

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

MINUTES

July 27, 2021

CONTENTS	PAGE
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	2
SPECIAL CEREMONIES	2
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	3
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	3
CONSENT CALENDAR	
A-01. Minutes of June 22, 2021	3
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
B. Appeal File No. PCUP21-002	3
C. File Nos. PCUP20-008 and PDEV20-010	9
D. File Nos. PCUP20-014 and PDEV20-017	10
E. File Nos. PCUP20-019 and PDEV20-029	11
MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.....	12
DIRECTOR’S REPORT.....	12
ADJOURNMENT	12

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

MINUTES

July 27, 2021

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

COMMISSIONERS

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

Absent: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Planning Director Zeledon, City Attorney Maldonado, Senior Planner Mejia, Senior Planner Grahn, Senior Planner Hutter, Associate Planner Aguilo, Assistant Planner Morales, Planning Intern Lomen, Assistant City Engineer Lee and Planning Secretary Berendsen

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Ricci.

SPECIAL CEREMONIES

Presentation to Robert Gregorek for his services as a Planning Commissioner for the last 25 years.

Mr. Zeledon spoke regarding Mr. Gregorek's 25 years of service on the Planning Commission and the unique perspective his geology background added, his love for the community and it's quality of life for all the citizens. He expressed his thanks for all the many major projects Mr. Gregorek has overseen in those 25 years, and recognized the major contribution he gave to the Historic Preservation Subcommittee and the preservation of the history of the city.

Mr. Murphy, Executive Director of the Community Development Agency, spoke about Mr. Gregorek's history on the Commission and expressed his appreciation of Bob's contribution to the city. Mr. Murphy wished him and his wife well.

Mr. Blum, a former Planning Director for the City of Ontario, spoke about Mr. Gregorek's love of poker and wine and expressed his admiration of the qualities that contributed to him being a successful Commissioner and his focus on the city and his good planning practices.

Mr. Zeledon presented a video in Mr. Gregorek's honor.

Several of the Commissioners expressed their appreciation for Mr. Gregorek's years of service and the example he set and how much he will be missed.

Mr. Gregorek spoke and thanked everyone and stated that was his fun job and how much he enjoyed serving the community and accomplished a lot.

There was a short recess for a reception to honor Mr. Gregorek.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Zeledon stated there are revised redlined Engineering conditions for Item C. He also welcomed Commissioner Guadalupe Anderson and gave a little background about her.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

A worker for the D'Andre Lampkin Foundation spoke and informed the Commission of a backpack back-to-school drive coming up, through the D'Andre Lampkin Foundation.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

A-01. MINUTES APPROVAL

Planning/Historic Preservation Commission Minutes of June 22, 2021, approved as written.

It was moved by DeDiemar, seconded by Ricci, to approve the Planning Commission Minutes of June 22, 2021, as written. The motion was carried 5 to 0. Mr. Willoughby and Ms. Anderson recused themselves, as they were not present at the last meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- B. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND APPEAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR FILE NO. PCUP21-002:** An appeal of the Zoning Administrator's approval of a Conditional Use Permit to establish and construct a second floor 574 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) above an existing covered patio exceeding 16 feet in height on 0.245-acre of land located at 1515 South San Antonio Avenue, within the RE-2 (Rural Estate—0 to 2.0 DU/Acre) zoning district. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301 (Class 1, Existing Facilities) 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); (APN: 1050-031-44) **submitted by Won Jun Choi. The Zoning Administrator approved this item on May 17, 2021.**

Mr. Gage reviewed the procedures for the appeal.

Planning Intern Lomen, presented the staff report. She described the location and surrounding area and the history of the item, and the decision of the Zoning Administrator. She described the site plan, floor plan, elevations, architectural design, height of the project, the appellant's issues and staff response to them, and the conditions surrounding the project. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission uphold the Zoning Administrator's decision to approve File No. PCUP21-002, 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 the dimension of the second story landing, in front of the door.

Mr. Zeledon stated it would be 6 feet.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification that the zoning allows for homes to be up to 35 feet in height.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes that is correct, the code allows up to 35 feet.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The appellant, Mr. Roldan spoke and expressed the reason he purchased this home 20 years ago was because it was a large lot and expressed that his wife is a realtor and that this addition will affect the value of the homes. He stated the proposed ADU on the plans sits on top of the existing patio and looks like a treehouse and appears like some of the hotels on Holt. He stated the existing patio height is 17 feet and the proposed ADU will take it up by 10 feet. He expressed that the windows that are facing north will have privacy glass but there is a door and a staircase that faces them and there will be no privacy from those. He stated he brought pictures from his master bathroom and sketched what it would look like and all they would see is stucco and that this ADU would be a huge overshadowing where they have barbecues and family time. He stated the area is a single story area and all I see is house, because the gable of the house is already huge and this is going above it and directly in our line of site. He expressed that they could have converted the garage or enclosed the patio, but the neighbor wants it above so they can enjoy their open area, but at our expense and we are discussed by it. He stated the neighbors gave him a deceitful letter that stated it was for his elderly in-laws and he knows that you don't put elderly people upstairs, so the story has changed. He stated the pictures puts in place what we will be looking at and he has shown the facts and impacts on their family. He stated the wall has a grade, their property sits like a stage the wall looks much taller on the neighbors side and this addition will look right into our master bathroom and it will be in front of our kitchen and patio views.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to see Mr. Roldan's pictures and wanted to clarify what was to the right of his lattice patio covered structure.

Mr. Roldan stated that it is the master bathroom area and bedroom.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that to the east of that is a storage area with sheds.

Mr. Roldan stated that is correct.

Mr. Lampkin sent well wish to Mr. Roldan's wife and wanted clarification on the grade difference.

Mr. Roldan stated that when the pool was being put in, they had to add two more sections so the wall would be high enough on their side. He stated the neighbors patio is the same level as his house and when you stand in the neighbors backyard you are eye level with his covered patio.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that if picture number 3 of the presentation gives an accurate idea of how the wall compares.

Mr. Roldan stated yes, the window that is showing is the bathroom window, and the patio is exposed and the aerial view where the corner meets the house, that is the kitchen window and we can see all that sky, but all we will see is building when the addition goes in.

Tamara Soussan, the representative for the applicant and designer for the project was present and stated they designed the structure to meet the zoning requirements, and the entire project is 26 x 22 feet and will sit where the open patio is and the height will be about 8 foot higher and with the corner and angle of the house the occupants won't see the pool which is 80 feet away. She stated they have included privacy glass in the kitchen and the small window at the entrance, so the occupant won't be able to see out onto the neighbor's property.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify it would be the same footprint as the existing patio.

Ms. Soussan stated yes.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know the height of the ADU.

Ms. Soussan stated it would be 24.7 feet above the existing patio and you would see a 3 foot difference from San Antonio.

Mr. Gage wanted to clarify that this project is south of the appellant's property and doesn't hinder a mountain view.

Ms. Soussan stated it didn't appear to hinder a mountain view.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if the privacy glass would be a film over the glass or a permanent glass.

Ms. Soussan stated it would be a permanent solution as it is a type of glass and there are several designs to choose from.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know why the stairway would be placed on the north side versus the east.

Ms. Soussan stated that was the only place, because of the 10 foot setback from the south, and because of the fence and pool, so it was the logical place to put it.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know what would stop the occupant from hanging out on the landing overlooking the appellant's property.

Ms. Soussan stated it is only 3 foot deep and meant for access only, and the open patio below is the area they would hang out at.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if the applicant informed the neighbors that the in-laws would live there.

Ms. Soussan stated that originally when we spoke it was for his elderly in-laws or parents.

Mr. Gage wanted to know why they didn't build it where the patio currently is.

Ms. Soussan stated it would block the windows from the bedrooms below and they wanted to maintain the place to sit for the pool area.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that if it was built on ground level, if it created a safety access issue for the house.

Ms. Soussan stated they would have to redesign the interior to exit from the backyard door to the patio.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if there was anywhere else a detached ADU could go on the property.

Ms. Soussan stated that for the amount of space needed, she doesn't think so and based on the setbacks and the pool, the answer is no.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarification regarding the two exits to the rear and if you put the it on the floor level, would all exits be blocked.

Ms. Soussan stated the sliding glass door that is currently below the patio would be blocked

Mr. Lampkin wanted the clarify that not all the exits would be blocked.

Ms. Soussan stated only one would be blocked.

The daughter of the appellant, Aimee Roldan spoke and stated she has spent her life in this home before the neighbor's home was there, once the home goes up and different people are coming in and out of the

home over the years, she started to see men's faces over the wall and could see from our patio, which sits higher because of the grade and she could see into their home and see what was going on. She stated as she grew older, she could see men's faces looking longer, and staring. She stated that because of their raised grade with the entire backyard facing the neighbor's entire side yard, you can see into the neighbor's house and the aerial doesn't show how high our patio sits and how much you can see, unless you are there. She stated that where this intended structure is going to be, people are going to be on the landing, where they will be able to look directly down into the single bathroom in the house, that we all use.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification regarding the one bathroom everyone uses.

Ms. Roldan stated there are multiple bathrooms but that is the bathroom everyone uses for showering, because this is the safe place.

Mr. Gage wanted clarification regarding the privacy concerns before the ADU and after the ADU, with the windows you can't see out of.

Ms. Roldan stated there is an uncomfotability she has grown up with because of the position of the house and her bedroom and now this ADU would be taking away any privacy for the yard and this structure would look over from the back corner and you can have privacy glass, but you can't make the staircase private.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if typically, when people come over to use the pool, if that is the bathroom primarily used.

Ms. Roldan stated not when other people come over, but more by the family, in the homes daily activities.

Mr. Roldan stated the master bath has a nicer shower for daily use, and his family of four uses that shower. He stated he has the letter from the neighbor regarding his elderly in-laws. He expressed that the neighbors want to keep the patio for their enjoyment, but at his family's expense. He expressed that even though the footprint is 600 square feet, it's straight up, and the footprint upwards is very large. He stated because San Antonio slopes he can see from the kitchen windows past the dairies and stated the value of his home and the neighbor's home and when you put something like this next to a million dollar home it just doesn't function right and doesn't have the flow.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that because of the slope they can see past the dairies from the kitchen looking across down San Antonio.

Mr. Roldan stated no, that from the back side of the house our view you can currently see to Fern and the picture he brought is our view and it will block everything. He stated he took the picture from the bathroom and looking from the patio and stated his daughter does outdoor gardens in that area.

Mr. Zeledon wanted to give some context that the RE zone does allow for 35 feet structures, but a conditional use permit is required to mitigate impacts. He stated this site was once vacant and people have the ability to develop their property. He stated that the applicant had to meet the 10 foot setbacks, and wanted to utilize the space to the best of their ability. He stated that if they convert the garage, then you have nowhere to park and we looked at the context of the neighborhood and yes it's going to sit above the patio and the appellat states it's going to look like stilts, but we are going to make sure it is designed well and there is a 5 foot wall limiting visibility. He stated the grades do go from north to south which makes the applicant's visibility more limited and we looked at it carefully because we wanted to make sure that the structure above the patio maintained the 10 foot setback which is required and a 35 foot setback from the wall and house would block the view of the neighbor's pool, and second we added the frosted glass. He expressed that we understand that privacy is an important issue and we have mitigated to the best of the ability, but people can enjoy their property and the applicant wanted access to his pool and

when it comes to ADUs we are regulated by the state. He explained that ADUs are to provide additional housing and it doesn't matter who lives or rents there. We hope the new owners are respectful of their neighbors, but we can't control that and this project is consistent with the neighborhood and with the state guidelines. He stated staff still supports the project.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that it is a five foot wall on the applicant's side.

Mr. Zeledon stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if it could be raised a foot.

Mr. Zeledon stated it could be raised a foot to a 6 foot block wall out the house from applicant's side.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that if it was taken to 6 feet it would block the applicant's view of the house.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes.

Mr. Willoughby stated he wanted to address the concern of the appellant's daughter regarding people looking over.

Mr. Zeledon stated that with the grade as is, at 5 feet, walking back and forth, it would take an effort to look over the wall. He stated that this is becoming pretty common to only have 4 foot setbacks in Ontario Ranch which is why they frost the windows for privacy.

Mr. Dean wanted to confirm that this project follows all state, city and county codes.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes it does.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if the project was built on the first floor, could it be consistent with code and state laws.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes, but there would be some issues because of the pool, and the required setbacks from it, or they would have to eliminate the pool and put a detached ADU or covert the garage, but the property is a smaller lot for the area so they are very limited. He stated it would be a challenge.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if there are other properties with second story additions to the rear and if staff had aerial shots of those and what is adjacent to that.

Mr. Zeledon stated that because of the high vaulted pitch of the roofs in the area, it is only going to be 3 feet above the existing roof line and staff feels pretty confident the project will maintain the values of the neighborhood.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know staff was aware if the house down the street with an addition had access from the outside or interior.

Mr. Zeledon stated no, it might be just a regular addition and explained that there are different types of ADUs and most ADUs will have an access from the outside. He explained that the landing is 6 feet wide, but that it is 3 feet at the landing and then 3 feet to the door, this is not a 6 foot area to congregate.

Mr. Lampkin stated that you could put a chair out there.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes.

Mr. Gage wanted to clarify that the applicant wanted to build above the patio, to have access to the pool and is there room north to build it and still have access.

Mr. Zeledon stated that bedroom one and bedroom three currently have access to the backyard area, they would have to redesign the existing access but they could possibly put a smaller unit there, however for functionality and the ability to gather underneath it, next to the pool, going above is a lot easier.

Mr. Gage wanted to know with the state laws regarding ADUs do we have a choice to deny this.

Attorney Maldonado stated it weighs in favor of you not having an option to deny, because it meets all the standards and the decision is based on what is raised in the appeal, so if you deny it you would have to agree with one of the three reasons as to why he wanted you to deny it.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify if we were to ask the designer to place the ADU on the first floor, would that put us within compliance with state law regarding the need to approve or deny.

Attorney Maldonado stated no, because that would require a denial, you have to approve or deny based on the reasons the appellant raised.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarification on the three reasons the appellant gave for denial.

Mr. Zeledon went over the three reasons.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that on the appeal form the statement that additional square footage can be obtained by enclosing the patio, is not a bullet point for denial.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes, they could convert the patio and access to the pool is an issue, but as is they meet all state and development codes and it is consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify it is also within homeowner's right.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes.

Ms. Soussan stated she thinks the staff did an excellent job of presenting the project and she did design it within the parameters of the code and feels they are in compliance.

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

Mr. Lampkin stated that the new state law requires at cities to look at options for ADUs and we have to look at it and if it meets the conditions and it is the right of the property owners, and we need to entertain such projects.

Mr. Gage stated that when something like this goes up next to your house, privacy is an issue when it is above a patio. He stated he can understand the reservations of the appellant and he they want access to pool and access from the house and laws regulate how close to the pool and the city has mitigated what they can and it won't be 35 feet high and only 3 feet from the current house, with privacy windows and if this was on the north property line, he would have more objections and wanted to know if there were any complaints from southern neighbors.

Mr. Zeledon stated there are no other complaints from the south.

Mr. Gage stated that they would have to depend on the planning department so it is designed to not look like a tree house above a patio. He stated he understands both sides.

Mr. Ricci stated he understands couple thoughts because his property sits the same way and think mitigate all the concerns and could there be an enclosed staircase, or for upper portion to be enclosed. However, he understands we have to abide by the state and make accommodation for ADUs and one thing we need to do is trust my neighbor to be mindful of other neighbors, when you live in a community and you adapt and trust people don't take advantage.

Mr. Zeledon stated no we haven't, not sure how it would work with a lattice or full enclosure and designed with stucco as you go up and he wanted to remind them that the staircase is 35 feet away from property line.

Mr. Ricci stated he understands and we really have to consider this.

Mr. Lampkin clarified that we have to pay attention to the laws and what we have to do and we sympathize with Mr. Roldan and we have to evaluate it on what the state laws says.

Mr. Willoughby stated that as staff has indicated they have met all the codes, regulations and have tried to mitigate as much as possible and he know we all have to deal with privacy issues and he understands.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Willoughby, seconded by Dean, to adopt a resolution to uphold the Zoning Administrator's decision to approve the Conditional Use Permit, File No., PCUP21-002, 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.

Mr. Zeledon stated they have 10 days to appeal the Planning Commission decision to City Council.

- C. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR FILE NOS. PDEV20-010 AND PCUP20-008:** A Development Plan (File No. PDEV20-010) to construct a 3,306 square foot convenience store, a 953 square foot carwash and fueling station in conjunction with a Conditional Use Permit (File No. PCUP20-008) to establish alcoholic beverage sales for a Type 21 ABC License (Off-Sale General) on 0.97 acres of land located on the southeast corner of Holt Boulevard and Grove Avenue, within the Business Park zoning district. Staff has determined that 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: 0110-131-01 and 0110-131-19) **submitted by Mr. Amer Chris Sabbah.**

Senior Planner Mejia, presented the staff report. She described the location and surrounding area and current condition of the parcel. She described the site plan and the street widening for BRT that will be coming in the next 3 – 7 years, access and internal circulation, parking, elevations and architectural design, interim landscaping, the convenience store and it's floor plan, and the CUP requested for alcohol sales and the location of the alcohol items. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File Nos. PCUP20-008 and PDEV20-010, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolutions, and subject to the conditions of approval.

No one responded.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant, Chris Sabbah was present and stated this is an awkward shaped property in an under-served area and with development on the rise in the area, the design will bring a lot of character to that corner.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if he had a timeline for the project.

Mr. Sabbah stated they would like to start it right away.

Mr. Ricci wanted to know if there would be security cameras at the back of the car wash as it will be an obscured area.

Mr. Sabbah stated there will be a lot of security and lighting that will be in place throughout the whole property.

Mr. Ricci stated this was one of his concerns.

Mr. Zeledon stated that this is a condition of approval from the police department to have surveillance cameras.

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

Mr. Willoughby stated this would be the only gas station from Vineyard to Mountain.

Mr. Zeledon stated yes that is correct, because the north side doesn't allow for gas stations.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Willoughby, seconded by Lampkin, to adopt a resolution to approve the Conditional Use Permit, File No., PCUP20-008, and the Development Plan, File No., PDEV20-010, subject to the amended 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, DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PDEV20-017 AND PCUP20-014: A Development Plan (File No. PDEV20-017) and Conditional Use Permit (File No. PCUP20-014) to construct and establish a 60-foot tall stealth (AT&T) wireless telecommunications facility (mono-eucalyptus) with a 1,040 square foot equipment enclosure/lease area on 1.71 acres of land located on the east side of Oaks Avenue, approximately 500 feet south of Phillips Street, within the AR-2 (Residential-Agricultural – 0 to 2.0 DUs/Acre) zoning district. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 3 (Class 15303, New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) 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); (APN: 1014-121-04) **submitted by AT&T.**

Mr. Ricci recused himself from this item, as he works for the applicant.

Associate Planner Aguilo, presented the staff report. She described the location and the surrounding area and existing condition of the property. She described the site plan, landscaping, elevations and photo stimulation. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File Nos. PCUP20-

014 and PDEV20-017, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolutions, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know who owns the property.

Ms. Aguilo stated Southern California Edison.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. John Pappas representing AT&T was present and stated he was here to answer any questions.

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

Mr. Lampkin stated he thinks with this design, this will blend nicely into the community

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by Dean, to adopt a resolution to approve the Conditional Use Permit, File No., PCUP20-014 and the Development Plan, File No., PDEV20-017, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, Dean, DeDiemar, Gage, Lampkin, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, Ricci; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 6 to 0.

- E. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR FILE NOS. PDEV20-029 AND PCUP20-019:** A Development Plan (File No. PDEV20-029) and Conditional Use Permit (File No. PCUP20-019) to construct and establish an outdoor trailer truck storage facility on 3.44 acres of land located at 5601 East Santa Ana Street, within the Utility Corridor (UC) 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 (ALUCP); (APN: 238-081-64) **submitted by EPD Solutions.**

Assistant Planner Morales, presented the staff report. He described the location, surrounding area, and existing condition of the property. He described the elevations, landscape, and internal circulation. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File Nos. PCUP20-019 and PDEV20-029, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Dean wanted to know if they would use the current address of the existing building.

Mr. Morales stated that is correct.

Mr. Zeledon stated that once the project is built the building will probably be issued a separate address.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jeremy Krout representing the applicant, was present and stated he was here to answer any questions.

Mr. Lampkin security plan for the site and how while there be access.

Mr. Krout stated during the daytime the gates will be open to allow access and there would be CC TV that

will be monitoring the site and the ingress and egress on a regular basis and for night access there will be key fobs that will be used.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that there would not be on site supervision.

Mr. Krout stated security personnel would be rotating through, but would not be on the site.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if the 55 spaces would allow for a 53 feet truck and trailer to park there.

Mr. Krout stated the parking is for the trailer portion only.

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

Mr. Lampkin stated this would be a vast improvement to the area.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by Ricci, to adopt a resolution approving the Conditional Use Permit, File No., PCUP20-019 and the Development Plan, File No. PDEV20-029, subject to the 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.

MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Old Business Reports From Subcommittees

Historic Preservation (Standing): This subcommittee did not meet.

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 the Monthly Activity Reports are included in their packet and once again acknowledged Mr. Gregorek's service on the Planning Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Willoughby motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Ricci. The meeting was adjourned at 9:41 PM to the next meeting on August 24, 2021.

Heaven Beundersen
Secretary Pro Tempore

[Signature]
Chairman, Planning Commission