

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

**MINUTES**

**February 27, 2024**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	2
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	2
CONSENT CALENDAR	
A-01. Minutes of January 23, 2024 .....	2
A-02. File No. PDEV23-026 .....	2
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
B. File Nos. PUD22-006 and PDEV22-042 .....	4
C. File Nos. PUD23-002 and PDEV23-017 .....	9
MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.....	10
DIRECTOR’S REPORT.....	10
ADJOURNMENT .....	10

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

**MINUTES**

**February 27, 2024**

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

**COMMISSIONERS**

**Present:** Chairperson DeDiemar, Vice-Chairman Gage, Anderson, Del Turco, Lampkin and Ricci

**Absent:** Dean

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Community Development Executive Director Murphy, City Attorney Guiboa, Planning Director Noh, Principal Planner Eoff IV, Senior Planner Grahn, Senior Planner Ayala, Assistant Planner Morales, Senior Associate Engineer Tang, Assistant Engineer Fregoso, Traffic Manager Bautista, and Planning Secretary Berendsen

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Lampkin.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Noh stated no announcements or agenda changes.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No person from the public wished to speak at this time.

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

Mr. Gage pulled Item A-02 from the consent calendar.

**A-01. MINUTES APPROVAL**

Planning/Historic Preservation Commission Minutes of January 23, 2024, approved as written.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Ricci, seconded by Anderson, to approve the Consent Calendar, as amended. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, DeDiemar, Del Turco, Gage, Ricci; NOES, None; RECUSE, Lampkin; ABSENT, Dean. The motion was carried 5-0.*

**A-02. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV23-026:** A hearing to consider a Development Plan to construct 95 detached single-family dwellings and 96 attached multiple family dwelling units within 16 6-plex buildings on

approximately 19.62 acres of land generally located west of Haven Avenue, south of Riverside Drive and north of Chino Avenue, within the Planning Area 3 land use district of the West Haven Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with an Amendment to the West Haven Specific Plan, for which an Addendum to the West Haven Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 200471095) was adopted by the City Council on July 7, 2007. 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; (APN: 0218-151-10) **submitted by Landsea Homes. The Development Advisory Board recommended approval of this item on February 5, 2024, with a 5 - 0 vote.**

Assistant Planner Morales, presented the staff report. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File No. PDEV23-026, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolutions, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify the SCE trail will connect to the north and south.

Mr. Morales responded.

Mr. Noh responded.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to confirm on connecting the SCE trail with the developer to the south.

Mr. Noh responded.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to make sure there wouldn't be mixed product on the trail.

Mr. Noh stated they would make sure there is continuity.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to confirm that currently there isn't a security plan in place.

Mr. Noh responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to clarify that all the cluster units will have 2 parking spaces in garages.

Mr. Morales stated that is correct.

Mr. Gage wanted to confirm there will be driveways for parking as well.

Mr. Morales stated that is correct.

Mr. Gage wanted to clarify that the row-town product would also have garages.

Mr. Morales stated yes.

Mr. Gage wanted to know where the 200 additional parking stalls were located.

Mr. Morales explained.

Mr. Gage wanted to confirm that extra 200 aren't required parking.

Mr. Morales stated that is correct.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

Mr. Lampkin made comments regarding the SCE path and spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Gage spoke in favor of the project.

*It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by Ricci, to approve the Development Plan, File No. PDEV23-026, subject to conditions. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, DeDiemar, Del Turco, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci; NOES, None; RECUSE, None; ABSENT, Dean. The motion was carried 6-0.*

**PLANNING/HISTORIC COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- B. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PUD22-006 AND PDEV22-042:** A public hearing to consider: [1] a Planned Unit Development (File No. PUD22-006) to establish development standards and design guidelines for the 5.81-acre project site; and [2] a Development Plan (File No. PDEV22-042) to construct 357 apartment units and 3,800 square feet of commercial space on 5.81 acres of land, located at the northeast corner of Mountain Avenue and Fourth Street, within the MU-8b (Mountain/Fourth Mixed Use) zoning district. An Addendum to The Ontario Plan 2050 Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2021070364), which was certified by the City Council on August 16, 2022, was prepared. 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; (APNs: 1008-513-16, 1008-522-01, 1008-522-02, and 1008-522-03) **submitted by JAT Land Development LLC. The Development Advisory Board recommended approval of File No. PDEV22-042 on December 18, 2023, with an 8 – 0 vote. The Planning Commission continued this item from the January 23, 2024 meeting. City Council action is required for File No. PUD22-006.**

Senior Planner Grahn, presented the staff report. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Addendum and File No. PUD22-006 and approve File No. PDEV22-042, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolutions, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Del Turco wanted clarity on the parking.

Mr. Grahn clarified.

Mr. Del Turco wanted to know how the parking numbers are figured.

Mr. Noh stated it is per bedroom.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarity on how this is consistent to what is going on in the area and how it relates to the 2050 TOP.

Mr. Noh responded.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that this project is not part of housing elements numbers.

Mr. Noh stated that is correct, but will help meet the housing numbers.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if the BRT will connect there.

Mr. Noh stated not at this time, only along Holt Blvd.

Mr. Gage wanted to clarify that the parking garage six stories and 4 stories and will it be sitting above the parking structure.

Mr. Grahn responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to see the views again.

Mr. Grahn explained the parking structure.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if these would be rated as luxury apartments or low income apartments.

Mr. Grahn stated they would be market rate apartments.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if they could be changed later in regards to the income component, and made into a low income complex later.

Mr. Noh responded.

Mr. Gage wanted to know if the parking management program includes assigned spaces for each apartment, and why is this important.

Mr. Noh explained.

Mr. Gage wanted to confirm there would be two rows of trees on Fourth Street.

Mr. Grahn stated yes.

Mr. Noh explained the landscaping.

Mr. Gage wanted to know where the houses on Harvard closest to project site were.

Mr. Grahn responded.

Mr. Noh explained site plan was designed to mitigate the impact to the adjacent residents.

Mr. Ricci wanted to know if the traffic study had a comparison to what is there now with the residential use versus existing business/commercial uses.

Mr. Noh explained what was analyzed.

Mr. Ricci clarified that trips proposed were based on commercial.

Mr. Noh responded.

Mr. Ricci stated less traffic for residential rather than commercial.

Mr. Noh stated yes.

Ms. Dediemar wanted to know what would happen with the existing post office.

Mr. Grahn stated their existing lease expires in May 2026.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know if the post office will stay.

Mr. Noh stated it will depend on the applicant and the post office negotiations.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know if the parking structure will be enclosed parking.

Mr. Grahn stated the parking spaces are open.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know if there would be any storage available in the open parking.

Mr. Grahn stated no.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know what the gate between the project and Harvard looks like now and would consist of with the project.

Mr. Grahn explained the existing and what was proposed.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know about the traffic between the Harvard and Mountain.

Mr. Grahn stated there is no access to Mountain.

Mr. Del Turco wanted to confirm there would be 16 spots for guest parking.

Mr. Grahn stated there are about 47 spots would be available and 16 is what is required.

Mr. Del Turco clarify 16 spots for guests.

Mr. Grahn stated 47 spots.

Mr. Del Turco wanted to know if the applicant could increase the number of guest if landscape was adjusted.

Mr. Grahn stated no, all parking is within the structure.

Ms. DeDiemar stated her concerns regarding the height of the project and the visually, which makes it not fit in with what is there now.

Mr. Grahn responded.

Mr. Noh responded and stated this is a transition project for the corridor.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Cody Small representing the applicant, spoke regarding acquiring the property after city council approval, and that the team is available to answer questions.

Nancy Bumstead, with Bumstead Bicycles, a current business in the center, spoke regarding the applicant for the project giving financial assistance for remaining businesses on the property.

William Peniat, with William Computer Repair, a current business in the center, spoke regarding the developer taking care of the remaining tenants.

Ms. DeDiemar asked him what his business was.

Mr. Peniat stated a computer repair business.

Mark Terzano spoke regarding the EIR, traffic, noise, and Harvard access, in opposition of the project.

Rozanna Pitassi spoke opposition of the project.

Damian Ross spoke regarding the homeless, privacy, and Harvard access, in opposition of the project.

Victor Goball spoke regarding traffic, in opposition of the project.

Cody Small rebutted and stated once he owns the property, he would offer the existing 5 tenants \$1.00 a month rent until construction begins.

Mr. Gage asked if the applicant agreed with the conditions of approval.

Mr. Small stated yes.

Mr. Gage asked if the project would be gated.

Mr. Small stated it would not be gated but management staff will be there at all times.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that it isn't gated because the units are facing outwards.

Paul Anderson TCA Architects addressed the gating of the site, the parking garage lines of sight, in regards to the scale of the overall neighborhood, and the number of cars.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that the 5<sup>th</sup> level parking is roof top.

Mr. Anderson stated the 5<sup>th</sup> level parking is level with the rooftops.

Mr. Lampkin clarified that there is a partial basement underground parking.

Mr. Anderson stated yes, partial level.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if they know who will be managing the property.

Mr. Anderson referred to the developer.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know the security plan lighting of the parking structure.

Mr. Anderson stated it will be lit according to the police requirements.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if there would be patrol on sight.

Mr. Anderson deferred to the developer.

Luke Monagy with S&E Engineers, the environmental specialist explained the soil sampling remediation plan.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that a response plan has been developed but is being reviewed.

Mr. Monagy stated yes, it has to be reviewed by several agencies.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that the remediation didn't meet the requirements necessary for the

project.

Mr. Mongay stated it meets the current commercial use but needs remediation for residential.

Mr. Lampkin read the statement from the DTSC, and wanted to know how the project can go forward.

Mr. Noh explained the area effected and no permits will be issued till DTSC has approved plan.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to clarify that if the response plan is determined inadequate the project won't move forward.

Mr. Noh stated that is correct.

Mr. Lampkin wanted clarity on the security and lighting plan.

Mr. Small explained security and lighting plan.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know how they will mitigate safety concerns.

Mr. Small stated he would look into the plan.

Mr. Small explained about the post office.

Mr. Lampkin wanted to know if there was an offer made to the post office.

Mr. Small stated they don't have that amount of square footage,

Mr. Gage wanted to know if the Bank of America building for the post office or bike shop.

Mr. Small stated he encourages the communication.

Mr. Del Turco wanted to clarify the lease on the post office.

Mr. Small stated it terminates.

Mr. Noh stated Economic Development staff will help with relocation, and also that noticing was completed.

Ms. DeDiemar closed the public hearing.

Ms. DeDiemar reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Mark Terzano addressed the architecture regarding the height of the building.

Mr. Anderson the Architect responded.

Mr. Trazano wanted to know about trees being planted.

Mr. Anderson responded.

Mr. Trazano wanted to know if the trees would block the neighborhood.

Mr. Anderson explained.



Mr. Guiboa stated that Mr. Terzano's questions need to be addressed to the Commission and not the architect.

Ms. DeDiemar asked the Architect to address Mr. Trazano's concerns outside of the meeting.

As there was no one wishing to speak, Chairperson DeDiemar closed the public testimony

Mr. Ricci spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Gage spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Lampkin spoke in favor of the project.

Ms. Anderson spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Del Turco spoke in favor of the project.

Ms. DeDiemar spoke in favor of the project.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Ricci, seconded by Lampkin, to adopt a Resolution to recommend approval of the Addendum. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, DeDiemar, Del Turco, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci; NOES, None; RECUSE, None; ABSENT, Dean. The motion was carried 6-0.*

*It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by Anderson, to adopt a Resolution to recommend approval of the Planning Unit Development, File No. PUD22-006, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, DeDiemar, Del Turco, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci; NOES, None; RECUSE, None; ABSENT, Dean. The motion was carried 6-0.*

*It was moved by Gage, seconded by Ricci, to adopt a Resolution to approve the Development Plan, File No. PDEV22-042, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, DeDiemar, Del Turco, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci; NOES, None; RECUSE, None; ABSENT, Dean. The motion was carried 6-0.*

Short recess was taken.

- C. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PUD23-002 AND PDEV23-017:** A public hearing to consider a Planned Unit Development (File No. PUD23-002) to establish development standards and design guidelines for the project site in conjunction with a Development Plan (File No. PDEV23-017) to construct 69 multiple-family dwellings on approximately 1.19 acres of land located at 218 East D Street, 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 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: 1048-556-01, 1048-556-02, 1048-556-03, 1048-556-04, 1048-556-05, and 1048-556-14); **submitted by Euclid Investment Group, LLC. The Development Advisory Board recommended approval of File No. PDEV23-017 on February 21, 2024 with a 6 – 0 vote. City Council action is required for File No. PUD-23-002.**

Senior Planner Ayala, presented the staff report. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning

Commission recommend approval of File No. PUD23-002, and approve File No. PDEV23-017, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolutions, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Del Turco wanted to clarify what a podium courtyard is.

Ms. Ayala responded and explained.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Scott Felix, with Euclid Investment Group, complimented working the city staff on the project.

Mr. Gage asked the applicant if he agreed with the conditions of approval.

Mr. Felix stated yes.

As there was no one wishing to speak, Chairperson DeDiemar closed the public testimony

Mr. Lampkin spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Gage commented regarding the Planning Department staff.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Lampkin, seconded by Del Turco, to adopt a Resolution to approve the Development Plan, File No. PDEV23-017, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, DeDiemar, Del Turco, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci; NOES, None; RECUSE, None; ABSENT, Dean. The motion was carried 6-0.*

*It was moved by Gage, seconded by Lampkin, to recommend adoption of a Resolution to approve the Planned Unit Development, File No. PUD23-002, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Anderson, DeDiemar, Del Turco, Gage, Lampkin, Ricci; NOES, None; RECUSE, None; ABSENT, Dean. The motion was carried 6-0.*

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

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

**Historic Preservation (Standing): Did not meet this month.**

#### **NOMINATIONS FOR SPECIAL RECOGNITION**

None at this time.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Noh stated the Monthly Activity Reports were available.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

DeDiemar adjourned the meeting at 9:17 PM, to the next meeting on March 26, 2023.

  
Secretary Pro Tempore

  
Chairman, Planning Commission