



# THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

THE REGULAR MEETING **MINUTES** OF

THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

AND

THE PLANNING COMMISSION

MAY 11, 2016 - 7:00 PM

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

## I. CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance **7:07 PM**

Roll Call

Chairman Wimberly X Vice Chairman Oaxaca X

Munoz X Macias A Fletcher X

## 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.*

*None*

## III. 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.*



# HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 2

- A. DESIGN REVIEW DRC2015-00975 – D.R. HORTON - A request for site plan and architectural review of 31 single-family residences on 6.5 acres of land in the Low Medium (LM) Residential District (4-8 dwelling units per acre) of the Victoria Community Plan located on the northwest corner of Kenyon Way and Lark Drive; APN: 1089-011-04. Related Files: Tentative Tract Map 18508, Variance DRC2016-00154 and Minor Exception DRC2016-00256. The City Council adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for this project on June 3, 2015. The California Environmental Quality Act provides that no further environmental review or Negative Declaration is required for subsequent projects or minor revisions to projects within the scope of the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B. VARIANCE DRC2016-00154 – D.R. HORTON - A request to reduce the required setbacks on Lots 19 and 31 related to Design Review DRC2015-00975 for the site plan and architectural review of 31 single-family residences on 6.5 acres of land in the Low Medium (LM) Residential District (4-8 dwelling units per acre) of the Victoria Community Plan located on the northwest corner of Kenyon Way and Lark Drive; APN: 1089-011-04. Related Files: Tentative Tract Map 18508, Design Review DRC2015-00975 and Minor Exception DRC2016-00256. Related Files: Tentative Tract Map 18508, Design Review DRC2015-00975 and Variance DRC2016-00154.
- C. MINOR EXCEPTION DRC2016-00256 – D.R. HORTON - A request to increase the maximum wall height up to 8 feet due to a grade difference related to Design Review DRC2015-00975 for the site plan and architectural review of 31 single-family residences on 6.5 acres of land in the Low Medium (LM) Residential District (4-8 dwelling units per acre) of the Victoria Community Plan located on the northwest corner of Kenyon Way and Lark Drive; APN: 1089-011-04.

*Tabé van der Zwaag, Associate Planner, presented the staff report and gave a brief PowerPoint presentation (copy on file).*

*Maile Macabio, project manager for DR Horton said it was a pleasure working with staff and that she was prepared to answer questions.*

*Chairman Wimberly opened the public hearing. Seeing and hearing no comments, he closed the public hearing.*

*Commissioner Fletcher said the design is compatible, the variance reasonable, and the Minor Exception makes sense. He thanked the applicant for listening to the DRC.*

*Commissioner Munoz agreed and added that it is a challenging area to develop-they did well to accommodate the constraints of the property.*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 3

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca agreed that it is a good design, a good selection of plans & homes and is responsive to market conditions.*

*Chairman Wimberly concurred and said it is an infill project and has land challenges. He said staff and the applicant did a good job and he looks forward to seeing it complete.*

*Moved by Munoz, seconded by Fletcher, carried 4-0-1 (Macias absent) to adopt the resolutions approving Design Review DRC2015-00975, Variance DRC2015-00154, and Minor Exception DRC2016-00256.*

- D. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT DRC2015-00887 – CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA – A proposed General Plan Amendment to 1) to change the land use designations of multiple parcels within the City, generally located along Foothill Boulevard near the intersections of East Avenue, Etiwanda Avenue, Haven Avenue, and Vineyard Avenue, and near the southeast corner of the intersection of Etiwanda Avenue and Candlewood Street, from their existing designations of General Commercial, Industrial Park, or Office (depending on the parcel) to Mixed Use; 2) to revise Tables LU-1, delete Tables LU-3 through LU-8, and LU-10 through LU-14 of the General Plan that describe the uses and development ranges permitted within each area designated for Mixed Use development and to correct numbering of Table LU-9; 3) revise Tables LU-15 through LU-18 that summarize and describe the build-out capacity for each land use classification throughout the City; 4) revise Figures LU-2 and LU-3 of the General Plan that identify the (existing and added) locations of the parcels that are designated for Mixed Use development; 5) revise text associated with these tables and figures; and 6) to correct any typographical errors and omissions within the existing text associated with these tables and figures; APNs: 0207-211-05, 0207-211-42 through -46, 0208-353-01 through -03, 1100-031-06, -07; 1100-041-01 through -03, 1090-601-04, -06 through -08, 1090-601-20 and -21, 1100-161-01 through -03, 0229-311-14 and -15, 1100-191-04, and 1100-201-03, -04, -06, and -07. Staff has prepared a Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item was continued from the April 27, 2016 meeting date. This item will be forwarded to the City Council for final action. This description is a revision of the original published on March 24, 2016 and was re-noticed on April 28, 2016.

*Dominick Perez, Associate Planner, gave the staff report and PowerPoint presentation (copy on file).*

*Commissioner Fletcher asked where residents will go for their services if we are abandoning the idea of providing commercial/community services at the east end of town. He mentioned potential loss of revenue and a previously conceived community center. He asked what other developers indicated they would be interested. He asked if existing uses located in this area would still be allowed. He said he is not opposed to changing the land uses along Foothill Boulevard but we should encourage developers to put in what these folks need.*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MAY 11, 2016

Page 4

*Mr. Perez said there are existing commercial services along Foothill-several portions developed and some are not. He said this issue was not specifically analyzed.*

*Commissioner Fletcher asked if the existing uses would still be allowed.*

*Mike Smith, Senior planner responded that those uses would still be allowed. He said the applicants would be asked to be sure the new uses integrate with the existing. There is the intent to provide integration.*

*Mr. Smith said on the parcels that are vacant, they would be required to have 2 land uses or 2 housing types and the developer would have to meet the intent of the Mixed Use District. He said staff has received calls expressing interest in Mixed Use development and are encouraged that we have done the standards, but the interested parties have not yet provided concrete plans, just interest in a mix of residential and commercial uses.*

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

*Commissioner Munoz said he had no concerns, he was glad there is the ability to tweak the General Plan and that he supports the changes.*

*Commissioner Fletcher asked if changing the General Plan but not the zoning map provides staff more control over the submitted projects.*

*Mr. Smith said that with each proposal the applicant will be required to apply for an amendment to the map-and that the applications would run together with the design review and get reviewed concurrently. The amendment would then go to the City Council for final review and action.*

*Commissioner Fletcher said he believes the change is good and may revitalize Foothill Boulevard. He said staff will have to be vigilant in enforcing the design standards. He asked if future developers will have to produce an EIR and if that would be difficult.*

*Steven Flower, Assistant City Attorney said each project will have to do a site specific environmental assessment. He said the fine tuning of their environmental review will be based upon what is proposed. He said with respect to future applications, because we don't know what mix of uses will be provided, it would be impossible to analyze the impacts now.*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca said this is the best opportunity to maximize the best use of these locations. He said a lot of these parcels are vacant and what is developed is non-conforming. He said there are lots of reasons they have not been developed but changing the land use will create more opportunity to maximize their use and is a much more*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 5

*responsive approach to what the City needs and will help redevelop the Foothill corridor. He said this is good work by staff.*

*Chairman Wimberly said this is a broad measure that allows these areas to be beneficially developed.*

*Moved by Munoz, seconded by Oaxaca, carried 4-0-1 (Macias absent) to recommend the approval of General Plan Amendment DRC2015-00887 and the proposed Negative Declaration to be forwarded to the City Council for final action.*

- E. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT DRC2014-01132 - FOOTHILL & EAST, LLC – A proposed amendment to Development Code Table 17.36.020-2 (Development Standards for Mixed Use Zoning Districts) to clarify permitted uses in the Mixed Use Zoning Districts and allowing Transit Orientated Developments (TOD) within ½ mile of a transit stop and to amend Section 17.36.020 A and B, Figure 17.36.020-1 and Table 17.36.020-1, to add the proposed site to the Development Standards for Mixed Use Zoning Districts Tables, Figures and Text for consistency with the proposed Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131 amending the zoning designation of the site from Community Commercial (CC) to Mixed Use (MU)) for the development of a proposed 193-unit, multi-family residential development with the potential for 3,246 square feet of commercial space to support future mass transit opportunities for a site located on 8.8 acres of land within the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District at the northwest corner of Foothill Boulevard and East Avenue; APN's: 1100-201-03, 04 and 07. Related Files: Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131, Tentative Tract Map SUBTT19945, Development Review DRC2014-01130, Minor Exception DRC2016-00169, Tree Removal Permit DRC2014-01134 and Uniform Sign Program DRC2015-00318. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item will be forwarded to the City Council for final action. This description is a revision of the original published on March 24, 2016 and was re-noticed on April 28, 2016.
- F. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT DRC2014-01131-FOOTHILL & EAST, LLC - A request to change the zoning designation for 8.8 acres of land from Community Commercial (CC) to Mixed Use (MU) related to the development of a 193-unit, multi-family residential development with the potential for 3,246 square feet of commercial space to support future mass transit opportunities on a project site within the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District at the northwest corner of Foothill Boulevard and East Avenue; APNs: 1100-201-03, 04 and 07. Related Files: Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132, Tentative Tract Map SUBTT19945, Development Review DRC2014-01130, Minor Exception DRC2016-00169, Tree Removal Permit DRC2014-01134 and Uniform Sign Program DRC2015-00318. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item will be forwarded to the City Council for final action. This item was continued from April 27, 2016.



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 6

- G. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP SUBTT19945 - FOOTHILL & EAST, LLC - A request to subdivide 8.8 acres of land for residential condominium purposes related to the development of a 193-unit, multi-family mixed use development with the potential for 3,246 square feet of commercial space to support future mass transit opportunities on a project site of within the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District at the northwest corner of Foothill Boulevard and East Avenue; APNs: 1100-201-03, 04 and 07. Related Files: Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132, Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131, Development Review DRC2014-01130, Minor Exception DRC2016-00169, Tree Removal Permit DRC2014-01134 and Uniform Sign Program DRC2015-00318. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item was continued from April 27, 2016.
- H. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DRC2014-01130 - FOOTHILL & EAST, LLC - A request for site plan and architectural review of a 193-unit, multi-family residential development with the potential for 3,246 square feet of commercial space to support future mass transit opportunities on a site located on 8.8 acres of land within the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District at the northwest corner of Foothill Boulevard and East Avenue; APNs: 1100-201-03, 04 and 07. Related Files: Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132, Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131, Tentative Tract Map SUBTT19945, Minor Exception DRC2016-00169, Tree Removal Permit DRC2014-01134 and Uniform Sign Program DRC2015-00318. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item was continued from April 27, 2016.
- I. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND MINOR EXCEPTION DRC2016-00169 - FOOTHILL & EAST, LLC - A request to reduce the required parking by 44 spaces (52 spaces if 3,246 square feet of retail tenant space is developed) related to the development of a 193-unit, multi-family residential development with the potential for 3,246 square feet of commercial space to support future mass transit opportunities on a project site of 8.8 acres of land within the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District at the northwest corner of Foothill Boulevard and East Avenue; APNs: 1100-201-03, 04 and 07. Related Files: Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132, Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131, Development Review DRC2014-01130, Tentative Tract Map SUBTT19945, Tree Removal Permit DRC2014-01134 and Uniform Sign Program DRC2015-00318. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item was continued from April 27, 2016.
- J. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TREE REMOVAL PERMIT DRC2014-01134 - FOOTHILL & EAST, LLC - A request to remove approximately 184 trees related to the development of a 193-unit, multi-family residential development with the potential for 3,246 square feet of commercial space to support future mass transit opportunities on a project site of 8.8 acres of land within the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District at the



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MAY 11, 2016

Page 7

northwest corner of Foothill Boulevard and East Avenue; APNs: 1100-201-03, 04 and 07. Related Files: Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132, Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131, Tentative Tract Map SUBTT19945, Development Review DRC2014-01130, Minor Exception DRC2016-00169 and Uniform Sign Program DRC2015-00318. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item was continued from April 27, 2016.

- K. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND UNIFORM SIGN PROGRAM DRC2015-00318 - FOOTHILL & EAST, LLC - A request to review the Uniform Sign Program related to the development of a 193-unit multi-family residential development with the potential for 3,246 square feet of commercial space to support future mass transit opportunities on a project site within the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District at the northwest corner of Foothill Boulevard and East Avenue; APNs: 1100-201-03, 04 and 07. Related Files: Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132, Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131, Tentative Tract Map SUBTT19945, Development Review DRC2014-01130, Minor Exception DRC2016-00169 and Tree Removal Permit DRC2014-01134. Staff has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts for consideration. This item was continued from April 27, 2016.

*Tabbe van der Zwaag, Associate Planner, gave the staff report and PowerPoint presentation (copy on file). He noted title changes of the resolutions before the Commission and the fact that the 3,246 square feet was noted as potential commercial space and is now shown as commercial and/or Live Work units. He said the proposal currently allows the developer to have live/work units to satisfy the requirement and the proposal is now for 190 units with 3 live/work spaces.*

*Commissioner Fletcher questioned the Development Code Amendment – specifically the footnote about properties of 5 acres or less and the TOD. He said he would like to discuss these items separate from this project application. He said we are moving too quickly into high density and these are important topics needing discussion. He said he likes the design and he acknowledged the "two use" issue has been resolved although he had concerns about the parking.*

*Candyce Burnett, Planning Director said the intent is to take care of some clean up items to the Code at the same time, hence the footnoted items.*

*Mr. van der Zwaag said the required parking is based on the existing code- the Mixed Use standards do not change the parking requirement for residential, office or commercial projects – 422 spaces are required.*

*Ms. Burnett said the general parking standards are exactly the same as required for apartments/condos (based upon unit count and bedroom count) - the difference in Mixed Use standards is if they are asking for a variance or exception then they would have to provide a parking study to address the change or request for the lack in parking and that if*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 8

*they were trying to meet other intents such as a true TOD development they could use it to justify a request for less parking. She said if they can't meet the minimum standard then we work backwards and refer to a parking Study Management Plan and ask them for a Peer review parking study to determine if the parking is adequate or not.*

*Commissioner Fletcher said the second peer review study did not confirm that the parking is ok-that group said it might be a problem. He said he has concerns about parking, the speed at which we are trying to build all this, and he expressed concern about making amendments to documents that we just enacted in order to help new development proposals meet those standards. He said he is opposed to off-site/on-street parking in that area.*

*Mr. Van der Zwaag said the original study maintains the project can meet the standard because of a reduction of car use, close proximity to transit, and a large storage area for bikes is provided to encourage alternative transportation as well as a parking management plan that allows for more control, limitations and inspections and strong communication with residents regarding what is allowed. If their plan fails, and we get complaints, the parking may have to be redesigned and reduce units. The Peer review was concerned about an intense commercial use with evening hours and so the property manager will have to lease to uses that do not use parking during the evening hours. He said parking on East Avenue would provide an extra buffer of parking.*

*Commissioner Fletcher said the DRC should see their site plan that shows the parking. He expressed concern that this has not been figured out yet.*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca expressed similar concerns noting they had a discussion at DRC regarding parking, hence the agreement for a Peer review: they said there is a 9%+ shortfall and he is not comfortable with the street parking option. He said mitigations were suggested and it sounds like we are depending on a lot of policing and constraints on the potential retail uses. He said he wants the developer to be closer to meeting our standards and for them to consider other options.*

*Kamran Benji, the applicant for Foothill & East deferred to his traffic engineer regarding the Peer review and noted the main concern is night time parking. He said other cities are willing to consider lesser parking standards and they have exhausted other parking options. He said East Avenue is not a major street and does not have a lot of traffic.*

*Commissioner Fletcher asked what unit count adjustment they would have to make to meet the parking requirements.*

*Mr. Benji said they would have to consider the financial impact and the delays and impacts already experienced due to the recession.*

*Commissioner Fletcher said we need to consider the best interests of our residents and*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MAY 11, 2016

Page 9

*quality life as well as development-parking in the neighborhoods can be a difficult problem.*

*Commissioner Munoz asked for an explanation of the changes to East Avenue to accommodate extra parking.*

*Mr. Benj said it would be on the west side of East Avenue.*

*Mr. van der Zwaag said it would require the loss of a lane on East Avenue.*

*Dan James, Sr. Civil Engineer said the traffic engineer reviewed this request and said he is open to parking on East Avenue and the reduction of a lane is acceptable. He said the details are not resolved yet. The number of stalls has not been finally determined.*

*Mark Bertone of Madole Associates said a new study closes the #2 southbound lane. Improvements for walkers would be added south to the development. It appears the parking may extend north beyond the project northerly boundary.*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca said it appears to accommodate 11 vehicles and then possibly more north of the project northerly boundary.*

*Mr. Bertrone said about 62 spaces extending north beyond the utility corridor.*

*Mr. van der Zwaag said only one house on the corner of Via Veneto would potentially have a parking space adjacent to the homeowner's property.*

*Chairman Wimberly asked if the applicant reviewed the number of units that would need to be reduced to meet the parking requirements.*

*Ambarish Mukherjee, representing LSA said they did not.*

*Mr. van der Zwaag said it is roughly 2 vehicles per unit and so to keep all the parking contained on site it would drop the number of units by 15-20. 1:54*

*Mr. Mukherjee said other cities are looking at this new type of development. He said there is a lack of adequate surveys and parking metrics to look at, so they have looked at other communities where they have done this type of development such as Pasadena. Other cities when they do mixed use/high density there are parking issues because there is more population within a smaller area. He said to provide enough parking for this type of development would result in a huge parking area which contrary to the concept of high density/mixed use development. He said with respect to the Peer review: without taking any credits, this will be short 40 spaces. If credits are considered, it is only short about 10-20 spaces. Because of a lack of rates for Mixed Use development, it was difficult to determine final results. He said the Peer review did not refute the findings it just expressed concern about parking during the evening hours.*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 10

Serafin Maranan, Principal at Architects Orange said with respect to unit reduction, they felt the parking study reinforced that the parking is adequate. If had to reduce 10-15 units.

*Commissioner Fletcher suggested they split the difference to 12 units, thereby meeting the parking requirement without going offsite. He said the history of city says we have tried to avoid off-site parking. He asked if they can agree to a condition of no off-site parking.*

*Mr. Benji said considering all the reductions, they meet the requirements. He said with respect to the parking plan-it may not be written but we have agreed to concessions and negotiated with City staff; it includes monitoring and enforcement.*

*Ms. Burnett noted that Commissioners Fletcher and Oaxaca are referring to larger policy issues. She said urban development looks and feels different and it has never been done in our city-we thought it might be difficult. She said we have been setting the stage for this and now we have to look at how we shift to allow this type of development. She said the idea of "No on-street parking" does not fit the urban model-it would mean no Mixed Use development will work anywhere-part of the problem is density. True urban development with 4 stories would never meet the parking requirement. She said we have a training scheduled with other professionals to help the Commission understand this type of development. She said staff knows they are 9% deficient and that is why there is a Minor Exception request. The study and the peer review did not consider the possibility of on-street parking, that came later after other options were explored. She said we know this is a change and parking provided may be acceptable to be below the standards in some locations in the city but not in others. She said these are larger policy decisions that will have to be considered by the Commission and the City Council. She said we are generally in favor of supporting urban development and it is a change from what we have seen in the past. She said the applicant tried to make deals with the other property owners without success.*

*Commissioner Fletcher expressed concern about amending the General Plan noting that the two footnote items slipped in. He said he likes the design and location, but not the parking. He said it would be great if they came in with fewer units and we could still achieve our TOD goals. He said this should have come back to DRC since it did not meet the parking requirement.*

*Mr. Benji said they did discuss parking at the DRC.*

*Commissioner Fletcher said nothing was said about 65 cars parked up East Avenue. He asked if they could agree that all the parking would be on site.*

*Steven Flower, Assistant City Attorney said there is not a mechanism to enforce that requirement if East Avenue is opened for parking as streets are intended for parking-law enforcement would have no way of matching up vehicles with where people live.*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MAY 11, 2016

Page 11

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca said with respect to Ms. Burnett's comments that the Commission ventured into a policy discussion and did not intend for the applicant to be burdened with that. He said his project should not be driving policy. He said he would be in favor of considering using other metrics used by other cities for this type of development. He asked for more specifics on how the applicant's team looked at the parking credits/reductions that can be given for this type of development.*

*Mr. Mukherjee said they used the guidelines from San Bernardino County which allow for transit credits and shared parking credits mixed use development. He said when those were applied, it reduced the demand and then the project would meet the city's requirements. He said the peer study mitigation was only a recommendation.*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca said the transit component is expected to evolve over time. He asked if the future transit is expected to alleviate the some of the parking demand.*

*Mr. Mukherjee it is how transit and land use interact. The use can create a trigger for transit. If the transit plans move forward you will see a demand in the future that could lessen the impact of the parking.*

*Chairman Wimberly opened the public hearing.*

*Daniel Gurrera said there is already a parking problem on Marshall Court which he concluded emanates from nearby apartment residents. He said once cars park on the street, there is no enforcement. He said he is opposed to 190 units and removal of a lane from East Avenue. He expressed concern about lower property values and lower income residents as well as safety because of students walking on the east side to school. He thought people are being dropped off and picked up there.*

*Bond Mendez said she lives west of San Sevaine and she would like Mixed Use development, however, she has a concern about the parking overflow from the San Sevaine Apartments –there is parking overflow and it is a management problem. She does not support parking on East Avenue for safety reasons. She said only 3,200 square feet out of the total square footage is very little commercial. She said she is supportive overall.*

*Chairman Wimberly closed the public hearing after seeing and hearing no further comment. He redirected to the Commission for comment.*

*Commissioner Munoz said it is a difficult project and he thanked the applicant for their work over the years and meeting the challenges. He said he sees some issues with the parking that can be overcome with good management. He said the City has not ever done this before and it is challenging. He said he appreciated the comments from the residents. He said he is inclined to move forward in spite of reservations and we need a chance to learn.*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MAY 11, 2016

Page 12

*Commissioner Fletcher said he likes the design. He expressed concerns about the parking and too many units and item F (Zoning Map Amendment) has 2 policy issues that have nothing to do with this application that he would rather discuss that at a workshop. He said he would rather see the applicant go back and look for compromises and send the project back to DRC for the parking issue.*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca said he shares the uncertainty. He said conceptually the project approach is the right one and said they did a great job on the design. He said he has heard enough that if conditions are structured appropriately we could move forward and he is not opposed to street parking as it is part of our evolution and we have seen it work elsewhere. He agreed Item F would be better addressed elsewhere-he asked if they could vote on Item F separately.*

*Steven Flower said we have a number of Development Code changes included as Item F that have been initiated in the draft resolution but is up to the Commission to make a recommendation to Council. If the Commission wants to support the one Development Code change that supports this development but not the other two you could make a mixed recommendation, but we would have to explain why in a revised resolution. He said we would also need to change the resolution to reflect the removal of those items.*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca said he would be comfortable with that separation and if he could base a motion upon that. He asked that we schedule a future discussion about parking requirements for this type of development that will help us make a recommendation on these projects so that we set a consistent guide for future applicants.*

*Chairman Wimberly agreed and concurred in that the project looks great but we have uncovered policy issues that need discussion elsewhere. He said we should not penalize the applicant for this.*

*Moved by Munoz, seconded by Wimberly to recommend approval of the Code changes and Zoning Map Amendment as presented and to approve the other resolutions for the rest of the project as stated in the staff report. The motion failed 2 in favor 2 against (Fletcher and Oaxaca voted no, Macias was absent).*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca suggested a new motion to remove portions of Item F – remove the two footnotes. He said he would like to provide the applicants a complete picture as to what they can expect as far as expectations and give us an opportunity to have discussion regarding these new types of development with uniform guidelines.*

*Donald Granger, Senior Planner said the goal could be accomplished by redacting the two offending footnotes because they do not apply to this project because it is over 5 acres in*



## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 13

size.

*Steven Flower said we should bring back a new resolution for the Development Code but it would add two weeks to the applicant's timeline and we want the Council to see this action clearly.*

*Vice Chairman Oaxaca said he did not want to delay the applicant and therefore withdrew the motion.*

*Mr. Flower suggested that because on Page 152 of the agenda packet 1) a and b do not strictly apply to this project, the resolution could be amended. He suggested a recess.*

*Chairman Wimberly announced a 5 minute recess at 9:55p.m. The Commission reconvened at 10:07pm with the same members present (Macias absent).*

*Mr. Flower read into the record that Section 6 of Resolution No. 16-24 shall be as follows:*

*6. The Commission does not recommend that the City Council approve the following aspects of the Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132 because these matters are not necessary for the proposed development of the project site and require further study(s) and consideration:*

*a. Amend Development Code Table 17.36.020-2 to add a footnote stating that "on project sites of 5 acres (net) or less, two or more housing types/product, such as detached and attached SFR; SFR and MFR; combinations of SFR, townhomes, condominiums, and apartments; etc., shall satisfy the requirement for providing a combination of two or more uses."*

*b. Amend Development Code Table 17.36.020-2 to add a footnote stating that "subject to Planning Commission Review and Approval, Transit Oriented Developments within ½ mile of a transit stop are exempt from meeting the minimum two land use requirement."*

*Moved by Oaxaca, seconded by Fletcher, carried 4-0-1 (Macias absent) to recommend approval of Development Code Amendment DRC2014-01132 and Zoning Map Amendment DRC2014-01131 to be forwarded along with the Mitigated Negative Declaration of environmental impacts to the City Council for final action with a revision as noted in the record. Specifically, the Commission revised Resolution 16-24 (page E-K 152 of the agenda packet) for the Development Code Amendment to remove Planning Department Conditions 1) a and b that added footnotes to Table 17.36.020-2 because these items do not apply to this project and were matters of policy the Commission wished to discuss at a later time. The Commission also adopted the resolutions of approval for Tentative Tract Map SUBTT19945, Development Review DRC2014-01130, Minor Exception DRC2016-00169, Tree Removal Permit DRC2014-01134 and Uniform Sign Program DRC2015-00318.*



# HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES**

MAY 11, 2016

Page 14

## IV. COMMISSION BUSINESS/HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND PLANNING COMMISSION

### L. INTER-AGENCY UPDATES

*None*

### M. COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

*None*

## V. ADJOURNMENT

10:13 PM

*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 May 5, 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 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



# HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION *MINUTES*

MAY 11, 2016

Page 15

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 \$2,597 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](http://www.CityofRC.us).**