

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, April 25, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

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

ABSENT: Thomas Osborne, Vice Chairman

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Daniel Mc Hugh, City Attorney
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner
Joshua Altopp, Assistant Planner
David Jump, 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 except Commissioner Osborne.

II. CONSENT ITEM(S) - None

III. OLD BUSINESS - None

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. **MIKE LYON, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING for Variance No. 731** for a variance from Section 18.32.170 of the Redlands Municipal Code to increase the allotted maximum coverage by structures from 20.00% to 26.31% to allow the construction of a new home, garage, RV garage, and accessory patios on a vacant lot located at 1714 Rossmont Drive (APN: 0176-152-19) in the R-A (Residential Estate) District.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp noted a correction on a Municipal Code Section referred to in the staff report. Mr. Altopp gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. He stated staff would support under grounding of the garage but could not support the proposed recreational vehicle (RV) garage.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Wayne Collins, project architect, thanked staff for its excellent presentation. Mr. Collins stated the proposed project could proceed without the RV garage; however they felt the RV garage would be a benefit to the neighbors; without the garage, there will be a RV parked with a six (6) foot wall. Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Collins for clarification on the roof line which appears to protrude 6-7 feet into the setback. Mr. Collins stated the roof looks nicer with a square hip, rather than angling the hip.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Collins if the existing 24-inch tree will remain on the property. Mr. Collins responded that all existing trees will remain.

Discussion was held on the finished floor elevation of the garage.

Mr. Carl Davis, who lives across the street from the proposed project, expressed concern on the proposed variance. Mr. Davis stated General Plans and precise zoning plans are the result of hard work and research by professional planners with drafts, re-drafts, and public hearings. Mr. Davis stated a variance represents the trashing of the entire process for the benefit of a sole property owner. Mr. Davis stated the proposed variance represents 1,200 square feet of additional structure, which is substantial. Mr. Davis expressed concern on the RV garage stating there are two (2) other RV garages in the City and one of them looks like a truck stop. Mr. Davis stated extending the structure to a building that is larger than his house, is an excessive variance. He stated he believes there is a City ordinance that prohibits parking of recreational vehicles in the front yard.

Mr. Mike Lyon, applicant, stated he would have no problem eliminating the RV garage.

Commissioner Miller expressed concern on the roof overhang, stating it may require cutting down an existing tree. Commissioner Miller asked the applicant to consider angling the roof to follow the angle of the wall.

Mr. Shaw stated there are limitations on the projections; the applicant would have to comply with the provisions of the Code because the variance does not accommodate a roof projection into the setback beyond that allowed by Code. Mr. Shaw stated a roof can extend into a side yard provided it is no closer than two (2) feet from the side property line. Mr. Shaw stated the Code did not appear to address front yard setbacks.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated there is a provision that allows a maximum five (5) foot protrusion into the front yard setback.

Commissioner Miller noted if the variance is granted, it will result in a 30% increase. Commissioner James concurred, stating he believes the project without a RV garage would be fine.

Commissioner Shamp commended the applicant on his solution for the garage stating planting grass on top of the garage was an expensive, but desirable solution.

Commissioner Miller asked for comments from the other commissioners relative to the roof overhang.

Commissioner Cook concurred stating she felt five (5) foot is a large overhang.

Commissioner Foster stated he did not have an opinion other than hoping the tree can be retained. Commissioner Shamp concurred with Commissioner Foster.

Commissioner Miller asked staff if the Commission can take the roof into consideration if it is within City standards. City Attorney Dan McHugh stated the Commission can condition the variance to have a reduction in the roof line.

Commissioner James concurred with Commissioner Miller that the roof line should be reduced.

Commissioner Shamp stated he is not comfortable with basing approval of the variance on modifying the roof overhang. He stated he felt the Commission should be careful not to overstep their scope.

Mr. Collins stated, aesthetically, the roof will appear to be more massive without the roof overhang, and it will be less attractive. He stated the tree will remain.

Commissioner Miller stated the eve line could remain the same by adding another hip to the roof. Mr. Collins stated it is a truss roof, which could create some problems.

Commissioner Miller stated he would leave it up to the judgment of the design professional; He commented that it was an excellent floor plan.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission determine that the proposed project has been determined to be exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under section 15305(a) of Article 19, Categorical Exemptions.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 731 for the revised request that does not include the RV garage 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. The unique triangular shape of the parcel, the two front setbacks, and the topographical conditions have limited the buildable area resulting in a subterranean garage.
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. In order to ensure that this owner has the same right as others in the R-A zone and to develop his property to the fullest, the garage will be landscaped on top and incorporated as part of the rear yard.
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, and have no effect on current living conditions for neighbors of those living at the property in question ensuring aesthetics and safety issues are minimized. The new garage construction will not affect any of the adjacent property owners or the public in general.

4. The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the General Plan of the City of Redlands. The construction of the garage, on the referenced property would not change the existing nature of the residential neighborhood.

Chairman Macdonald advised the audience that the proposed RV garage was withdrawn by the applicant.

B. CITY OF REDLANDS, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

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 **General Plan Amendment No. 109** an amendment to change the land use designation from Railway Corridor to Public Institutional on approximately 8.82 acres (APN: 0298-047-17) located on the northwest corner of Mentone Blvd. and Opal Avenue.

Commissioner Shamp recused himself due to a possible conflict of interest at 2:31 p.m.

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

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on 5-0 vote (Commissioner Shamp excused) that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council of the Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 109 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 James, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on 5-0 vote (Commissioner Shamp excused) that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1102 recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 109, changing the land use designation of the subject property from Railway Corridor to Public Institutional on approximately 8.82 acres APN: 0298-047-17.

Commissioner Shamp returned to the meeting at 2:34 p.m.

C. **CITY OF REDLANDS, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: BOB DALQUEST)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration
2. **PUBLIC HEARING on General Plan Amendment No. 111** to modify the text of Section 4.61 (Downtown) of the Land Use Element by establishing that mixed-use projects combining residential and commercial uses are allowed in areas of the downtown that are in the "Commercial" land use designation; and adding new Guiding Policy 4.61(e) to establish a policy that encourages mixed-use projects which integrate retail, restaurant and/or office uses along with urban housing at a density up to the High-Density Residential standard (0 to 27 dwelling units per acre).
3. **PUBLIC HEARING on Ordinance Text Amendment No. 311** for an amendment to Section 18.92 (C-3, General Commercial District) of the Redlands Municipal Code by establishing the permitted residential density in a mixed-use project combining residential and commercial uses to be that allowed in the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) District.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Dalquest stated the City wishes to encourage mixed use projects in the downtown area, but it is necessary to modify the existing General Plan text and add a guiding policy that will encourage mixed use projects. Mr. Dalquest stated the main purpose of the Ordinance Text Amendment is to establish residential density for a mixed use project.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Dalquest if the language would allow for live-work type projects. Mr. Dalquest stated it would.

Mr. Bill Cunningham, representing The Redlands Association, stated he has not had an opportunity to examine the proposed document, however he would like to examine it to determine if it complies with Measure U. Mr. Cunningham stated that 27 dwelling units would add to the traffic and the document does not address the 20% requirement for low and moderate income. Mr. Cunningham stated any residential housing in a redevelopment area would provide no housing revenue to the General Fund. Mr. Cunningham asked if a Mitigated Negative Declaration, rather than a Negative Declaration, would be appropriate. Mr. Cunningham raised the issue of consistency with the General Plan and stated a more appropriate environmental examination would be a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Mr. Cunningham stated the Redlands Association has never had a quarrel with mixed use, but the density of the project raises significant issues.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Dalquest if the impact of increased density is controlled, and if so,

how. Mr. Dalquest responded that an incoming project would be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the project is subject to Measure U. Mr. Dalquest stated they are establishing policy; the zoning allows for mixed use and it is staff's opinion that the project warrants a Negative Declaration.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Shamp and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 111 and Ordinance Text Amendment No. 311, and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It is recommended that this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Shamp and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1104, recommending that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment No. 111.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Shamp and carried on a 6-0 vote the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1105, recommending that the City Council adopt Ordinance Text Amendment No. 311.

D. CITY OF REDLANDS, 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 **General Plan Amendment No. 110** an amendment to the circulation element of the General Plan changing the street designation for the segment of New York Street between Redlands Boulevard and Colton Avenue from a "Collector" street to a "Local" street.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the City proposes to downgrade a segment of New York Street from a "collector" street to a "local" street so that it is consistent with the Circulation Element. Mr. Baeza stated the Public Works Department recommended the intersection of Redlands Boulevard and New York Street be eliminated due to its hazardous design. Mr. Baeza stated New York Street will connect to Stuart Street at a future date and the intersection of Stuart Street and Redlands Boulevard will be eliminated.

Mr. Shaw noted only the portion of New York Street north of Redlands Boulevard to Colton Avenue will be eliminated. Mr. Shaw stated that Stuart Street will require a separate action.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment No. 110 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 James, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Planning Commission Resolution No. 1103 recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 110, changing the street designation of New York Street between Redlands Boulevard and Colton Avenue from a "Collector" to a "Local."

E. BULLDOG COMMONS, LLC, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on an Environmental Impact Report.
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 on **Conditional Use Permit No. 836** to develop a forty (40) unit apartment complex on a 3.07 acre property located at the southeast corner of Grove Street and Sylvan Boulevard in the R-2, Multiple Family Residential District.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the applicant requested the proposed project be continued to May 9th so that they may provide additional project information

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, 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 continue the Environmental Impact Report, Socio-Economic

Cost/Benefit Study, and Conditional Use Permit No. 836 to May 9th.

F. **BUCKEYES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider an addenda to a certified Mitigated Negative Declaration.
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Conditional Use Permit No. 865 (Revision No. 1)** amending conditions of approval for a Conditional Use Permit for the development of a (24) twenty-four unit condominium development on a 2.6 acre property located on the south side of Highland Avenue, west side of Ford Street, and immediately east of the I-10 Freeway in the R-2, Multiple Family Residential District.
3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Tentative Tract No. 17691 (Revision No. 1)** amending conditions of approval for a Tentative Tract Map for a twenty-four (24) unit condominium development on a 2.6 acre property located on the south side of Highland Avenue, west side of Ford Street, and immediately east of the I-10 Freeway in the R-2, Multiple Family Residential District.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the applicant requested the proposed project be continued to May 9th so that they may provide additional project information.

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

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue the addenda to the certified Mitigated Negative Declaration, Revision 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 865, and Revision 1 to Tentative Tract No. 17691 to the meeting of May 9, 2006.

City Attorney Dan McHugh left the meeting at 2:57

V. **ADDENDA - NONE**

VI. **MINUTES**

A. **April 11, 2006**

Assistant Director Jaquess suggested the minutes be tabled to the evening session to allow the Commissioners time for review prior to taking a final action.

VII. **LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF APRIL 18, 2006**

VIII. **Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of April 18th.**

VIII. ADJOURN TO EVENING SESSION

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting to the evening session at 3:00 p.m.

7:00 P.M.

IX. RECONVENE NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Macdonald reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Item VI-A was heard at this time.

VI. MINUTES

A. April 11, 2006

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of April 11th.

A. **GARDNER CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, 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 adoption of **Specific Plan No. 60**, the Casalingo Specific Plan for the development of a 5.69 acre site at the northwest corner of Wabash Avenue and Los Altos Drive.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Tentative Tract Map No. 17622** to subdivide 5.69 gross acres into 14 residential lots and 2 common area lots for a private street and common open space located at the northwest corner of Wabash Avenue and Los Altos Drive in the R-A-A, Rural Estate Animals District (Proposed Specific Plan No. 60).

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Relative to the application for a Minor Exception Permit that was filed, Mr. Hartel stated it was determined that the permit was not necessary because the wall height could be incorporated into the Specific Plan.

Mr. Hartel summarized issues expressed by staff:

1. The site is designated very low density residential (0 - 2.7 dwelling units per gross acre). The project falls within this range.
2. The General Plan states smaller infill lots may be approved. The prevailing development pattern in the vicinity of the project is 1.63 dwelling units per gross acre, which is substantially less than the 2.46 dwelling units per acre that is proposed. Mr. Hartel stated the proposed project is not consistent with the prevailing density of development in the vicinity.

Mr. Hartel stated staff recommends two (2) options for the Commission to consider:

1. Continue the project for a redesign; to a maximum of nine (9) units, or
2. Continue the project and direct staff to bring back Conditions of Approval and motions for approval.

Commissioner Shamp asked if a gated community is consistent with either the R-A-A zoning district or low density under the General Plan. Mr. Hartel responded in the affirmative. Mr. Shaw stated the City has no policies on gated communities.

Commissioner Foster asked if the existing on-site palm trees will be incorporated into the project. Mr. Hartel stated that the project landscaper could respond to that question.

Mr. Mark Gardner, Gardner Construction and Development, 555 Cajon Street, stated the Specific Plan was designed based on the needs and desires of their "target market buyers."

Mr. Mitch Gardner, project architect, stated each of the design disciplines such as architecture, interior design, civil engineering design, and landscape architecture worked in a concerted effort to emulate a Tuscan feel. Mr. Gardner stated both floor plans offer outdoor living rooms and outdoor kitchens; stonework; wrought iron accessories such as door pulls, window treatments, light fixtures and railings; walk-in closets, three car garages, and barbeques.

Mr. Sean Burch, STB Landscape Architects, 15 S. Fifth Street, stated Casalingo is intended to be a quiet retreat. Mr. Burch stated the clubhouse will have a shade structure, barbeque, and picnic tables. Mr. Burch stated the trees were chosen for their suitability to Redlands' climate; the shrubs and ground covers provide a variety of colors, textures, shapes, and sizes.

Mr. Bud Thatcher, Thatcher Engineering, 345 5th Street, noted a correction in the staff report relative to the Minor Exception Permit. Mr. Thatcher stated the project could net 15 units based on gross acreage and the homes will be single story, although 2.5 stories are

allowed. Mr. Thatcher stated he concurs with staff's recommendation to require 50% of the trees to be 24 inch box. Mr. Thatcher stated there is a fifteen (15) foot separation between the buildings and there will be no interior fence lines within the development. Mr. Thatcher stated he concurred with requiring future interior fencing to have the approval of the homeowner association and staff. Mr. Thatcher stated he concurred with staff's recommendation that a Minor Exception Permit is not needed.

Mr. Thatcher noted an error in the wording in the staff report, stating the development will include covered garage spaces not "covered and garage spaces."

Referring to Policy 3.01b, Mr. Thatcher stated the development will retain the characteristics of the neighborhood by re-introducing architecture that is consistent with our history.

Referring to Policy 4.40n, Mr. Thatcher stated they are creating a project that establishes single family, single story residences. He continued that they have put in place policies to provide for ongoing protection against building alterations and fencing and will allow for a high level of continued maintenance.

Mr. Mark Gardner stated Casalingo is designed to meet the demand of the ever growing senior community in the City. He stated they are inundated daily with requests to be placed on their housing development waiting list. Mr. Gardner stated if the development is reduced to nine (9) homes, it will be a regular subdivision with no diversity, variety, or ingenuity. He stated if they are approved for fourteen (14) homes, it will be the project presented to the Commission. Mr. Gardner asked the Commission to support the project as designed.

Commissioner Foster asked if the existing palm trees will remain on site. Mr. Gardner stated if they can utilize the palm trees within the framework of the landscape plan that has been designed, they would like to use the palm trees. Mr. Gardner stated they want to ensure that the residents on Los Altos will not have their views blocked.

Mr. Burch stated he was not planning to use the palm trees, however he would be happy to incorporate them into the landscape plan if it is the wish of the Commission.

Commissioner Miller asked if the front yard setbacks are less than 20 feet from face of garage to the back of the sidewalk. Mr. Burch stated the intent of the Specific Plan is to provide for a full twenty (20) foot parking space in front of the garage that does not encroach into the sidewalk.

Commissioner Miller stated it appears that Lot 4 shows a distance of fourteen (14) feet not twenty (20) feet.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Thatcher for information relative to the retaining wall that will run adjacent to Wabash.

Mr. Thatcher stated there is an existing steep slope that comes from the previous development down to the curb. Mr. Thatcher stated the Engineering Department requires the applicant to grade the sidewalk area behind the curb. Mr. Thatcher stated the proposed wall will become green with plantings.

Commissioner Shamp commended the project saying it is a gorgeous project that will benefit the fourteen (14) families that will live behind the gate. Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Mitch Gardner what the neighborhood will contribute to the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Mitch Gardner responded that it will be a beautiful project.

Mr. Mark Gardner stated the project they are proposing will have the least impact on the neighborhood. He stated a regular nine-lot subdivision would include front yard landscaping but not rear yard. Mr. Gardner continued by stating if they build two-story houses, they will look down upon the surrounding neighbors, and they will lose their privacy. He stated they are trying to be thoughtful and considerate of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Shamp stated he wants to look beyond the design and materials of the houses, and look at the neighborhood as a community. He asked Mr. Gardner how the project is integrated into the community of homeowners.

Mr. Gardner responded by reading a letter from a senior homeowner who supports the proposed project. Mr. Gardner stated their project would allow seniors who currently live in the neighborhood to scale down their homes and remain in the neighborhood.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bob Toister, 30689 Los Altos Drive, stated he has lived in his neighborhood for 35 years and the one constant has been that all developments conform to the current zoning. Mr. Toister read several sections from the General Plan to support his position. Mr. Toister brought a picture of the proposed development site, stating a cluster of fourteen (14) homes would not conform to the site. Mr. Toister asked the Commission to support a recommendation to have the project redesigned to conform to the zoning.

Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Toister for his reaction to Mr. Gardner's comments that they might have to build a development of two-story, 4,000 square foot homes in order to be economically viable. Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Toister how he would feel if he had a two-story home built directly across the street. Mr. Toister responded he would prefer to have a two-story home built on the property, rather than set a precedent with a Specific Plan that does not conform with the zoning.

Mr. Richard Hoar, 30508 Los Altos Drive, stated he has lived in his home since 1988. He stated he cares what happens in Redlands and what happens to Redlands. Mr. Hoar stated the project will directly affect him and his family. Mr. Hoar stated he believes

Specific Plan 60 is, in effect, a zone change that is not consistent with the General Plan. Mr. Hoar stated he is opposed to Specific Plan 60 and he supports staff's recommendation for a redesign of the project.

Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Hoar the same question he posed to Mr. Toister, relative to single story versus two-story houses. Mr. Hoar stated he would have the same response as Mr. Toister.

Mr. Richard Roy, 30671 Los Altos Drive, stated he has lived in his home for eleven (11) years. He stated the Swim and Tennis Club was an eyesore that needed to go. Mr. Roy stated other developments in the area conform to the zoning. He stated he likes the proposed plan, but he suggested the developer build 7-9 houses. He stated he would prefer to see two-story homes.

Ms. Fannie Van Hying, 30590 Los Altos Drive, asked the Commission for its help in maintaining the existing zoning. Ms. Van Hying stated they carefully evaluated their neighborhood and chose the location of their home sixteen (16) years ago because of its low density. Ms. Van Hying stated the high density will create major parking and traffic problems. Ms. Van Hying stated the proposed project is not a senior development; families with children will move into the houses, creating an unsafe environment. Ms. Van Hying stated she believes properties should be developed in conformity with existing homes in the area. She stated she would prefer two -story houses.

Ms. Terri Sorenson, 12633 Wabash, stated they built their home twenty-seven (27) years ago, because of its low density and rural feel. Ms. Sorenson stated questioned whether the people who desire this development should have precedent over the people who have been living in the area for many years. She stated she believes the property can be developed and a profit can be realized by the developer, without the high density as proposed. Ms. Sorenson stated there is no guarantee that senior citizens will buy the homes because it is not a senior project. Ms. Sorenson asked the Commission to choose the alternative for a redesign of the proposed project.

Mr. Roger Battin, 1638 Valle Del Sol Drive, stated he previously sent a letter to the Commission in support of Mr. Gardner's demolition of the Swim and Tennis Club. Mr. Battin asked the Commission to supports staff's recommendation for redesign stating he believes the project should be in accordance with the zoning for that area. Mr. Battin complimented another development in the area, Griffin Homes, stating it is a great project.

Mr. Mark Adams, 1660 S. Wabash, expressed concern stating the project should be in compliance with the density of the surrounding homes. Mr. Adams stated the houses will be 14 feet from each other with no fencing. He stated the area of Mariposa Elementary School is very busy and very crowded; the houses should be built according to the zoning.

Mr. Andrew Smith, 727 La Solana Drive, stated many of his neighbors are concerned with keeping the zoning consistent. Mr. Smith stated they have an unofficial homeowners association that requires 20,000 square foot lots and rear landscaping is mandatory. He stated they too, are impressed with Griffin Homes, which is a welcome project and addition to the neighborhood.

Ms. Lois Lauer, 1143 Kimberly Place, stated she currently lives in a PRD that was proposed in 1977 and turned down twice prior to being approved. Ms. Lauer stated developers hesitate to build PRDs because of the long, involved planning process. Ms. Lauer stated she feels the proposed project is a good project for the City and she believes there is a need for more.

Commissioner Cook asked Ms. Lauer about the impact of this type of project on the surrounding neighborhood. She asked Ms. Lauer if the her development affected the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Lauer stated to her knowledge there has been no impact; the surrounding properties have increased in value. Ms. Lauer welcomed anyone who is interested to take a look at her PRD.

Ms. Ann Bryan, 1900 Country Club Drive, stated she ran a comparison of the square footage of surrounding properties in response to comments that the sizes of the proposed homes were not consistent with the neighborhood. Ms. Bryan stated the majority of the surrounding properties range from approximately 2,200 to 3,330 square feet. Ms. Bryan stated she has clients who are looking for this type of housing who are having to move out of town to find it. Ms. Bryan urged the Commission to approve the proposed project.

Ms. Peggy Brier, 30587 Los Altos Drive, stated she has lived in the area of the proposed project for the past twenty years. Ms. Brier stated at the time they were looking to buy a home, they were looking for a larger sized home with a minimal yard and would have jumped at the chance to purchase a home in a planned community such as Mr. Gardner's development. Ms. Brier stated she would prefer to have fourteen (14) nicely maintained, single story homes than eight (8) or nine (9) large two-story homes that would block their view. Ms. Brier stated the homes are designed for people who do not have families at home and would like to scale back on yard work. Ms. Brier stated she feels the project will enhance the neighborhood and she urged the Commission to approve the development as proposed.

Mr. Wes Green, 1721 Allison Way, stated the project is a plus for Redlands and the buyers of the community. Mr. Green stated two-story houses would be an "eyesore." He stated he owns a condominium where Ms. Lauer resides and he believes it is a fabulous project.

Ms. Sue Yeoman, 1672 S. Wabash, stated they have lived in their home for twelve (12) years. She stated she is familiar with the Kimberly Place development, which is on a flat parcel with surrounding lot sizes of 7,500 feet; it is not zoned R-A-A and does not have 20,000 square foot lot minimum requirements. She stated approving the Specific Plan Amendment sets a dangerous precedent for all vacant parcels in the South Redlands hills. Ms. Yeoman expressed concern on the proposed tiered retaining walls stating there is a large grade change that will be filled in and retained. She stated she prefers a two-story house looking into her back yard.

Mr. Mark Kumlar, 12754 Puesta Del Sol, stated he would prefer nine (9) two-story homes with smaller footprints. Mr. Kumlar stated he is worried about the precedent that would be set if the gated community is approved. He stated the proposed project does not meet the R-A-A zone he

questioned why we have zoning districts if we are going to ignore the zoning restrictions.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing and allowed the applicant an opportunity for rebuttal.

Mr. Mark Gardner stated it is difficult to get away from the issue of profit for the developer. Mr. Gardner stated the project is not a dense project; it is within the R-A-A zone and they are allowed to build a PRD or establish a Specific Plan. He stated they chose a Specific Plan because they wanted to identify every aspect of the project.

Mr. Gardner stated he distinctly remembers the residents stating they did not want to lose their views during meetings he had with the neighborhood. He stated he listened to the concerns of the neighborhood and he believes the project will be an asset to the community with its current design.

Commissioner James stated he believes it is a nice project, however he is concerned with the density. He alluded to Mr. Gardner's comment that he needs 36,000 square feet of building area to realize a profit; currently his plans show 41,000 square feet. Commissioner James suggested Mr. Gardner eliminate Lots 1 or 2 and move the other houses, resulting in a reduction of density and the needed building area square footage.

Mr. Gardner stated he does not want to be in a position of bartering. He stated they are in compliance with what is allowed by the General Plan.

Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Gardner if he would redesign if the Commission chooses to ask for a reduced density. Mr. Gardner stated he would not. He asked the Commission to deny rather than continue the project stating he would take his chances with an appeal to the City Council. Commissioner Foster thanked Mr. Gardner for his candor.

Commissioner Cook stated initially she felt the project was too dense, however she believes a variety of projects adds interest to the community. Commissioner Cook stated she sees value in this type of project and she thinks it is a very good project. She stated there is a lot of detail in this project that is not usually seen on tract developments.

Commissioner Miller asked for clarification on the applicant's statement that the General Plan encourages a variety of lot sizes in the same neighborhood. Commissioner Miller asked if it states we should have a variety of housing types in the community.

Mr. Shaw responded he was not sure if it was specified. Mr. Shaw read the General Plan and he does not believe it is specific as to a "neighborhood" or a "community." Mr. Shaw stated the Specific Plan is a change of zone to allow a greater density than the surrounding R-A-A zone.

Commissioner Miller stated in the years he has been on the Planning Commission Gardner Development has brought in some of the finest residential projects in town. Commissioner Miller stated he believes his role as a Commissioner is to preserve the character of the neighborhood and residents should be able to rely on the principles of the General Plan and the intentions of the zoning. Commissioner Miller stated he believes the proposed project is out of character with the neighborhood as established. He stated the quality of the architecture is superb and the quality of the landscaping is very nice however, the proposed homes would have a frontage of approximately 65 feet while the existing homes have 105 feet of frontage. Commissioner Miller stated the

minimum setback is 25 feet from the property line; the proposed homes have 12 feet. These differences are substantial.

Commissioner Miller stated he had concerns relative to the proposed project:

- (1) The percent of slope for the proposed project is just short of the maximum 15% slope that would require a less dense development.
- (2) When there is a higher density, the lots become narrower which tends to make the houses deeper and results in encroachment into the back yard.
- (3) The houses are only 48 feet wide, while other homes in the area have estate like quality.
- (4) It is a risk to pursue a PRD; if a single family development has been proposed it would have been less grief for the developer.
- (5) If the project could be reduced to 12 units, the square footage for the homes could be increase; resulting in larger frontage for the homes, more trees could be planted between the home and the street, and the homes would be shallower with larger front yards.

Commissioner Foster stated he was not opposed to the proposed project. Commissioner Foster stated if the project should come back to the Commission with a proposal for two-story homes, he would guarantee that there will an equal number of residents in the audience who would be opposed to two-stories. Commissioner Foster stated the development provides the types of homes and communities that will be necessary in the future as we deal with an aging population. Commissioner Foster stated he believes it is a commendable project that will sell out. Commissioner Foster stated it is a high quality project, and he concurred with Commissioner Miller's comments regarding the high quality of Gardner Construction project. Commissioner Foster expressed support for the project as proposed.

Commissioner Shamp stated initially he did not particularly care for the project. Commissioner Shamp stated he would prefer to see intermingling of large and small homes, first time buyers and senior citizens. Commissioner Shamp stated his biggest concern was the proposed gated community, because it is not integrated into the neighborhood; it is segregated. Commissioner Shamp stated the most compelling argument is the need for the housing market to respond to market demands.

Commissioner Shamp stated he supports the project as proposed.

Commissioner James stated he is struggling with the potential zone change. Commissioner

James stated he really likes the project and he believes it will be an asset to the neighborhood. Commissioner James asked the applicant to take two (2) weeks to consider a less dense project (twelve units).

Chairman Macdonald stated the Commissioners have been very eloquent, weighing all the issues, and the positives. Chairman Macdonald stated he does not believe the project will be a detriment to the neighborhood; there is a consensus from the Commission that the project is a good project and should be approved. Chairman Macdonald stated it is an excellent, high quality project that will fill a need. Chairman Macdonald requested the alternative motion for the project be read at this time.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 4-2 vote (Commissioners James and Miller voting no) that the Planning Commission continue Specific Plan No. 60 and Tentative Tract No. 17622 to May 9, 2006, and direct staff to bring back appropriate positive motions and Conditions of Approval.

X. ADJOURN MEETING TO MAY 9, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting to May 9th at 9:10 p.m.

Patti Ortiz
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department