

**CITY OF ONTARIO PLANNING COMMISSION/
HISTORIC PRESERVATION MEETING**

MINUTES

August 28, 2018

CONTENTS	PAGE
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	2
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	2
CONSENT CALENDAR	
A-01. Minutes of July 24, 2018	2
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
B. File No. PMTT17-010 / PM 19978	3
C. File Nos. PMTT13-016 / TT 18929 & PWIL18-003	4
D. File No. PMTT13-017 / TT 18930	4
E. File No. PDA18-001	5
F. File Nos. PCUP18-008 & PDEV18-008	6
G. File No. PSPA18-004	10
MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.....	15
DIRECTOR'S REPORT.....	15
ADJOURNMENT	15

**CITY OF ONTARIO PLANNING COMMISSION/
HISTORIC PRESERVATION MEETING**

MINUTES

August 28, 2018

REGULAR MEETING: City Hall, 303 East B Street
Called to order by Vice-Chairman Willoughby at 6:30 PM

COMMISSIONERS

Present: Vice-Chairman Willoughby, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek,
and Reyes

Absent: Chairman Delman

OTHERS PRESENT: Planning Director Wahlstrom, Assistant Planning Director
Zeledon, City Attorney Duran, Principal Planner Mercier, Senior
Planner Noh, Assistant City Engineer Do, Assistant Building
Official Rico and Planning Secretary Berendsen

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner DeDiemar.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that there are three changes on the agenda. The first change pertains to the file number for Item C, which should be PWIL18-003. The other changes are pertaining to the items before them, which are an updated Exhibit C for Item E and an email received for Item F regarding questions and comments about the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one responded from the audience.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

A-01. MINUTES APPROVAL

Planning/Historic Preservation Commission Minutes of July 24, 2018, approved as written.

It was moved by DeDiemar, seconded by Downs, to approve the Planning Commission Minutes of July 24, 2018, as written. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PMTT17-010/TPM 19978: A Tentative Parcel Map (File No. PMTT17-010/PM 19978) to subdivide 10.06 acres of land into 9 numbered lots, for property located at the southwest corner of Ontario Ranch Road and Haven Avenue, within the Retail land use district of Planning Area 10B of The Avenue Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously analyzed in The Avenue Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2005071109) certified by the City Council on December 19, 2006. This project introduces no new significant environmental impacts. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport, and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). (APN: 0218-412-02) **submitted by Frontier Real Estate Investments.**

Senior Planner Noh, presented the staff report. He described the location and the surrounding area. He explained the history of the New Haven Commercial Center project that was approved several months ago. He described the parcel sizes and the CC&R's that include the reciprocal access, landscape maintenance and the shared parking agreement and parking management plan. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File No. PMTT17-010, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gavin Reed, Frontier Real Estate Investments, appeared and stated that things are moving forward on the project with the grading plans in for review and Stater Bros. finally signed the lease.

Mr. Reyes asked about other tenants in place.

Mr. Reed stated that they have been holding off on signing other leases because they wanted to get Stater Bros. on board first. He stated some of the clients they have been working with are Jersey Mikes, Dunkin Donuts, Chase Bank, Carl's Jr, Great Clips, and Pacific Dental. He stated they have been holding off on leasing Shop Areas 1 and 2 because they want those to be big draws once they are built.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification if sit-down restaurants are going in within Areas 1 and 2.

Mr. Reed stated yes, on the end caps closest to the landscape portion those are designed for sit-down restaurants and enclosed patio areas with alcohol services.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if they had a start time for construction.

Mr. Reed stated that they are starting with the Stater Bros. building. He stated the grading plans should be approved in about 6 weeks. He stated the first part of the year they will start construction concurrently with Stater Bros., so everything comes online at the same time.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Vice-Chairman Willoughby closed the public

testimony

Mr. Gage stated he is looking forward to the project being completed.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Gage, seconded by Gregorek, to adopt a resolution to approve the Parcel Map File No., PMTT17-010, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDietmar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW FILE NO. PMTT13-016/TT 18929 AND TENTATIVE WILLIAMSON ACT CANCELLATION FOR FILE NO. PWIL 18-003 (#77-515):

A Tentative Tract Map (File No. PMTT13-016/TT 18929) to subdivide 54.81 acres of land into 207 residential numbered lots and 24 lettered lots for public streets, pocket park and landscape neighborhood edges, and a petition to cancel Williamson Act Contract 77-515 (File No. PWIL18-003), for property located at the southwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Eucalyptus Avenue, within the Conventional Small Lot Residential district of Planning Area 1 and within the Neighborhood Commercial Center district of Planning Area 2 of the Subarea 29 Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with the Subarea 29 Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2004011009) certified by the City Council on October 17, 2006. The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area of the Ontario International Airport (ONT), and has been found to be consistent with the policies and criteria set forth within the ALUCP for ONT. The project site is also located within the Airport Influence area of Chino Airport and is consistent with policies and criteria set forth within the 2011 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook published by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics. (APNs: 0218-271-11) **submitted by Richland Communities. City Council Action is only required for the Williamson Act Contract Cancellation.**

D. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PMTT13-017/TT 18930:

A Tentative Tract Map (File No. PMTT13-017/TT 18930) to subdivide 49.45 acres of land into 225 residential numbered lots and 26 lettered lots for public streets, pocket parks and landscape neighborhood edges, for property located at the northwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Merrill Avenue, within the Conventional Small Lot Residential district of Planning Area 1 of the Subarea 29 Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with the Subarea 29 Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2004011009) certified by the City Council on October 17, 2006. The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area of the Ontario International Airport (ONT), and has been found to be consistent with the policies and criteria set forth within the ALUCP for ONT. The project site is also located within the Airport Influence area of Chino Airport and is consistent with policies and criteria set forth within the 2011 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook published by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics. (APN: 0218-271-19) **submitted by Richland Communities.**

- E. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR FILE NO. PDA18-001:** A Development Agreement (File No. PDA18-001) between the City of Ontario and Roseville Investments, LLC, to establish the terms for the development of Tentative Tract Map 18929 (File No. PMTT13-016) to subdivide 54.81 acres of land into 207 residential numbered lots and 24 lettered lots and Tentative Tract Map18930 (File No. PMTT13-017) to subdivide 49.45 acres of land into 225 residential numbered lots and 26 lettered lots. The properties are bounded by Eucalyptus Avenue to the north, Merrill Avenue to the south, Archibald Avenue to the east and the Cucamonga Flood Control channel to the west, and located within the Conventional Small Lot Residential district of Planning Area 1 and within the Neighborhood Commercial Center district of Planning Area 2 of the Subarea 29 Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with the Subarea 29 Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2004011009) certified by the City Council on October 17, 2006. The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area of the Ontario International Airport (ONT), and has been found to be consistent with the policies and criteria set forth within the ALUCP for ONT. The project site is also located within the Airport Influence area of Chino Airport and is consistent with policies and criteria set forth within the 2011 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook published by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics. (APNs: 0218-271-11 and 0218-271-19) **submitted by Richland Communities. City Council action is required.**

Senior Planner Noh, presented the staff reports. He described the location and the use history of the site, and the surrounding area. He explained the lot sizes and product types, the landscape and pocket park areas they are proposing. He described the Williamson Act Cancellation and the fees involved. He explained the Development Agreement and the key points that are included: 10 year term, with 5 year option, the infrastructure improvements, public service funding, and the park, school district and affordable housing requirements. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File Nos. PMTT13-016 & PMTT13-017, and recommend approval to City Council for File Nos. PWIL18-003 & PDA18-001, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Downs wanted clarification on the park locations.

Mr. Noh explained where they would be.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification if they will get to look at the parks in more detail with the development plan.

Mr. Noh stated yes when the development plan comes in they will see more detail and the amenities being offered.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification regarding ground water retention in park areas.

Mr. Noh stated that yes according to the requirements of the WQMP they need to have percolation areas for water runoff.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification if they would be improving or widening the bridges over the channel.

Mr. Noh stated yes this is part of the Development Agreement improvements.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Mike Buyer, representing Richland Communities, appeared and thanked Mr. Noh for his presentation and stated that Richland is bringing in a new coastal builder for this project that they are very excited about.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Vice-Chairman Willoughby closed the public testimony

Mr. Gregorek stated he likes the larger lots and layout of the project.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Downs, to adopt a resolution to approve the Tentative Tract Map, File No. PMTT13-016. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

It was moved by Gage, seconded by DeDiemar, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Williamson Act Cancellation, File No. PWIL18-003, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Downs, to adopt a resolution to approve the Tentative Tract Map, File No. PMTT13-017. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

It was moved by Downs, seconded by Gage, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Development Agreement, File No. PDA18-001, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

F. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PCUP18-008 & PDEV18-008:**

A Conditional Use Permit and Development Plan to establish and construct a 6-story, 208-room hotel and 8,000-square foot restaurant pad on 4.95 acres of land, generally located on the southeast corner of Archibald Avenue and Inland Empire Boulevard, within the OH (High Intensity Office) zoning district. The proposed project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), as amended, and the Guidelines promulgated thereunder, pursuant to Section 15332 (Class 32, In-Fill Development Projects) of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport, and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the

Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). (APNs: 0210-191-29, 0210-191-30, 0210-191-31 and 0210-191-32); **submitted by Heartland Alliance, LLC. City Council action is required.**

Principal Planner Mercier, presented the staff report. He described the surrounding area and the location of the project. He explained the proposed hotel site and the proposed amenities offered. He explained the access points, landscape and the Caltrans right-of-way driveway access condition. He described the architectural elements and the elevations. He went over the market feasibility report. He addressed the letter received regarding the project. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File No. PDEV18-008, and recommending approval to City Council for File No. PCUP18-008, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification regarding where Mr. Maury, who submitted the letter is located and what is his business.

Mr. Mercier stated Mr. Maury is immediately east of the project, located in Transpark development and he had already talked with him.

Mr. Reyes requested that Engineering address the board regarding the issues within the letter.

Mr. Do, Assistant City Engineer, went through each question. He stated the first question regarding the additional traffic signal on Inland Empire Blvd, falls within our design guideline for traffic signal spacing, and is warranted due to the volume of traffic generated by the project and geometry of the street, that it would be unsafe to provide unprotected left turns out knowing the speeds of the divided arterial highway.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification if the traffic signal would be open for both east and west bound traffic on Inland Empire Blvd.

Mr. Do stated that it would be a 4 lane intersection that would line up with the driveway to the north so it would provide movement from all four directions. He stated the west bound left lane turn pocket is already there, as it was always the intention to have this signal here. He addressed item 1a regarding the three signals that cars exiting out of Transpark would have to go through to get to the 10 freeway off Archibald and stated the signals will be interconnected to minimize the impacts. He stated item B regarding that a U-turn would be allowed here as well as at both Archibald and Turner.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification regarding traffic going west from Haven.

Mr. Do stated that the signal saves them from having to go to Archibald to make a U-turn. He addressed the next item regarding ingress and egress inlands works against what Mr. Myers is stating and that median cuts would slow down traffic and allows for unprotected left turns. Mr. Do stated these concerns were brought up 2 years ago and were denied then for the same reasons.

Mr. Willoughby stated that it would seem less safe and allow more hazards with these cuts.

Mr. Do stated that was correct and then deferred the last question about paint palettes to planning.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification regarding engineering's knowledge of the Caltrans driveway.

Mr. Do stated the previous applicant had gotten a conceptual approval from Caltrans and he explained the Caltrans strip for the driveway, would have to be purchased by the applicant from Caltrans and Caltrans would have to go through a decertification process which is basically a vacation of their right-of-way.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification regarding the driveway being right turn-in only.

Mr. Do stated that was correct that it would be turn-in only for the reasons he had previously stated regarding turns across multiple lanes.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification regarding if Caltrans had approved of this project.

Mr. Do stated not at this time.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification regarding the colors and if the applicant could address that.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gene Fong, Axis GFA, the architect of the hotel, appeared and spoke. He clarified that the hotel is only five stories, not six stories, but is proposed with a terrace lounge area on the rooftop deck to take advantage of the views. He stated that because of the terrace, building and safety classified it as an A occupancy rather than a B occupancy, so they may need to adjust this item to comply with code depending on the type of construction needed.

Mr. Willoughby asked if the rooftop terrace is a design element that might change.

Mr. Fong stated that was correct.

Mr. Willoughby addressed staff regarding the height of this project compared to the Hilton across.

Mr. Mercier stated it was a shorter.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification regarding the colors.

Mr. Fong stated the concept is create a sense of movement and with different facades and treatments.

Mr. Reyes stated the landscape plan looks great but wanted clarification on the site amenities that go with the hotel.

Mr. Fong described the guest experience and the transparency of the design, to see through to see what amenities are offered as they arrive. The idea is to have an indoor/outdoor effect on the terrace alongside the ballroom.

Mr. Downs wanted clarification regarding the restaurant pad and for an inside restaurant.

Mr. Fong stated that the idea is to have a third party restaurant but also to offer food and beverage within the hotel.

Mr. Willoughby wanted asked if the hotel will have food and beverage within.

Mr. Fong stated yes it will.

Mr. Downs wanted to know if there was a tenant for the restaurant pad.

Mr. Fong stated not yet.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if the egress off Archibald with Caltrans, was still something the applicant would pursue.

Mr. Fong stated yes that was the intent, but the right turn-in is ideal.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification regarding the main entrance location.

Mr. Fong stated the main entrance faces towards Inland Empire Blvd.

Mr. Reyes stated the terrace is something unique and would like to see this stay good feature to keep.

Mr. Fong stated they intend to keep it, but it may have be smaller to comply with building and safety. He stated they wouldn't be able to have food and beverage service up there, but would use the terrace for guest to enjoy the views.

Mr. Willoughby stated this is a nice asset that none of the other hotels have and would be an attraction for meetings.

Mr. Fong stated they recognize that as well.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Vice-Chairman Willoughby closed the public testimony

Mr. Gage asked if there was anything the city can do to encourage the rooftop terrace.

Mr. Mercier stated it is a building code issue and a construction type issue.

Mr. Fong stated it is a construction type issue because typically for 5 stories there would be a concrete construction at the base and four stories of Type 3 wood construction, but because of the terrace on the roof, which would exceed 750 square feet, that triggers a Type 1 construction which is either steel or concrete construction. He stated it then becomes a financial issue.

Mr. Gage stated it's a money thing.

Mr. Reyes stated the terrace is an important item and it's hard to make a decision on this item without the guarantee that this terrace will be included.

Ms. Wahlstrom clarified that a terrace can be achieved at 750 square feet, which would give certainty for tonight's decision.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification regarding beverages being served on the terrace.

Mr. Fong stated yes they can have beverages and food, it just limits the space.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification regarding the maximum number of people allowed in the 750 square feet.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated she would work with the building official regarding this space and other ways to expand the space

Mr. Reyes stated he was glad the applicant brought their team so they could get more information and he likes the colors and landscape.

Mr. Willoughby stated the color pallet has a modern look.

Mr. Gregorek stated the terrace amenity is a different amenity that adds to the project and he likes the whole design.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Downs, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Conditional Use Permit, File No. PCUP18-008, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

It was moved by Downs, seconded by DeDiemar, to adopt a resolution to approve the Development Plan, File No. PDEV18-008. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

G. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT

REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PSPA18-004: An Amendment to the Meredith International Centre Specific Plan, revising the sign standards/guidelines for freeway identification signs and for uses over 200,000 square feet in area, within the Urban Commercial land use district. Staff is recommending the adoption of an Addendum to the Meredith International Centre Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2014051020), reviewed in conjunction with File Nos. PGPA13-005 and File No. PSPA14-003, and certified by the City Council on April 7, 2015. This project introduces no new significant environmental impacts. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport, and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). (APNs: 0110-311-52, 0110-311-53, 0110-311-54, 0110-311-55, 0110-321-29, 0110-321-68, 0110-321-72, 0110-321-73, 0110-321-74, 0110-321-75, 0110-321-76, 0110-321-77, 0110-321-78, 0110-321-79); **submitted by Real Development Solutions, LLC. City**

Council action is required.

Principal Planner Mercier, presented the staff report. He described the location and the sign standards for one freeway identification sign for the Meredith International Centre Specific Plan. He explained the standards for the more than 200,000 square foot occupant. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council for the Addendum to an EIR and File No. PSPA18-004, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification how this project sign compares to other signs in the area.

Mr. Mercier stated the Mark Christopher sign directly across the freeway is 60 feet in height, but only includes one business. He stated the auto center signs in the City range from 75 feet to 85 feet in height.

Mr. Gage wanted to know the height of the Ontario Center Sign.

Mr. Mercier stated the Ontario Center sign is 60 feet high.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know the height of the billboard sign at Mountain and I-10.

Mr. Mercier stated that sign was 80 feet high.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know the digital space square footage of that sign.

Mr. Zeledon stated the digital portion is the size of a billboard.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if the sign face was comparable in size.

Mr. Mercier stated it was comparable.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted clarification of why the height is almost double the height of some of the other signs in the city.

Mr. Mercier stated the reason for the height of the sign is due to the overpasses that block the views and landscaping aspects of the site.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know who proposed this height.

Mr. Mercier stated the applicant did, based on a study they did on various heights on the property.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted clarification if the sign would introduce all the businesses within the Meredith Plan.

Mr. Mercier stated that was correct, the 105 foot sign is for all the businesses within Meredith Specific Plan. He stated that the portion of the sign that adds height is mostly architectural.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know if the topper that makes up a large portion of the sign is needed

and how much height does it contribute.

Mr. Mercier deferred to the applicant regarding the need.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated the LED display portion of the sign would be 1344 square feet per sign face. She stated that the sight line studies that were done took into account bridges, trees and other obstacles that you don't really notice. She stated the height for the LED portion was derived based on these studies and they needed to add an architectural aspect so it didn't look like just a billboard sign, which it isn't a billboard because it would be promoting all the different retailers within the Meredith Specific Plan.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if it would be used as a landmark for the whole Meredith Center.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated yes that this is a significant center and location within the city and the sign is meant to add prominence to this location and the design is important. She stated that tonight they are approving the Specific Plan Amendment to allow this type of sign, not the sign itself.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification if this sign would be about 20 feet above the main Auto Center sign.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated yes but the Auto Center sign is a different type of sign aesthetically and the LED facing of that sign is actually located higher than where this LED portion would be.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification regarding the specific location and Planning Commissioners approval of the sign at a different time.

Mr. Mercier stated that the specifics would be done through staff review only and that if they wanted to review those aspects that Planning Commission approval could be added to the Specific Plan Amendment.

Mr. Reyes stated there needs to be a specific sign layout plan to really highlight where the signs will sit and he wanted clarification if there were locations already.

Mr. Mercier stated the sign that identifies the Meredith Specific Plan, a location has been identified which would be on the QVC Way cul-de-sac, adjacent to the freeway.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification on how would we address future retailers and how they have their signs.

Mr. Mercier stated those signs would be subject to the requirements of the city's development code.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated this is a long freeway frontage and 2 signs are currently allowed. This amendment is allowing for the height essentially.

Mr. Mercier stated the freeway sign for the retailer does not include a LED display.

Mr. Willoughby clarified that the retailer would need to occupy 200,000 square feet or more.

Mr. Mercier stated that was correct and they would also need 600 feet of frontage along the freeway.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated it was imperative to have this size of sign to attract future auto dealerships to this area.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted clarification that if they recommend this amendment to City Council, are we opening the possibility that staff could approve future signs going up without the Planning Commission having any input.

Mr. Mercier stated no.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted clarification that this would be the only sign of this size within the Meredith Specific Plan.

Mr. Mercier stated that is correct.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Perry Banner, of Michael Baker International, representing the applicants Craig Development Corporation and Real Development Solutions, appeared and spoke. He stated he would like to provide clarity regarding the two proposed parts to the amendments: one for the one freeway identification sign which is meant to be a gateway sign, and the second part of the amendment is to attract the big box retailers to the center to the Meredith Center. He stated that tonight we are creating the codes for these types of opportunities, not approving the signs. This Amendment allows for greater flexibility to attract more to the city. He stated the reasons from the height of the sign in regards to embankments and future tenant buildings that would block it, and they want to create an iconic sign that is taller and appears the more slender not something that looks short and dumpy, and also to be a partnership with the city, for free advertising for events and having their name on the sign.

Mr. Reyes asked for clarification on the location of the sign west of the Audi dealer.

Mr. Banner stated that is correct, it would be about 115 feet off the freeway right-of-way on QVC Way cul-de-sac.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know the difference in grade elevations from the freeway to the ground of the sign.

Mr. Banner stated where the freeway right-of-way is there isn't that much of a grade difference, but the embankment on the lower right of I-10 is an issue.

Mr. Willoughby stated the curve of the interstate heading east the development does drop the view off.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Vice-Chairman Willoughby closed the public testimony

Mr. Reyes commented that tonight we are dealing more with the Specific Plan Amendment but feels they should take a look at the design as a planning commission.

Mr. Willoughby asked if the Commissioners would like to condition this approval regarding seeing the proposed design elements in the future.

Mr. Gregorek concurred.

Ms. Wahlstrom wanted clarification that it would be the freeway identification sign that would come back to the Commission.

Mr. Reyes stated without a location or a site plan, he wants them to be able to look over the design for consistency.

Mr. Willoughby stated there is a location for the sign.

Mr. Reyes stated yes there is a rough location without the completed site plan and his concern about the sign is the design more than the location.

Mr. Willoughby clarified that it was the Meredith International Center sign that would be reviewed only.

Mr. Reyes stated that was correct.

Mr. Banner wanted clarification if a sign review was a normal occurrence for other developments within the city.

Mr. Willoughby stated yes the Commission has reviewed other signs within the city. He wanted clarification if this could be brought forward quickly.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated yes we could bring it forward quickly once the design is submitted.

Mr. Willoughby stated that they have been working on the Meredith Center for quite a while and they want to keep it looking as good as possible.

Vice-Chairman Willoughby reopened the public hearing for Item G

Mr. Willoughby stated the request that the sign design comes before the Commission

Mr. Reyes stated yes that is correct and not meant to slow down the process.

Mr. Banner wanted clarification if the Commissioners are weighing in or are they making a motion on the design.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated a sign program would not be required, being that this is a Specific Plan area, and there are already standards in place. She stated that staff would work with the applicant, then bring it forward as information at briefing or bring it for review and approval when the sign permit comes in.

Mr. Willoughby clarified that the Commissioners would like to see the final design and have approval of the design.

Mr. Gregorek stated yes.

Ms. DeDiemar stated she would like to see it at briefing and as a consent item.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated they would see it at briefing and put on consent calendar.

Mr. Willoughby stated that is correct.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Vice-Chairman Willoughby closed the public testimony

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Reyes, seconded by Gregorek, to recommend adoption of the Addendum to an EIR, the Specific Plan Amendment, File No., PSPA18-004, with the addition of Planning Commission review of the sign design, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Downs, Gage, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Delman. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Old Business Reports From Subcommittees

Historic Preservation (Standing): This subcommittee met on August 9, 2018.

* 6 properties requested for removal.

Development Code Review (Ad-hoc): This subcommittee did not meet.

Zoning General Plan Consistency (Ad-hoc): This subcommittee did not meet.

New Business

NOMINATIONS FOR SPECIAL RECOGNITION

None at this time.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Wahlstrom stated the Monthly Activity Reports are in their packets.

ADJOURNMENT

Gage motioned to adjourn, seconded by Reyes. The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 PM.

Gwen Berendsen

Secretary Pro Tempore

Ralf W. J.

Chairman, Planning Commission