landscape plan, and**
7. **Architecturally, the proposed sign does not go with the approved building.**

Chairman Webber requested a short recess.

Chairman Webber reconvened the meeting and stated that items III-A and III-B, which were tabled earlier during the meeting, would be heard at this time.

- A. **CONCEPT PLAN NO. 1 (AMENDMENT NO. 2) - PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and 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.

- D. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 781 - 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 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.

City Attorney Dan McHugh stated he understood that the Commission had difficulty with the vagueness of the language relating to the Conditional Use Permit and the co-applicant of the warehousing portion of the Concept Plan. Mr. McHugh stated he spoke with Mr. Hartel and Mr. Shaw, and staff believes the Commission can recommend the Concept Plan to the City Council and suggest the language for the Conditional Use Permit be tailored to make it consistent with state law.

Mr. McHugh stated adding a co-applicant and trying to tie it to a specific user is not the best way to address this issue because under state law, Conditional Use Permits run with the land and are not tied to a particular user.

Mr. McHugh stated if the Commission has some concern about the vagueness and possible illegality of the Conditional Use Permit language as drafted with regard to the warehousing, it can be noted for the record and sent to the City Council with the understanding that the Community Development Director and the City Attorney will work with the applicant to make the language less vague and be consistent with state law.

Mr. McHugh stated if there other individual requirements that the Commission feels should be attached to the Conditional Use Permit, they can be discussed at this time. Mr. McHugh stated there is quite a bit of protection under the Conditional Use Permit provisions.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, stated it appears the City Attorney will rewrite the language to strongly favor the City, and they have no objection. Mr. Meyer stated the burden of proof will be on the applicant to bring forth a potential building that satisfies not only the normal Conditional Use Permit findings and criteria, but also additional findings that will protect the City.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Mr. Shaw stated there was a discrepancy between the applicant's suggesting a 250k square foot building and the staff's recommendation for a 150k square foot building. The Commission reached a consensus to change the size to 150k square feet.

Commissioner Miller asked that the wording (Commercial/Industrial District, Section III.B.2) should be changed to "**two or more of the findings**" rather than "one or more finding" as presently written.

Mr. Jaquess stated the applicant revised the wording to reflect this change.

Relative to building architecture, Chairman Webber stated he prefers a balanced look on all corners and wants parapets added to the sides. Commissioner Miller stated he takes exception to the tower

elements but agrees to the windows at all corners. Commissioners Macdonald and Osborne concurred.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 4-1 vote (Commissioner Laymon voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Concept Plan No. 1 (Amendment No. 2) and Commission Review and Approval No. 781, 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 Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald and carried on a 4-1 vote (Commissioner Laymon voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval No. 781. It is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 4-1 vote (Commissioner Laymon voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 1031 and recommend to the City Council adoption of Concept Plan No. 1 (Amendment No. 2) as revised in the staff report above. **It should be noted that the wording in Concept Plan 1 may have some vagueness to it and it is recommended that the City Council work with the City Attorney to ensure compliance with state law.**

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 4-1 vote (Commissioner Laymon voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council for Commission Review and Approval No. 781, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use.
2. That the site properly relates to Mountain View Avenue, San Bernardino Avenue, and Almond Avenue, which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development.
3. That the conditions of approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 781 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare.
4. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community.
5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial/Industrial

Designation of the General Plan **with the deletion of Condition of Approval 38 (Planning Division).**

- H. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 801** - A Conditional Use Permit to install a ninety (90) foot high monolyptus cellular tower for a wireless telecommunication facility located at 1402 Cajon Street (Prospect Park) in the O, Open Land District. Request Submitted by SPRINT PCS.

Project Planner Alicia Heideman stated the project description as shown on the staff report is incorrect; the height for the proposed monolyptus cellular tower should be ninety (90) feet, not one hundred (100) feet. Ms. Heideman requested the proposed project be continued to September 14th as the City Council is scheduled to hear an appeal on the Environmental Review Committee action for this project on September 7th.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Ms. Carol Smith, who is opposed to the proposed project, stated she came to the meeting to ensure the project was continued. Ms. Smith stated they (the opposition) feel very passionately about this issue and they felt the appeal before the City Council would be one more opportunity for them to voice their concerns. Ms. Smith stated she hopes the City and Sprint will come together and find a better location for the site.

Ms. Debbie Melvin, representing Sprint, stated a noise study that was conducted fell below City noise standards. Ms. Melvin stated she hopes the City and Sprint can come to a conclusion that will benefit the neighborhood and the City.

City Attorney Dan Mc Hugh stated he wanted to explain the appeal to be heard by the City Council; it is based on the Environmental Review Committee (ERC) decision of whether or not to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration. City Attorney Mc Hugh stated there are two issues to consider: (1) Does the City Council have jurisdiction over the appeal? (There is some question as to whether it is a legitimate appeal), and (2) Is it right to move forward and require preparation of a Negative Declaration? If the City Council upholds the ERC decision, the matter will come back to the Commission with a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Cook arrived at 4:08 p.m.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commission Laymon, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Conditional Use Permit No. 801 to the Planning Commission meeting of September 14, 2004.

- I. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 813** - Public Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Conditional Use Permit to install a seventy foot high wireless telecommunications facility (water tower) located in a City Grove south of the I-10 freeway and east of California Street within the EV/CG, General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by SPRINT PCS.

Project Planner Alicia Heideman stated at the time the staff report was written, staff had not received revised plans, however she has since received photo simulations from Sprint. Ms. Heideman requested the proposed project be continued to September 14th so that it can be reviewed by staff.

Ms. Heideman stated she wanted the Commission to review the photo simulations to determine if this is the direction in which they want to go.

Ms. Heideman reviewed the photo simulations with the Commission.

Ms. Shaw stated staff is looking at moving the tower in closer proximity to other eucalyptus trees in the area however, this would require an amendment to the lease because of the change in location.

Mr. Shaw stated that staff would also like to discuss the possibility of a sign with decorative features, such as a packing house seal, or the words "Welcome to Redlands".

Commissioner Laymon stated she has no objection to the site but was concerned with the design.

Commissioner Miller stated he prefers this design to the water tower, but he feels it would need additional trees planted.

Chairman Webber stated the problem with the proposed project is that it stands by itself.

Commissioner Macdonald asked if there was any thought on using the tower as a car dealer sign. City Attorney Mc Hugh state it might be difficult because than it would be an offsite advertising sign.

Ms. Heideman stated the applicant would like to bring forward a plan for a tree.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Conditional Use Permit No. 813 to the September 14th Planning Commission meeting.

Chairman Webber advised that items III-E and III-F could be heard at this time due to the arrival of Commissioner Cook.

- E. **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 270 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and 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.
- F. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 772 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and 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.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the proposed project was continued from the Planning Commission meeting of July 27th due to a question as to whether the traffic signal at Alabama Street and Citrus Avenue should be required as a mitigation measure. Mr. Baeza stated staff met with the

Public Works Department and determined that the traffic signal would be required as a Condition of Approval rather than a mitigation measure.

Mr. Baeza stated the applicant revised the elevations to include vertical elements and changed the painting scheme.

Mr. Mike Mueller, representing the applicant, stated he was available to answer questions.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Minor Subdivision No. 270 and Commission Review and Approval No. 772 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 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Minor Subdivision No. 270 and Commission Review and Approval No. 772. It is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Laymon, 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.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Laymon, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission move that the Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No.270 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

5. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan, Municipal Code and East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Industrial/ Commercial and is consistent with the General Plan, Municipal Code, and East Valley Corridor Specific Plan;
6. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into eight (8) commercial parcels;
7. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a eight (8) unit commercial subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of

Industrial/Commercial and zoning of EV/IC, Commercial Industrial both allow for commercial subdivisions;

8. 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;
9. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems; The initial study prepared for the project includes mitigation measures addressing the projects potential to create health problems;
10. 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;
11. 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.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Laymon, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 772, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use.
2. That the site properly relates to Iowa Street which is designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development.
3. That the conditions of approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 772 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare.
4. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community.
5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial/Industrial Designation of the General Plan.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16742 - PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission consideration of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 9.86 gross acres into fifteen (15) residential lots and two (2) common area lots for property located on the south side of Center Street east of Burke Street in the R-E, Residential Estate District. Request submitted by MO BEHZAD.

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

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the proposed project site has an average cross slope of over 15% and is subject to the Hillside Development District. Mr. Baeza stated Measure N requires that implementing guidelines be passed by a 4/5 vote of the City Council, however the current Hillside Development District was adopted by a vote of 3-1-1. For that reason, the City Attorney is in the process of evaluating this issue further. Mr. Baeza stated an environmental determination must be made on the project due to CEQA time limitations.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, stated there is an ordinance on the books that was not adopted by the required 4/5 vote of approval. Mr. Meyer stated the proposed project was designed pursuant to Measure N standards. Mr. Meyer wanted it noted for the record that City Attorney Dan Mc Hugh was not the City Attorney at the time the ordinance was adopted.

City Attorney Mc Hugh stated the project is consistent with Measure N and the Commission may be analyzing the proposed project exclusive of the Hillside Development ordinance.

Mr. James Di Aguilera, representing the applicant, stated he is a land use attorney for the City of Loma Linda. Mr. Di Aguilera stated it is his opinion that the issue regarding the adoption of the ordinance is irrelevant to the Commission's action relative to the tract. Mr. Di Aguilera stated the tract is designed to meet the standards of Measure N, which is a restrictive ordinance that imposes greater standards on development than would occur without the measure. Mr. Di Aguilera stated he understood that the project is being continued due to the absence of Conditions of Approval. Mr. Di Aguilera stated he wanted it noted for the record that this is a "red herring" as far as the issue of ordinance not being adopted effecting the approval process of this tract. Mr. Di Aguilera stated they will indemnify the City as to any litigation on this tract as they want the tract to move forward.

Mr. Floyd Eicher, who lives on the corner of Ridge and Pacific, stated in the Environmental Review Committee recommendation it was mentioned that eight (8) houses would have access off Center Street and seven (7) houses would have access off a street located south of the proposed project. Mr. Baeza stated it is not a public street but a private street located along the southern boundary of the project site.

Mr. Nancy Yowell, who lives on Center Crest, stated there is a blind corner on the left hand side as you exit the cul-de-sac. Ms. Yowell stated a stop sign is needed due to the dangerous traffic situation.

Ms. Mary Sue Meza, stated there is a history of pedestrian use for the past forty years. She stated and the vehicles coming from Center Crest making a left turn cannot see the traffic coming down from Sunset. Ms. Meza stated there is concern on the height of the proposed houses, as current zoning allows up to 2.5 stories. Ms. Meza asked who would be responsible for maintaining the common area and the trails.

An unidentified man from the audience wishing to speak, refused to speak into the microphone and was advised by Chairman Webber that his comments would not be on record.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne asked City Attorney Mc Hugh if the Commission would be voting on the environmental issue only at this time. City Attorney stated that was correct.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract No. 16742 and direct staff to file and post a Notice of Determination in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not have individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Tentative Tract Map No. 16742 to the September 28, 2004 Planning Commission meeting.

- B. **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 272 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a tentative parcel map to subdivide 3.31 acres into two (2) commercial parcels located on the south side of the Interstate 10 Freeway, west of Tennessee Street in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by GAYATREE PATEL.
- C. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 716 (REVISION NO. 1) - PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission to consider a revision to an approved conditional use permit for a three-story hotel on 3.31 acres by modifying the site plan and landscape plan in order to subdivide the site into two parcels located on the south side of the Interstate 10 Freeway, west of Tennessee Street in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by GAYATREE PATEL.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest stated the original Conditional Use Permit was approved in November 2000. Mr. Dalquest stated the project site was originally three (3) contiguous parcels that were merged together. The following year, the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan was amended to allow hotels to have a floor area ratio of 60%, which directly affected this property, as the land identified as Lot 2 became excess land. Mr. Dalquest stated the revision to the Conditional Use Permit proposes separating Lot 2 from the original proposal. Mr. Dalquest stated the Municipal Utilities Department has imposed a Condition of Approval that the building envelope be located on the area within 200' of the easterly boundary.

Mr. Dalquest stated as the new lot line is being created, it kicks in the requirement for a perimeter landscape planter. A Condition of Approval has been prepared that requires a full width landscape planter. Mr. Dalquest stated a decision must be rendered by the Planning Commission at today's meeting.

Mr. Dalquest stated that staff is recommending three additional Conditions of Approval that they would like read into the record:

Condition of Approval 28 (Conditional Use Permit) to read:

The Landscape Plan shall be modified by replacing the five (5) podocarpus along the south

property line and the nine (9) Mexican fan palms along the west property line with the planting of 24-inch box trees of the same quantity to be selected from the Planning Commission's List of Recommended Shade Trees.

Condition of Approval 29 to read:

The site plan and Landscape Plan shall be modified to included a five (5) foot full width planter along the shared property line with Lot 2. Fifteen (15) gallon trees shall be planted at twenty (20) foot intervals from the Planning Commission's List of Recommended Shade Trees.

Condition of Approval 9 (Minor Subdivision) to read:

The shared property line between Lot 1 and Lot 2 shall be adjusted westerly six (6) feet in order for Lot 1 to provide a perimeter landscape planter along the parking stalls that abut this lot line.

Commissioner Miller expressed his concern on a relatively low level building that will be looked down upon as you exit the freeway. Commissioner Miller stated he is not opposed to the lot subdivision but he would prefer to see a concept of what is going to be built there.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Hadish Pratka representing the applicant, thanked the staff for doing a wonderful job working with the applicant.

Chairman Webber asked if there is any information on how the lot will be developed. Mr. Pratka stated there will be a professional office building built within the next twelve (12) months.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Dalquest if a Condition of Approval was required on the original project that required the entire parcel be landscaped. Mr. Dalquest stated there was a Condition of Approval that required it be landscaped along with benches, tables, trees and hydroseeding. Commissioner Miller stated there is still going to be a lot of land left over that cannot be developed.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber stated they would prefer to have more than hydroseeding. Commissioner Miller concurred.

Discussion was held relative to hydroseeding the parcel and installation of a temporary irrigation system.

Chairman Webber reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Pratka stated since the applicant owns the hotel next door, the last thing they want to see is their room rates drop because there is a dust bowl located next door. They have no objection to landscaping the site by hydroseeding.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Mr. Dalquest suggested Condition of Approval 12 be revised to read:

Prior to the final inspection of this project, Lot 2 shall contain a wild flower hydroseed mix over the entire parcel for dust control purposes and be irrigated with an above-ground surface system. Said ground cover shall be maintained in a good condition year round.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Laymon, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that Revision 1 to CUP No. 716 and Minor Subdivision No. 272 does not require further environmental processing, pursuant to Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, based on the following findings:

1. The proposed revision and subdivision would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects;
2. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken; and,
3. There is no new information of substantial importance with respect to this project's environmental consequences that was not known at the time the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Laymon, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Minor Subdivision No. 272. It has been determined that the 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 Laymon, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 716, 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, 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 Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 716 therefore be APPROVED, subject to all department recommendations, with the addition of:

Condition of Approval 28 (Conditional Use Permit) to read:

The Landscape Plan shall be modified by replacing the five (5) podacarpus along the south property line with and the nine (9) Mexican fan palms along the west property line with the planting of 24-inch box trees of the same quantity to be selected from the Planning Commission's List of Recommended Shade Trees.

Condition of Approval 29 (Conditional Use Permit) to read:

The site plan and Landscape Plan shall be modified to included a five (5) foot full width planter along the shared property line with Lot 2. Fifteen (15) gallon trees shall be planted at twenty (20) foot intervals from the Planning Commission's List of Selected Shade Trees.

and the revision of Condition of Approval 12 to read:

Prior to the final inspection of this project, Lot 2 shall contain a wild flower hydroseed mix over the entire parcel for dust control purposes and be irrigated with an above-ground surface system. Said ground cover shall be maintained in a good condition year round.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Laymon, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No. 272, 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 site is physically suitable for the type of development;
3. That the site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development;
4. That the design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause any substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat;

5. That the design of the subdivision and the type of improvements will not cause serious public health problems;
6. That the design of the subdivision and 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;
7. Subject to section 66474.4 of the Subdivision Map Act, the land in question is not subject to a contract entered into pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commencing with section 51200 of the Government Code;
8. That Minor Subdivision No. 272, therefore, be APPROVED subject to all departmental recommendations with the addition of Condition of Approval 9 (Minor Subdivision) to read:

The shared property line between Lot 1 and Lot 2 shall be adjusted westerly six (6) feet in order for Lot 1 to provide a perimeter landscape planter along the parking stalls that abut this lot line.

Chairman Webber stated that the Planning Commission would recess at 6:00 p.m. and return at 7:00 p.m. for the evening session.

Mr. Jaquess suggested that Chairman Webber inquire which items the members of the audience are interested in, so that the item could be heard before the recess.

- D. **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2004-3-A** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a General Plan Amendment to amend Policy 5.31(d) of the Circulation Element regarding residential access on arterial streets. Request submitted by CITY OF REDLANDS.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest gave a brief presentation and stated the amendment provides guidelines relating to arterial access.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Herb Williams, 1028 Occidental Circle, stated he does not understand how the environmental impact report can be approved without a traffic study on San Bernardino, from the "donut hole" area to Mentone Beach to the east. Mr. Williams stated the freeway jams up at Wabash and drivers are now using San Bernardino to go home, which has increased traffic considerably. Mr. Williams stated the Conditions are vague and he felt that specific concepts are needed to allow access.

Mr. Bill Cunningham, stated one has to look at the General Plan to see the amount of growth and traffic that is expected. Mr. Cunningham stated to add driveway access along any arterial is a gross mistake as arterials are designed for traffic flow. Mr. Cunningham urged the Commission to retain

the traffic standards as they are.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber stated the minor arterials we have in the City are high speed street, and he felt allowing residential access on minor arterials would tend to slow the traffic down.

Mr. Dalquest stated in some areas it may be warranted to have residential access on minor arterials, but there are very few areas in the City where a major arterial would have access onto a residential area. Mr. Dalquest noted that San Bernardino Avenue and Lugonia Avenue are major arterials west of Texas Street.

Mr. Shaw stated currently residential access from minor arterials is prohibited, however the proposed amendment would allow flexibility for residential access from minor arterials when it is warranted.

Mr. Dalquest stated the proposed amendment allows access on minor and major arterials. Commissioner Laymon stated she would be more comfortable if minor arterials were specifically allowed.

Commissioner Miller stated the language appears to allow the Commission to deny projects they feel should not allow access onto the arterials.

Mr. Shaw stated there have been instances where the design of the subdivision warranted access on a minor arterial.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 2004-3-A 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 Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1038 recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 2004-3-A.

Chairman Webber stated that item IV-I would be heard at this time.

- I. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16610 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider approval for a tentative tract application to merge two parcels for a total of 4.79 acres located on the north side of Cypress east of Hibiscus Drive (APN Numbers 173-017-87 and 173-061-25) in the R-S, Suburban Residential District Request submitted by REDLANDS CYPRESS VILLAS.

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

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Seeing no comments forthcoming and with the applicant waiving his right to speak, Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote that Section 15162 of the CEQA Handbook applies to this proposal which allows a past negative declaration to be used for a project located on the same site based upon the following findings:

- 1) No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- 2) No substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- 3) No new information of substantial importance which was known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time of the previous negative declaration adoption.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve Tentative Tract No.16610 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

14. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of High Density Residential and a zoning of R-2-2000, Multiple Family Residential and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
15. The site, which is located on the north side of Cypress and east of Hibiscus Drive, is physically suitable for the type of development;
16. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a five lot merger;
17. The design of 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;

18. 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;
6. The design of the merger 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 merger; 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.

V. ADJOURN TO EVENING SESSION

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to the evening session

7:00 P.M.

VI. RECONVENE EVENING SESSION

Chairman Webber reconvened the evening session. All commissioners were present except Commissioner Thompson.

Items IV E, F, G, and H, which carried over from the afternoon session were heard at this time.

- E. **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2004-3-B** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Public/Institutional to Office on a 0.66 acre City-owned parcel located on the south side of Barton Road, approximately 300 feet west of Lakeside Avenue. Request submitted by CITY OF REDLANDS.
- F. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 407** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a Zone Change from C-1 (Neighborhood Stores) District to A-P (Administrative and Professional Office) District on a 0.66 acre City-owned parcel located on the south side of Barton Road, approximately 300 feet west of Lakeside Avenue. Request submitted by CITY OF REDLANDS.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Shaw stated there is an individual who has indicated an interest in office use for the site.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

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

Chairman Webber stated office space is needed in the City and he will support the proposed project.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 2004-3-B and Zone Change No. 407, 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 Cook, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1039 recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 2004-3-B, changing the designation of the property from Public/Institutional to Office.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1040 recommending to the City Council approval of Zone Change No. 407, changing the designation of the property from C-1 (Neighborhood Stores) District to A-P (Administrative and Professional Office) District.

- G. **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2004-3-C** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Parks/Golf Courses to Public/Institutional on a 5-acre parcel owned by the San Bernardino County Board of Education located approximately 630 feet east of Judson Street and 650 feet south of San Bernardino Avenue. Request submitted by CITY OF REDLANDS.
- H. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 408** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a Zone Change from A-1 (Agricultural) District to E (Educational) District on two contiguous parcels totaling 14.5 acres owned by the Redlands Unified School District and the San Bernardino County Board of Education located on the northeast corner of Judson Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. Request submitted by CITY OF REDLANDS.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Dalquest stated the site is planned for a public medical therapy facility for elementary aged children.

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 recommend approval to the City Council on the Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 2004-3-C and Zone Change No. 408, and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It is recommended that this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that move that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1041 recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 2004-3-C, changing the designation of the subject property from Parks/Golf Courses to Public/Institutional.

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. 1042 recommending to the City Council approval of Zone Change No. 408, changing the designation of the subject properties from A-1 (Agricultural) District to E (Educational) District.

Chairman Webber stated items VI A, B, C, D, and E would be heard at this time.

- I. **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2004-3-D (formerly General Plan Amendment No. 101)** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a General Plan Amendment to: a) change the land use designation from Agriculture to Very-Low-Density Residential on 30.8 gross acres located on the west side of Wabash Avenue (Assessors Parcel Number 168-132-05), south of San Bernardino Avenue, and north of Capri Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request submitted by ARIEF NAFTALI.
- B. **AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE REMOVAL NO. 106** - 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 30.8 gross acres located on the west side of Wabash Avenue (Assessors Parcel Number 168-132-05), south of San Bernardino Avenue, and north of Capri Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request submitted by ARIEF NAFTALI.
- C. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 406** - 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 one parcel totaling 30.8 gross acres located on the west side of Wabash Avenue (Assessors Parcel Number 168-132-05), south of San Bernardino Avenue, and north of Capri Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District. Request submitted by ARIEF NAFTALI.

- D. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 834** - Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a **PUBLIC HEARING** a Conditional Use Permit for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on 30.8 gross acres into 93 residential lots and six (6) common lots located on the west side of Wabash Avenue (Assesors Parcel Number 168-132-05), south of San Bernardino Avenue, and north of Capri Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District (Proposed R-E Residential Estate District). Request submitted by ARIEF NAFTALI.
- E. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16878** - Planning Commission to consider 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 30.8 gross acres into 93 residential lots and six (6) common lots located on the west side of Wabash Avenue (Assesors Parcel Number 168-132-05), south of San Bernardino Avenue, and north of Capri Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District (Proposed R-E Residential Estate District). Request submitted by ARIEF NAFTALI.

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

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Arief Naftali, representing the owner, stated he was available to answer questions. Mr. Naftali stated they were introduced to the idea of incorporating the open space in the middle of the project so that all residents would have access to it.

Commissioner Osborne noted that the plans show a fence and two streets that would have to be crossed in order for residents to access the open space area. Mr. Naftali stated the fence is flexible; it could be left open.

Mr. Shaw stated the applicant has not submitted a landscape plan; they are looking for feedback from the Commission.

Chairman Webber proposed that the fence shown on the site plan be removed.

Commissioner Cook stated that the houses in Plans B and D appear to be driveway and garage on half the house.

Commissioner Miller concurred with Commissioner's concern relative to children having to cross the street. He stated he would prefer to see a better proportioned park area in the center of the development. Chairman Webber stated the street is not a major highway, it is a local street.

Chairman Webber asked Mr. Naftali what is planned for the open space. Mr. Naftali they plan to have picnic shelters and barbeque racks. Commissioner Cook stated the open space area is not wide enough. Chairman Webber asked why the open space area is not located in the center of the development. Mr. Naftali responded by saying access is closer to the proposed open space area.

Commissioner Miller stated if the park was located at the fork in the road, it would be more open, safer, and inviting.

Commissioner Miller expressed concern on Lot 11, which has an unusual shape. Commissioner

Miller suggested changing the property line. Commissioner Miller stated Lot 58 would have limited space for a house because it is located on a corner.

Commissioner Cook noted that the usable space on Lot 92 would be tight.

Commissioner Miller noted the property line between Lot 29 and Lot 30 could be adjusted to allow more frontage on Lot 30.

Mr. Bill Cunningham requested clarification on the gross acreage. Mr. Cunningham stated if trees are going to be planted in the open space area they should be shifted over closer to Capri Avenue, in order to allow more realistic citrus acreage.

Mr. Chuck Hastings, whose home backs up to Capri Avenue, stated the noise level will probably increase dramatically and he is concerned about the additional traffic that will travel on Capri Avenue.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he like the idea of bringing the homes down from Capri Avenue and placing the fifty (50) foot area of open space on San Bernardino Avenue.

Discussion was held on the proposed orange grove. Mr. Shaw stated that staff's recommendation is that the grove would be maintained by a Homeowners' Association or a Community Facilities District (CFD), not the City.

Commissioner Laymon suggested eliminating the two (2) smaller lots and moving the open space from the center to create a pocket park with access to the cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Cook stated the lots are very narrow, resulting in houses that are not as aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Macdonald expressed concern that the one story homes have a combined fifteen (15) foot setback and the two-story model has a combined seventeen (17) foot side yard setback.

Mr. Shaw stated the proposal to go from agricultural to very low density is a policy issue for the Commission to decide. Mr. Shaw stated there are other very low density land use designations that would accommodate larger lots and greater setbacks. Mr. Shaw stated the applicant should recognize some of the concerns being raised relative to lot width, density, and the need for more open space. Mr. Shaw stated the Commission has a lot of latitude as they review the project.

Mr. Shaw noted that the zoning designation on the property is agricultural with RE being the maximum density that the Commission can approve.

Commissioner Miller stated a PRD allows for narrower lots, which loses the character of the RE zoning designation.

Mr. Shaw stated the Commission can work with the applicant on the existing applications to address their concerns or state that they will not approve a project at that density. Mr. Shaw stated the applicant could be asked to redesign the lots.

Commissioner Miller suggested the Commission give some direction but should also spend more

time driving in a larger area to get a better handle to determine at what point a transition is needed. Commissioner Miller stated he was disturbed by two rows of backyards for the entire length of the property, that front on streets.

Commissioner Laymon stated that area is conducive to development because it is flat, which will result in a homogenous group of houses. Commissioner Laymon stated diversity is what makes an interesting community.

Project Planner Alicia Heidemen noted that there is a PRD-RA zoning designation that allows for a larger lot size than the RE zoning designation and requires require open space.

Chairman Webber asked for a consensus from the Commission.

Commissioner Macdonald stated lot widths, side yard setbacks, and parking in the cul-de-sacs which has almost eliminated is an issue.

Commissioner Miller stated he does not object to the density itself, if it didn't bring along with it the narrow lots and the narrow side yard setbacks.

Commissioner Thompson stated the Commission could require larger lots with less density and create a transition zone.

Commissioner Laymon stated she would like to explore the PRD-RA option suggested by Ms. Heideman.

Commissioner Cook concurred with Commissioner Macdonald relative to side yard setback and narrow width lots.

Commissioner Osborne stated he felt the open space should be consolidated and he suggested adding landscape to tie in Lots A, B, and C. Commissioner Osborne felt the density should be reduced but he is not concerned with the lot size.

Commissioner Osborne asked if the Commission wants setbacks greater than ten (10) feet. Commissioner Miller stated they do not want setbacks less than ten (10) feet. Commissioner Cook stated she would support ten (10) foot setbacks. Commissioner Miller stated the open space should be contiguous.

Mr. Shaw stated that staff would be glad to work with the applicant on a redesign of the proposed project.

Commissioner Miller stated they want the proposed project to have the "feel" of a residential estate neighborhood. He suggested the applicant strive to achieve a 1/3 - 2/3 ratio between garage and house frontage and he would be flexible with the side yard setbacks if the overall lot is bigger.

Mr. Naftali gave a summary of the concerns he heard expressed by the Commission:

1. Minimum of ten foot (10) side yard setbacks
2. Minimum lot width of 80 feet

Commissioner Osborne stated he concurred with Commissioner Miller on side yard setbacks.

Commissioner Macdonald suggested a redesign of the proposed project would accomplish the goal of the Commission.

Mr. Shaw stated the Commission could go with a R-A or R-R zoning designation.

Chairman Webber stated they want larger lots and side yard setbacks.

Mr. Naftali asked if there is a preference from the Commission relative to consolidating the open space. Chairman Webber stated they would prefer to have wider open space centrally located.

Mr. Naftali asked if there is a specific minimum lot square footage the Commission would like to see. Chairman Webber stated he does not like deep, narrow lots.

Mr. Shaw suggested the proposed project be continued to September 28th due to the fact that the agenda for September 14th is quite long.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Laymon, and carried on a 6-0 vote to continue General Plan Amendment 2004-3C, Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 106, Zone Change No. 406, Conditional Use Permit No. 834, and Tentative Tract No. 16878 to the Planning Commission meeting of September 28th.

- F. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 400** - Public Hearing for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration for a Zone Change from unincorporated San Bernardino County RS-1 (Single Family Residential, one dwelling unit per acre) to the City of Redlands R-E/PRD (Residential Estate, Planned Residential Development), on approximately 28.5 acres located on the east side of Wabash Avenue, north of Interstate 10 Freeway. Request Submitted by GRIFFIN INDUSTRIES.
- G. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 815** - Public Hearing for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a Conditional Use Permit for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on approximately 66.2 gross acres consisting of 80 residential lots and four (4) common lots located on both sides of Wabash Avenue, north of Reservoir Road, and east of Sophia Court and Buckingham Drive in the City of Redlands R-E (Residential Estate) District and the unincorporated San Bernardino County RS-1 (Single Family Residential, one dwelling unit per acre) District (R-E District pending). Request submitted by GRIFFIN INDUSTRIES.
- H. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16586** -Public Hearing for Planning Commission

consideration of a recommendation to the City Council for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 66.2 gross acres into 80 residential lots and four (4) common lots located on both sides of Wabash Avenue, north of Reservoir Road, and east of Sophia Court and Buckingham Drive in the City of Redlands R-E (Residential Estate) District and the unincorporated San Bernardino County RS-1 (Single Family Residential, one dwelling unit per acre) District (R-E District pending). Request submitted by GRIFFIN INDUSTRIES.

Project Planner Asher Hartel stated the proposed project is currently under revision and the revised plans have not been submitted, therefore staff requests the project be continued to September 14th.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commission Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Zone Change No. 400, Conditional Use Permit No. 815, and Tentative Tract No. 16586 to September 14, 2004.

- I. **RDA 2004-III-01** - A recommendation to the City Council for the approval of points for a Residential Development Allocation request for Tentative Tract No. 16556, an approved residential subdivision consisting of 107 lots on 40 acres located on the south side of San Bernardino Avenue, east of Hanford Street. (Note: This request is for 40 allocations; 77 allocations have been previously awarded.) Request submitted by KB HOMES.

Mr. Asher Hartel noted the correct number of allocations for KB Homes is 32, not 40. Mr. Hartel stated that 75 allocations have been previously awarded and they are looking for the remaining 32 allocations. Mr. Hartel stated the various City departments have awarded the project 60 points to date. Mr. Hartel stated the project has not been heard by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission.

The Planning Commission recommended 38 points for a total of 98 points recommended to the City Council.

- J. **RDA 2004-III-02** - A recommendation to the City Council for the approval of points for a Residential Development Allocation request for Tentative Tract No. 16548, an approved residential subdivision consisting of 64 multiple-family residential units on 5 acres located at the southwest corner of Orange Avenue and Kansas Street. (Note: This request is for 29 allocations; 35 allocations have been previously awarded.) Request submitted by ABCO REALTY & INVESTMENTS, INC.

Mr. Hartel stated the various City departments have awarded the project 53 points. The Planning Commission recommended 38 points for a total of 91 points recommended to the City Council.

VII. ADDENDA

A. APPLICATION FOR A PERSON TO PERSON TRANSFER OF AN ON-SALE BEER AND WINE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE LICENSE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1150 BROOKSIDE AVENUE, SUITE A.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated there was no response from the Police Department, therefore staff is recommending approval of the Person to Person transfer of an On-Sale Beer and Wind Alcoholic Beverage License.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the application for a Person to Person transfer of an On-Sale Beer and Wine Alcoholic Beverage License for property located at 1150 Brookside Avenue, Suite A. No conditions are recommended since there are no problems associated with the site.

B. MAINTENANCE OF 99 CENT STORE

Director Jeff Shaw stated there were concerns raised during the last meeting relative to the landscaping of the 99 Cent Store. Mr. Shaw stated Code Enforcement was advised and they in turn contacted the manager and the real estate manager who maintains the property. They identified that they do have a problem and stated that they are in the process of hiring a property management company to resolve this issue. Mr. Shaw stated they hope to have someone hired within the week. Commissioner Cook noted that some of the trees are dead. Mr. Shaw stated he would keep the Commission up to date on this matter. Commissioner Cook noted that the awning is completely covered in dust and dirt.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 27, 2004

Commissioner Osborne stated he previously advised the Secretary of minor corrections to the minutes.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of July 27, 2004 with corrections noted.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMUNICATIONS

A. City Council Report

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of August 3rd.

B. Status of Major Projects

Mr. Shaw stated a Status of Major Projects list was provided in the Planning Commission packet.

X. ADJOURN TO SEPTEMBER 14, 2004

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting to September 14th.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Ortiz, Senior Administrative Assistant
Community Development Department

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department