

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, May 9, 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
Thomas Osborne, Vice Chairman

ABSENT: Thomas Osborne (absent evening session only)

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Daniel Mc Hugh, City Attorney
Bob Dalquest, Principal Planner/Project Manager
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner
David Jump, Associate 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.

II. CONSENT ITEM(S)

A. **GENEIL VINES, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL, AICP)

1. Planning Commission to consider **Commission Sign Review No. 307** for a four (4) foot high, 11.5 square foot freestanding sign for the Pure Gold building at 303 Brookside Avenue at the southwest corner of Brookside Avenue and Grant Street in the Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District.

B. **G. LOUIS FLETCHER, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. A request for final approval of Parcel Map No. 17604 (**Minor Subdivision No. 296**) a subdivision of 3.06 acres into two (2) separate parcels located at 153 Sierra Vista Drive in the R-A, Residential Estate District.

C. **HERMELINDA RUIZ, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission determination of General Plan consistency for **Street Vacation No. 137** a request to vacate a triangular shaped portion of property on the west side of Tribune Street consisting of approximately 536 square feet, varying between 16 feet and 5 feet in width and approximately 51 feet in length located immediately south of Courier Avenue within the R-2, Multiple-Family Residential District.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Consent Calendar.

III. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. **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 23rd so that additional information could be prepared.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue the Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, Environmental Impact Report, and Conditional Use Permit No. 836 to the meeting of May 23, 2006.

B. **RICK DEL CARLO, SCP REDLANDS, LLC, APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council for an amendment to **Specific Plan No. 33 (Amendment No. 2)** (located generally south of Lugonia Avenue west of Alabama Street and east of Idaho Street) amending Section 3. A 2. (Permitted Uses) to include the Permitted Uses allowed under the EV/CG, General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the applicant is proposing to expand the allowed uses to include those uses found in the EV/CG, General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rick Del Carlo, applicant, thanked Mr. Jeff Shaw and Mr. Baeza for their assistance. Mr. Del Carlo stated he was available to answer questions.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 1106 and recommend that the City Council approve Amendment No. 2 to Specific Plan No. 33.

C. 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 Map No. 17691 (Revision No. 1)** amending conditions of approval for a Tentative Tract Map for a twenty-four (24) unit condominium development on 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.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated the project was approved by the City Council in September 2005. Mr. Baeza stated the project was conditioned to require that a sound wall be built to reduce exterior noise to a level less than 60 CNEL prior to occupancy of the units. Mr. Baeza stated the applicant proposes to revise a mitigation measure and the corresponding Conditions of Approval to temporarily eliminate access to some of the balconies in the development. Mr. Baeza stated staff spoke with an official from SANBAG and it is estimated that construction on the sound wall will begin in January 2007 and should be completed within a year.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Baeza if the sound wall will run along the freeway. Mr. Baeza stated the sound wall will continue west of the proposed project.

Chairman Macdonald asked Mr. Baeza if the Fire Department commented on the sealed exterior doors. Mr. Baeza stated the project came before the Environmental Review Committee (ERC) of which the Fire Marshal is a member. Mr. Shaw stated that the doors are not required for access purposes.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the doors will be sealed to prevent sound from coming into the units. Mr. Baeza responded that the exterior noise level on the balcony without the sound wall would be higher than what is allowed by the General Plan.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Baeza if the residents could have the option of not having the door sealed shut. Commissioner Osborne asked the applicant to explain how the door/window will be sealed.

Mr. Marwan Alabassi, applicant, thanked Mr. Shaw and Mr. Baeza for their assistance. Mr. Alabassi stated the project was conditioned to meet requirements for interior and exterior noise. Mr. Alabassi stated he spoke with a Caltrans superintendent who indicated the sound walls would be built sooner than expected. Mr. Alabassi stated the buyers would be given a disclosure stating that six (6) balconies would be unuseable until a sound wall is constructed, at which time the doors would be modified to allow for access.

Commissioner James asked how the doors would be closed off. Mr. Alabassi stated the sliding doors would be closed with an attachment to the railing that would prohibit the doors from opening.

Commissioner Shamp stated he is comfortable with the fact that the sound wall will be built and he questioned the need to seal off the door. Commissioner Shamp stated he would be comfortable with allowing access to the balconies.

Mr. Shaw stated they are trying find a solution in which the project will comply with the General Plan and there will be minimal impact on the applicant relative to modification of his project.

Commissioner Shamp stated he is comfortable with the project as it stands. Chairman

Macdonald stated he is not.

Commissioner Miller stated the California Uniform Building Code requires that you have the ability to exit every bedroom. Commissioner Miller stated the door in question is located in the living room therefore it is not addressed by the Code.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the addendum for the Certified Mitigated Negative Declaration for, Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 865, and Revision No. 1 to Tentative Tract Map No. 17691.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Revision No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 865, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;

1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plans of the City. The project is a multiple family development in an area designated for medium density residential development;
2. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare. The project is designed with adequate street access and will meet all building codes;
3. The proposed development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations of the City's General Plan, and applicable zoning district and the City's development standards. The project is consistent with the General Plan Noise Element and meets development standards of the proposed R-2, Multiple Family Residential District with the exception of a previously approved variance;
4. The proposed development is appropriate at the proposed location. The project site is not well suited for single family development but can accommodate the multiple family development.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Revision No. 1 to Tentative Tract Map No. 17691 subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval;

1. The proposed map is still consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential and zoning of R-2, Multiple Family Residential District and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
2. The site is still physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to accommodate twenty-four (24) condominiums;
3. The site is still physically suitable for the density of development of a twenty-four (24) unit condominium development. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Medium Density Residential and Zoning allow for twenty-four (24) 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;
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.

D. WHISPER RANCH, APPLICANT
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING for Variance No. 729** for a variance from Section 18.32.070 of the Redlands Municipal Code to increase the allotted maximum coverage by structures from 20% to 25% to allow the construction of a new home, and accessory patios on a vacant lot located at 1365 Fountain Place in the R-A, Residential Estate District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, stated a substantial amount of open space has been provided along with the preservation of the oak trees that are on-site. Mr. Meyer explained two alternative options he could have utilized to develop the property:

1. If he had developed the property as a PRD he would have been allowed 30% coverage.
2. He could have extended the lot lines westerly and created an easement for the road.

Commissioner James stated if the variance is granted, they would set a precedent for all six (6) lots within the development to have 25% coverage. Mr. Meyer responded he may come back to the Commission for a variance approval for one more lot in which a single story residence is planned.

Mr. Meyer stated if he included the area in front of each lot, there would not be a need for a variance. He stated he did not want to give individual property owners ownership of the oak trees as they would be able cut down the trees at future time. Mr. Meyer stated currently the trees are owned in common; currently he is president of the homeowners' association and no one can cut the oak trees down.

Commissioner Osborne noted when the tentative tract came before the Commission for approval there was some discussion on the oak trees; Commissioner Osborne stated he felt the applicant did a good job preserving the oak trees.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 729 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 preservation of open space and mature trees within the development creates an exceptional condition that affects the property;
2. That the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same vicinity and zone district, but which is denied to the property in question; there are properties in the vicinity and zone that have coverage that exceeds the twenty percent.
3. That 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; the project is in a gated community and the site will have a large rear yard setback minimizing impacts to other properties.
4. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the General Plan of the City of Redlands; the General Plan Land Use Designation of Very Low Density Residential will not be affected by the project.

E. **TOM BELL, INC., APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: BOB DALQUEST)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration
2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study
3. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 823** for the construction of a 69,666 square foot building for a new Toyota of Redlands automobile dealership on 8.0 acres located on the west side of New York Street, north of the Interstate 10 Freeway, in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for **Variance No. 726**, a variance from Section EV4.0140(b)(1) to allow a six (6) foot landscape setback along the west property line adjacent to freeway right-of-way where twenty-five (25) feet is required for a proposed automobile dealership on 8.0 acres, located on the west side of New York Street, north of the Interstate 10 Freeway, in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING** on **Variance No. 727**, a variance from Section EV4.0255(a)(7) to allow trees to be planted at greater than twenty (20) foot intervals along the west periphery planter for a proposed automobile dealership on 8.0 acres, located on the west side of New York Street, north of the Interstate 10 Freeway, in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Dalquest noted a unique feature of the plan is that approximately 243 vehicles will be parked on the roof.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Dalquest to explain the intent of having a twenty-five (25) foot setback along the freeway. Mr. Dalquest responded it is for aesthetics purposes; the mature eucalyptus trees and landscaping will soften the freeway views. Mr. Dalquest stated the project has been conditioned to require a landscape finger every ten (10) spaces along the west property line.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dennis Flynn, project architect, thanked the Planning staff for the very professional manner in which they handled the project. Mr. Flynn stated he was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Flynn to explain how the air-conditioning equipment would be handled. Mr. Flynn stated there would be air-conditioning pads with condensers on the roof and coils in the attic. Mr. Flynn stated the units would be located toward the center of the roof for screening purposes. Mr. Flynn stated the primary use of the roof will be for vehicle inventory.

Commissioner Osborne asked the Commission if the appearance of the roof would be improved with the planting of box trees. Commissioner Shamp stated it appears the freeway is higher than ten (10) feet above the project site. He estimated the freeway is 12-15 feet higher than the project site. Mr. Dalquest stated the building is set back approximately 75 feet from the fence and there is an increase in the grade as you move toward the center of the property.

Mr. Flynn stated the vehicles on the roof are not visible from grade level. Mr. Flynn stated the average height of the building is approximately 23 feet and the parapet is 4 feet high. Mr. Flynn stated the trees, if planted on the roof, are an "eye catching" element because we are not used to seeing trees on a roof. Mr. Flynn stated if the freeway is taller than the roof, they would incorporate screening.

Commissioners Cook and James concurred with Mr. Flynn relative to the visibility of trees on the roof.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Flynn how Title 24 energy code "cool roof" requirements would be met. Mr. Flynn stated the roof is a concrete surface, which is a lighter color material and it wears the best.

Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Flynn if the glass windows would create a glare problem for vehicles traveling on the freeway. Mr. Flynn stated the sight line from the freeway will not be on a one-to-one level with the glass because of the elevation grade difference.

Commissioner Miller commented there is a fairly large absence of landscaping on the project. He suggested introducing landscaping between the building and the fire lane. Commissioner Miller suggested making the new vehicle delivery area more "park like." He stated normally the project would have more landscaping but that cannot be accomplished because of the easement.

Commissioner Miller suggested adding more landscaping against the building where the service bays are located. Mr. Flynn stated he would be happy to work with staff on this matter. Mr. Shaw stated the trash enclosure will have to be relocated with landscaping planted on either side.

Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Flynn if wall-mounted lights could be placed on the parapet and lights could be placed on the condensing units. Mr. Flynn stated the difficulty in placing lights on the parapet is they are not as effective when placed at a low height. Mr. Flynn stated the light poles would be placed inward so the "throw of light" is not visible as you walk around the edge of the property.

Chairman Macdonald stated a Condition of Approval will be added to address this issue.

Mr. Mario Saucedo, representing the North Redlands Visioning Committee (NRVC), stated they are opposed to the variance. Mr. Saucedo stated the community of North Redlands is adamant that future development complies with Measure U, the General Plan and the East Valley

Corridor Specific Plan so that they are aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Saucedo stated they want to ensure that the project setbacks meet the standards of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan in addition to the planting of trees at ten (10) foot intervals. Mr. Saucedo stated the NRVC is opposed to approval of the variance. He stated the NRVC will give a presentation on the North Redlands Vision Plan at the May 23rd Planning Commission meeting.

Chairman Macdonald asked staff to briefly explain the reasons for the variance proposals. Mr. Dalquest stated the property is a triangular configuration which would require a considerable amount of land to be used for landscaping. Mr. Dalquest stated there is a ten (10) foot sewer easement that runs along the freeway which prohibits planting of trees for landscaping. In total, Mr. Dalquest stated this would require over ½ acre of land to be designated for the setback. Mr. Dalquest stated staff believes that landscape fingers every ten (10) spaces are adequate.

Mr. Saucedo stated that explaining the reason for the variances is helpful, however they would like to ensure the project is aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Miller stated he appreciates the work of the NRVC in trying to ensure consistency throughout the City. Commissioner Miller stated to his knowledge virtually all development along the freeway in the past 2-3 years has had the same condition of approval imposed. Commissioner Miller asked if it is accurate to state that the planting of trees in a sewer easement is prohibited. Commissioner Osborne stated the area cannot be landscaped because of the sewer easement.

Commissioner Shamp cautioned staff against using Toyota Corporate Development standards as a justification for the findings for a variance. He stated he is in favor of the variance.

Commissioner James noted the right-of-way along the freeway and the utilities easement is unique.

Commissioner Osborne stated the Commission has approved the same type of variances to other developments along the freeway corridor.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval No. 823, Variance No. 726 and Variance No. 727, and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined 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 James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for

Commission Review and Approval No. 823. 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 James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 726, based on the following findings, and subject to the attached conditions of approval:

1. That the request for the variance has exceptional or extraordinary circumstances because of the triangular configuration of the property, coupled with Caltrans' right-of-way running 1,138 feet along the west property line, and due to the site being below grade of the freeway;
2. That the Variance from the twenty-five (25) foot freeway landscape setback has been granted by the Planning Commission on numerous properties that exhibited similar circumstances within the same vicinity and under the same or similar zoning district;
3. That the granting of the variance from the twenty-five (25') foot freeway landscape setback will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements of others in the vicinity because no negative visual impacts from freeway views or surrounding properties would result; and,
4. That the property in question would remain consistent with the intent and guidelines of the Redlands General Plan.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 727, based on the following findings, and subject to the attached conditions of approval:

1. That the request for the variance has exceptional or extraordinary circumstances due an existing sewer easement and the requirement to extend the easement to a width of 15 feet along 1,138 feet of the west property line, and due to the triangular configuration of the site;
2. That such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same vicinity and zone district, but which is denied to the property in question because of the sewer easement along the west property line which would require 0.54 acre of

land to comply with the requirement to plant trees at twenty (20) foot intervals along a perimeter planter;

3. That the granting of the variance from this requirement will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements of others in the vicinity because no negative visual impacts from freeway views or surrounding properties would result; and,
4. That the property in question would remain consistent with the intent and guidelines of the Redlands General Plan.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 823, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the site for the intended use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use, and all of the required yards, setbacks, walls or fences, landscaping and other features to adjust the use to those existing or permitted future uses of land in the area, with the exception of the two variances that accompany this application which address a unique situation along the west property line;
2. That the site properly relates to streets and highways which are properly designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development;
3. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community, is consistent with the policies, programs, and objectives of the Redlands General Plan;
4. That the conditions set forth in the approval and those shown on the approved site plan are deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare;
5. That Commission Review and Approval No. 823, therefore, be approved subject to all departmental recommendations **with the addition of Planning Division Condition of Approval 26 to read:**

Provide additional planting of trees and shrubs along the south side of the building that faces the freeway, to include the indoor car delivery area and adjacent to the service center in the vicinity of the relocated trash enclosure.

F. **RBF CONSULTING, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Minor Subdivision No. 298** a request to allow the subdivision of a 39,781 square foot medical office building into fourteen (14) separate condominium units located at 255 Terracina Boulevard within the M-F, Medical Facilities District.

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

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ken Spear, Medical Real Estate Development, stated he is in concurrence with the staff report and Conditions of Approval with the exception of Building and Safety Condition of Approval 1 that requires the applicant to ..."Provide a one-hour fire-resistive separation, horizontal and vertical, between each unit."

Mr. Spear stated they have completed eighteen (18) condominium office projects in the past and have never had to implement a horizontal separation between units. Based on a conversation Mr. Spear had with Chief Building Official Richard Pepper, the Code is subject to interpretation, however it would be acceptable to add the phrase "if deemed necessary by the Chief Building Official" to the Condition of Approval.

Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Spear what good it would do to have a vertical separation but not a horizontal. Mr. Spear responded that they are selling "air" space"; there is a common system that handles the fire protection sprinklers, therefore the Association owns the common area.

Mr. Shaw stated he does not have a problem with revising the Condition of Approval with the wording as suggested.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the proposed condominium parcel map does not require further environmental processing, pursuant to Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, based on the following findings:

1. The proposed project would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects; no changes to the approved project will occur or are proposed through the creation of condominium space.
2. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken; the project will be constructed and operated

in the same manner as the previously approved project and,

3. There is no new information of substantial importance with respect to this project's environmental consequences that was not known at the time the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted; no new information is available that would have an impact on the proposed project's environmental consequences.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Parcel Map No. 17637 subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

1. 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 a zoning of M-F, Medical Facilities and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
2. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site meets all development standards relating to height, size, and area and can accommodate the subdivision of interior airspace.
3. The site will be physically suitable for medical office development. The site allows for two-way travel at all locations, has sufficient emergency access, includes multiple ingress and egress points, all off-site improvements have been completed to avoid future traffic impacts, and all Municipal Code development standards have been met.
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 medical office project and is not likely to cause any serious public health problems, as pedestrian access ways will be installed, no offensive emissions or odors will be associated with the development, nor will noise affect surrounding receptors as all uses will be conducted within an enclosed building.
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

with the a revision to Building and Safety Division Condition of approval 1 to read:

Condominium units need to comply with the California Building Code, 2001 Edition, Table 5-A-Wall Protection Base on location. Provide a one-hour fire-resistive separation, horizontal **if deemed necessary by the Chief Building Official** and vertical, between each unit.

G. **RICK LAZAR, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL, AICP)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Conditional Use Permit No. No. 261 (Revision No. 1)** proposed 664 square foot covered patio structure at existing residence at 1132 Kimberly Place in the PRD/R-E (Planned Residential Development/Residential Estate) District.

Project Planner Asher Hartel 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 Foster, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 261, Revision No. 1, subject to the following findings:

1. That the proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plans of the City, because the project at 1132 Kimberly Place is within an approved Planned Residential Development that is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Regulations. The proposed accessory patio structures and wall/fence are consistent with the City's land use plans;
2. That the proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, because Conditions of Approval from various City departments require any necessary improvements;
3. That the proposed development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations of the City's General Plan, the applicable zoning district and the City's development standards because current standards have been applied to the project Conditions of Approval;
4. That the proposed development is appropriate at the proposed location because both the General Plan and Zoning District provide for the use of the accessory structures at 1132 Kimberly Place.

H. **HEEMSTRA SIGNS, APPLICANT**

Planning Commission Minutes of
May 9, 2006
Page 15

(PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL, AICP)

1. Planning Commission to consider **Commission Sign Review No. 280, Revision No. 1** for a revision to Uniform Sign Program No. 25 for the Citrus Grove Business Park located at 310 - 390 Alabama Street in the I-C District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Hartel stated the location of the proposed pedestal sign is in the Citrus Grove Business Park. He stated the sign program for the adjacent parcel to the north does not provide for freestanding signs.

Commissioner Osborne stated a sign program has been approved for this development that does not allow for a freestanding sign therefore the Commission could deny the proposed project. Commissioner Osborne stated he believes the proposed sign would detract from the signs that are currently on Alabama.

Mr. Shaw suggested the Commission continue the proposed project rather than deny it if it is the desire of a majority of the Commission. Mr. Shaw stated staff can suggest that the applicant return to the Commission with a proposal for a monument sign, and/or come back for motions for denial at the next meeting. Mr. Shaw stated there is not a lot of signage on Alabama Street, therefore this sign would set a precedent.

Commissioner Foster asked staff to explain the technical differences between a pedestal sign and a monument sign.

Mr. Hartel stated a pedestal sign has a base that has to be at least 1/4 the width of the sign and cannot exceed twelve (12) in overall height; the maximum height on a monument sign is four (4) feet off the ground.

Chairman Macdonald stated the preference of the Commission has been to continue the use of monument signs.

Discussion was held on the sign for Storage West on Redlands Boulevard.

Commissioner James stated he felt a monument sign is appropriate for a business park with side treatments around the sign. Mr. Shaw questioned the materials proposed for the sign. Commissioners Cook and Foster concurred with Mr. Shaw.

Mr. Jaquess stated he was not sure why the applicant is not at the meeting. Mr. Shaw stated there are a number of comments relative to height, design, and materials that should be passed onto the applicant.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Commission Sign Review No. 280, Revision No. 1 to May 23, 2006.

Commissioner Miller asked if there is a consensus from the Commission for a monument versus a pedestal sign. Chairman Macdonald stated there was.

Mr. Jaquess stated there is a consensus that the sign materials should not be acrylic or plastic. Commissioner Miller suggested channel letters on pre cast which would match the building.

I. **GLEN ARNELL, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 828** to reduce the required front yard setback from 25 feet to 20 feet due to the downhill topographical conditions to allow the construction of a new home, garage, and accessory patios on a vacant lot located at 611 E. Sunset Drive North (APN: 0176-041-32) in the R-E (Residential Estate) District.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Altopp stated the topographical conditions of the parcel qualify for a setback closer than what is required by the Code.

Mr. Shaw noted there are no Public Works Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report. Mr. Jaquess stated that Mr. Ron Mutter, Director of Public Works, would check their files to determine if there are Conditions of Approval and he would bring them to the meeting.

Mr. Shaw suggested the proposed project be tabled pending the information from the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Miller stated in his opinion, a deep lot is not justification for reducing a setback. Commissioner James concurred with Commissioner Miller.

Mr. Jaquess stated the Code specifically accommodates this type of situation through the Commission Review and Approval process rather than submittal for a variance.

The project was tabled to the evening session at 4:01 p.m.

V. **ADDENDA - NONE**

VI. **MINUTES**

A. **April 25, 2006**

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0 vote (Commissioner Osborne abstaining) that the Planning Commission approved the minutes of April 25th with a correction noted.

VII. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF MAY 2, 2006

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council actions of May 2, 2006.

Commissioner Foster stated he read about the City of Yucaipa moving forward with a project on Live Oak Canyon Road. He expressed concern of the impact of that development on our city. Commissioner Foster asked Mr. Shaw to explain the process involved for this type of project.

Mr. Shaw stated we present to City Council a Notice of Environmental Actions from surrounding jurisdictions periodically. He stated staff prepares a summary of those actions. Relative to Commissioner Foster's question, Mr. Shaw stated the City did comment on the Yucaipa project and suggested the least intense project as it relates to our General Plan. He stated the City will have an opportunity to review and comment on the environmental process for the project.

Commissioner Foster stated he appreciated the explanation.

VIII. ADJOURN TO EVENING SESSION

Chairman Macdonald stated that Commissioner Osborne would be excused from the evening session.

Commissioner Foster stated he would be absent from the May 23rd Planning Commission meeting.

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting to the evening session 4:08 p.m.

7:00 P.M.

IX. RECONVENE OLD BUSINESS

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

Item I-1 was heard at this time.

II. **GLEN ARNELL, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 828** to reduce the required front yard setback from 25 feet to 20 feet due to the downhill topographical conditions to allow the construction of a new home, garage, and accessory patios on a vacant lot located at 611 E. Sunset Drive North (APN: 0176-041-32) in the R-E (Residential Estate) District.

Mr. Jaquess stated staff met with the Public Works Department and determined that there are no Conditions of Approval for the project.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner James, 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 15303 Class 3 New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures of Article 19, Categorical Exemptions.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review & Approval No.828 subject to the following findings and attached Conditions of Approval.

1. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed single family residence because it complies with all property development standards for the 'R-E' Residential Estate zoning district;
2. The site properly relates to E. Sunset Drive North which is designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development of a single family residence because the home will be required to meet all infrastructure development standards of the City of Redlands both on and off-site;
3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 828 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 and Municipal Code requirements.

Chairman Macdonald noted that Commissioner Osborne has been excused from the meeting.

A. GARDNER CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: ASHER HARTEL, AICP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.
2. **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.
3. **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 stated the proposed project was continued from the April 25th Planning Commission; at that time staff was directed to return with motions for approval. Mr. Hartel stated since the public hearing, minor modifications have been made to the project and the Minor Exception Permit has been withdrawn, as the standards for the walls are included in the Specific Plan. Mr. Hartel stated the Specific Plan has been amended to require City and homeowner association approval of interior fences. Mr. Hartel stated the landscape plan has been amended to increase the tree sizes to a minimum 24 inch box.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Mr. Mark Gardner, Gardner Construction, stated he concurred with the staff report and was available to answer questions.

Mr. Mark Kumlar, 12754 Puesta Del Sol, gave a brief PowerPoint presentation with photos of the neighborhood. Mr. Kumlar stated they are concerned about preserving the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Kumlar stated 80% of the neighbors are opposed to the project, which is denser than the existing neighborhood.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Kumlar what it is about the density that he is opposes.

Mr. Kumlar responded the appearance of the street scene, closeness of the homes (15 feet apart), similarity of the homes (only 2 models) and the homes would be on the same plain.

Ms. Pat Pratt, stated they purchased their home because of the view. Ms. Pratt stated the fullness of the proposed trees (60-70 feet tall) will block their view. She suggested the trees have a height of 3-5 feet. Ms. Pratt stated they bought their homes because of the open space, view, and peace and quiet. She stated the project will generate a lot of traffic.

Mr. Mark Gardner stated his proposed project (2.4 units per acre) is considered very low density (0- 2.7 units per acre) as defined by the General Plan. Mr. Gardner stated thirty years ago, there was opposition to the Kimberly Place project when it was first proposed. Mr. Gardner stated the project was designed so that it would not hinder the view of the residents and the gated community was designed for seniors to have peace and quiet.

Relative to Ms. Pratt's comments, Mr. Gardner stated when the site was demolished, 8 or 9 olive trees were removed and the neighbors were ecstatic. Mr. Gardner stated if he was to build a regular subdivision with two-story homes, the trees would not be an issue because they would not be seen above the houses.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner James stated he believes the project is a good project overall, although he believes twelve homes would be better.

Commissioner Cook stated she drove past the Kimberly Place project and she feels it fits in nicely with the neighborhood. Commissioner Cook stated she believes the proposed project will also fit in nicely with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Miller stated the proposed project is nicely designed but it is out of step with the neighborhood. He stated it is an established neighborhood, not an evolving neighborhood. Commissioner Miller stated the graphics that were presented by Mr. Kumlar speak for themselves.

Commissioner Shamp stated the opponents to the project spoke very eloquently. He stated the comments made by the project's opponents would occur with any development of the site. Commissioner Shamp stated Mr. Gardner presented compelling arguments for this type of housing in the neighborhood. Commissioner Shamp stated allowing people to stay in the neighborhoods that they love is a great amenity. He stated he is not bothered by the density and he supports the proposed project.

Commissioner Foster stated he believes it is an outstanding project. Commissioner Foster stated it is a high-end, upscale project that will compliment the neighborhood and the community. He stated it is their obligation as a Commission to ensure these types of housing opportunities for "child free" households in the community.

Chairman Macdonald stated he lives in the neighborhood which ranges from 12,000-14,000 square foot lots. Chairman Macdonald stated it is a needed project that fits in the neighborhood.

MOTION

It was moved Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-1 vote (Commissioner Miller voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Specific Plan No. 60 and Tentative Tract No. 17622, 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 Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-1 vote (Commissioner Miller voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council on the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Tentative Tract No. 17622 for the reason 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 Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-1 vote (Commissioner Miller voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the ordinance approving Specific Plan No. 60 and rescinding the existing R-A-A District zoning.

MOTION

It was moved Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-1 vote (Commissioner Miller voting no) that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve Tentative Tract No. 17622, based on the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

- I. The proposed map is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The project has a General Plan land use designation of Low Density Residential and zoning of Specific Plan No. 60, and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;
2. The site, which is located on the northwest corner of Wabash Avenue and Los Altos Drive, is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into fourteen (14) residential lots and is consistent with Land Use Plan and property development standards of Specific Plan No. 60;
3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a fourteen (14) lot residential subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Density Residential allows for the proposed fourteen (14) 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; public streets and pedestrian access will be provided throughout the project site;
7. That pursuant to California Government Code Section 66474.4, of the Subdivision Map Act the land is not subject to a contract entered into pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. The property is not under Williamson Act Contract.

X. ADJOURN MEETING TO MAY 23, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

Patti Ortiz
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department