

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

**MINUTES**

**July 26, 2022**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	2
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	2
CONSENT CALENDAR	
A-01. Minutes of June 28, 2022 .....	2
A-02. File No. PDEV19-047.....	2
A-03. File No. PDEV21-020 .....	3
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
B. File Nos. PVAR21-006 and PDEV21-033 .....	3
C. File Nos. PUD20-001 and PDEV20-009 .....	5
D. File No. PSPA22-003 .....	7
E. File Nos. PGPA20-002 and PADV22-002 .....	7
MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.....	11
DIRECTOR’S REPORT.....	11
ADJOURNMENT .....	12

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

**MINUTES**

**July 26, 2022**

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

**COMMISSIONERS**

**Present:** Chairman Willoughby, Vice-Chairman DeDiemar, Anderson, Dean, Gage, Lampkin, and Ricci (Arrived at 6:34 PM)

**Absent:** None

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Executive Director Community Development Murphy, Planning Director Zeledon, City Attorney Guiboa, Principal Planner Ruddins, Senior Planner Batres, Senior Planner Grahn, Associate Planner Aguilo, Associate Planner Antuna, Associate Planner Vaughn, Assistant Planner Morales, Assistant City Engineer Lee, and Planning Secretary Berendsen

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Anderson.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Zeledon stated that there was an updated resolution for Item D.

Mr. Lampkin commented about the Seeds of Joy event and program.

Mr. Ricci arrived at 6:34 PM.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one responded from the audience.

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

**A-01. MINUTES APPROVAL**

Planning/Historic Preservation Commission Minutes of June 28, 2022, approved as written.

**A-02. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE**

**NO. PDEV19-047:** A hearing to consider a Development Plan to construct 10 detached single-family dwellings on 10 vacant parcels totaling approximately 1.83 acres of land generally located at the northwest corner of Olive Street and Orange Avenue, within the LDR-5 (Low Density Residential – 2.1 to 5.0 du/ac) 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: 0108-481-18, 0108-481-19, 0108-481-20, 0108-481-21, 0108-481-22, 0108-481-23, 0108-481-24, 0108-481-25, 0108-481-26, and 0108-481-27) **submitted by Texton Construction Co., Inc.**

- A-03. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV21-020:** A hearing to consider a Development Plan to construct a 45,000-square-foot industrial building on 2.02 acres of land located at 1044 and 1050 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; (APNs: 1049-131-15 and 1049-131-016) **submitted by HK Ventures, Inc.**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by DeDietmar, seconded by Lampkin, to approve the Consent Calendar.*

*The June 28, 2022 minutes as written. It was approved (6-0), with Dean recusing himself as he was not at this meeting.*

*The remainder of the Consent Calendar, including Development Plan, File No. PDEV19-047, and Development Plan, File No. PDEV21-020, subject to conditions of approval. It was approved unanimously by those present (7-0).*

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- B. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND VARIANCE REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PDEV21-033 AND PVAR21-006:** A public hearing to consider a Development Plan (File No. PDEV21-033) to construct one 2,800-square-foot drive-thru restaurant with a 500-square-foot outdoor patio, in conjunction with a Variance (File No. PVAR21-006) to reduce the front drive aisle setback along an arterial street from 20 feet to 13 feet, on 0.42-acre of land located at 1610 East Fourth Street, within the CC (Community Commercial) 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) and Section 15305 (Class 5, Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations) 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; (APNs: 0110-181-11 and 0110-181-19) **submitted by Hannibal Petrossi.**

Associate Planner Vaughn, presented the staff report. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File Nos. PVAR21-006 and PDEV21-033, 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 if any measures were taken to limit the effect of headlights in the drive thru area.

Ms. Vaughn stated there will be a pony wall to block the car lights.

Mr. Zeledon stated prior to occupancy everything should be in place.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification on parking.

Ms. Vaughn responded.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification of keeping excess parking.

Ms. Vaughn explained the parking in the center.

Mr. Zeledon explained the parking and how calculations for the center were completed and the parking agreement within the center.

Mr. Ricci wanted clarification on the parking on the south side of the project.

Ms. Vaughn further explained the parking.

Mr. Ricci wanted to know about designated walkways from the southside parking.

Mr. Zeledon stated they would work with applicant to have a painted crosswalk there.

Mr. Ricci stated he liked the designated stop at the exit of the drive isle.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarification on the variance.

Ms. Vaughn responded.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know how does variance compare to the other businesses on 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Zeledon explained the setback of the buildings.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that parking is based on square footage.

Ms. Vaughn stated that is correct.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Hannibal Petrossi, the applicant for the project, spoke in favor of the project and thanked staff.

Mr. Willoughby asked if the applicant agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Petrossi stated yes.

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

Mr. Lampkin thanked the applicant for the Starbucks on Euclid Ave.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by Gage, to approve a resolution for the Variances, File No., PVAR21-006, and the Development Plan, File No. PDEV21-033, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, Dean, DeDiemar, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

C. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PUD20-001 & PDEV20-009:** A hearing to consider a Planned Unit Development (File No. PUD20-001) to establish development standards, design guidelines and infrastructure requirement for 0.81-acres of land, in conjunction with a Development Plan (File No. PDEV20-009) to construct a mixed-use project consisting of 59 multiple-family dwellings, 2,500 square feet of retail space, and two levels of podium parking, on property located at 549 West Holt Boulevard, within the MU-1 (Downtown Mixed-Use) 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) 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; (APN: 1049-021-09) **submitted by Kathy Huynh. City Council action is required on Planned Unit Development.**

Senior Planner Batres, presented the staff report. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for File No. PUD20-001, and to approve File No. PDEV20-009, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Gage asked regarding architecture and size and how it fits with the surrounding area.

Mr. Batres explained the Ontario Plan and looked at the surrounding area.

Mr. Zeledon explained the downtown districts and what the BRT will be bringing to the area and the vision that goes with this.

Mr. Ricci wanted to clarify if there would be double stacked parking on some of the spaces.

Mr. Batres stated those are tandem parking spaces, about 12 %.

Mr. Ricci wanted to know about commercial parking and access.

Mr. Batres responded.

Mr. Ricci wanted to know about retail access.

Mr. Batres stated there is front access at Holt.

Mr. Ricci wanted to clarify that access is only from front designated path.

Mr. Batres stated yes.

Mr. Zeledon clarified the site plan.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know the uses for retail spaces.

Mr. Batres responded.

Mr. Zeledon explained that the PUD explained those uses.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know about the waste management plan for the retail.

Mr. Batres responded.

Mr. Zeledon explained the trash enclosure areas.

Mr. Lampkin challenges for articulation on east and west elevations.

Mr. Zeledon responded.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know about trash truck access.

Mr. Batres explained the circulation plan.

Mr. Zeledon explained the waste management plan.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that the area to the east and west of the project will change in the future.

Mr. Zeledon stated that is correct.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Huynh, the applicant's son spoke in favor of the project and thanked staff.

Mr. Willoughby asked if they had done similar projects.

Mr. Huynh stated they have done expansions but this is their first whole project.

Mr. Gage wanted to know what type of retail was envisioned.

Mr. Huynh stated professional services or convenient stores.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if they would manage the property.

Mr. Sam Wang explained retail envisioned and stated they manage their own property.

Mr. Lampkin asked if the applicant agrees to the Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Kaleb Wong, representing the architects, stated they agree with the Conditions of Approval except with the finish.

Mr. Batres stated the finish will be approved during the plan check process.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know what the vision with the setbacks of the windows of the project.

Mr. Wong explained the process of the design, they wanted it to be keystone in the area.

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

Mr. Gage explained his reservations, but spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Willoughby spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Lampkin spoke in favor of the project.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Anderson, seconded by Ricci, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Planned Unit Development, File No., PUD20-001, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, Dean, DeDiemar, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

*It was moved by Ricci, seconded by Dean, to approve the Development Plan, File No., PDEV20-009, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, Dean, DeDiemar, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

- D. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PSPA22-003:** A public hearing to consider an amendment the Ontario Gateway Specific Plan, modifying Table 2.B (Permitted Land Uses by Planning areas) to allow "Auto Sales and Services" as a permitted land use in the Office Planning Area 1 land use district. The project is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) 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. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA. The property affected by this Specific Plan Amendment 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; (APN: 0210-212-60) **submitted by the City of Ontario. City Council action is required.**

Planning Director Zeledon, presented the staff report. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for File No. PSPA22-003, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution.

No one wished to speak.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one wished to speak.

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

Mr. Willoughby spoke in favor of this project.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Gage, seconded by DeDiemar, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Specific Plan Amendment, File No., PSPA22-003. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, Dean, DeDiemar, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

- E. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, AND COMMUNITY CLIMATE ACTION PLAN UPDATE FOR FILE NOS. PGPA20-002 AND PADV22-002:** A public hearing to consider certification of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2021070364), 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. PGPA20-002) for The Ontario Plan (TOP) update, including its component parts: Vision, Governance Manual, and Policy Plan; and [2] an update to the Community Climate Action Plan (File No. PADV22-002). 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; **City initiated. City Council action is required.**

Principal Planner Ruddins, presented the staff report. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for File Nos. PGPA20-002 (Parts A, B, and C) and PADV22-002, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarification on the Environmental Justice survey dates.

Ms. Ruddins stated it was a mistake and should be 2021.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know about the 2010 TOP outreach.

Ms. Ruddins stated the 2010 update took over two years and included extensive community outreach.

Mr. Lampkin development seeing result of what residents were asking for from the 2010 TOP.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Zeledon explained the outreach in 1998 and the 2010 land use plan and how the land use came into fruition.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know what percentage from last TOP to the proposed TOP, has changed to commercial.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know the percentage change of industrial.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if the environmental justice survey was mandatory or voluntary.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know some of the factors of influence for the land change.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to know the loss of agricultural land, with these changes.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that in 2010 there was no Ag land use and this TOP is just continuing with that.



Ms. Ruddins stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification on new buildings being all electric.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know where the cooling center locations.

Ms. Ruddins stated where the cooling centers are located.

Mr. Gage wanted to know about the input from other school districts.

Ms. Ruddins stated it was a point of outreach.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if Ontario kids will go to other school districts.

Mr. Zeledon responded.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification about air quality from construction.

Ms. Nicole Vermilion with Placeworks, the consultant for the project, responded

Mr. Gage wanted clarification on the effects of diesel trucks.

Ms. Vermilion responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if they will be going to electric trucks.

Ms. Vermilion responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to know how the future looks for electric cars and trucks.

Ms. Vermilion responded.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know about the clean idol requirements on diesel trucks has helped.

Ms. Vermilion responded and referred to the Air District.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know what are the impact of project CEQA review.

Ms. Vermilion responded.

Mr. Zeledon explained about the school districts in Ontario Ranch.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Anna Gonzales spoke in opposition of the item.

Cecil Howel spoke in opposition of the item.

Randy Beckandem spoke in opposition of the item.

Impara Miramontes spoke in opposition of the item.

Liz Senga spoke in opposition of the item.

Jasmine Cunningham spoke in opposition of the item.

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

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know the community meeting dates.

Ms. Ruddins explained the dates for each meeting.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know the number of meetings.

Ms. Ruddins stated 15.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification on each meeting.

Ms. Ruddins responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to know more about the small particulate matter.

Ms. Vermilion responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if small particulate should still be a concern.

Ms. Vermilion responded.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to clarify that the AG preserve is owned by private landowners.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to clarify that the current use can continue until the owner decides to change it.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to clarify if the AG use leaves, they can't do AG on the land anymore.

Mr. Zeledon responded.

Ms. DeDiemar explained her understanding of the annexed AG preserve and the current land uses.

Mr. Zeledon stated she was correct and expanded further.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that San Bernardino County still owns 200 acres down there.

Mr. Zeledon stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby spoke regarding his hesitation on telling landowners what they have to do with their land.

Mr. Lampkin spoke regarding the issue with Amy's Farm being a private matter.

Mr. Zeledon responded.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarification on the Environmental Justice survey.

Ms. Ruddins responded with the dates and expanded on the community outreach.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know about the 108 responses to surveys.

Ms. Ruddins stated these were specific to the environmental justice survey.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know about the letter not being legible.

Ms. Ruddins addressed this issue.

Mr. Gage spoke in favor of the speakers and wanted to know if we have any influence with SBC on the 200 acres of land they own and make this a historic land area.

Mr. Zeledon stated this has been an ongoing discussion with the County and explained about the farm hub that will be going into The Great Park.

Mr. Gage talked regarding the history of the AG area.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by Dean, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the General Plan Amendment (Parts A, B, and C), File No., PGPA20-002 and the Community Climate Action Plan, File No. PADV22-002. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, Dean, DeDiemar, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

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

#### **Old Business Reports From Subcommittees**

**Historic Preservation (Standing):** This subcommittee met on July 14, 2022.

Mr. Gage recapped the meeting.

**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**

Mr. Zeledon stated Monthly Activity reports are not available at this time and will be included in next month's packet.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Lampkin motioned to adjourn the meeting in memory of County Assessor Bob Dutton; it was agreed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 PM to the next regular meeting on August 23, 2022.

  
Secretary Pro Tempore

  
Chairman, Planning Commission