

MINUTES: of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, January 9, 2007, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

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

ADVISORY STAFF
PRESENT:

Jeff Shaw, Director
Michael Reiter, Assistant City Attorney
Manuel Baeza, Senior Planner
Tamara Alaniz, Assistant 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.

Chairman Macdonald stated that Commissioner Miller left the meeting due to a conflict of interest on one of the Consent Calendar items.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. **HEEMSTRA SIGNS, APPLICANT**
(PROJECT PLANNER: TAMARA ALANIZ)

Planning Commission to consider **Commission Sign Review No. 317** for one (1), eighteen (18) square foot freestanding monument sign for Carlson Chiropractic on the northeast side of Cajon Street at 529 Cajon Street in the A-P, Administrative and Professional Office District.

B. **HOWARD ROBERTS DEVELOPMENT**
(JOSHUA ALTOPP, ASSISTANT PLANNER)

Parcel Map No. 17283 – Request for a Final Map Approval of Parcel Map No. 17283 (Minor Subdivision No. 286), located on the northwest corner of Park Avenue and Iowa Street in the EV-IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

MOTION

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

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 2:01 p.m. Commissioner Miller advised the Commission that he had a conflict of interest on Consent Calendar item II. B.

III. OLD BUSINESS

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

1. Planning Commission to consider **Commission Review and Approval No. 829** to develop a four (4) building commercial center with 110,512 square feet of floor

area on approximately 5.39 acres located at the northeast corner of Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue in the C-3, General Commercial District.

Project Planner Manual Baeza stated that this project came before the Planning Commission back in November, 2006, and was recommended to the City Council for approval. All applications were approved by the City Council with the exception of the Commission Review and Approval which was being returned to the Planning Commission for approval. Staff recommended approval of the Commission Review and Approval subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the Commission had any questions or comments relative to the Commission Review and Approval. No comments were forthcoming and Chairman Macdonald asked for a motion.

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. 829, subject to the following findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

1. That the site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use; the project meets all development standards of the C-3, General Commercial District;
2. That the site properly relates to Texas Street and San Bernardino Avenue which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development;
3. That the conditions of approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 829 are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare;
4. That the use is desirable for the overall development of the community; the project will provide new shopping and employment opportunities to City residents;
5. The proposed commercial center will be consistent with the Commercial designation of the General Plan.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

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

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. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 835** to develop a thirteen (13) building commercial center with 165,350 square feet of floor area on approximately 12.9 acres located on the north side of San Bernardino Avenue, south side of Pioneer Avenue, immediately west of the 210 Freeway in the EV/CG, General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Minor Subdivision No. 303** (Tentative Parcel Map No.18311) to subdivide 12.9 acres into airspace lots for office condominium purposes for a proposed commercial center located on the north side of San Bernardino Avenue, south side of Pioneer Avenue,

immediately west of the 210 Freeway in the EV/CG, General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave a PowerPoint presentation and overview of the proposed project. Mr. Baeza indicated that Caltrans plans to expand the off-ramps and on-ramps in the vicinity of the project, and referred to correspondence from Caltrans that was distributed to the Commissioners prior to the start of the meeting. Mr. Baeza commented that staff was not satisfied with the design of the project and displayed examples of attractive architecture that would be more appropriate for the site. Staff recommended continuance of the project to the February 13, 2007 meeting for revisions to the architecture and landscaping and to obtain additional information from Caltrans.

Commissioner Shamp asked Mr. Baeza what was the intent of the 100 foot setback of the building. Mr. Baeza commented on the requirements of the East Valley Corridor Plan stating it is to establish larger, open space enhancements.

Commissioner Osborne commented that all the buildings that are seen from the 210 freeway or San Bernardino Avenue should have enhanced architecture.

Chairman Macdonald asked to explain how meeting the 100 foot setback requirement would result in a less attractive development. Mr. Baeza referred to the site plan on the PowerPoint presentation and addressed Chairman Macdonald's question.

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

Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, provided background on the project, reviewed issues regarding the site plan and building setbacks, and addressed the Caltrans issue. Mr. Meyer stated that he concurred with the staff report and conditions of approval.

Commissioner James and Chairman Macdonald had questions relative to the 150 feet that Caltrans was proposing to acquire, and the setbacks of the project site. Mr. Meyer addressed their questions and passed around a schematic that Caltrans prepared for the Commissioner's to review.

Roger Deitos, Principal at GAA Architects, thanked Mr. Baeza for his help in resolving site plan issues and gave an overview of the site plan, landscaping, and architecture of the buildings.

Commissioner Miller commented on the integrated concrete cornice and asked if it occurred between the two towers. Mr. Deitos stated that it was between the two towers.

Mr. Deitos indicated that earth tone colors would be used on the buildings, making it look like a contemporary type building and integrating it with landscaping.

Commissioner Osborne commented that the landscaping around the perimeter versus the narrow interior would be more visible if several of the single story buildings on the site were built as a single structure. Mr. Deitos responded to Commissioner Osborne's suggestion.

Commissioner Miller commented on the pedestrian environment connecting building one and two to building three and asked Mr. Deitos to show how that would be accomplished. Mr. Deitos addressed Commissioner Miller's question.

Commissioner Miller commented that he found the cluster design of the buildings appealing but had concerns relative to building three appearing isolated from the rest of the development. Commissioner Miller commented that the ceremonial entrance was done very nicely but that a real entry statement is

needed, such as a tower element that would give the site a stronger presence. He indicated that something special is needed at the corner, such as a plaza area with indoor/outdoor dining.

Commissioner Shamp concurred with Commissioner Miller's comments stating that he liked the small, intimate courtyards, the retail and entry piece. Commissioner Shamp asked what motivated the orientation of building three. Mr. Deitos referred to the constraints of the site, stating that the western drive is the only signalized entrance into the project. He indicated that they did explore pushing building three back but felt it was a better solution to have visibility off the freeway with exposure of glass. The exposure for the building adjacent to the freeway offered a lot more potential for visibility versus the smaller buildings.

Mr. Meyer asked for more feedback on the architecture to ensure that Mr. Deitos was obtaining the correct information relative to the architecture, site planning and upgrades.

Chairman Macdonald stated that he liked Commissioner Miller's and Shamp's suggestion of a tower element at the southeast corner of building one.

Commissioner Shamp clarified nothing more needed to be done to the building except for more site enhancements, such as art, and pulling the parking back from the corner so that the view from cars stacking up past the corner of building one and down San Bernardino Avenue is more attractive.

Commissioner James indicated that he had no problem with the setback. He was in agreement with the other Commissioners relative to the architecture. He stated that he liked buildings one and two and liked the orientation of building three. Commissioner James commented that he would like to see more architectural detail in buildings four and five that would match building one.

Commissioner Shamp commented on the architectural style stating that it is simply stated and clean. The landscaping is good given the parking requirements and constraints on the available landscaping area.

Commissioner Osborne stated that the setback and the architecture was adequate and concurred with the enhancement that Commissioner's Miller and Shamp proposed.

Commissioner Cook indicated that she liked the architecture but felt that all the buildings needed to be enhanced, stating that the three story building is very plain. She commented that the space between buildings eight, nine, ten and eleven need to look better.

Commissioner Foster concurred with Commissioner Cook and liked the architectural examples that staff demonstrated in the presentation. He stated that he would have trouble supporting the proposed architecture since more could be done to enhance it. He indicated that a substantial statement, such as art, is needed on the corner. The landscaping is nice but architecture is substandard.

Commissioner James stated that he liked the overall project and had no problem with the setback.

Commissioner Miller indicated that he was comfortable with the setback. He had concerns relative to the three story building, stating that it appeared flat. He suggested more landscaping and eliminating a few parking stalls to create some peninsulas for additional planting. He suggested that a cornice could be incorporated to make the building more interesting. Mr. Deitos commented on the architecture of building three, stating that a cornice could be easily incorporated.

Commissioner Miller indicated that the glass panels on the eastside of building six needed to continue around the building.

Chairman Macdonald asked the Commission for their comments relative to additional enhancements. Commissioner Shamp commented on all of the buildings and stated that building three is plain. He would prefer to see greater depth to the facades using textures and materials to make the building less flat looking.

Commissioner James commented on the north elevation of buildings four and five, stating that he would like to see more enhanced architecture.

Commissioner Miller concurred with Commissioner James, stating that the south side of buildings four and five should have a similar front that is as nicely articulated as buildings one and two.

Pat Meyer commented on the properties surrounding the project and stated that there was an application pending for a warehouse building immediately across the street from this site. Mr. Meyer passed around the proposed site plan to the Commissioners for their review.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Foster, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Commission Review and Approval No. 835, and Public Hearings for the Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and Minor Subdivision No. 303 to February 13, 2007.

Commissioner Miller recused himself at 3:20 p.m. due to a conflict of interest on item IV. B.

B. **ADRIAN GAUS, 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 **General Plan Amendment No. 113** amending the General Plan Land Use Designation from Low Density Residential (0 to 6 units per acre) to Medium Density Residential (0 to 15 units per acre) on 3.63 acres located on the east side of Webster Street north of Lugonia Avenue in the R-1, Single Family Residential District (proposed R-2, Multiple Family Residential District).
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Zone Change No. 426** change the zoning designation from R-1, Single Family Residential District to R-2, Multiple Family Residential District on 3.63 acres located on the east side of Webster Street north of Lugonia Avenue.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on **Conditional Use Permit No. 889** to develop a seventy-one (71) unit senior housing complex on approximately 3.63 acres located on the east side of Webster Street north of Lugonia Avenue in the R-1, Single Family Residential District (proposed R-2, Multiple Family Residential District).

Project Planner Manuel Baeza gave an overview of the proposed senior housing complex. Mr. Baeza indicated that a Density Bonus Agreement was needed in order to develop the proposed site. Staff recommended continuance to the February 13, 2007 meeting to allow for additional evaluation of the project for consistency with new State requirements.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there was discussion relative to the reduced parking. Mr. Baeza addressed Chairman Macdonald's question and stated that it would be up to the City Council to approve the reduced parking request.

Chairman Macdonald asked why the block wall was not required to surround the entire complex. Mr. Baeza stated that the block wall was limited to the parking areas of the site but could be required to surround the entire site.

Commissioner Cook commented on the use of shuttle buses stating that it would alleviate the need for the seniors to have cars. Mr. Baeza stated that this was a housing authority project and that representatives in the audience could address this situation.

Director Shaw commented on two projects, Casa de le Vista and Fern Lodge, stating that both of those projects, while developed with reduced parking, have had more than sufficient spaces.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Dan Ackerman, Secretary/Treasurer of Housing Partners One and Executive Director of the County Housing Authority, gave a background on the project and addressed the parking issues.

Commissioner Osborne commented on the parking, stating that the number of spaces would not be adequate due to the potential able-bodied seniors that would be able to drive. Mr. Ackerman stated that he could provide market studies that show that the number of proposed spaces would be adequate for this project.

Commissioner James asked if the market studies would address independent living seniors. Mr. Ackerman indicated that the seniors needed to be independent in order to reside in the proposed housing development.

Commissioner Shamp asked if there was a bus stop on the site. Mr. Ackerman stated that there was not a bus stop on-site but one was close by on Lugonia Avenue.

Chairman Macdonald asked if a block wall around the other two sides of the project site would be appropriate for the security of the development. Mr. Ackerman stated that block walls were not good for security since people can hide behind them and would make a great graffiti backdrop. He suggested wrought iron fencing as another solution.

Geoff Bonney, representing Adrian Gaus Architects, addressed the fencing, parking, and site issues.

Commissioner Shamp stated that he liked the elevations but thought they could look less articulated. He indicated that the windows appeared small and asked Mr. Bonney to describe the brown trim around the window frames. Mr. Bonney addressed Commissioner Shamps questions relative to the elevations and windows.

Commissioner Shamp asked about the material being used for the railing. Mr. Bonney was unsure but Mr. Baeza indicated that the material board showed that the railing would be metal.

Commissioner Shamp commented on the solid railing on the ground floor units and had concerns that it would not allow someone sitting to see outside. Mr. Bonney stated that the solid railings would provide a security barrier and privacy since there would be no block wall for protection.

Mr. Ackerman passed out additional renderings to the Commission to give an idea of the type of materials proposed. He commented on the density issue and stated that another option being considered was to request a rezoning to R-3 if they cannot get a density bonus

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Albert Gusman, 1304 Live Oak Court, had concerns that this project would create more traffic in the area.

Chairman Macdonald commented that this project did not appear to generate a lot of traffic. Commissioner Osborne concurred.

Bernice Argleben, resident, had concerns relative to the traffic and suggested an alternative.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 6-0 vote (Commissioner Miller excused), that the Planning Commission continue the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Public Hearings for the Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, General Plan Amendment 113, Zone Change 426, and Conditional Use Permit No. 889 to February 13, 2007.

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 4:02 p.m.

C. **MEDICAL REAL ESTATE, APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: TAMARA ALANIZ)

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. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 841** to develop a two-story, 45,000 square foot building on approximately 3.2 acres generally located on the northeast corner of Iowa Avenue and Barton Road in the EV/AP, Administrative Professional District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.
4. **PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider **Minor Subdivision No. 307** (Tentative Parcel Map No.18374) to subdivide 3.2 acres into airspace lots for office condominium purposes generally located on the northeast corner of Iowa Avenue and Barton Road in the EV/AP, Administrative Professional District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Tamara Alaniz gave a PowerPoint presentation and overview of the proposed project. Ms. Alaniz passed an architectural rendering for the Commission's review. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant wished to address the Commission.

Ken Spear, applicant, commented on similar projects in the area and concurred with the conditions of approval. Mr. Spear asked for clarification of the term "cart" that was noted in item two (2) under the Solid Waste section of the Municipal Utilities conditions of approval. Commissioner Osborne stated that the word "cart" was another word for "dumpster".

Commissioner Cook commented that she liked the detail on the windows and that the building looks great. Commissioner Foster concurred that it was a nice job.

MOTION

It was moved 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 and Approval No. 841 and Minor Subdivision No. 307, 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 Osborne, and carried on a 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval No. 841, and Minor Subdivision No. 307, 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 Minor Subdivision No. 307, subject to conditions of approval, and based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code, in that the project site has a General Plan land use designation of office and a zoning of EV/AP, Administrative Professional District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan and the proposed subdivision complies with the applicable development standards of the General Plan and Municipal Code;
2. The site is physically suitable for the proposed 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 throughout the site, has sufficient emergency access with multiple ingress and egress points, off-site and right-of-way improvements have been conditioned 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 project 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 to avoid vehicular conflict, no offensive emissions or odors will be associated with the development, and associated noise will not affect surrounding receptors because 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; and,

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.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Foster, seconded by Commissioner Osborne, and carried on 7-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 841 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 medical office building and is designed to comply with all property development standards for the EV/AP zoning district including lot coverage, permitted uses, and required setbacks;
2. The site properly relates to Barton Road and Iowa Street which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because both streets will be constructed to city prescribed standards to their ultimate half-widths through compliance with project conditions of approval and the applicant has been conditioned to perform other required street improvements which will accommodate traffic movement and flow;
3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 841 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 land use designation and Specific Plan requirements regarding site design and permitted uses within the zoning district and land use designation.

Commissioner Miller recused himself at 4:20 p.m. due to a conflict of interest.

D. **FORD STREET PARTNERS LLC, 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. Consideration of **Commission Review and Approval No. 839** to develop a two-story office building with a floor area of 19,750 square feet on approximately 2.99 acres, located at the northeast corner of Ford Street and Reservoir Road (A.P.N. 0174-241-25 and 27) in the 'A-P' Administrative and Professional Office District.

Chairman Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Project Planner Joshua Altopp gave a PowerPoint presentation and overview of the proposed project. Mr. Altopp clarified that the proposed construction of the building would be stick-built with stucco exterior in lieu of the concrete tilt-up building described in the staff report. Staff recommended approval of the project subject to the conditions of approval.

Chairman Macdonald asked if the applicant wished to address the Commission.

Pat Meyer, representing applicant, Jay Diamond, concurred with the staff report and conditions of approval and was available for questions.

Commissioner Osborne commented on the width of the building and the size of tower element and asked if it could be widened and the roof lines expanded.

Glen Follett, GMID Architects, referred to the tower at the entry to the building, stating that they felt that it was in proportion with the building.

Commissioner Shamp had questions relative to the window glazing and asked if there was a reflective tint on the glass and if so, used for energy or privacy reasons. Mr. Follett responded that the tint was reflective and used for energy savings. Commissioner Shamp stated that he would rather see another window product used that would perform in a similar manner without the reflective coating. Mr. Follett stated that he would look into other possibilities.

Chairman Macdonald asked if this was a condition of approval that could be added and approved by the Community Development Director. Director Shaw commented on past concerns relative to reflective glass and suggested that staff could come back to the Commission with some thoughts and set some general criteria that could be recommended on future development projects.

Chairman Macdonald acknowledged that there were comments made from the applicant's representative that the glazing would be toned down.

Chairman Macdonald asked if there were any additional comments or support of the issue relative to Commissioner Osborne's concerns on the roof tower. Commissioner Cook understood Commissioner Osborne's concern on the roof tower and commented that the building was very nice looking.

Chairman Macdonald acknowledged that there was no other feedback relative to the roof tower and that the roof element could remain as presented.

Chairman Macdonald closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Miller excused), that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review & Approval No. 839 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 James, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Miller excused), that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review & Approval No. 839 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 James, seconded by Commissioner Shamp, and carried on a 6-0 vote, (Commissioner Miller excused), that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review & Approval No. 839 subject to the following findings and attached Conditions of Approval:

Planning Commission Minutes of
January 9, 2007

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', Administration and Professional Office District;
2. The site properly relates to Ford Street and Reservoir Road which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by the proposed development because both streets will be constructed to city prescribed standards to their ultimate half widths through compliance with project conditions of approval;
3. The Conditions of Approval proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 839 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 the 'A-P', Administrative and Professional Office District.

This includes the addition of condition of approval number thirty-seven (37) as follows:

37. The applicant is to evaluate reducing the reflectivity of glass which is to be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director.

Adding Condition of Approval number thirty seven (37) was moved by Commissioner James, and seconded by Commissioner Shamp and carried on a 6-0 vote.

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

V. ADDENDA - NONE

VI. MINUTES

A. DECEMBER 12, 2006

It was moved by Commissioner James, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 7-0 vote to approve the minutes of December 12, 2006.

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

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

VIII. ADJOURN TO JANUARY 23, 2007

Chairman Macdonald adjourned the meeting at 4:47 p.m. to January 23, 2007.

Christine Szilva
Senior Administrative Assistant

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department

