MINUTES: of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, September 26, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

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

ADVISORY STAFF PRESENT:
Jeff Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Dan McHugh, City Attorney
Manuel Baeza, Senior 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. All Commissioners were present except Commissioner Miller.

Chairman Macdonald opened the Public Comment Period.

Bill Cunningham, 421 San Timoteo Canyon Road, commented on the changes that he has seen in northern San Diego and south Orange County and stated that there is "nothing like Redlands".

Chairman Macdonald closed the Public Comment Period.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. **FRANCIS HYONG, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

Planning Commission consideration of an extension of time for **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16287** a 12 lot subdivision on 3.16 acres within the R-1, Single-Family Residential District located south of Lugonia Avenue, approximately 110 feet north of Purdue Avenue, on the east side of Occidental Drive.

B. **GRANITE HOMES, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

Planning Commission to consider final landscape plans for **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16586** a 76 lot planned residential development containing 5 common area lots situated on a 66.20 acre site located north of Reservoir Road and east and west of Wabash Avenue within the R-E, Residential Estate District.

C. **MO BEHZAD, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider the appropriateness of an approved Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. Consideration of a **TIME EXTENSION FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 16742** to subdivide approximately 9.86 gross acres into fifteen (15) residential lots and three (3) common area lots for property located on the south side of Center Street east of Burke Street in the R-E, Residential Estate District.

D. PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR A PERSON TO PERSON AND STOCK TRANSFER OF AN ON-SALE BEER AND WINE LICENSE FOR JOHNNY'S SPORTS & TACOS AT 1756 EAST LUGONIA AVENUE, SUITE 108

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 6-0 vote to approve the Consent Calendar.

Commissioner Miller arrived at 2:03 p.m.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. **ENTERPRISE RENT-A-CAR, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.

3. PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 888** for the construction of a 8,961 square foot regional office, storage yard, and vehicle wash area on multiple parcels totaling 3.69 gross acres located on the north side of Park Avenue in between Nevada Street and New Jersey Street in the EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief presentation on the project. The proposed project was continued from the Planning Commission meeting of September 12th since there were not sufficient Commissioners for the 6/7th vote required relative to the reduced level of service. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Todd Kovalcik, representing Enterprise Rent-A-Car, was available for questions.

No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the recommended changes from the prior meeting were incorporated in the conditions of approval. Mr. Altopp responded the changes relative to the west elevation were incorporated in the conditions of approval.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit No. 888 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Conditional Use Permit No. 888 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard and the intersection of California Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 888 subject to the following findings and attached Conditions of Approval:

1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plans of the City. The proposed regional office headquarters for Enterprise Rent-A-Car is an office related use locating along Park Avenue. The site complies with the applicable land use plans of the City, thus ensuring that the proposed office will not affect the applicable land use plans of the City;

2. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare. The proposed regional office headquarters for Enterprise Rent-A-Car is a small office operation confined to within the building and property proposed for construction. There will be no outside affects on the public and the type of operation will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare;

3. The proposed development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations of the City's General Plan, the applicable zoning district and the City's development standards. The proposed use of a regional office for Enterprise Rent-A-Car is an office related use, the General Plan designation for the proposed location is Light Industrial, the zoning designation for the proposed location is Commercial Industrial, and the proposed project maintains the development standards as required by the zone;

4. The proposed development is appropriate at the proposed location. The regional office for Enterprise Rent-A-Car is an office related activity and being such is appropriate to be located at the proposed location.

Commissioner Miller advised the Commission that he was not in attendance for the Consent Calendar due to a conflict of interest relative to item II. C.

B. **QUANTUM STRUCTURES, 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 a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.

3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 108** an amendment to change the land use designation from Office to High Density Residential on approximately 7.5 gross acres (APN: 0292-201-08, 21, and 22) located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **AMENDMENT 33 TO SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 40** (East Valley Corridor Specific Plan) to change the land use designation from EV/AP, Administrative Professional District to EV2500RM, Multiple Family Residential-2500 District on approximately 7.5 gross acres (APN: 0292-201-08, 21, and 22) located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue.

5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 17693** - to subdivide 7.5 gross acres into eighty-one (81) numbered lots and one (1) lettered lot for the purpose of town homes for property located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue in the EV/AP, Administrative Professional District (proposed EV 2500RM, Multiple Family Residential 2500 District) of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

6. Consideration of **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 814** to develop an eighty-one (81) unit town home project on approximately 7.5 gross acres, located at the northeast corner of Alabama Street and Orange Avenue in the EV/AP, Administrative Professional District (proposed EV 2500RM, Multiple Family Residential District) of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald stated that this project was withdrawn and that no action will be taken.

C. **REDLANDS CHRISTIAN SCHOOL, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 675 Revision 2** - a revision to a Conditional Use Permit for the addition of a 1,440 square foot modular classroom and for the placement of five (5) storage containers on the grounds of a private school located at 1145 Church Street in the R-1, Single Family Residential District and R-2, Multiple Family Residential District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a brief presentation of the proposed project. He stated that the project was continued from the September 12th meeting so that the applicant could file the necessary paperwork for the storage containers. Staff recommends approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant would like to address the Commission.

Ray Leenstra, Administrator of Redlands Christian School, was available for questions.

No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Revision No. 2 to Conditional Use Permit No. 675 based on the following findings:

1. The proposed building addition at Redlands Christian School located at 1145 North Church Street is proper for the revision to the Conditional Use Permit;

2. The Redlands Christian School as proposed is a project that is necessary, essential, and desirable for the public welfare as well as the development of the community;

3. The project as proposed is not detrimental to existing or permitted uses in the R-1, Single family Residential District and R-2, Multiple Family Residential District where it is located;

4. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the Redlands Christian School;

5. The site properly relates to Church Street which is designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed project;

6. The conditions set forth on this Conditional Use Permit are deemed necessary and reasonable to protect the public health, safety and general welfare and the best interests of the neighborhood;

7. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Medium Density Residential District of the General Plan.

Commissioner Foster recused himself from New Business items IV. A and B due to a conflict of interest and left the meeting.

City Attorney Dan McHugh stated that Commissioner Shamp asked the City Attorney's office to look into a potential conflict of interest that he had relative to items IV. A and B. City Attorney McHugh received verbal advice from the FPPC (Fair Political Practices Commission) and determined that Commissioner Shamp could participate on new business items IV A. and B.

Commissioner Shamp commented that his conflict of interest was indirect, and opted to set aside his discomfort and judge new business items IV A. and B. on the projects merits.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

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

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on **CONCEPT PLAN NO. 1, AMENDMENT NO. 4** of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan to re-zone portions of three lots to allow existing zoning to be consistent with new lot configurations proposed under a separate lot

line application for parcels located within the Medical Facilities and Commercial/Industrial zoning designations within Concept Plan No. 1, specifically the properties located west of California Street, north of Lugonia Avenue, east of Research Drive and south of Almond Avenue.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner David Jump gave a brief overview of the project. Staff recommends approval of the project to City Council subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak. No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 6-0, (Commissioner Foster excused), vote to recommend to the City Council that Amendment No. 4 to Concept Plan No. 1 does not require further environmental processing, pursuant to Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, based on the following findings:

A. The proposed project would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects because the concept plan area remains unchanged, existing zoning will be modified to be consistent with an approved Lot Line Adjustment, and a reduced impact will occur from the loss of 0.51 acres of Medical Facilities zoned property as it is a higher impact land use;

B. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken; the proposed Concept Plan will be implemented as previously approved;

C. 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 Miller, and carried on a 6-0, vote (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of Amendment No. 4 to Concept Plan No. 1 modifying the existing zoning boundaries between Medical Facilities and Commercial/Industrial for consistency with the approved Lot Line Adjustment.

B. **KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITAL, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.

3. Planning Commission to consider **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 827** for a 120,159 square foot, three-story medical office building on an eleven (11) acre parcel located at the northwest corner of California Street and Lugonia Avenue within the Medical Facilities designation of Concept Plan No. 1.

4. Planning Commission to consider **COMMISSION SIGN REVIEW NO. 313** for the adoption of a uniform sign program for the Kaiser Permanente medical office building located at the northwestern corner of the intersection of California Street and Lugonia Avenue in the Medical Facilities District of Concept Plan No. 1.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner David Jump passed around material boards and architectural treatments of the buildings to the Commission for their review. Mr. Jump gave a PowerPoint and an animated 360 degree fly-around presentation of the proposed project. Staff recommended the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Osborne asked for clarification on the setbacks for the project. Mr. Jump responded that Mr. Osborne was correct in his understanding of the setbacks.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to address the Commission.

Dominick Nigro, representing Kaiser Foundation, stated that this project is very important to Kaiser Permanente's growth in the Inland Empire and that they have incorporated staff's comments into the design of the project. Mr. Nigro gave an overview of Kaiser's services and future growth and that the facility is targeted to open in the second quarter of 2008.

Commissioner Shamp asked if there were any sustainable design features included in the building. Mr. Nigro stated that Kaiser is an advocate of sustainable design and incorporate those features.

Greg Coles, Frank Webb Architects, referred to Planning Conditions of Approval number forty-one (41) relative to the bus turnout along Lugonia Avenue and asked to change it to a bus stop. Commissioner Osborne asked if the clarification could be worked out with Omnitrans and Public Works for approval for the bus stop but in the interim, retain the bus turnout in the condition of approval. Mr. Coles was agreeable with Commissioner Osborne's suggestion, but wanted to make sure it was not something that Kaiser would be held to in providing the turnout.

Director Shaw stated that staff could provide the option of a turnout or other acceptable stop subject to the approval of Public Works and Omnitrans.

Mr. Coles commented that he appreciated the help from staff and Commissioner Miller and thanked them for their insightful work.

Commissioner Miller commented on the retention basins and noticed there is grass and Camphor trees in the bottom of the basin and had concerns that the Camphor trees would not survive that type of environment. Mr. Coles stated that they hope the drainage will percolate quickly to eliminate any standing water in the basin. Mr. Nigro commented that the trees are on a slope of a bio-swale and that it is more of an infiltration or first flush, and therefore the water should flow.

Commissioner Shamp had questions relative to the mechanical screen and asked if it had been addressed in the design. Mr. Jump responded that it still is proposed as a metal screen. Commissioner Shamp had additional questions relative to the screen and Mr. Nigro responded to his concerns.

Commissioner Miller complimented the applicant on the architecture of the buildings. He referred to the rendering of the tower elements, stating that it implies a Burnt Sienna or dark Terra Cotta color but that the color board did not match. Commissioner Miller preferred the color depicted in the rendering and suggested lightening the color. He stated that red would be more cheerful and compatible with development on the north side of town. Mr. Nigro was agreeable and suggested that the colors should be looked at outside instead of under the fluorescent lighting.

Commissioner Shamp asked about the ochre color samples and asked which sample was the correct one. Mr. Nigro stated that the smaller color board was the initial one submitted to staff but during the development of the project, they worked with the client to enhance the exterior colors.

Chairman Macdonald asked Commissioner Miller if his comment about the color was resolved. Commissioner Miller stated that the color could be determined with some on-site trials.

Assistant Director John Jaquess stated that it should be clearly stated somewhere in the motion that the Commission is recommending a change in the color which matches the rendering to the best of the applicants ability.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the nature of the color was integral or painted stucco. Mr. Nigro stated that it was a painted finish and that they would support a requirement added into the conditions that an on-site mock-up be conducted.

Commissioner Shamp stated that he would be interested in seeing a mock-up of the actual colors that have been chosen since it is impossible to make a judgment either from a rendering or from small samples under fluorescent lighting.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne suggested a Condition of Approval relative to the color.

The Commission agreed that Commissioner Miller would be the referee in determining the colors.

Commissioner Shamp commented that he is excited in seeing a design of this quality happening in Redlands.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission approve of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval 827 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission approve of the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval 827 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of California Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission approve of Commission Review and Approval No. 827 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 medical office building use because it will comply with all property development standards for the Medical Facilities district of Concept Plan No. 1 including lot coverage, permitted uses, and required setbacks;

2. The site properly relates to California Street and Lugonia Avenue which are designed and will be improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because both streets will be constructed to city prescribed standards to their ultimate half widths through compliance with project conditions of approval and the applicant has been conditioned to perform other required street improvements which will benefit traffic movement and flow;

3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 827 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 Concept Plan requirements regarding site design and permitted uses within the zoning district and site designation of commercial/industrial.

This includes the amendment to Condition of Approval number forty-one (41) and addition of number forty-eight (48) under the Community Development Department as follows:

41. The applicant shall provide for a bus turnout or other accessible bus stop facility along Lugonia Avenue. Plans shall be submitted to Omnitrans detailing the proposed bus turnout or other accessible bus stop facility and ultimate approval from Omnitrans and the Public Works Department shall be submitted as proof of the approval of the submitted bus turnout or other accessible bus stop facility construction.

48. The applicant shall provide on-site color mock-ups for approval by Planning staff and Planning Commission representative. Colors shall match as close as possible to those indicated on the submitted renderings.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Foster excused), that the Planning Commission approve Commission Sign Review No. 313 subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Foster returned to the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

C. **ALAN RONSKA, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 312** amending Section 15.36.340 of the Redlands Municipal Code pertaining to allowable signs in the M-2, General Industrial District.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated that this project was continued from the September 12th meeting due to the request of the applicant to postpone its consideration. The applicant is requesting another continuance to the meeting October 10, 2006.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Ordinance Text Amendment No. 312 to the meeting of October 10, 2006.

D. **RICHARD BROWN, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

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

3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 17675 -** A Tentative Tract Map to subdivide 6.3 gross acres into eleven (11) lots for property located on the west side of Sunnyside Avenue and north side of Cypress Avenue in the R-S, Suburban Residential District

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave an overview of the proposed project. Staff finds the tract well designed and recommended approval subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald commented that it was difficult to view the thirty (30) foot difference in elevation without three dimensional cross sections. Director Jeff Shaw stated that staff looked at this as an infill site rather than hillside and did not require a three dimensional cross section from the applicant.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there was going to be manufactured slopes as high as thirty (30) feet. Mr. Baeza stated there would be thirty foot slopes in one area.

Pat Meyer, representing Richard Brown, concurred with the staff report and conditions of approval. He commented that the property is not considered hillside and that it is a requirement they drain the pads to Linda Vista which is why they are creating the slope condition.

Commissioner Osborne asked if there were CC&R's (Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions). Mr. Meyer stated that there were CC&R's for those lots to maintain the common driveway and the landscaping area. Mr. Baeza stated that the CC&R's were not included in the conditions but should be added.

Commissioner Shamp asked if there was any discussion with Public Works relative to using a different approach for draining the site that would not require the built up slopes. Mr. Meyer stated that staff writes conditions prohibiting cross lot draining.

Commissioner Shamp stated that his preference would be for Public Works to guide projects towards following the existing terrain and natural drainage patterns rather than disrupting the site.

Bill Cunningham, representing the West Redlands Water Company, stated that they have delivered water to this particular parcel and one to the north of this project since 1887. Mr. Cunningham wanted to be assured that the conditions of approval reflect their ability to continue maintenance of the pipelines in servicing the property to the north.

Mr. Meyer stated that this is standard operating procedure and referred to Public Works condition of approval number twelve (12) suggesting that with a minor change it would address this issue.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the Commission could amend a Public Works condition of approval. City Attorney McHugh stated that the Commission had the authority to amend the condition.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller commented that although the Commission asks for more natural contouring of slopes, he does not feel that it is necessary in this case since the embankments are along interior property lines and not visible to the public.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract Map No. 17675 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Tentative Tract Map No. 17675 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Osborne, seconded by Commissioner James, and moved on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Tract Map No. 17675 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 Low Density Residential and a zoning of R-S, Suburban Residential District and is consistent with both the General Plan and Municipal Code;

2. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is large enough to subdivide into eleven (11) lots;

3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of an eleven (11) unit subdivision. The General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Density Residential and R-S, Suburban Residential District Zoning both allow for at least eleven (11) 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.

This includes the modification to Public Works Condition of Approval number twelve (12) and the addition of Community Development Department Condition of Approval number twenty-four (24) as follows:

12. All irrigation lines that exist within any street right-of-way or on the property shall be replaced or relocated as necessary with C900 PVC or approved equivalent.

24. A homeowners association shall be established for the maintenance of the private street and any other improvements installed for the benefit of the tract. The applicant shall submit CC&R's for review and approval by the City Attorney to include provisions for the maintenance of the private street and other improvements installed for the benefit of the tract.

E. **CITRUS PACKING LLC, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: MANUEL BAEZA)

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

2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.

3. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 115** - an Agricultural Preserve Removal on approximately 3.5 acres located on the northeast corner of San Bernardino Avenue Texas Street in the A-1, Agricultural District (Proposed C-3, General Commercial District).

4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **General Plan Amendment No. 112** amending the General Plan Land Use Designation from Agriculture City Grove to Commercial for 5.39 acres located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue.

5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Zone Change No. 425** from A-1, Agricultural District to proposed zoning of C-3, General Commercial District for 5.39 acres located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue.

6. Consideration of a recommendation to the City Council on **Commission Review and Approval No. 829** to develop a four (4) building commercial center with110,512 square feet of floor area on approximately 5.39 acres located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District (proposed C-3 General Commercial District).

7. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council for **Minor Subdivision No. 301** (Tentative Parcel Map No.17873) to subdivide approximately 5.39 acres into 4 lots for property located

at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District (proposed C-3 General Commercial District).

8. **HEARING** for the Environmental Review Committee to consider **Demolition No. 150** - the demolition of a citrus packing facility to include a packing house and detached accessory buildings which are less than fifty (50) years of age for property located at 780 West San Bernardino Avenue in the A-1, Agricultural District (proposed C-3 General Commercial District).

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave an overview and showed a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval provided in the staff report along with two additional conditions of approval that were distributed to the Commission prior to staff's presentation.

Chairman Macdonald asked why color renderings were not available for review for the proposed buildings. Mr. Baeza stated that color renderings were not required and were not in the packets. However, staff handed out colored renderings as provided by the applicant just prior to the meeting.

David Agnew, David Evans & Associates, gave an overview of the existing packinghouse commenting that it has been continually vandalized since it closed in 2003. Mr. Agnew gave an overview of the proposed project. Mr. Agnew stated that the applicant desires to make an economically viable project by creating a walkable, mixed use retail/office project in north Redlands. He stated that they met with the Northside Visioning Committee who had input relative to the design of the structure and came up with the concept of creating some art kiosks that relate to the citrus industry. Mr. Agnew presented photographs of the existing packinghouse to show the current vandalized condition of the structure.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Agnew what was adjacent to the site. Mr. Agnew stated there is a City grove to the north and west, a water facility to the east and a vacant single family residential to the south.

Commissioner Shamp commented that this is setting a precedent as the first retail and commercial development at this intersection. Mr. Agnew concurred.

Assistant Director John Jaquess commented that it was setting a precedent to a degree of being the first development, but both of the northwest and southwest corners are planned for commercial development in terms of the General Plan and Specific Plan for the East Valley Corridor.

Commissioner Osborne referred to the elevations shown on the PowerPoint versus the renderings presented stating that they appeared different with respect to the proportion and glazing. Mr. Agnew stated that the elevation in the packet represents the two tower sections that face out onto Texas but does not include the lower building.

Commissioner Cook commented on the windows and glazing, stating that it appears as one, huge pane of glass in the renderings. Mr. Agnew stated that it represents a spandrel from a structural standpoint and will be a solid gray glazing down the whole thing. Commissioner Cook stated that it looks like a lot of gray glass and likes the look of the thicker tower. There was discussion relative to the inconsistencies shown in the renderings and drawings presented in the PowerPoint.

Matt Evan, David Evans & Associates, stated that the thicker tower was the correct proportion and that the color elevations are correct.

Commissioner Shamp commented on the yellow hand rail shown at the top floor of each of the buildings and asked if there was a deck. Mr. Evans stated that it was a faux balcony that would bring focus to the third level.

Commissioner Miller had questions relative to the faux balcony and Mr. Evans addressed his concerns.

Commissioner Cook had questions relative to the finish of the awning and how it would project out of from the building. Mr. Agnew stated the awning would be more of a mat finish and would extend at a straight angle.

Commissioner Miller commended the applicant for working with the Northside Visioning Committee and asked if they expressed any preferences for architectural character. Mr. Agnew responded that they did express preferences relative to the design.

Commissioner Osborne asked how they came up with the cornice color. Mr. Evans stated that the majority of the plaster on the upper levels of the building are gray and that the gray blue cornice color would be appropriate.

Mario Saucedo, Chairman of the Northside Visioning Committee thanked the property owner and representatives for their cooperativeness in listening to the concerns of the citizens of north Redlands as it relates to this property. Mr. Saucedo is supportive of all the recommendations relative to the project and although they are losing the packinghouse, they are gaining a beautiful project that will enhance the community.

Commissioner Cook asked Mr. Saucedo if they had any input on determining the colors of the building. Mr. Saucedo responded that they did not but were in favor of the project as presented.

Commissioner Miller stated that he appreciates how challenging if is for an architect to come up with a new building and is in favor of the land use designation of mixed use. Commissioner Miller stated that he has reservations relative to the architecture and that his sense of the building is that it is neither contemporary or traditional. He would like to see more identity to it and asked if the Northside Visioning Committee was open to some additional modifications as long as it retains the flavor expressed. Mr. Saucedo stated that they would be open to some modifications but did like the contemporary look.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Osborne stated that he felt that this building should set a higher standard since it is the first building in the new corridor of development. He was in agreement with Commissioner Miller stating that he did not like the architecture.

Commissioner Shamp stated that there is a precedence that he likes very much relative to this corner becoming the foundation of a walkable, mixed-use node. He addressed ideas relative to architecture, colors, the hand rail, windows, and cornices.

Commissioner Miller concurred with some of the ideas presented and addressed details relative to the contemporary or traditional design, the cornices, the glazing, introducing a trellis or additional canopies along the walkways and roofing tiles. Commissioner Miller asked staff about the bio-swales in the parking planters, and if there was sufficient landscaping to accomplish that. Mr. Baeza stated that the project did receive its initial approval on the Water Quality Management Plan.

Commissioner Osborne stated that there should be some roof element that separates the first floor from the second and third floor if it is a traditional building and suggested putting in a true tile element relative to the type of architecture. He agrees that the architecture should be either contemporary or traditional and that the current rendering is a bad mixture.

Commissioner Cook stated that she likes the meandering sidewalks, courtyards, diagonal corridor, fountain and the stores on the bottom and offices on top. She agrees that the architecture should be either contemporary or traditional and that there should be more orange trees in the mix of the landscaping.

Chairman Macdonald appreciates the sophisticated knowledge and abilities of the Commission but from a layman's standpoint, the building looks great.

Commissioner James concurs with most of the comments. The layout is excellent but feels the architecture could look better and would prefer to see it more traditional.

Commissioner Foster commented that he saw the design with more of a downtown Redlands look and that it should be more decorative and traditional.

Mr. Shaw asked if there were any timing issues relative to the project. Mr. Jaquess stated that if the applicant has something prepared within thirty (30) day, there would be time to process it within the required time frame.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

David Agnew stated that they should be able to come back with revised architecture in thirty days. Mr. Shaw stated that it would come back to the Commission at their October 24th meeting.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Citrus Packing LLC project be continued to the meeting of October 24, 2006.

Chairman Macdonald recessed the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Chairman Macdonald reconvened the meeting at 4:28 p.m.

F. **E.S.R.I., APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

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. 825 REVISION 1** to develop a new four story addition to an existing office building with the upper three floors for office use totaling 28,251 square and the 1st floor for storage totaling 4,000 square feet on a site with approximately 25.34 gross acres, located on the west side of New York Street within the ESRI office complex in the AP, Administrative and Professional District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief presentation of the proposed project. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Osborne asked if the building was a four story or a three story structure with a basement. Mr. Altopp stated that the building was technically a three story with a basement.

Dave Atchley, Facilities Manager for ESRI, was available for questions.

No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Shamp stated that he really likes the design of the building and that it is a great example of progressive architecture for Redlands.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review & Approval No. 825 Revision1 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review & Approval No. 825 Revision 1 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review & Approval No. 825 Revision 1 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 office building use because it complies with all property development standards of the A-P, Administrative and Professional District;

2. The site properly relates to New York Street, State Street, and Tennessee Street which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because all streets are constructed to City prescribed standards to their ultimate half widths;

3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 825 Revision 1 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 the General Plan Designation, Municipal Code requirements, and the development standards of A-P, Administrative and Professional District.

G. **OMNIPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 892** for the installation of a new approximately 50-foot tall cellular telecommunications church tower at Christ the King Church with all equipment located within the base of the tower with a 379 square foot lease area on an existing 4.57 acre residential parcel located at 1505 Ford Street in the R-E, Residential Estate District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a brief overview of the proposed cellular church bell tower. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to address the Commission.

Monica Moretta, representing Omnipoint Communications, was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Miller asked if the antennas were behind the bell. Ms. Moretta stated that the bell is actually in the middle of the tower and the antennas are inside the structure. The antennas cannot be seen from public views.

Commissioner Cook asked about the possibility of future co-location of other cell towers. Ms. Moretta stated there is space for another carrier to put their antennas but they would need to find their own lease space for their equipment and cabinet.

Commissioner Shamp asked if the bell was an actual bell. Ms. Moretta stated that it is an operational bell.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller stated that this is a great solution and fits so nice with the building.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit No. 892 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit No. 892 subject to the following findings, submitted plans, and attached conditions of approval:

1. The use applied for at this location is conditionally permitted in the R-E, Residential Estate District under the provisions of Chapter 18.178.090 and 18.192.020 of the Municipal Code, which allows the placement of public utility structures and service facilities to be permitted in any zone when such uses are determined by the City to be essential or desirable for the public health, safety, and welfare subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit;

2. The proposed establishment of the wireless facility at this location is necessary and desirable for the development of the community, is in harmony with the various elements or objectives of the General Plan, and is not detrimental to existing uses or to uses specifically permitted in the zone;

3. The project site is sufficient in size and shape to accommodate the proposed use, meets all development standards and other features required in order to adjust the use to those existing or permitted future uses on land in the neighborhood;

4. That the site for the location of the wireless service provider relates to streets and highways properly designed and improved to carry the type of traffic generated or to be generated by the proposed use. The site to be utilized by the wireless carrier was originally designed to handle all traffic generated by the conditionally permitted use allowed at the site;

5. The conditions for the proposed use are reasonably related to the use to address potential effects of the proposed use, and are necessary to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare and the best interests of the neighborhood.

H. **BARRY WICKMAN, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP

Consideration of **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 843** to construct a single-story retail commercial building of 8,048 square feet on 1.07 acres located at the southwest corner of Tennessee Street and Lugonia Avenue in the CG (General Commercial) District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan

PUBLIC HEARING for the Planning Commission to consider **VARIANCE NO. 739** a request to grant a variance from section 18.168.220 of the Redlands Municipal Code to allow a seventeen (17) foot landscape setback rather than the required twenty-five (25) foot setback to construct a single-story retail commercial building of 8,048 square feet on 1.07 acres located at the southwest corner of Tennessee Street and Lugonia Avenue in the CG (General Commercial) District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave an overview of the proposed project stating that it was previously approved by the Planning Commission in September, 2004. Mr. Altopp explained that the applicant requested additional time to allow construction to be started due to budget constraints. Due to a communication error, staff did not prepare the staff report for the Time Extension in time for City Council approval and is asking the Planning Commission to re-approve the project as an alternative method to granting the applicant additional time for construction.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant would like to address the Commission.

Barry Wickman, applicant, was available for questions.

No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that Commission Review and Approval No. 843 and Variance No. 739 does not require further environmental processing, pursuant to Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, based on the following findings:

A. The proposed project would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects; there are no new environmental effects beyond those previously identified;

B. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken; the project will be undertaken in the same manner as the previously approved project and;

C. 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 Shamp, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c and City Council Resolution 6202.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 739 subject to the following findings:

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 project site has an irregular shape and configuration. There is a significant grade difference between the property and the I-10 Freeway, therefore the area will not be seen from the freeway;

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 a number of properties in the City which have been able to develop within the twenty-five foot setback area of the freeway right-of-way;

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 reduced setback would not affect existing neighboring development as the project site is a virtual "island" between Tennessee Street and the Route 30 Freeway and is isolated from other properties in the vicinity;

4. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the General Plan of the City of Redlands. The project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation of Commercial.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Shamp, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 843 subject to the following findings:

1. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed commercial buildings;

2. The site properly relates to Tennessee Street, which has` been designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed commercial building;

3. The conditions proposed for Commission Review an Approval No. 843 shown on the site plan are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare of the neighborhood and the City of Redlands;

4. When completed, the project will contribute to the overall development of the neighborhood;

5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Commercial Designation of the General Plan and the General Commercial District of the EVCSP.

I. **ROSSMORE ENTERPRISES, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.

3. Planning Commission to consider **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 836** a light industrial development consisting of five separate buildings comprising a total of 288,126 square feet on a 16.32 acre site located on east side of Nevada Street, south of Park Avenue and north of Citrus Avenue within the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan Industrial/Commercial District (EV/IC).

4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 18259** a request to subdivide a 16.32 acre parcel into 5 separate light industrial parcels with the largest parcel occupying a total of 5.59 acres and the smallest parcel situated on 1.74 acres located on east side of Nevada Street, south of Park Avenue and north of Citrus Avenue within the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan Industrial/Commercial District (EV/IC).

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner David Jump gave an overview and PowerPoint presentation of the proposed project. Staff recommended the approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Shamp referred to page nineteen (19) of the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study relative to schools, stating that the project was located across the street from a school facility and asked how the Environmental Committee justified the judgment of "no impact". Assistant Director John Jaquess stated that the County Superintendent of Schools elected to build the school at the location with full knowledge that it would be surrounded by industrial buildings. The City of Redlands advised them not to build a school in this area but ignored the City's input and proceeded without consideration of land use.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to address the Commission.

Pat Meyer, representing Rossmore Enterprises, concurred with the staff report and conditions of approval.

Commissioner Shamp asked how much of the project is dedicated to warehousing and transportation. Mr. Meyer stated that the buildings are not designed to be typical distribution buildings but that it is an industrial park, and there will be some warehouse distribution.

Mr. Meyer commented on the school issue, agreeing with staff's response relative to the industrial use and that the school officials were aware that they would be surrounded by commercial and industrial operations.

Chairman Macdonald asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak. No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Shamp asked staff if there was an estimation of how much diesel truck traffic would be going in and off the site. Mr. Jump stated that there was an estimation of the amount of diesel truck traffic which is converted into car traffic to get the daily amount of trips. Commissioner Shamp stated that he was concerned about the diesel truck traffic and about the amount of diesel exhaust that would be generated a few hundred feet from a school facility. He expressed that the children should have their health protected as any other kids going to another school facility.

Commissioner Cook stated that the Commission could set specific hours relative to truck traffic. Commissioner Shamp stated that he would like to see more information about it.

Commissioner Miller stated that restrictions cannot be imposed at this property since the project is exactly what was intended to go there relative to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Cook stated that she understands the concern for the children but the developer should not have to pay a penalty for a school that went against the recommendations of the City to build in an industrial area.

Commissioner Osborne commented that the school facility looks temporary and we should not be putting any kind of restriction on a developer on something that may not be there for very long. Commissioner Shamp commented that the school facility is intended to be permanent.

Commissioner Osborne asked Mr. Shamp if he feels that this project should not be constructed because the school is there. Commissioner Shamp stated that the Commission needs to look at the issue more closely and find out what the real and imagined impacts are and if necessary, mitigate.

Commissioner James stated that he supports the project since it is in conformance with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and fits into the area.

Commissioner Shamp is not prepared to support it without additional information or an acknowledgement that item 11. (c) in the Socio Economic Cost Benefit Study is incorrectly marked as “no impact”.

Chairman Macdonald commented that the Commission appreciates Commissioner Shamps stance but believes it is beyond the Commissions authority to recommend any changes to types of uses as long as they conform with the General Plan and City code.

Commissioner Shamp stated that he is not asking for a change of use but for a study on the health effects relative to the children and an attempt to mitigate any resulting findings. Chairman Macdonald stated that he did not believe that is something that the Commission can request and asked staff for guidance.

Director Jeff Shaw stated that it would be up to the Commission for what information that they want to request.

Chairman Macdonald stated that the rest of the Commission understands Commissioner Shamp’s concerns, but that it is not necessary for any additional action to be taken.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval 836 and Tentative Tract No. 18259 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination” in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-1 vote, (Commissioner Shamp opposed), that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval 836 and Tentative Tract No. 18259 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of Alabama Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve a reduced LOS at the intersection of California Street/Redlands Boulevard during the peak hours as permitted in General Plan Policy 5.20b and 5.20c.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-1 vote, (Commissioner Shamp opposed), that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 836 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 industrial park use because it complies with all property development standards for the EV/IC zoning district;

2. The site properly relates to Nevada Street and Park Avenue which will be designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because both streets will be constructed to city prescribed standards to their ultimate half widths through compliance with project conditions of approval;

3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 836 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.

Tentative Tract

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner James, and carried on a 6-1 vote, (Commissioner Shamp opposed), that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Tract Map No.18259 subject to the attached 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 Commercial/Industrial and a zoning of EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and the 5 proposed lots are in conformance with allowed General Plan density and all lot sizes meet the size an dimensions allowed for in the Specific Plan;

2. The site is physically suitable for the type of development. The site is flat, is large enough to subdivide into five (5) lots, will install all required street improvements to ultimate right-of-way widths, and meets all development standards for the EV/CG, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan zoning district;

3. The site is physically suitable for the density of development of a five (5) lot subdivision. The project meets the allowed General Plan density and all zoning district development standards regarding lot size and dimension;

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 an industrial project and is not likely to cause any serious public health problems as the project will not be associated with the generation of significant noise, odors, or emissions, or be located near significant sources of these emissions;

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; all required easements will be shown and recorded with the final map for the 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 vacant and is not being used for agricultural purposes or part of an agricultural preserve.

J. **HOSSEIN AFSHARI, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study.

3. Planning Commission to consider **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 834** a medical office development consisting of three buildings totaling 122,604 square feet, two of the medical buildings will be single story comprising a total floor area of 19,752 square feet each with the third medical office building being two-story and consisting of a floor area of 83,100 square feet all occupying an 8.90 acre site located at the southwest corner of Alabama Street and Park Avenue within the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan Industrial/Commercial District (EV/IC).

Project Planner David Jump stated that there is a traffic impact analysis that requires approval from SANBAG, (San Bernardino Area Governments), prior to receiving approval from the Planning Commission. Staff is recommending continuance of the project to the October 10, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Commission Review and Approval No. 834 to October 10, 2006.

K. **FANCHER DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, INC., APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: DAVID JUMP)

1. Planning Commission to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

2. Planning Commission to consider **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 832** a 4,854 square foot Panera Bread restaurant and bakery to be developed within the Citrus Village Shopping Center of Specific Plan No. 41 on pad "C" of lot 7 within the overall 14.4 acre unified center located at the southwestern corner of Redlands Boulevard and Cypress Avenue.

Project Planner David Jump passed out revised elevations to the Commissioners and gave an overview and PowerPoint presentation of the proposed project. Mr. Jump stated that the north elevation facing Cypress Avenue is the only one without wainscoting at the bottom of it and may be something that the applicant could add to match the other elevations. Staff recommended the proposed project subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Cook asked what the opening was with the canopy over it was on the north elevation and the one next to it. Mr. Jump stated that he believed they were architectural features to give the building some relief.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant was available to address the Commission.

Bill Fancher, applicant, was available for questions.

Commissioner Miller asked about the green element at the front of the building and asked if it returned at all over the top of the parapet. Mr. Fancher stated that it did not return over the top and was just an architectural element to give it offsetting planes and make the building look a little more complex.

Commissioner James asked if staff's height requirements presented a problem for the applicant. Mr. Fancher stated that he concurred with the staff report and the height requirements would not be a problem.

Chairman Macdonald asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak.

Herman Fullgrabe, 615 Hibiscus Drive, asked to see where the road comes in relative to the project. Commissioner Cook stated that the project would be located where they currently hold the garage sales.

Mr. Fullgrabe asked about the parking for the project. Chairman Macdonald stated that the parking meets the code requirements.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval 832 and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code."

MOTION

It moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval 832 as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed."

MOTION

It moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 832 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 commercial use because it complies with all property development standards for the Specific Plan and Municipal Code;

2. The site properly relates to Cypress Avenue and Redlands Boulevard which have been designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because both streets have been constructed to city prescribed standards to their ultimate half widths;

3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 832 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.

V. ADDENDA

A. **HOWARD ROBERTS DEVELOPMENT, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: JOSHUA ALTOPP)

Considerations of **Commission Review and Approval No. 806** - To revise the color scheme for the approved 52,559 square foot, three building, concrete tilt-up, medical office buildings on approximately 3.6 acres located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Park Avenue and Iowa Street in EV/IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Commissioner Miller recused himself at 5:45 p.m. due to a conflict of interest.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp stated that the applicant is requesting an alternate color scheme for the project that was previously approved by the Planning Commission on September 12, 2005. Mr. Altopp gave an overview of the requested changes and stated that staff supports the alternate color scheme.

Commissioner Osborne commented on the proposed changes stating that there were architectural changes in addition to the color alterations and that the minor architectural changes were not included in the staff report.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the blue or tan colored picture is correct architecturally. Assistant Director John Jaquess stated that the blue color is the building that is currently approved. He stated that there were some minor architectural revisions to the building but that the brown coloring did not accurately reflect a lot of the shading and shadows that would have been there if extra time was taken to do it more completely. Staff is recommending approval since the overall changes were not significant.

Commissioner Foster stated that he felt that staff explained the changes adequately and that he understands that it is the same building with a couple minor changes.

Mr. Altopp stated that staff wanted the Commission to be aware that there were architectural changes but that the focus is on the color changes.

Bob Gibbs, Senior Vice President of Howard Roberts Development presented an exhibit of the proposed color scheme stating that considerable time was taken with an interior decorator and landscape architect in coordinating everything from the exterior to the interior of the building. Mr. Gibbs asked for the Commissions support in changing the colors.

Chairman Macdonald asked why the designer did not coordinate with the approved colors. Mr. Gibbs stated that the new colors would conform with the rest of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Osborne recommended that the applicant submit a color board of the proposed change or a rendering of exactly of what is proposed.

Chairman Macdonald stated that he liked the blue color. Commissioners Shamp and Osborne concurred with Chairman Macdonald but will support the color change.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Miller excused), that the Planning Commission approve the revised color scheme and architectural elevation revisions for Commission Review and Approval 806.

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

VI. MINUTES

A. September 12, 2006

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote, (Commissioners Osborne and Miller abstained), to approve the minutes of September 12, 2006 with correction.

VII. LAND USE AND CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2006

Mr. Shaw gave a brief presentation on the City Council Actions of September 19, 2006.

Chairman Macdonald advised that copies of the General Plan and Zoning Map were distributed to each of the Commissioners for reference when determining future developments proposing General Plan changes or amendments.

VIII. ADJOURN TO OCTOBER 10, 2006

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m. to October 10, 2006.

Christine Szilva Senior Administrative Assistant	Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director Community Development Department