



THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

THE REGULAR MEETING **MINUTES** OF

THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

AND

THE PLANNING COMMISSION

MARCH 23, 2016 - 7:00 PM

Rancho Cucamonga Civic Center
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, California

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance **7:03 PM**

Roll Call

Chairman Wimberly X Vice Chairman Oaxaca X

Munoz X Macias X Fletcher X

Additional Staff Present: Steven Flower, Assistant City Attorney; Tom Grahn, Associate Planner; Senior Planner, Dan James, Senior Civil Engineer; Dominick Perez, Associate Planner; Lois Schrader, Planning Commission Secretary; Mike Smith, Senior Planner; Donald Granger, Senior Planner

II. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

This is the time and place for the general public to address the Historic Preservation Commission or the Planning Commission on any item listed or not listed on the agenda. State law prohibits the Historic Preservation Commission or the Planning Commission from addressing any issue not previously included on the Agenda. The Historic Preservation Commission or the Planning Commission may receive testimony and set the matter for a subsequent meeting.

Comments are to be limited to five minutes per individual or less, as deemed necessary by the Chair, depending upon the number of individuals desiring to speak. All communications are to be addressed directly to the Historic Preservation Commission or Planning Commission, not to the members of the audience. This is a professional business meeting and courtesy and decorum are expected. Please refrain from any debate between audience and speaker, making loud noises, or engaging in any activity which might be disruptive to the decorum of the meeting.

Stewart Schwartz spoke in opposition of the Empire Lakes project proposal. He said it should be a "no



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MARCH 23, 2016

Page 2

project" and open space use alternatives should be explored because there is not much open space left. He said the project is not consistent with what has made Rancho Cucamonga a desirable city such as recreation, open space. He said our development patterns have been smaller and not mega urban developments; he expressed doubt about the City needing them. He said he believes few residents will be new users on the Metrolink. He said the project will have a negative impact on public transportation with many more cars and congestion. He doubted the appeal to professional millennials because there are no jobs here for them; we should build business infrastructure first. He said we don't need 4,000 housing units. He said the Planning department is not objective. He said all the studies involved Randy Lewis and are biased.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR/HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION

- A. Consideration of Regular Meeting minutes dated March 9, 2016
- B. Consideration of Pre-Application Workshop minutes dated March 9, 2016

Moved by Munoz, seconded by Fletcher, carried (4-0-1 Oaxaca absent-late arrival) to adopt the Consent Calendar.

IV. DIRECTOR'S REPORTS/PLANNING COMMISSION

- C. RANCHO CUCAMONGA METROLINK FEASIBILITY AND TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT STUDY – SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG) AND CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA: A study, prepared by AECOM, to determine a recommended transit-oriented development concept for the existing Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink San Bernardino Line station and the feasibility of introducing a potential future station with associated development at Haven Avenue.

Dominick Perez introduced and summarized how the study came about and the award of the grant that funded the study.

Veronica Siranosian with Aecom presented the study (copy on file). She thanked staff for their assistance, leadership and guidance.

Vice Chairman Oaxaca arrived at 7:20 PM

Commissioner Fletcher asked if the study supported Haven Avenue as a good location for



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MARCH 23, 2016

Page 3

the Metrolink station.

Ms. Siranosian said it could fit but is not an ideal location. She said Metrolink would not support a 2nd stop there because it is so close to the other station on Milliken and they have made recent improvements and investment at the Milliken station. She also mentioned a track realignment, platform conflicts with an active rail spur, existing land uses and grading and the future vision for Haven Avenue as an office corridor.

Commissioner Fletcher indicated the report seems to be transportation oriented and little is mentioned about the loss of open space or alternative uses and the loss of the golf course is not mentioned either. He expressed concern that it seems to have one goal; to develop Empire Lakes. He said there is little information on the 10-acre TOD site and how that can be developed and help ridership.

Ms. Siranosian said evaluating for the Empire Lakes development was not in the scope but they wanted to see how the 10 acres could be incorporated. She said the scenarios section contains more explanation. She said they looked at how Metrolink is used now and not how to improve ridership.

Steven Flower, Assistant City Attorney noted that although there is a proposal to develop Empire Lakes, this study is a separate document.

Commissioner Fletcher noted that this affects that site. He said there are many apartments along Milliken Avenue and he would like to know how many units are there now and also along 4th Street near Milliken Avenue. He said there may be perhaps 5,000 units near the current station and he would have liked to know that information with respect to ridership.

Ms. Siranosian said they did not look at the existing apartments and the focus of the study was the immediate 1/2 mile area around the station.

Vice Chairman Oaxaca said it is a detailed report and he understood the focus was to look at different scenarios with an innovative eye and integrate those ideas. He asked if the team looked at the commuting distance to the station. He noted he is a daily commuter on Metrolink. He said there are many apartments near and/or adjacent to the station but he observes very few walking to and from those apartments to the station. He asked what the catchment area is and if that would that help convince anyone. He asked if they looked at Fullerton and the Orange station in retrospect to see how many folks made buying/leasing decisions based on the proximity of the rail station. He said his involvement with it at the time indicated it was not as high as they had hoped for.

Ms. Siranosian said the catchment area/distance for light rail and BRT is about 1/2 mile,; biking 3 miles and driving about 10 minutes. She said the case studies included market analysis and favored a mix of uses incorporated near the station to create a mix for people to walk through. She said there is good potential for BRT that would supplement the



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MARCH 23, 2016

Page 4

Metrolink line.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if they surveyed actual riders.

Ms. Siranosian responded that the survey included 2 days at Chaffey College and on the Metrolink platform; and there was an on-line survey of City employees. She said they received a total of 239 responses - a small percentage of those ride the Metrolink.

Commissioner Munoz asked if the same presentation will go to the City Council.

Ms. Siranosian said the blue areas are the 10-acre and 14-acre parcels. She said they would clarify the drawings for the City Council.

Mike Smith, Senior planner clarified that the scope of the study was just to evaluate the feasibility of a Metrolink station at the Haven Avenue site and for TOD at the Milliken Avenue Station. It was noted that AECOM was directed by City staff to show how the TOD site could be integrated with Empire Lakes in the conceptual drawings but that Empire Lakes is a separate project.

Chairman Wimberly added that this is only conceptual and it was not just focused on the blue areas shown in Figure 5. He suggested they tailor the presentation for the Council so they get the real feel of what the study focus was.

Commissioner Macias said the consultant's scope was in response to staff's request and it is incumbent on staff to explain the scope and what we asked them to also conceptualize.

The Secretary received and filed the report.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS/PLANNING COMMISSION

The following items have been advertised and/or posted as public hearings as required by law. The Chairman will open the public hearing to receive testimony. All such opinions shall be limited to 5 minutes per individual for each project. Please sign in after speaking.

- D. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP SUBTT18908 – RICHLAND VENTURES, INC. – A proposed subdivision of approximately 10.6 acres into 30 single-family detached lots within the Low (L) Residential District in the Etiwanda North Specific Plan located at the northwest corner of East Avenue and Wilson Avenue – APN: 1087-081-25. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts.



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MARCH 23, 2016

Page 5

Dominick Perez, Associate Planner reported that correspondence was received from Fish and Wildlife noting concerns about the biological section of the environmental documents. Staff requested a continuance of the item to an unspecified date to adequately respond to the letter.

Chairman Wimberly opened the public hearing and hearing and seeing no comment, closed the public hearing.

Moved by Munoz, seconded by Oaxaca, carried 5-0 to continue the item to an unspecified date to allow time to adequately address the concerns noted in the letter.

- E. TIME EXTENSION DRC2015-01110 - PACIFIC SUMMIT-FOOTHILL, LLC - A request to allow for a one (1) year time extension of a previously approved 8-lot Tentative Tract Map (SUBTT16605) residential subdivision for condominium purposes on 21 acres of land in the Mixed Use (MU) District, located on the north side of Foothill Boulevard, between Red Hill Country Club Drive and the Pacific Electric Trail; APN: 0207-101-13. On April 12, 2006, a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts was adopted by the Planning Commission for Tentative Tract 16605. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, no further environmental review or Negative Declaration is required for subsequent projects or minor revisions to projects within the scope of the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Tom Grahn, Associate Planner gave the staff report and PowerPoint presentation (copy on file).

Chad Studnicki stated he is the applicant. He thanked staff for the project review and consideration of the time extension request. He said he looks forward to submitting a detailed proposal next year.

Chairman Wimberly opened the public hearing.

Renee Massey, a Red Hill resident, expressed concern about water usage and suggested we have a pause in building to conserve water.

Mr. Grahn said water is part of the review of the project. He said staff received a certification from CVWD the available supply of water for the project. He said staff has only received letters of support from CVWD and no requests from them for a moratorium. He confirmed that this request on the agenda tonight is for the map time extension and not for a future project on the site.

Richard Davidson said he is a resident of Red Hill and lives in the condos north of project



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MARCH 23, 2016

Page 6

area. He said 315 units were originally planned. He asked how many are proposed now.

Mr. Grahn recalled the original count was 206 units but that application expired – it was also on only 21 acres. He said the new proposal includes a new area and is now 24 acres with about 175 units. He confirmed it is a bigger area with a reduction in units.

Chairman Wimberly closed the public hearing.

Moved by Fletcher, seconded by Macias, carried 5-0 to adopt the Resolution approving Time Extension DRC2015-01110;

VI. COMMISSION BUSINESS/HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND PLANNING COMMISSION

F. INTER-AGENCY UPDATES

G. COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Fletcher commented on current mandated water restrictions/reductions and how that relates to the approval of new development, time extensions with respect to future CEQA review, and certified water supply letters provided by CVWD.

Mike Smith, Senior Planner said staff would look into it.

Commissioner Macias asked if additional CEQA review would be required once the applicant moves forward with his tract (referring to Item E on the agenda).

Steven Flower, Assistant City Attorney, commented that additional CEQA review may not be required if no significant changes to the project have occurred, however, in some cases it may be needed. He indicated there is a difficult nexus with respect to water usage, the current restrictions in place and the approval of new development.

Vice Chairman Oaxaca suggested staff be more specific in their reports about how the determination of available water supplies for new development rests in the jurisdiction of the water districts and not with the City.

Mr. Smith noted that staff is aware of this and staff report preparation will be more thorough in the analysis with respect to water.



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MARCH 23, 2016

Page 7

Commissioner Fletcher asked if a presentation by the water district could be scheduled to explain how they are handling these requests. He said there is a perceived disconnect with the public in this area.

Mr. Smith said staff will look into that.

Commissioner Macias reported two Code Enforcement issues of possible unpermitted sales of items during the weekends.

Mr. Smith noted the locations and issues and assured the Commissioners that they would be referred to Code Enforcement.

Mr. Flower said they could be illegal but could also be a temporary use or a special sale. He said the Commissioners in general can bring these types of reports to staff but there is no role for staff to direct Code Enforcement. He suggested staff check it out the report and forward it on to Code Enforcement as appropriate.

Mr. Smith said staff is comfortable with that approach.

Commissioner Fletcher noted that when he has informed staff of his concerns, Code Enforcement is prompt in responding.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

AT 8:30 PM THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADJOURNED TO THE RAINS ROOM TO DISCUSS PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW DRC2016-00142 – DR HORTON.

I, Lois J. Schrader, Planning Commission Secretary of the City of Rancho Cucamonga, or my designee, hereby certify that a true, accurate copy of the foregoing agenda was posted on March 17, 2016, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting per Government Code Section 54964.2 at 10500 Civic Center Drive, Rancho Cucamonga.



If you need special assistance or accommodations to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Department at (909) 477-2750. Notification of 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. Listening devices are available for the hearing impaired.

INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION

The Planning Commission encourages free expression of all points of view. To allow all persons to speak, given the length of the agenda, please keep your remarks brief. If others have already expressed your position, you may simply indicate that you agree with a previous speaker. If appropriate, a spokesperson may present the views of your entire group. To encourage all views and promote courtesy to others, the audience should refrain



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MARCH 23, 2016

Page 8

from clapping, booing or shouts of approval or disagreement from the audience.

The public may address the Planning Commission on any agenda item. To address the Planning Commission, please come forward to the podium located at the center of the staff table. State your name for the record and speak into the microphone. After speaking, please sign in on the clipboard located next to the speaker's podium. It is important to list your name, address and the agenda item letter your comments refer to. Comments are generally limited to 5 minutes per individual.

If you wish to speak concerning an item *not* on the agenda, you may do so under "Public Comments." There is opportunity to speak under this section prior to the end of the agenda.

Any handouts for the Planning Commission should be given to the Planning Commission Secretary for distribution to the Commissioners. A copy of any such materials should also be provided to the Secretary to be used for the official public record.

All requests for items to be placed on a Planning Commission agenda must be in writing. Requests for scheduling agenda items will be at the discretion of the Commission and the Planning Director.

AVAILABILITY OF STAFF REPORTS

Copies of the staff reports or other documentation to each agenda item are on file in the offices of the Planning Department, City Hall, located at 10500 Civic Center Drive, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730. These documents are available for public inspections during regular business hours, Monday through Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except for legal City holidays.

APPEALS

Any interested party who disagrees with the City Planning Commission decision may appeal the Commission's decision to the City Council within 10 calendar days. Any appeal filed must be directed to the City Clerk's Office and must be accompanied by a fee of \$2,584 for all decisions of the Commission. (Fees are established and governed by the City Council).

Please turn off all cellular phones and pagers while the meeting is in session.

Copies of the Planning Commission agendas, staff reports and minutes can be found at www.CityofRC.us.