

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, December 13, 2005, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: George Webber, Chair
James Macdonald, Vice-Chairman
Thomas Osborne, Commissioner
Paul Thompson, Commissioner
(VACANCY)

ABSENT: Ruth Cook, Commissioner
Gary Miller, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF
PRESENT: Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner
Joshua Altopp, Assistant Planner
David Jump, Assistant 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 Cook and Miller.

II. CONSENT ITEM(S)

A. PROLOGIS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

2. Planning Commission to consider **Commission Sign Review No. 296** for a ten (10) foot, four (4) inch tall, 39.5 square foot freestanding sign for the Prologis Warehouse/Distribution building located at 2290 Palmetto Avenue in the Regional Industrial District of Concept Plan No. 2.

B. PROLOGIS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider **Commission Sign Review No. 297** for a ten (10) foot, four (4) inch tall, 39.5 square foot freestanding sign for the Prologis Warehouse/Distribution building located at 2200 Palmetto Avenue in the Regional Industrial District of Concept Plan No. 2.

C. MEDICAL REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. A request for final approval of **Parcel Map No. 16954 (Minor Subdivision No. 282)** a subdivision of 3.51 acres into 2 parcels located on the east side of Terracina Boulevard approximately 400 feet south of Olive Avenue within the MF, Medical Facilities District.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the consent items.

III. OLD BUSINESS

D. RYLAND HOMES, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 109** for 10.37 gross acres on property located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue, and east of Hanford Street in the A-1, Agricultural District.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Zone Change No. 416** from A-1, Agricultural District to R-E, Residential Estate District on 10.37 gross acres located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue, and east of Hanford Street in the A-1, Agricultural District.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Conditional Use Permit No. 860** for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on 10.37 gross acres consisting of 28 residential lots and multiple common open space lots located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue, and east of Hanford Street in the A-1, Agricultural District.
6. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Tentative Tract Map No. 17502** to subdivide 10.37 gross acres into 28 residential lots and multiple common open space lots located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue, and east of Hanford Street in the A-1, Agricultural District.

7. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Variance No. 717** from Section 18.36.090 of the Redlands Municipal Code to reduce the required front yard setback from twenty-five (25) feet to fifteen (15) feet on two corner lots (Lots 7 and 8) in Tract 17502 in the A-1, Agricultural District (change to R-E, Residential Estate District pending), located north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Pioneer Avenue, and east of Hanford Street.

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project, stating the variance application was withdrawn. Mr. Hartel stated the project, which is located at the westerly edge of the B2 zone is further removed from the airport than the proposed Walton project. Mr. Hartel stated the Walton project is scheduled to go before the City Council on December 20th. Mr. Hartel stated the Airport Advisory Board reviewed the proposed project and ultimately made a decision to accept the current project, subject to the same restrictions that were placed on the northerly open space area for a previous Ryland project.

Mr. Hartel stated the staff report includes a recommendation to the City Council for approval or the option to continue the proposed project to January. Mr. Hartel stated the proposed project is a continuation of Ryland's 52-lot Planned Residential Development (PRD) which is adjacent to the proposed project to the east. Mr. Hartel stated the Airport Land Use Plan Compatibility Plan indicates that the project is located in Zones C and B2. Mr. Hartel stated Zone C allows residential uses, as proposed and Zone B2 allows open space, as proposed. Mr. Hartel stated the Municipal Utilities Department has placed Conditions of Approval that are consistent with the adjacent Ryland Project. Mr. Hartel stated the Municipal Utilities Department requires an aviation easement on all the lots and a deed notice for all properties that will disclose the proximity of the airport.

Mr. Hartel stated that adjacent residential projects to the east (Ryland Homes) and to the south (K B Homes) have processed zone changes from A-1 Agricultural District to R-E, Residential Estate District. Mr. Hartel stated the Commission has the option of continuing the project to January 10th in view of the pending Airport Land Use planning efforts and proposed Walton Development project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing Ryland Homes, thanked the Commission for continuing the project to today's meeting. Mr. Meyer stated he had an opportunity to meet with the Airport Advisory Board and after lengthy discussion, an action was taken to support the proposed Ryland Homes project subject to Conditions of Approval. Mr. Meyer stated they withdrew their request for a variance. Mr. Meyer requested the Commission move forward with a recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed project.

Mr. John James, Airport Advisory Board member, stated he was available to clarify the action taken by the Airport Advisory Board. Mr. James stated he felt the proposed Ryland Homes II project is

compatible with the Airport Land Use Plan. Mr. James stated there was discussion as to whether the project is an in-fill project; Mr. James stated he did not feel the project met all three required findings to qualify as an in-fill project. Mr. James stated he believes the Ryland Homes II project is significantly different from the proposed Walton project. Mr. James stated he opposes the Walton project.

Commissioner Macdonald asked Mr. James if there was discussion on the possibility of moving the B2 line southerly so that it would be closer to San Bernardino Avenue. Mr. James stated there is a new Master Plan under development and from that Master Plan there will be a new land use plan; they did not try to speculate what the new land use plan will show.

Commissioner Macdonald stated there has been discussion that the Ryland Homes I project was a mistake; the Commission felt it was not adequately informed of the potential consequences at the time the project was approved. Mr. James concurred with Commissioner Macdonald's statement and said their disappointment was expressed in the language of the motion.

Commissioner Osborne stated if the B2 zone was moved to the south, the existing Ryland Homes project would have homes located within the zone. Commissioner Osborne asked if the existing homes located within the B2 zone would have to be demolished. Mr. James stated he did not believe that is required by the current Land Use Plan; the B2 zone does allow residential uses, however the density would be reduced.

Chairman Webber summarized that the Airport Board took action based on the existing Airport Land Use Plan. Mr. James stated that Ryland Homes I is existing but they feel everything east of the project should be held in abeyance until the new Master Plan and Airport Land Use Plan are completed. Mr. James stated the Board feels the proposed project complies with the current Land Use Plan.

Chairman Webber asked Mr. James why the project differs from the Walton Project. Mr. James stated the Ryland Homes II plan is surrounded by residential dwellings.

Chairman Webber stated the current plan may be changed.

Mr. Bill Cunningham, The Redlands Association, stated if this project is approved, he did not see how Walton can be denied. Mr. Cunningham stated if Ryland Homes I is a mistake, the density of Ryland Homes II should be reduced. Mr. Cunningham stated no approval should be made until the issue is solved globally.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Macdonald concurred with Mr. Cunningham. Commissioner Macdonald stated all ramifications should be considered until the Airport Land Use Plan and General Plan are revised and there is a firm land use designation for the area.

Commissioner Thompson concurred with Commissioner Macdonald and Mr. Cunningham. Commissioner Thompson stated he is opposed to development in the area; he feels the approval of Ryland Homes I is a mistake that would be compounded by the approval of Ryland Homes II.

Commissioner Osborne stated he believes the Ryland Homes II project could be considered in-fill. Commissioner Osborne suggested the proposed project be continued to January although he did not believe the Airport Land Use Plan would be completed at that time.

Mr. Shaw stated that staff's recommendation to continue the project until January is to allow the City Council to take an action on the proposed Walton project and resolve some policy issues.

Chairman Webber stated the main issue that needs to be addressed is the helicopter pattern. Chairman Webber stated he did not believe the Commission can make a valid decision until the Airport Plan issue is resolved.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson , seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 109, Zone Change No. 416, Conditional Use Permit No. 860, and Tentative Tract No. 17502 to January 10, 2006, to allow the project to be reviewed with respect to the pending Walton development projects and Airport and Land Use planning efforts in this area of the City, and for the applicant to revise the map to include the necessary lot width revisions.

B. CHEN KUO, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. Planning Commission consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 803** to develop a four (4) building, fifty-two (52) unit motel with an area of 19,730 square feet on an approximately one (1) acre property located on the north side of Colton Avenue approximately 420 feet west of Texas Street in the C-4, Highway Commercial District.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dilip Tuwari, project architect, stated he was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Osborne stated he felt the design and colors of the archway are lacking although it does look better than the previous plan that was submitted. Commissioner Osborne stated the height of the building on the west side is out of proportion with the rest of the project. Commissioner Osborne stated the second story building looks like a three story building without

windows. Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Tuwari to match the center archway colors with the other color elements.

Mr. Tuwari stated he could drop the parapet by approximately four (4) feet.

Commissioner Osborne requested adding a Condition of Approval that requires the height of the parapet to be reduced and the colors of the archway elements, both top and center, to match.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval No. 803. It is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 803, 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; The project meets all development standards of the C-4, Highway Commercial District;
2. That the site properly relates to Colton Avenue 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. 803 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare; Mitigation measures included as part of the Conditions of Approval address temporary noise and air quality impacts generated by development of the project;
4. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community; The project will provide lodging facilities for individuals visiting the City;
5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial Designation of the General Plan; The proposed motel is a commercial use and the addition of **Condition of Approval 6** to read:

The building parapet west of the entry arch shall be reduced in height to be the same height as the westernmost parapet

and the addition of **Condition of Approval 7** to read:

The archway treatment for the top of the arch shall match the color of the center treatment of the arch.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

E. REDLANDS ADVENTIST ACADEMY, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Hearing for the Planning Commission to consider **Revision 2 to Commission Review and Approval No. 753** for the addition of one-thousand one hundred ninety-six (1,196) square feet covered area between two previously approved buildings, the conversion of a structure from office to classrooms, and the shifting of the parking area to ten (10) feet from the front property line located at 130 Tennessee Street in the E, Educational District.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the applicant is in the process of redesigning the project to meet development standards. Mr. Baeza stated staff recommended the proposed project be continued to January 10th.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Revision No. 2 to Commission Review and Approval No. 753 to January 10, 2006.

B. WESTERN REALCO, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Conditional Use Permit No. 870** to develop a 417,821 square foot warehouse and distribution building on approximately 20.84 acres located on the south side of San Bernardino Avenue, north side of Almond Avenue, west of California Street and immediately east of the Salton warehouse and distribution facility in Concept Plan No. 1 of East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Baeza stated it is the desire of the City to have businesses with higher employment levels, therefore a higher parking requirement was developed in the Concept Plan for this purpose.

Mr. Baeza stated earlier in the year Young's Market made a presentation of its plans to move to the site, however due to time constraints, that is no longer possible. Mr. Baeza stated the Commission will have to decide if the current parking requirements will be sufficient for the proposed speculative building. Mr. Baeza stated it is difficult to guarantee high employment for an extended length of time with changes in the marketplace. Mr. Baeza stated it may be best to have a building geared for high employment so as not to lose another high quality tenant.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Vance Mape, Bixby Land Company, stated the proposed building is a product of Amendment 1 to Concept Plan 1. Mr. Mape stated Section B 2(d) allows for buildings larger than 150k square feet under specific conditions:

1. The building cannot be closer than 250 feet to California Street.
2. Buildings must adhere to all conditions and developments standards of Concept Plan 1.
3. Employment must be promoted by adhering to specific parking ratios.

Mr. Mape stated the building is more than 250 feet from California Street, and in their opinion it exceeds all design elements and required criteria.

Mr. Terry Dickens, Bixby Land Company, stated he worked with Young's Market for a long time, however due to the uncertainty of the time involved for processing, they moved to a city where the building was complete. Mr. Dickens stated he wants to move forward with the building and be ready to meet the demand, when it comes.

Mr. Dickens requested approval of the proposed project stating it will be a positive addition to the community and ultimately will provide high employment.

Chairman Webber asked Mr. Dickens for the possibility of attracting higher employment businesses to Redlands. Mr. Dickens responded by saying they have reviewed a number of "build to suit" requests over the last several years and they cannot deliver the building in time. Mr. Dickens stated unfortunately businesses don't plan their expansion plans far enough in advance, and therefore are attracted to buildings that are already built or are in the process of being built.

Chairman Webber stated there seems to make a market for office/business condominium projects. Mr. Dickens stated they currently have five (5) buildings (ranging from 25k to 147k square feet) that are under construction south of Almond Avenue.

Mr. Dickens stated the Panasonic Company was looking at their building on Mountain View Avenue and San Bernardino Avenue but it did not have sufficient parking for 1,000 employees.

Mr. Shaw stated under warehouse distribution, there is an alternative plan for providing additional parking spaces on site. Mr. Shaw stated in some cases, it does require modification of the loading/unloading areas.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber stated he does not have enough information to feel comfortable about approving the proposed project. Chairman Webber stated they must find a way to provide a lot more jobs than the warehouse projects that have been approved in the past and to stop eating up territory.

Commissioner Osborne stated it is a "Catch 22"; if a project is approved, there is no guarantee that a company will come in with the desired employment ratio.

Commissioner Thompson stated he is willing to take a chance and he supports approval of the project.

Chairman Webber stated he drives through many cities that are "eating" up their land with giant warehouses. He stated he feels Redlands should hold out for businesses with high employment. Chairman Webber stated he prefers not to have large warehouses which preclude opportunities for other development.

Commissioner Macdonald asked if the proposed project could be conditioned to require a specific minimum number of employees. City Attorney Dan Mc Hugh they would have to research the issue further, however he has not seen such a condition imposed by this city.

Mr. Mc Hugh stated he felt it was unlikely from a legal perspective.

Commissioner Osborne concurred with Commissioner Thompson, stating he is willing to take the chance that if the building is approved, they may get a desirable company. Chairman Webber stated he feels it is more likely that they will get another warehouse.

Commissioner Macdonald stated that "big box" warehouses are limited because they must meet significant employment requirements. Commissioner Macdonald stated the

Commission made the decision that they are not going to approve anymore warehouses in that area.

Chairman Webber stated that Young's Market needed a warehouse with a distribution center. Commissioner Osborne noted there would be some sales people employed at the site.

Commissioner Macdonald asked if staff had some recollection relative to conditions of approval for large warehouses. Mr. Shaw stated there was some discussion on a requirement for high employment or high sales tax revenue; staff was directed to forward a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Shaw stated staff was told that they could not legally restrict an entity as far as an employment ratio or sales tax requirement.

Mr. Shaw stated that the Commission has some latitude relative to approving or denying a project.

Commissioner Macdonald stated on that basis, he would have to concur with Chairman Webber.

Mr. Pat Meyer, speaking on behalf of Bixby Land Company, stated that Bixby Land Company has made an effort to comply with the amended concept plan. Mr. Meyer stated the proposed building has single loaded docks with a huge amount of parking. Mr. Meyer stated the building has been designed for high employment. Mr. Meyer stated the applicant is asking for the Commission's support to let them capture a higher user in the marketplace. Mr. Meyer stated that Bixby Land is a local landowner that will have to come before the Commission for future projects.

Mr. Meyer stated if the Commission cannot come to a consensus, he would like the project to be continued to January so that it can be heard by the full Commission. Chairman Webber concurred.

Commissioner Macdonald stated a continuance may not be necessary. Referring to Mr. Meyer's comment that Bixby Land will come before the Commission in the future, he stated if Bixby Land doesn't live up to its promise, the Commission will look carefully at future projects. Commissioner Macdonald stated on that basis, he would vote for approval of the project at this time.

Chairman Webber stated it is an important decision and he felt they should wait for a decision by the full Commission. Commissioner Macdonald stated he did not feel that additional input from either side will make a difference.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit No. 870 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 Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Conditional Use Permit No. 870. It is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-1 vote (Chairman Webber voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 870 subject to the following findings, submitted plans, and attached conditions of approval.

1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plans of the City; the project is consistent with the land use plan of Concept Plan No. 1;
2. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare; the project includes mitigation measures designed to address temporary environmental impacts ;
3. The proposed development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations of the City's General Plan, and applicable zoning district and the City's development standards; the project meets development standards of Concept Plan No. 1 ;
4. The proposed development is appropriate at the proposed location; the project is a warehouse and distribution facility and will be adjacent to similar uses to the north and west.
5. The project complies with the architectural and site planning design standards as outlined in Concept Plan No. 1.
6. The project is designed to promote high employment exceeding the minimum parking requirement of one (1) stall per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

C. REALTY BANCORP EQUITIES TLG, LLC, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Revision No. 1** to **Conditional Use Permit No. 825** amending the conditions of approval for parking lot lighting for the development of a 13,650 square foot drug store with drive through pharmacy on a 0.85 acre property located on the southeast corner of Lugonia Avenue and Church Street in the C-2, Neighborhood Convenience Center District.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated that staff is waiting on revised project plans, therefore staff recommends the project be continued to January 10th.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 825 to January 10, 2006.

D. OLYMPIC BARRINGTON PARTNERSHIP, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Conditional Use Permit No. 862** for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on 4.50 gross acres consisting of twenty (20) residential lots and one (1) common open space lot located at the northeast corner of Ford Street and Patricia Drive, in the Planned Residential District of Specific Plan 23.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Tentative Tract Map No. 17577** to subdivide 4.50 gross acres into twenty (20) residential lots and one (1) common open space lot located at the northeast corner of Ford Street and Patricia Drive, in the Planned Residential District of Specific Plan 23.
5. Consideration of **Minor Exception Permit No. 295** to allow the construction of decorative block walls of up to nine (9) feet in height as sound walls along the rear and side of residential lots in Tentative Tract 17577, a twenty (20) lot residential subdivision located at the northeast corner of Ford Street and Patricia Drive, in the Planned Residential District of Specific Plan 23.

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project and distributed revised Conditions of Approval from the Public Works Department. Mr. Hartel stated the

Commission can continue the proposed project to allow for plan revisions to remedy common open space shortfalls and provide all lots with outdoor living areas with 25 foot dimensions, or approve the project with a Condition of Approval that requires a lot line adjustment to provide 20% open space.

Commissioner Macdonald asked for the minimum ratio of building footprint to lot square footage. Mr. Hartel stated that Specific Plan No. 23 does not address that issue. Mr. Hartel stated the maximum permitted coverage of all structures is 30% of the total project area.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, stated the guiding principal behind the site plan is the sound wall. Mr. Meyer stated the criteria for a 8-9 foot wall to be placed at the edge of the flat pad was dictated by the noise requirements.. Mr. Meyer stated they can provide the minimum private area for all yards, however they may not have a 25' X 25' dimension.

Commissioner Macdonald stated as long as the yard meets the 625 square minimum, he is not concerned if the dimensions are something other than 25' by 25'.

Mr. Meyer stated the project exceeds the minimum required open space. Mr. Meyer stated some of the areas have been disqualified by staff because they do not meet the minimum 50' dimension. Mr. Meyer stated he concurs with the conditions of approval.

Mr. Meyer stated there is a large area on the other side of the sound wall that will be landscaped and maintained by a homeowners' association.

Mr. Shaw stated the added Public Works Department Condition of Approval will require maintenance costs for a ten foot wide median. Mr. Shaw asked Mr. Meyer if he would agree to a Community Facilities District (CFD) to be responsible for maintenance costs. Mr. Meyer did not agree with the requirement for a CFD stating he did not feel it was fair to the twenty homeowners. Mr. Meyer stated he understood the area would be paved and he discussed the possibility of planting trees.

Mr. Shaw suggested adding a CFD that would be responsible for the entire area which would include both the residential and office component of the project.

Chairman Webber stated he would like to see a minimum 4' to 5' wide trail with decomposed granite located in the large sloped open space areas of the project.

Ms. Mary Hampton stated she lives on Oak Street and she cannot imagine a street median going all the way to Redlands Boulevard.

Ms. Hampton asked how a trail will be managed on a steep hill without contributing to the erosion of the hill. Ms. Hampton stated she feels the trail if nicely landscaped, will provide an aesthetic benefit.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he feels it is a good location for a project such as this but he expressed concern on a number of issues:

1. Five foot setbacks are not appropriate for this area
2. The size of the lots (5,000 square feet) is too small for this area
3. Eleven guest spaces are not sufficient for large homes such as these
4. CC & R's will prevent parking in the street; parking in a driveway is not much better
5. Wooden fences become bleached by the water

Commissioner Macdonald questioned the open space and how it can be used by the residents since it is located on a slope. Commissioner Macdonald stated the project needs a significant revision to increase lot size and parking, and to incorporate the project's open space.

Commissioner Macdonald stated it appeared the project would be more appropriate as a townhouse or condominium project due to space limitations.

Mr. Hartel stated the Specific Plan provides for single family detached or attached residences. Mr. Hartel stated the Specific Plan allows one side yard setback of "0" provided the opposite side yard is not less than ten feet.

Mr. Meyer stated the applicant looked at the potential of the property and then was shown different variations of dwelling units. Mr. Meyer stated the applicant spent a considerable amount of time talking to local Realtors. Mr. Meyer stated the two-story unit was designed with a master bedroom on the ground floor so that it could be utilized by a senior resident. Mr. Meyer stated the homes are going to be marketed for "empty nesters" and were intentionally designed as detached units.

Mr. Meyer stated the project will be well received by the neighborhood and in the marketplace.

Commissioner Macdonald stated he drives down the streets of Fontana and sees the two-story homes with five (5) foot side yard setbacks and that is not what he wants. Mr. Meyer stated they have done as good a job as possible given the constraints of the property.

Commissioner Macdonald expressed concern that the residents will be parking their vehicles in the driveway. Mr. Meyer stated he is convinced that there are many prospective home buyers who want this lifestyle. Mr. Meyer stated the project will be a move down from large, high maintenance lots.

Chairman Webber stated he can see the project as more of an enclave than a normal subdivision.

Mr. Bill Cunningham, The Redlands Association, stated he concurs with Commissioner Macdonald. Mr. Cunningham stated he does not agree with the ten-foot unadorned median. Mr. Cunningham stated he believe some arrangement can be made to plant trees in the median, which would enhance the neighborhood.

Ms. Hampton stated she did not receive notification of the meeting; she read about it in the Daily Facts. Ms. Hampton stated she believes the neighbors are happy to have anything other than the Ralph's project. Ms. Hampton expressed concern on future development and stated she would prefer to see the property as a wilderness park.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

Chairman Webber recessed the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

Chairman Webber reconvened the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Chairman Webber asked for a consensus on changing the wooden fences to composition. The Commission reached a consensus to change the fences to composition.

Chairman Webber stated there is some revision needed relative to open space and the trail. Chairman Webber stated he would like to see a minimalistic trail; the Commission concurred.

Mr. Shaw requested direction relative to requiring a Community Facilities District (CFD). Mr. Shaw stated the Public Works Director concurred with having a CFD if landscaping is a component of the median. Chairman Webber stated he would prefer a ten (10) foot median with trees and a CFD which would be responsible for maintenance of the entire project.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit No. 862 and Tentative Tract No. 17577, 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 Thompson, and carried on a 3-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Conditional Use Permit No. 862 and Tentative Tract No. 17577. It

is recommended that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or over burden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 3-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 862 based on the following findings:

1. The Planned Residential Development applied for at the northeast corner of Ford Street and Patricia Drive is proper for a Conditional Use Permit; the project meets all requirements of Specific Plan No. 23;
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 Planned Residential District of Specific Plan No. 23 where it would be located;
4. The size and shape of the site is adequate for the proposed Planned Residential Development; the site is large enough to accommodate the proposed twenty (20) residential lots;
5. The sites properly relate to Ford Street and Patricia Drive, which are 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 is 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 Medium Density Residential (0-15 units per acre) General Plan Designation

with the addition of Condition of Approval 17 to read:

Prior to final map approval, a private trail three (3) feet in width shall be designed from Ford Street to Patricia Drive around the north and east sides of the site, with access from the seating area on Ford Street, on the perimeter slope around the project. The trail shall be installed prior to occupancy of the first house,

and the addition of Condition of Approval 18 to read:

Fences between lots shall be of a composite material and not of wood.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 3-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Tract No. 17577, based on the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

8. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential and zoning of Planned Residential District of Specific Plan No. 23, and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
9. The site, which is located on the northeast corner of Ford Street and Patricia Drive, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into twenty (20) residential lots and is consistent with the property development standards of the Planned Residential District of Specific Plan No. 23;
10. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a twenty (20) lot residential subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Medium Density Residential allows for the proposed twenty (20) dwelling units;
11. 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;
12. 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;

13. 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;
14. 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 31 to read:

The Ford Street median shall be landscaped and contain trees, and shall be maintained by a Community Facilities District to be approved by the City prior to final map approval.

and the addition of Condition of Approval 32 to read:

Prior to final map approval, a private trail three (3) feet in width shall be designed from Ford Street to Patricia Drive around the north and east sides of the site, with access from the seating area on Ford Street, on the perimeter slope around the project. The trail shall be installed prior to occupancy of the first house,

and the addition of Condition of Approval 33 to read:

Fences between lots shall be of a composite material and not of wood.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 3-1 vote (Commissioner Macdonald voting no) that the Planning Commission approve Minor Exception Permit No. 295, based on the following findings:

1. The location of the walls along rear and side property lines will not have a negative impact on the character of the neighborhood.
2. The walls as proposed will not be injurious to the aesthetics of the neighborhood.
3. The proposed walls will not pose a threat to public health or safety.

**E. DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)**

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a revision to **Conditional Use Permit No. 521** to allow the installation of a soil vapor extraction compound at the Shell gasoline station located at 941 California Street in the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan General Commercial District (EV/CG).

Project Planner David Jump gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission deem revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 521 exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under Section 15330, Class 30 because the type of Project is a specifically allowed exemption of an on-site soil vapor extraction system.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 521 subject to the following findings, submitted plans, and attached conditions of approval:

1. The use applied for at this location will no adversely affect the applicable land use plans of the City because the use is a temporary soil remediation service that is beneficial to the overall community and environment and will adhere to all required property development standards for the EV/CG District.
2. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare because the location of the Soil Vapor Extraction Unit will no interfere with vehicular or pedestrian movement and is a beneficial remediation technology for the removal of potentially harmful contaminants from soils at this site.
3. The proposed development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations of the City's General Plan, the applicable zoning district and the City's development standards because the proposed project will create a cleaner environment for citizens and create a better quality of life.

4. The proposed development is appropriate at the proposed location as the use will remove volatile and semi-volatile contaminants from the soils below the Shell gasoline station at 941 California Street minimizing potential negative environmental effects.
- F. CITY OF REDLANDS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)
 7. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration.
 2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Zone Change No. 424** from unincorporated San Bernardino County R-S, Single Family Residential and unincorporated San Bernardino County 7-M-RM, Multiple Family Residential to the City of Redlands R-1, Single Family Residential on approximately 13.59 acres (APN: 0298-251-05, 06, 07, and 08) located north of Mentone Blvd and west of Amethyst Street.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp stated Amethyst Bible Church is seeking to build a new church facility for residents in Mentone. Mr. Altopp stated the parcel on which they plan to build will have to be annexed to the City in order to receive services. Mr. Altopp stated an application was submitted to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO); at that time LAFCO required that the annexation be expanded to include the four (4) parcels to the north.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Ms. Housley stated her property is adjacent to the proposed church and is one of the four (4) parcels referred to in the staff report. Ms. Housely stated her address was shown incorrectly therefore she did not receive information regarding this process in a timely manner. Ms. Housely stated she is opposed to annexation to the City because she plans to add a second home on her property. Mr. Jaquess advised Ms. Housely that she would be able to add a second home under certain circumstances, however she would have to annex to the City to receive City sewer and water services.

Ms. Housely stated she believed her taxes would be lower if she remained in the County. Mr. Jaquess responded that her taxes would remain the same, with the exception of a paramedics tax. Mr. Shaw stated there is also an open space tax that would be applied to the property.

Ms. Housely inquired if it would be possible to have a cell tower on her property. Mr. Shaw stated that cell towers are allowed with an approved Conditional User Permit however, there are standards that would have to be met.

Mr. Shaw suggested Ms. Housely speak with the Municipal Utilities Department regarding the issues she raised. Mr. Shaw suggested Ms. Housely consider annexation, as it can be costly to process an annexation as an individual.

Ms. Housely asked if it would be possible to lease her property to a company for commercial uses or use it for storage of recreational vehicles. Mr. Shaw stated that neither use would be permitted. Mr. Shaw offered to provide Ms. Housely with a list of permitted uses.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Negative Declaration for Zone Change No. 424 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with 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 Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1077 recommending to the City Council approval of Zone Change No. 424, changing the designation of the subject property from unincorporated San Bernardino County 'RS' (Single Family Residential) to the City of Redlands 'R-1' (Single Family Residential District) on approximately 10.50 acres (APN 0298-251-05, 06, and 07) and changing the designation from unincorporated San Bernardino County, '7M-RM' (Multiple Family Residential) to the City of Redlands 'R-1' (Single Family Residential District) on 3.59 acres (APN 0298-251-08).

G. TRINITY EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCH, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER; MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration
2. PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider Revision No. 7 to Conditional Use Permit No. 541 for the addition of two (2) buildings with a combined area of 51,725 feet, the expansion of parking areas and the relocation of an existing building for an existing religious institution on an 18.9 acre site located at 1551 Reservoir Road in the R-E, Residential Estate District.

Mr. Jaquess stated that staff recommends the proposed project be continued to January 24, 2006.

Commissioner Thompson noted that the project had been deemed complete in September and he questioned whether there was a time frame restriction relative to processing the application.

Mr. Jaquess stated there is a March 3rd deadline for processing of the project.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Revision No. 7 to Conditional Use Permit No. 541 to January 24, 2006.

5. ADDENDA - None

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. November 22, 2005

No action was taken due to lack of a quorum.

7. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF DECEMBER 6, 2005

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of December 6th.

8. ADJOURN TO JANUARY 10, 2006

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting at 5:28 p.m. to January 10, 2006.

Patti Ortiz
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department