

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, February 28, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: James Macdonald, Acting Chairman
Ruth Cook, Commissioner
Paul Foster, Commissioner
John James, Commissioner
Gary Miller, Commissioner
Thomas Osborne, Commissioner
Eric Shamp, Commissioner

ABSENT:

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Daniel Mc Hugh, City Attorney
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner

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

Acting Chairman Jim Macdonald called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. All commissioners were present.

A. ELECTION OF COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Mr. Shaw opened up nominations for Planning Commission Chair. It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Cook and carried unanimously to elect Jim Macdonald as Planning Commission Chair.

It was moved by Commissioner Cook to elect Tom Osborne for Vice Chair.

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald to nominate Gary Miller for Vice Chair. Commissioner Miller withdrew his nomination for consideration.

It was carried unanimously to elect Tom Osborne as Vice Chair.

B. APPOINTMENT TO THE OPEN SPACE COMMITTEE

Mr. Shaw stated as a result of Caroline Laymon's resignation, there is a vacancy on the Open Space Committee. Commission James volunteered to serve on the committee. Mr. Shaw stated that Commissioner James would join Commissioner Osborne as a representative on the Open Space Committee.

II. CONSENT ITEM(S)

A. **MKJ IOWA COMMERCE CENTER, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Request for Final Approval of **Parcel Map 16372** (Minor Subdivision No. 270) 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.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated the applicant is working to resolve an issue relative to a street name. Therefore, staff recommends the proposed project be continued to March 14th.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue the Request for Final Approval of Parcel Map No. 16372 to March 14th.

III. **OLD BUSINESS**

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

2. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study
4. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 815** to develop a commercial/office park of 10 buildings with 84,300 square feet of floor area on approximately 9.6 acres, located on the east side of Ford Street, north side of Patricia Drive, and south side of the Interstate 10 Freeway in the Administrative and Professional Office District of Specific Plan 23.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Minor Subdivision No. 288** (Tentative Parcel Map No. 17353) to subdivide approximately 9.6 acres into eight commercial lots and one lettered lot for common open space and parking areas, located on the east side of Ford Street, north side of Patricia Drive, and south side of the Interstate 10 Freeway in the Administrative and Professional Office District of Specific Plan 23.

Project Planner Asher Hartel requested the proposed project be continued to March 14th.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Commission Review and Approval No. 815 and Minor Subdivision No. 288 to March 14, 2006.

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **YOCUM-BALDWIN DEVELOPMENT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio- Economic Cost/Benefit Study
1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Minor Subdivision No. 291**(Tentative Parcel Map No. 16515) to subdivide Assessor's Parcel Number 0169-022-06, consisting of 6.86 acres, into two parcels of 4.75 and 2.11 acres within the C-M (Commercial Industrial) and C-4 (Highway Commercial) Districts located at 940 W. Colton Avenue on the northeast corner of Colton Avenue and New York Street.

Commissioners James and Miller were recused due to a potential conflict of interest at 2:10 p.m.

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Ms. Vicky Valenzuela, Thatcher Engineering, stated she concurs with staff's recommendations.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission find that no environmental review is required. The project qualifies as a categorical exemption from environmental review per Section 15315, Class 15, of the CEQA Guidelines as a minor land division.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Minor Subdivision No. 291. 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 Shamp, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No. 291, subject to the following findings:

5. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Commercial and zoning of C-M (Commercial Industrial) District and C-4 (Highway Commercial) District, and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
6. The site, which is located at the northeast corner of Colton Avenue and New York Street, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into two commercial lots and is consistent with the property development standards of the C-M (Commercial Industrial) District and C-4 (Highway Commercial) District;
7. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of two commercial lots. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial allows for the proposed subdivision;
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;

5. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems. This is a commercial subdivision project that does not consist of any construction and will not cause any serious public health problems, aside from temporary air quality and noise impacts during future construction that will be addressed in the review of a future project;
6. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision; public streets and pedestrian access will be provided;
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.
8. That improvements required of the project are necessary to insure public health and safety and are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area.

Commissioners Miller and James returned to the meeting at 2:17 p.m.

B. HOSSEIN AFSHARI, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

6. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
7. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
8. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 822** to develop a fifteen (15) building office park with a combined floor area of 101,127 square feet on approximately 7.44 acres, located on at the southeast corner of Redlands Boulevard and Nevada Street in the EV/CG, General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Commissioner Shamp recused himself due to a potential conflict of interest at 2:18 p.m.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Baeza stated the project was reviewed by staff and the Municipal Utilities Department identified issues relative to turning radius and access. In addition, Mr. Baeza stated the proposed project does not meet the 1:250 parking ratio that is required for development in this area. Mr. Baeza stated since the writing of the report, the applicant has adjusted the gross square footage and this reduction would indicate that the applicant does comply with parking standards, although it has not been confirmed by staff. Mr. Baeza stated at least 30 additional trees are needed to meet parking area planting requirements.

Mr. Baeza stated in staff's opinion, the project design fails to meet the City's expectations for development along Redlands Boulevard; the building architecture fails to create a focal point for the project.

Mr. Baeza stated staff recommends the proposed project be continued to April 11th.

Commissioner Osborne asked if the building square footage will have to be reduced to meet landscaping requirements. Mr. Baeza stated the square footage could remain the same if the applicant went with two-story buildings.

Mr. Hossein Afshari, applicant, stated they are dedicating 10 feet on Redlands Boulevard and 11 feet on Nevada Street, which results in a site reduction of approximately 10,000 square feet. Mr. Afshari stated they are a couple thousand feet short of their required landscaping and they are working on that issue.

Mr. Afshari stated he was told that there are no Public Works Department standards relative to a turning radius, therefore he was referred to the Fire Department. Mr. Afshari stated he used the Fire Department turning radius standards. Mr. Afshari stated they will provide the trees that are needed.

Commissioner Foster noted that staff indicated concerns relative to the store frontages along Redlands Boulevard, and he asked Mr. Afshari to comment. Mr. Afshari responded their target is customers who are interested in purchasing buildings with square footage ranging from 1,500- 3,000 square feet. He stated that larger buildings are usually leased, which is a different market.

Mr. Afshari stated the buildings are approximately 40-50 feet away from Redlands Boulevard with 49 feet of landscaping. He stated the buildings will not be visible in 5 -10 years. He stated the buildings are designed with simple lines and architecture.

Commissioner Miller stated if the applicant chooses to ignore the concerns expressed by staff, he will not support the project. Mr. Afshari stated that staff is requesting 2-story buildings as a focal point, however that is not the product they are trying to provide. Mr. Afshari stated he felt it was a waste of money to add tiles to the base of buildings that will be covered with shrubs.

Commissioner Miller stated if the applicant chooses to ignore the concerns expressed by staff, he will not support the project when it returns to the Commission. Mr. Afshari stated that staff is asking for two-story buildings, which is not the product he wants to provide. Mr. Afshari stated they would consider other alternatives to enhance the architecture.

Commissioner Miller stated staff has made some very clear suggestions. He stated Redlands Boulevard is the signature street for our community; and a series of repeating light industrial buildings is not what he (Commissioner Miller) wants to see on the street. He stated a monumental character on the corner is an excellent suggestion. He stated there needs to be differentiation and relief on the buildings.

Mr. Afshari stated he believes they are introducing "Class A" office buildings; they do not look industrial. He stated they do not believe their buildings are any less than other buildings he has seen on Redlands Boulevard.

Commissioner Cook expressed concern that this is a retail corridor, and there is no retail in the project. Commissioner Cook stated it would be a nice component for this project. Mr. Afshari stated they have been advised by their broker, that mixing retail with office will result in a conflict relative to parking and trash enclosures.

Mr. Afshari stated they have had their Water Quality Management Plan approved, their landscaping and conceptual grading completed, and 90% of their working drawings completed based on the input they

received; now they hear that staff is considering two story or multi story buildings. Commissioner Cook stated they are looking for a focal point that sets the buildings apart.

Mr. Afshari stated they would like to review the recommendations and evaluate making revisions and return to the Commission in April.

Commissioner Osborne noted that an entry statement doesn't have to be a two-story building, but it should have an architectural treatment that indicates it is the entry to the office business park.

Commissioner Miller stated a recent project proposed on Ford Street is an excellent example of "Class A" office buildings and retail combined. Commissioner Miller stated the architecture on that project is very nice, and he suggested Mr. Afshari look at the drawings for that project.

Chairman Macdonald stated the comments made by the Commissioners regarding Redlands Boulevard is significant; he suggested Mr. Afshari look at the development on New Jersey Street and Redlands Boulevard, which is a combination of retail with light industrial to the rear. Chairman Macdonald stated the Commission will support a good project but he believes there needs to be a lot of improvement on this project.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne noted that the General Plan was revised approximately two years ago, and the area along Redlands Boulevard was not all zoned retail. Mr. Shaw stated this site had been previously zoned industrial commercial and it was changed to commercial, which allows office as a permitted use. Commissioner Osborne stated if the applicant chooses not to have retail along the frontage, he is within his rights.

Mr. Shaw stated staff has suggested a focal point and integrating commercial into an office complex. Mr. Shaw stated staff is concerned with the lineal "cookie cutter" type of development that is proposed for a very prominent street.

Commissioner Osborne suggested a variation in the setback would be helpful. Chairman Macdonald stated a reduction in the density of the project would ease parking and landscaping problems.

Referring to a comment by the applicant that they are losing time, Commissioner Miller stated these are not new issues; he met with the applicant and staff to discuss the project 2-3 weeks prior.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Commission Review and Approval No. 822 to April 11, 2006.

Commissioner Shamp returned to the meeting.

C. KEITH MCCANN, 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 **Minor Subdivision No. 287** (Tentative Parcel Map No. 17380) to subdivide approximately 3.92 gross acres into four (4) residential lots to be located at the southwest corner of Pleasant View Drive and Marion Road in the A-2,

Estate Agricultural District and R-E, Residential Estate District.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation. Mr. Baeza noted revisions to Public Works Department Conditions of Approval 10(a) to read:

Dedicate to provide for a 60 50 foot street right-of-way width **with a ten (10) foot tree planting easement** including 13 foot radii at properly line return,

and a revision to Planning Division Condition of Approval 10 to read:

This approval is for the subdivision of 3.29 gross acres into four (4) residential lots and ~~one (1) common area lot~~ in the R-E, Residential Estate District and A-2, Estate Agricultural District.

Commissioner Miller asked if a project can be conditioned to include planting of citrus and palm trees. Mr. Shaw responded typically this is required with Planned Residential Developments (PRDs) or conditional use permits. Mr. Shaw stated originally the applicant worked with staff to change the zoning on the entire property, however staff insisted the zoning remain the same (A-2 zone). Mr. Shaw complimented the applicant on the design of the subdivision. Mr. Shaw stated typically staff does not require landscaping to be installed for a standard subdivision.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Don Williams, applicant's representative, stated he appreciates the time staff worked with him.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Williams if he would agree to plant palm trees to match the palm trees that are on the opposite side of the street (Marion Road). Mr. Williams agreed to plant the trees.

Mr. Baeza stated that Public Works Condition of Approval 10(f) which requires the applicant to plant street trees could be revised to require planting of palm trees.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Williams if the native trees will remain on the lot. Mr. Williams stated they will attempt to keep the trees on the lot if possible and clean them up.

Mr. Shaw suggested that Planning Division Condition of Approval 26 which pertains to a Homeowner's Association or CFD be deleted because there is no common ownership of land.

Commissioner James stated he concurred with Commissioner Miller's suggestion to plant palm trees however, he was unsure about planting the citrus trees.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the wording can be changed to require the street trees to be spaced to match the palm trees on the other side of the street. Mr. Shaw stated that the wording can be changed.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Minor Subdivision No. 287 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 Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Minor Subdivision No. 287 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 Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No. 287 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed Minor Subdivision is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Very Low Density Residential a zoning of A-2, Estate Agricultural District and R-E, Residential Estate District and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code.
2. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into four (4) lots;
3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a four (4) unit subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Very Low Density Residential and zoning of A-2, Estate Agricultural District and R-E, Residential Estate allow for four (4) dwelling units.
4. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject site is not identified as being within an area containing biological resources or within a wildlife corridor;
5. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems. This is a residential project and is not likely to cause any serious public health problems, aside from temporary air quality and noise impacts during construction addressed in the project's Mitigation Measures;
6. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision; no access easements exist on the site and adequate access will be provided to future lots;
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 within the City Agricultural Preserve is not under a Williamson Contract.

8. That improvements required of the project are necessary to insure public health and safety and are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area

with a revision to Planning Division Condition of Approval 10 to read:

This approval is for the subdivision of 3.29 gross acres into four (4) residential lots and one (1) common area lot in the R-E, Residential Estate District and A-2, Estate Agricultural District,

with a deletion of Planning Division Condition of Approval 26;

with a revision to Public Works Condition of Approval 8 (d) to read:

Provide **palm trees** spaced to match the trees across the street

with a revision to Public Works Condition of Approval 10 (a) to read:

Dedicate to provide for a **50** foot street right-of-way width **with a ten (1)) foot tree planting easement** including 13 foot radii at property line return

With a revision to Public Works Condition of Approval 10 (f) to read:

Provide street trees spaced **to match the trees across the street** avoiding sewer and water laterals.

Mr. Shaw thanked the applicant for working closely with staff to make a number of revisions to the project.

D. **VENTURE POINT - RED I, LLC, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

9. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration

10. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study

11. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 821** to develop a four (4) building industrial/warehouse park with a combined floor area of 76,742 square feet on approximately 4.43 acres, located at the southwest corner of Park Avenue and Nevada Street in the EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

12. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Minor Subdivision No. 295** to subdivide approximately a 4.43 acre property into four parcels located at the southwest corner of Park Avenue and Nevada Street within the EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Commissioner Shamp recused himself at 3:00 p.m. due to a potential conflict of interest.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. John Clement, Venture Point Development, stated he was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Clement to address staff's comments that the buildings were plain.

Mr. Clement stated he met with staff which resulted in changes made to the project to accommodate staff's comments; including a change in elevations, the addition of faux windows, and the entrances were moved to the corners.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated the applicant met with staff and made changes based on staff's comments. Mr. Jaquess stated it was not their intent to suggest the buildings were plain; they are fairly typical of what is seen by the Commission. Mr. Jaquess stated the Commission may want to make suggestions if they feel the buildings should be enhanced. Mr. Jaquess thanked the applicant for making changes.

Commissioner James asked why the smallest building has the largest loading dock. Mr. Clement responded that the building has a user who has a need for the number of docks shown.

Commissioner James stated he felt the buildings were plain looking. Mr. Altopp stated the elevations shown in the packet are current. Commissioner James stated he would like to see consistency on Redlands Boulevard. Commissioner James stated he felt the buildings need more windows and some type of treatment on top.

Mr. Clement stated the zoning for the property is industrial; which allows a specific amount of office use. Mr. Clement stated the project exceeds parking, landscaping, and setbacks.

Commissioner Foster asked if he would consider some type of roof line treatment. Mr. Clement stated he did not think it would be favorable to do more, but he is open to other ideas.

Commissioner Miller stated they have a series of repeating rectangles; in his opinion this facility does not rise to the quality of the R. P. Wages project on the corner of Alabama Street and Park Avenue.

Commissioner Miller stated the southeast corner of the building would benefit with more articulation. Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Clement for clarification on a symbol on the plans that is not labeled. Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Clement if he could add landscaping around the fence. Mr. Clement stated he would add landscaping if he is allowed to install it by Southern California Edison.

Commissioner Cook stated she liked the idea of adding interest to the rectangles. Mr. Clement stated he would be happy to work with staff.

Commissioner Osborne stated the plans show a flat plane on the buildings. Mr. Clement stated they add form work, which is later painted, to add some relief to the walls.

Commissioner Miller stated some of the big warehouses in the north end of town have variety within the panels. Commissioner Miller stated he believes some distinction can be created between the panels. Mr. Shaw stated there were three possible alternatives; the Commission can give the direction to staff to make the final decision, the applicant can work with one or more commissioners to finalize the plan, or the project can return to the Commission.

Mr. Jaquess asked for specific direction from the Commission if it decides to delegate the final decision making to staff. Mr. Jaquess stated the Commission could delegate a sub committee to make a final decision.

Commissioner Miller stated he would be happy to provide specific guidelines to staff or be on the sub committee, if it is acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Clement concurred.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller stated he felt it would be effective to have a different cornice treatment at the office component. He suggested the applicant make a distinction between where the warehouse portion of the building meets the office portion. Commissioner Miller suggested greater variety within the texturing and pattern of the panels.

Referring to the north elevation, Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Clement if he would consider adding texture to the wall, and eliminating the two (2) foot panel. Commissioner Miller concurred with Commissioner Osborne, stating another option would be to add more articulation on the corners.

Commissioner Cook stated she thought a cornice around the edge of the roof would look nice.

Chairman Macdonald asked Mr. Shaw if Conditions of Approval should be added to the proposed project to address the issues that were discussed.

Mr. Shaw stated Condition of Approval 35(a) would be added to read:

The applicant shall enhance the architectural treatment to include the office component that may include a cornice treatment and differentiate between the office and warehouse with some type of surface treatment, and also expand a variation in the pattern of the wall treatments.

Mr. Shaw added that Commissioner Miller would be included in the review of the proposed project.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review & Approval No. 821 and Minor Subdivision No. 295 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 Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review & Approval No. 821 and Minor Subdivision No. 295 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 Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, 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 Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review & Approval No. 821 subject to the following findings and attached Conditions of Approval.

9. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to

accommodate the industrial complex use because it complies with all property development standards for the 'EV/IC' zoning district;

2. The site properly relates to Nevada Street and Park Avenue which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because both streets will be constructed to city prescribed standards to their ultimate half widths through compliance with project conditions of approval;
3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 821 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare;
4. The use is desirable for the overall development of the community because the proposed project conforms with both the General Plan Designation, Municipal Code requirements, and the development standards of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan **with the addition of Condition of Approval 35(a) to read:**

The applicant shall enhance the architectural treatment to include the office component that may include a cornice treatment and differentiate between the office and warehouse with some type of surface treatment, and also expand a variation in the pattern of the wall treatments.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No. 295 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;
6. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide for the proposed purposes;
7. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of the proposed parcels. The General Plan Land Use Designations of Industrial/Commercial and zoning of Commercial Industrial of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan both allow for industrial offices;
4. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject site is not identified as being within an area containing biological resources or within a wildlife corridor;
5. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems;

6. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision;
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 in an agricultural preserve.
8. That improvements required of the project are necessary to insure public health and safety and are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area.

Commissioner Shamp returned to the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

Chairman Macdonald requested a short recess at 3:35 p.m.

Chairman Macdonald reconvened the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

E. JAVIER GARCIA, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Minor Subdivision No. 294** a request to subdivide Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0167-261-66 and 67, two lots which total 20,695 square feet, each containing two (2) attached dwelling units, into individual condominiums with floor areas of 1,663 and 1,695 square feet within the R-2, Multiple-Family Residential District located on the west side of Tribune Street at the convergence of Courier Avenue approximately 300 feet south of Lugonia Avenue.

Mr. Jaquess gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Ms. Melissa Hanson, Armantrout Architects, stated she was available to answer questions.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission deem Parcel Map No. 17730 (Minor Subdivision No. 294) to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under Section 15315, Class 15, Minor Land Divisions as the project is zoned for residential use, will involve a maximum of four units, and is in conformance with the General Plan and Municipal Zoning Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Tentative Parcel Map No. 17730 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 Cook, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Parcel Map No. 17730 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

3. 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 a zoning of R-2, Multiple-Family Residential District, providing 8.51 units to the acre and allowing only one residential dwelling unit per each 3,000 square feet of lot area which is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
4. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into four condominiums and conforms to lot development standards for the R-2, Multiple-Family Residential District of the Municipal Code;
5. The site will be physically suitable for the residential development. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Medium-Density Residential, and R-2, Multiple-Family Residential District zoning both allow for residential development in accordance with specified development standards and improvements.
6. 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;
7. 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, such as those associated with hazardous emissions or dangerous features.
8. 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;
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 in an agricultural preserve.

City Attorney Dan Mc Hugh left the meeting at 3:49 p.m.

F. BEAZER HOMES, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. A recommendation to the City Council for the approval of points for **RDA 2006-I-01** for **Conditional Use Permit No. 783** and **Tentative Tract No. 16390**, an approved 139 unit single-family Planned Residential Development project on a 46.45 acre site located north of Pioneer Avenue, south of the Santa Ana River and west of Orange Street in the RE, Residential Estate and R-1, Single-Family Residential District. (Note: This request is for 29 allocations; All other allocations have been previously awarded.)

Mr. Jaquess reviewed the project. Mr. Jaquess stated the applicant has previously been awarded residential allocation points and is requesting an allocation for their final 29 units. A total of 29 points were recommended to the City Council.

G. OLYMPIC BARRINGTON, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. A recommendation to the City Council for the approval of points for **RDA 2006-I-02** for **Conditional Use Permit No. 862** and **Tentative Tract No. 17577**, an approved 20-unit single-family Planned Residential Development project on a 4.50 acre site located on the northeast corner of Ford Street and Patricia Drive in the La Colina supplement to Specific Plan No. 23. (Note: This request is for 20 allocations; no other allocations have been previously awarded.)

Mr. Jaquess reviewed the project. A total of 35 points were recommended to the City Council.

H. MONTROSE PARK, LLC., APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. A recommendation to the City Council for the approval of points for **RDA 2006-I-03** for **Tentative Tract No. 17533**, an approved 10-unit single-family residential project on a 3.75 acre site located south of San Bernardino Avenue, north of Sherry Way, and east of Grove Street in the RE, Residential Estate District. (Note: This request is for 10 allocations; no other allocations have been previously awarded.)

Mr. Jaquess reviewed the project. A total of 32 points were recommended to the City Council.

Commissioner Cook stated that a higher level of architecture could have given the project the needed points; Commissioner Shamp added that smaller lot sizes would have helped with more points.

Mr. Bedros Tchaghlassian, applicant, addressed the Commission questioning why the previous project (RDA 2006-I-02) was given a point under category 2(c); and his project was not given the point.

Chairman Macdonald stated it is part of the interpretation; the projects are evaluated individually, and no consideration is given to their relation to previous projects.

I. ABCO REALTY AND INVESTMENTS, INC., APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. A recommendation to the City Council for the approval of points for **RDA 2006-I-04 for Conditional Use Permit No. 845 and Tentative Tract No. 17253**, an approved thirty-seven (37) unit condominium project on 2.56 acres located on the southwest corner of Lugonia Avenue and Church Street. (Note: This request is for 37 allocations; no allocations have been previously awarded.)

Mr. Jaquess reviewed the project. A total of 37 points were recommended to the City Council.

Mr. Jaquess stated the four projects will be forwarded to the City Council with the Planning Commission's recommendation for points.

Mr. Shaw stated the Montrose Park project will not be recommended for an allocation because it did not receive the total 90 points that are required, unless the City Council modifies the point allocation.

V. ADDENDA - None

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. JANUARY 24, 2006

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 4-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of January 24, 2006.

B. FEBRUARY 7, 2006 (JOINT MEETING WITH CITY COUNCIL)

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried unanimously that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of February 7, 2006.

C. FEBRUARY 14, 2006

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of February 14, 2006.

VII. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF FEBRUARY 21, 2006

Mr. Shaw gave a brief summary on the City Council actions of February 21st.

VIII. ADJOURN TO MARCH 14, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting to March 14th at 4:58 p.m.

Patti Ortiz
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department