

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

**MINUTES**

**January 25, 2022**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	2
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	2
CONSENT CALENDAR	
A-01. Minutes of December 20, 2021 .....	2
A-02. File No. PDEV21-016 .....	2
A-03. File No. PDEV21-026 .....	3
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
B. File No. PMTT20-005 (TPM 20253) .....	3
C. File Nos. PGPA19-004 and PSP19-001.....	6
D. File No. PDCA22-001 .....	11
MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.....	12
DIRECTOR’S REPORT.....	12
ADJOURNMENT .....	12

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

**MINUTES**

**January 25, 2022**

**REGULAR MEETING:** Virtual Meeting  
Called to order by Chairman Gage at 6:30 PM

**COMMISSIONERS**

**Present:** Chairman Gage, Vice-Chairman Willoughby, Dean, DeDiemar, Lampkin, and Ricci

**Absent:** Anderson

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Planning Director Zeledon, City Attorney Maldonado, Principal Planner Mercier, Senior Planner Ayala, Senior Planner Mejia, Senior Planner Hutter, Associate Planner Aguilo, Assistant Planner Vaughn, Assistant City Engineer Lee, and Planning Secretary Berendsen

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Gage.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Zeledon stated that there are redlines for Item A-03 on their Conditions of Approval and Resolution, for Item C there are also redlines on the EIR Resolution and 6 public comments were received for this item and Item D is being requested to be continued to a future date.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Mr. Zeledon stated no public comments were received.

Mr. Mercier stated there were no persons wishing to speak at this time.

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

**A-01. MINUTES APPROVAL**

Planning/Historic Preservation Commission Minutes of December 20, 2021 approved as written.

**A-02. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV21-016: A Development Plan to construct a 37,309-square-foot industrial building on**

1.60 acres of land located at the southeast corner of the Sunkist Street and Taylor Avenue, within the IG (General Industrial) zoning district. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 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: 1049-212-05, 1049-212-06, 1049-212-07, 1049-212-08, 1049-212-09, 1049-212-10, 1049-212-11, and 1049-212-12) **submitted by OC Engineering.**

- A-03. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV21-026:** A Development Plan to construct a 44,885-square-foot industrial building on 2.03 acres of land located at 1030 and 1042 East Holt Boulevard, within the IP (Industrial Park) zoning district. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 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: 1049-131-13 and 1049-131-14) **submitted by Holt LPIV 8 LLC.**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by DeDiemar, seconded by Willoughby, to approve the Consent Calendar including the Planning Commission Minutes of December 20, 2021, as written, the Development Plan, File No. PDEV21-016 and the Development Plan, File No. PDEV21-026, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Dean, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Anderson. The motion was carried 6 to 0.*

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- B. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PMTT20-005:** A Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 20253) to subdivide 53.53-acres of land into 27 numbered lots and 3 “common” lettered lots generally bordered by Guasti Road to the north, Old Guasti Road to the south, Turner Avenue to the east and Archibald Avenue to the west, within Planning Areas 2 and 3 of the Guasti Plaza Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with the Guasti Plaza Specific Plan, File No. 4413-SP, for which an Environmental Impact Report (FEIR No. 90-4/State Clearinghouse No. 91-122-009) was certified by the City Council on August 20, 1996 and in conjunction with an amendment to the Guasti Plaza Specific Plan, File No. PSPA08-006, for which a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2008111072) was certified by the City Council on May 3, 2011. This application 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: 0210-192-11 and 0211-201-15) **submitted by Ontario Airport Venture, LLC.**

Senior Planner Ayala, presented the staff report. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File No. PMTT20-005, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know the current condition of buildings on the property.

Ms. Ayala stated the buildings have been mothballed to preserve and there is a condition of approval to the project, that a conditions assessment of each building is to be completed.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know when the assessment would need to be completed.

Ms. Ayala stated before the recordation of the final parcel map.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if the new owner must take steps to preserve the buildings according to the assessment.

Ms. Ayala stated that is correct.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification on the PAP referenced being waived.

Ms. Ayala explained the PAP options.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification on parcels being sold individually in reference to the PAP.

Ms. Ayala explained they would have the option to either use this PAP or present a new PAP or a Development plan.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if parking would be evaluated at that time.

Ms. Ayala stated yes, those items would be considered at that time.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification regarding the staff report on page 6 – the red letter conditions reroof structure

Ms. Ayala stated it was condition 2.15a (page 22 of 49), that was requested to be added by the applicant, to clarify the intent of the conditions assessment and resolve eminent threats, but not to include rehabilitation or reroofing.

Mr. Gage wanted further clarification on what their obligations would be regarding the roofs.

Ms. Ayala responded that it is difficult to say at this time without the conditions assessment.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if the red letter condition prevents reroofing from being completed.

Ms. Ayala responded that the conditions assessment is critical to see what the next step is.

Mr. Gage wanted to know big picture if dividing the parcels what is in place to make sure this area is cohesive in the final build out.

Ms. Ayala stated the Guasti Plaza Specific Plan that will unify the site, and preserves the rehabilitation of the historic core.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if project comes forward is it a requirement for a Historian to be on staff.

Ms. Ayala stated there is no requirement but a Certificate of Appropriateness would be required from HPSC.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Pat Russell with Saris Regis Group was present virtually and spoke in favor of the project.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted an explanation regarding the impetus to add residential instead of business park.

Mr. Russell stated this was presented by the previous owner.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to clarify it was existing.

Mr. Russell stated that is correct and that those residential units are included in the updated housing element.

Mr. Gage wanted to know why he wanted to change item 2.15 regarding no reroofing.

Mr. Russell responded what they were trying to clarify what the future uses are going to be, mainly the warehouses, and want to protect in place, not do structural rebuilds at this time.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if they are marketing cohesively around the historic aspects.

Mr. Russell responded that the SP has controls in place to compliment the historic era and structures and make it cohesive.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if Planning Area 3 is being marketed for three parking structures.

Mr. Russell responded this was a plan created by the previous owner and they will look at the allowed uses and what is compatible with what is existing.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know what damage has been done from winds and what are they doing to protect them.

Mr. Russell stated the only damage is to the plastic sheeting that protects the bungalows and they are looking to repair and replace that sheeting.

Mr. Mercier stated no other persons wanted to speak on this item.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Gage closed the public testimony

Mr. Lampkin spoke in favor of moving this project forward.

Mr. Gage spoke regarding the history of the project area and about adding a condition regarding the roofs and preserving the historic structures.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by DeDiemar, to adopt a resolution to approve the Tentative Parcel Map, File No., PMTT20-005, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Dean, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, Gage; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Anderson. The motion was carried 5 to 1.*

- C. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, AND SPECIFIC PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PGPA19-004 AND PSP19-001:** A public hearing to consider certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2021010318), including the adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, in conjunction with the following: [1] A General Plan Amendment (File No. PGPA19-004) to modify the Policy Plan (General Plan) Land Use Plan (Exhibit LU-01), changing the land use designation on 219.39 acres of land from 157.06 acres of Low-Medium Density Residential (5.1-11 dwelling units per acre) and 62.36 acres of Business Park (0.6 FAR) to 184.22 acres of Industrial (0.55 FAR) and 35.17 acres of Business Park (0.6 FAR), and modify the Future Buildout Table (Exhibit LU-03) to be consistent with the proposed land use designation changes; and [2] A Specific Plan (File No. PSP19-001, South Ontario Logistics Center Specific Plan) to establish the land use districts, development standards, guidelines, and infrastructure improvements for the potential development of up to 5,333,518 square feet of Industrial and Business Park land uses on the project site, generally bordered by Eucalyptus Avenue to the north, Merrill Avenue to the south, existing right-of-way for the future Campus Avenue extension to the west, and Grove Avenue to the east. 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 (ONT ALUCP). 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: 1054-071-01, 1054-071-02, 1054-081-03, 1054-091-01, 1054-091-02, 1054-101-01, 1054-101-02, 1054-231-01, 1054-231-02, 1054-241-01, 1054-241-02, 1054-321-01, 1054-321-02, 1054-311-01, 1054-311-02, 1054-051-01, 1054-051-02, 1054-061-01, 1054-061-02, 1054-251-01, 1054-251-02, 1054-301-01, and 1054-301-02); **submitted by Grove Land Venture, LLC. City Council action is required.**

Assistant Planner Vaughn, presented the staff report. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for File Nos. PGPA19-004 and PSP19-001, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know what is in the surrounding area and how it effects what can be built.

Mr. Zeledon responded regarding the area and the surrounding industrial and Chino Airport restrictions.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarification regarding the potential buildout of the buildings and the cohesiveness.

Mr. Zeledon responded projects will be evaluated for consistency and usually go with a theme.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if this was designed with the intent for residents to live and work local.

Mr. Zeledon stated job house balance is the goal.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarification regarding the surrounding streets current use.

Mr. Zeledon stated currently traffic has increased with construction in the area, and Eucalyptus is being used as an east west connector to get to Euclid, Merrill is seeing more use as it is a truck route, and Grove Ave. is currently limited and not heavily used, but they will be used more as development continues in the area.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know when the NOP was circulated for this project.

Ms. Vaughn stated it went together with the Community meeting in December 2020.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know about community input at that time.

Mr. Zeledon stated there were a few comments.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify there was virtual participation at the meeting.

Ms. Vaughn stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted south side of Merrill city of Chino will those improvements done on the North and South side concurrently.

Mr. Zeledon stated that is the idea and they are working with City of Chino regarding the south side improvements.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to make sure Merrill would be able to handle the truck traffic.

Assistant City Engineer Lee stated they have been working with City of Chino regarding some of the area right of ways, and we currently have enough room for the circulation lanes for both directions and are working on the sidewalk and parkway areas.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify the airport impact regarding residential.

Mr. Zeledon stated that is correct and yes impacts from the airport are not conducive to residential, but also with Industrial already to the east and west.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know in PA 5 that has an airport zoning area overlay, is parking allowed there.

Mr. Zeledon stated there are limits to what is allowed and it would need to be analyzed.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know within the 600 foot noticing radius, how many residential addresses are in that area.

Mr. Zeledon stated that not a lot of residential are in more of the AG area.

Ms. Vaughn stated a lot of PO boxes to the south property owners at the airport, and 500 total mailers, which includes the interest list that includes about 60.

Mr. Zeledon stated the mailing didn't included any of the Ontario Ranch communities.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify one of the CEQA guidelines issue to resolve land use compatibility.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes land use compatibility was looked at and residential is not compatible.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if we would be in violation of CEQA guidelines if we put in residential.

Mr. Zeledon stated not necessarily, that any land use would have an impact and you would need to evaluate it.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify this is more of a holistic approach.

Mr. Zeledon stated that is correct.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jeff Johnston with Grove Land Ventures and REDA, was present virtually and spoke in favor of the project.

Samuel Nateo spoke in opposition of the project.

Louie Lopez with Ironworks Local 433, spoke in opposition of the project.

Godfrey Washtiera with CARE, spoke in opposition of the project.

Lois Sicking Dieter with LOCCA, spoke in opposition of the project.

David Hansen with Local 398 Plumbers and Steam Cutters, spoke in opposition of the project.

Ayda Marshall with CARE, spoke in opposition of the project.

Eli Gonzalez with District Ironworks, spoke in opposition of the project.

Anthony Noriega with LULAC, spoke in opposition of the project.

Randy Wetmur with Ironworkers Local 416, spoke in opposition of the project.

Irene Chisholm spoke in opposition of the project.

Juan Amado with Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters, spoke in favor of the project.

Mario Vasquez with Teamster Local 1932, spoke in opposition of the project.



Ivan with Anchor Church, spoke in opposition of the project.

Andrea Galvan spoke in opposition to the project.

Desiree Vincenta spoke in opposition to the project.

Pastor Zack with CARE California, spoke in opposition to the project.

Shawn Silva with CARE California, spoke in opposition to the project.

Albert Duarte with Ironwork Local 416, spoke in opposition to the project.

Frankie Jimenez with Ironworks Local 416, spoke in opposition to the project.

Thomas Ruiz with Labors and National Union #783, spoke in support of the project.

Raymond Smith a resident in South Ontario, spoke in opposition of the project.

Mr. Johnston the applicant rebutted the opposition.

Steven Peekcorn with Golden State Environmental Justice Alliance, spoke in opposition of the project.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if the commission could include in the COA, a condition to have a certain percentage of local workers used in the project.

Attorney Albert Maldonado spoke to clarify that this would be inappropriate to require such a condition at this time.

Kevin Thomas with Kimley Horn, the EIR consultant, spoke in rebuttal of the comments received regarding the EIR.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that they would look at all the comments and they would be addressed in the Final EIR.

Mr. Thomas stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know when the Final EIR would be circulated.

Mr. Thomas stated the Final EIR would be available to the public 10 days before City Council.

Mr. Zeledon stated CEQA doesn't require any changes to the DEIR and the Final EIR must be 10 days before City Council for circulation.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that all comments are being addressed appropriately.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes.

Mr. Thomas responded to the EIR air quality with an overriding of consideration.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know why the commission is approving the DEIR.

Mr. Zeledon stated the only difference in the Final EIR would be the response to comments which will be part of the City Council packet.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know if the EIR should be recirculated after the response to comments.

Mr. Zeledon stated the response to comments is not required to recirculate and does not change the Draft EIR.

Mr. Gage wanted to clarify where the pollution comes from and what safeguards are put in place to help mitigate.

Mr. Thomas responded regarding regulations with emissions from warehouses.

Mr. Gage want to know if diesel emissions were the main contributor.

Mr. Thomas stated yes, the majority and energy consumption.

Mr. Mercier stated no other persons wished to speak on this item.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Gage closed the public testimony

Ms. DeDiemar broke down the public comments into three main issues: The EIR is a draft and not the Final EIR which includes the response to comments, the use of union labor, and the project being a warehouse and all the issues that come with that. She stated that the EIR consultant and applicant adequately answered all those areas and spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know the number of warehouses in the City.

Mr. Zeledon stated he doesn't have an exact number.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know how many warehouses in the city exceed 1 million square feet.

Mr. Zeledon stated about 10.

Mr. Willoughby spoke regarding emission regulations coming down, the compatibility with the surrounding warehouses and airport, the much needed infrastructure, and spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Lampkin reiterated DeDiemar and Willoughby's comments and spoke in favor of the public participation and the project.

Mr. Gage reiterated the other Commissioners comments and spoke in favor of the project.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

***It was moved by Willoughby, seconded by DeDiemar, to recommend adoption of the EIR with a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and a Statement***

*of Overriding Considerations Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Dean, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Anderson. The motion was carried 6 to 0.*

*It was moved by Willoughby, seconded by DeDiemar, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the General Plan Amendment, File No., PGPA19-004, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Dean, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Anderson. The motion was carried 6 to 0.*

*It was moved by Willoughby, seconded by DeDiemar, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Specific Plan, File No., PSP19-001, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Dean, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Anderson. The motion was carried 6 to 0.*

- D. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDCA22-001:** A public hearing to consider a Development Code Amendment proposing the repeal of Division 6.07 (Public Art) of Chapter 6.0 (Development and Subdivision Regulations) and Reference I (Public Art Program) of the Development Code (Title 9 of the Ontario Municipal Code). This Amendment will facilitate the future establishment of a substantially revised Public Art Ordinance within Title 5 (Public Welfare, Morals, and Conduct) of the Ontario Municipal Code. The project Amendment is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the guidelines promulgated thereunder, pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, in that the activity is covered by the common sense exemption (general rule) that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment; **City Initiated. City Council action is required.**

Mr. Zeledon stated this Item is being requested to be continued to a future date.

No one responded.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Mercier stated no persons wished to speak on this item.

As there was no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Gage closed the public testimony

There was no Planning Commission deliberation.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Gage, seconded by Dean, to continue this item to a future meeting. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Dean, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Anderson. The motion was carried 6 to 0.*

### **MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Old Business Reports From Subcommittees**

**Historic Preservation (Standing):** This subcommittee met on January 13, 2022.

Mr. Willoughby stated they removed some tier determinations for the airport, as HPSC was not the lead authority for the properties.

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

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

**New Business**

Mr. Willoughby requested an update on industrial buildings within the city, at a future briefing.

**NOMINATIONS FOR SPECIAL RECOGNITION**

None at this time.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Zeledon stated the Monthly Activity Reports for November and December are in their packets.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Lampkin motioned to adjourn, seconded by Willoughby. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 PM.

  
Secretary Pro Tempore

  
Chairman, Planning Commission