

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, March 14, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

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

ABSENT: Ruth Cook, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF

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

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

Chairman Macdonald called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. All commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Cook.

II. CONSENT ITEM(S)

(It is recommended that the following item(s) be acted upon simultaneously unless separate discussion and/or action is requested by a Commissioner or a member of the audience.)

Director Jeff Shaw requested that item II-D be pulled from the consent calendar.

A. **WILLIAM BUSTER, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL)

1. Planning Commission to consider the appropriateness of an approved Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. Consideration of a **Time Extension for Conditional Use Permit No. 816** for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on 10.6 acres consisting of seven (7) residential lots and three (3) common lots located north of Sunset Drive, approximately 200 feet west of Helen Drive in the R-A, Residential Estate District.
3. Consideration of a **Time Extension for Tentative Tract No. 16488** to subdivide approximately 10.6 gross acres into seven (7) residential lots and three (3) common lots located north of Sunset Drive, approximately 200 feet west of Helen Drive in the R-A, Residential Estate District.
4. Consideration of a **Time Extension for Variance No. 670**, a Variance from

Section 18.144.200 (B) of the Redlands Municipal Code to permit recreational open space within private rear yards in lieu of the requirement for recreational open space in the proposed common area of Tract No. 16488 located north of Sunset Drive, approximately 200 feet west of Helen Drive in the R-A, Residential Estate District.

B. 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.

C. HEEMSTRA SIGNS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. A request for Planning Commission consideration of **Commission Sign Review No. 301** for a nineteen point six (19.6) square foot freestanding sign for Cajon Professional Building located at 256 Cajon Street in the A-P, Administration and Professional District.

E. THIENES ENGINEERING, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

6. Determination of General Plan consistency for proposed **Street Vacation No. 134** a request to vacate a portion of the east side of Kansas Street approximately eight (8) feet wide and 515 feet in length immediately south of Park Avenue within the I-P, Industrial District.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Shaw wanted it noted for the record that the location of the sign for item II-D was incorrectly identified in the staff report as the southeast corner of Redlands Boulevard and Sixth Street; it should have been the southwest corner.

Item II-D was heard at this time.

D. TOM KAISER, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. A request for Planning Commission consideration of **Commission Sign Review No. 304** for a twenty-one (21) square foot freestanding sign for Unocal 76 Gas and Service Station located at 201 East Redlands Blvd. in the TC, Town Center District of Specific Plan No. 45 Downtown Specific Plan.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Sign Review No. 304.

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 gave a brief presentation on the proposed project.

Commissioner Osborne asked if it would be a violation of the Specific Plan to include a recommendation for acquisition and development of the parcel that is not currently part of the project.

City Attorney Dan Mc Hugh stated he and Mr. Shaw addressed the matter prior to the last meeting, and it is their opinion that it would not be an appropriate condition to require the parcel to be acquired. He stated they do not believe it would be in violation of the Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Pat Meyer, applicant's representative, stated the residential component of the project has been approved by the Commission; this is the office/commercial component. Mr. Meyer stated the project is consistent with the Specific Plan. Mr. Meyer stated there is a need for this type of use in the I-10/Ford Street corridor. Mr. Meyer stated revisions have been made to the architecture based upon comments made by the Planning Commission. Mr. Meyer stated he believes the Condition of Approval that requires two (2) loading zones is not necessary but he will defer to the judgment of the Commission. Mr. Meyer stated it is their experience that this type of office component will not generate large deliveries; most of the deliveries will be handled by UPS or Fed Ex. He stated he concurs with staff recommendations.

Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Meyer if it would be difficult to add an additional one foot length/depth for a loading zone. Mr. Meyer stated it could be done however, they are trying to keep the parking ratio high rather than at a minimum.

Mr. Meyer stated they have been successful in reaching an agreement to acquire the parcel of the land that is currently not part of the project. He stated they hope to open escrow within the next day or two.

Commissioners Miller and Osborne concurred with Mr. Meyer relative to the two (2) loading zones for the office buildings. Commissioners Shamp, James, and Foster concurred with Mr. Meyer. Chairman Macdonald stated that Condition of Approval 26 would be deleted.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval No. 815 and Minor Subdivision No. 288, 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 James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval No. 815 and Minor Subdivision No. 288. 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 James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 815 subject to the following findings:

1. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed commercial and office buildings;
2. The site properly relates to Ford Street and Patricia Drive, which have been designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed commercial and office park buildings;
3. The conditions proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 815 shown on the site plan are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare of the neighborhood and the City of Redlands;
4. When completed, the project will contribute to the overall development of the neighborhood;
5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Administrative and Professional Office District of Specific Plan No. 23 **with the deletion of Planning Division Condition of Approval 26.**

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the

Planning Commission approve Minor Subdivision No. 288, subject to the following findings:

6. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Office and zoning of Administrative and Professional Office District of Specific Plan No. 23, and is consistent with both the General Plan and Specific Plan;
7. The site, which is located on the east side of Ford Street, north side of Patricia Drive, and south side of the Interstate 10 Freeway, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into eight commercial lots and one lettered lot for common open space and parking areas and is consistent with the property development standards of the Administrative and Professional Office District of Specific Plan No. 23;
8. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of eight commercial lots and one lettered lot for common open space and parking areas using a planned unit development condominium format. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Office allows for the proposed subdivision;
9. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject site is not identified as being within an area containing biological resources or within a wildlife corridor;
10. The design of the subdivision or type of improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems. This is a commercial/office park 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;
11. The design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision; public streets and pedestrian access will be provided throughout the project site;
12. That pursuant to California Government Code Section 66474.4, of the Subdivision Map Act the land is not subject to a contract entered into pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. The property is not under Williamson Act Contract.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. **QUIEL BROS., APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. A request for Planning Commission consideration of **Commission**

Sign Review No. 303 for a forty-two (42) square foot building mounted sign for Xrtainment Zone located at 409 E. Palm Avenue, in Specific Plan No. 41 (Citrus Village).

Project Planner Joshua Altopp stated the Sign Program allows the applicant to request Planning Commission approval of a logo that exceeds the maximum allowed letter height. Mr. Altopp stated the proposed sign will protrude eight (8) inches below the fascia. Mr. Altopp stated the applicant proposes to construct a steel casing and attach it to the underside of the fascia to address this issue.

Mr. Joel Peterson, applicant, stated his business will utilize exercise and computer technology to provide a family wellness center. Mr. Peterson stated he is proposing a 42 square foot sign although a 59.16 square foot sign is allowed. Mr. Peterson stated the letters in his proposed sign are less than the 36-inch height that is allowed.

Mr. Peterson stated the "X" in his sign is the logo and it is three (3) inches below the maximum 48-inch height that is allowed for a logo.

Mr. Peterson stated it is not feasible for him to enlarge the frontage or move the logo up due to a copper overhang. Mr. Peterson stated the "X" design of the logo represents a person exercising.

Mr. Peterson stated there is a concern that the protrusion of the "X" will cause it to have an unfinished look. He stated he can add decorative sheet metal so that there isn't a hollow area behind the lettering.

Commissioner James stated he felt the business concept, logo and sign are excellent however, he felt the sign was too big for the front of the building and a reduction in the size of the sign would make it look better.

Mr. Altopp stated that signage up to 36 inches can be approved at a staff level, however anything larger than 36 inches must be approved by the Planning Commission. Mr. Altopp stated the height as proposed is allowed subject to Planning Commission approval, however there is an issue due to the protrusion of the lettering below the fascia.

Commissioner Osborne asked it is not specifically addressed in the Sign Code, would it be prohibited? Mr. McHugh stated it is a discretionary decision by the Commission.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Altopp if the variance requested by the applicant is for the logo or the lettering. Mr. Altopp stated it is for either one.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Peterson to clarify why he does not want to reduce the size of the "X" by eight (8) inches so that it will fit entirely on the fascia. Mr. Peterson stated it goes against the original design of the logo.

Chairman Macdonald asked Mr. Peterson if he considered increasing the size of the fascia in order to provide more visibility of the sign. Mr. Peterson responded that increasing the fascia would mean the frontage would have to be lowered and built out, which would result in a substantial increase in costs.

Chairman Macdonald asked staff to comment on the addition of the decorative metal to the "X." Mr. Jaquess stated it was presented as an alternative by the sign company in an effort to meet Code. He stated staff felt it appeared to meet the letter of the Code.

Commissioner Shamp stated the discussion has primarily focused on the subject of advertising; the intent of the Specific Plan is to keep a rein on advertising. Commissioner Shamp stated he believes it is critical to keep

the reins in place because it will set a precedence. He stated he would lean to other solutions that will keep the sign from hanging below the edge of the soffit, either by sign reduction or by lowering the fascia.

Commissioner Foster concurred with Commissioner Shamp, stating two reasonable options have been presented to the applicant for consideration. Commissioner Foster stated he did not see a need for a logo of that large a size on the building.

Commissioner James stated he feels the sign is attractive, however he does not know if it fits this particular building in this instance. Commissioner James stated he believes it would be perfectly readable if it was reduced in size or if another option was utilized.

Commissioner Osborne stated the Specific Plan allows up to 36 inches and the sign, excluding the logo, is in compliance. Commissioner Osborne stated the logo which extends below the fascia is what is being proposed to the Commission.

Commissioner Miller stated the proposal to run the sheet metal may meet the letter of the law but may not meet the spirit of the law. Commissioner Miller stated the projection may make a nice artistic statement, but he (Miller) has to judge the sign within the entire context of the center. He stated if the building fascia is dropped it will be different from the other building which introduces a lack of uniformity. Commissioner Miller stated the sheet metal repair or trim will look like someone accidentally made the sign too big and tried to fix it. Commissioner Miller stated there should be a good reason to justify going up to 48 inches and he does not see the justification in this case.

Chairman Macdonald stated it is apparent the Commission feels the logo should be reduced to fit within the space of the existing fascia. Chairman Macdonald asked Director Shaw what alternatives are available to the Commission.

Mr. Shaw stated the Commission can:

1. Approve the proposed project with conditions of approval
2. Deny the application as submitted, or
3. Request a continuance to explore additional alternatives or considerations

Chairman Macdonald asked Mr. Peterson to comment. Mr. Peterson stated the only facility in the Albertson's Center that has a blue tiled entryway is his facility. Mr. Peterson asked Commissioners Miller and Shamp to comment on uniformity.

Commissioner Miller stated he did not believe an argument to make the facility less uniform is a compelling argument.

Mr. Peterson stated he would request a continuance so that he can work with staff to come up with something that is feasible and to look at the cost of rebuilding a new store front.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Foster and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Commission Sign Review No. 303 to March 28th.

B. JANET CLARK, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Variance No. 725** from section 18.40.100, Maximum Coverage, to allow an increase in the percentage of permitted lot coverage from 30% to 35% for a proposed room addition totaling 257 square feet for the rear of a single-family residence located within the R-S, Suburban Residential District approximately 300 feet south of Cypress Avenue at 621Cajon Street.

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

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing. The applicant declined to speak. Chairman Macdonald closed 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 Variance No. 725 subject to the following findings and attached Conditions of Approval:

1. There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances, or conditions, applicable to the property or the intended use, that do not apply generally to other properties, or uses, in the same vicinity and zone due to the existing lot being 45 percent substandard compared to R-S, Suburban Residential District standards relating to lot size.
2. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same vicinity and zoning district, but which is denied to the property in question, such as Variance No. 711 and 686 which were granted and specifically related to lot coverage standards with the R-S zoning district.
3. The granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements of others in the vicinity, as no encroachment into the front yard setback would occur maintaining sufficient distance to ensure aesthetic and safety issues are minimized.
4. The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the General Plan of the

City of Redlands **with the incorporation of the Building and Safety Department Conditions of Approval** that were distributed at the meeting.

C. **PGP PARTNERS, INC., APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council for **Amendment No. 3 to Concept Plan No. 1** amending the Concept Plan with the elimination of a street located north of Lugonia Avenue, south of Almond Avenue, east of Mountain View Avenue and west of Research Drive in the Commercial Industrial District of Concept Plan No. 1.
4. Consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on **Commission Review and Approval No. 819** to develop a six (6) building industrial park with 715,925 square feet of floor area on approximately 38.36 acres, located on the north side of Lugonia Avenue, the east side of Mountain View Avenue, and the south side of Almond Avenue in the Commercial Industrial District of Concept Plan No. 1.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council for **Minor Subdivision No. 297** (Tentative Parcel Map No.17815) to subdivide approximately 38.36 acres into 8 lots for property located on the north side of Lugonia Avenue, the east side of Mountain View Avenue, and the south side of Almond Avenue in the Commercial Industrial District of Concept Plan No. 1.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Baeza stated staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend final approval of the project with the architecture to return to the Commission for final approval.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Relative to the termination of Lugonia Avenue, Chairman Macdonald stated it appears to be a fairly heavily traveled street; he inquired about plans and provisions for the traffic that currently uses Lugonia Avenue. Mr. Shaw responded that the Concept Plan was amended to allow the traffic to travel on Lugonia Avenue and continue north to Almond Avenue on Research Drive.

Mr. Blair Dahl, PGP Partners, stated they inherited the site plan and building configuration from Majestic Realty. Mr. Dahl stated he concurs with the staff report and he requested approval of the architecture at this time, rather than having to return to the Planning Commission for final approval. Mr. Dahl stated his company primarily handles industrial projects and they tend to do nice projects. He stated they have added glass, color, more articulation on the building fascias and parapets, and provided more vertical interest along the elevations.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Dahl if he is asking the Commission to accept the architecture as presented, or if he is asking for specific items that can be written into Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Dahl stated he believes it will be a great project as presented and he would like to proceed.

Commissioner James stated ultimately down the road, the buildings could convert to more of an office use; he asked Mr. Dahl if the parking spaces are asphalt. Mr. Dahl stated the parking spaces would not be striped, going in. Mr. Dahl stated he believes they will have a mix of uses.

Commissioner Miller stated it is a nice project. He expressed concern relative to the retention basin which is quite deep. Commissioner Miller stated the loading docks located on the other side of the retention basin will be visible on Mountain View Avenue. He asked the applicant to explore placing a solid wall at the retention basin.

Mr. Dahl responded they could place a berm on the east side between the retention basin and the loading area with trees on top. Mr. Dahl stated the building is located 300 feet from Mountain View Avenue. Mr. Dahl stated the water quality basins will have a California native grass mix and it will not be any deeper than 6-7 feet.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Dahl if the paving is asphalt or concrete. Mr. Dahl responded that the drive aisles are asphalt and the loading areas are concrete. Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Dahl if there is a possibility of leaving the proposed parking areas landscaped and only to be filled in on an as-needed basis. Mr. Dahl indicated probably not as they are designed for the access and efficiency of the trucking. Commissioner Shamp asked how the trucking could be accommodated if the parking is "maxed out." Mr. Dahl stated it would be unusual to have so many employees with this type of building.

Mr. Dennis Roy, RGA Architects, stated they looked at the original elevations and started over again with the project. Mr. Roy stated they included variation on the parapet heights and glass at the entry areas. Mr. Roy stated they tried to create a rhythm with glass at the corners of the building on the facades along Almond Avenue and they worked with strong patterns of paint reveals. Mr. Roy stated they tried to orient the truck courts away from the streets and incorporated screen walls to minimize the view of loading areas. Mr. Roy stated there is a provision in the Code that states loading areas have to be screened if they are within 70 feet of a right-of-way; their building is 300 feet away.

Mr. Roy stated all of the buildings have two (2) primary entrances which means they can go with a single tenant or two tenants and the parking areas are divided as well. Mr. Roy stated a heavier employment user will have less trucking and loading needs. Mr. Roy stated even if they stripe out all the parking as shown on the site plan they will still have adequate room for loading zones. Mr. Roy stated they are showing a possible layout but there are many different variations that will work.

Mr. Roy stated they selected a palette of earth tones and tans for the buildings.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Roy what size storm event the retention basin is designed to retain. Mr. Roy responded it is a question best answered by the civil engineer. Mr. Jaquess stated it is not a traditional flood control basin; it is more of a water quality basin that is designed to retain a first flush runoff and let the water percolate.

Commissioner Shamp asked what type of roofing equipment would be used. Mr. Roy stated it would be a standard cap sheet although there is a possibility of putting a coating on, based on a performance calculation under Title 24 standards.

Commissioner Miller asked for clarification on the pad elevations for Building 5. Commissioner Miller stated he agrees with adding berms on the east side of the retention basin, however if the finished floor of Building 5 is significantly higher than the retention basin, the berm probably will not do a lot of good. Mr. Roy stated the

building pad would be approximately four (4) feet below the finished floor and would slope down gradually (approx. 2%) toward the retention basin.

Commissioner Miller stated he is sensitive to this corner because it is close to an entry point. Mr. Roy stated they worked with staff on the southwest corner of the building by adding glass to the upper levels and stepping up the parapets.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Chairman Macdonald asked if staff had recommendations for improving the architecture. Mr. Jaquess stated staff met with the applicant, who addressed a number of recommendations, however they would like some input from the Commission.

Commissioner Shamp stated he is content with the architectural details on the warehouse buildings as he tends to want to see the money spent on landscaping not on the "boxes."

Commissioner Miller stated the north elevations are nice and the east elevations are good, however he suggested the raised element be broadened up one additional module. Commissioner Miller stated generally, it is a good design.

Commissioner Osborne stated the loading docks will probably be visible from Mountain View unless the area is heavily landscaped. Commissioner Osborne suggested that larger trees be planted on the south corner. Mr. Shaw stated staff can require 3-4 foot berming with shrubs that can grow 3-4 feet high on the back side.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing and asked Mr. Dahl for comments.

Mr. Dahl stated he was going to make the same suggestion as Mr. Shaw relative to the berming and shrubs.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Chairman Macdonald asked Mr. Baeza to prepare a Condition of Approval to address this issue. He stated it appears the Commission is satisfied with the architectural design of the buildings and the changes that have been suggested, and it will not be necessary for the project to return to the Commission for further review. Mr. Baeza also noted that Planning Division Condition of Approval 38 which requires the project to return to the Commission for final approval, should be deleted. Mr. Shaw suggested replacing the wording on Condition of Approval 38 to include a requirement for berming and shrubs.

Mr. Baeza noted that Planning Division Condition of Approval 17 requires a reciprocal parking and access agreement. Mr. Baeza noted the applicant agrees with the reciprocal access, however they requested that the reference to parking be deleted. Mr. Baeza also noted an error in the wording for the motion of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Amendment No. 3 to Concept Plan No. 1 Commission Review and Approval No. 819, and Minor Subdivision No. 297 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It is recommended that the 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 Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Amendment No. 3 to Concept Plan No. 1 Commission Review and Approval No. 819, and Minor Subdivision No. 297 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It is recommended that the 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 Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve Amendment No. 3 to Concept Plan No. 1.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve Commission Review and Approval No. 819 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 complies with setback and coverage limits established by Concept Plan No. 1.
2. That the site properly relates to adjoining streets which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development; adjoining streets will be widened to their ultimate half width to accommodate additional traffic.
3. That the Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 819 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare; the project 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.
4. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community; once developed the project will provide employment opportunities within the city;
5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial/Industrial designation of the General Plan **with the revision to Planning Division Condition of Approval 38 to read:**

Berming of a height of three (3) to four (4) feet shall be incorporated into the design of the retention basin. A three (3) to four (4) feet high berm on the east side of the retention basin to include a solid shrub row that will grow to a minimum height of four (4) feet.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve Minor Subdivision No. 297 subject to the Conditions of Approval, and based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan, Municipal Code and Concept Plan No. 1 of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan;
2. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into eight (8) commercial properties;
3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of an eight (8) parcel subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of industrial/commercial and zoning of Concept Plan No. 1 of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan both allow for commercial subdivisions.
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; the project 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' the project is required to provide easements to properties located on the south side of Lugonia Avenue.
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 not necessary to insure public health and safety and are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area **with the revision of Planning Division Condition of Approval 17 to read:**

The recorded map shall provide a reciprocal parking and access agreement to be recorded over all the properties to provide unrestricted access to ~~parking spaces~~, drive aisles and driveways. Adequate access easements shall be provided to properties located on the south side of Lugonia Avenue subject to review and approval by the City.

Mr. Mc Hugh left the meeting at 3:58 p.m.

V. ADDENDA

F. Alcoholic Beverage Control License Transfer for the Flamingo Cocktail Lounge located at 338 N. Orange Street

Mr. Jaquess stated staff was notified by Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) of a request to transfer ownership of the license. He stated as part of the transfer, the City has the opportunity to review and provide input. Mr. Jaquess stated the Redlands Police Department raised a concern relative to the operation of the facility stating they do not believe there is adequate on-site security. Mr. Jaquess stated staff is recommending a condition be added that requires two (2) on-site security personnel during the hours when the facility is open; one for the front of the building and one for the rear of the building.

Commissioner Shamp suggested adding a condition that requires the Flamingo Cocktail Lounge to clean up all trash and cigarette butts at closing every night.

Mr. Jaquess stated he would be happy to forward the recommendation to ABC.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the person to person transfer related to the On-Sale General License for the Flamingo Cocktail Lounge subject to the following condition as there are existing problems associated with this facility.

1. A minimum of two security personnel shall be present on-site at all times when the business is open. One of the security personnel shall be at the front door adjacent to Orange Street and a second shall be stationed at the back door adjacent to the alley **with the addition of Condition 2 to read:**
2. **The Flamingo Lounge shall clean up trash and debris in the front and rear of the facility at the close of business each day.**

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. February 28, 2006

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of February 28, 2006, with corrections noted.

VII. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF MARCH 7, 2006

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of March 7th.

VIII. ADJOURN TO MARCH 28, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting to March 28th at 4:10 p.m.

Patti Ortiz
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department