

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

MINUTES

July 23, 2019

CONTENTS	PAGE
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	3
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	3
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	3
CONSENT CALENDAR	
A-01. Minutes of June 25, 2019.....	3
A-02. PDEV19-037	3
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
B. File No. PHP19-006	4
C. File Nos. PMTT19-001 & PDEV19-004.....	5
D. File No. PMTT18-010	6
E. File Nos. PVAR17-004, PMTT17-004 & PDEV17-015	7
F. File No. PGPA19-002	9
G. File No. PDEV18-041	9
H. File No. PDEV18-042	9
I. File No. PSPA18-010	12
J. File No. PDEV18-039	12
K. File Nos. PCUP18-041 & PDEV18-040	17
L. File No. PDA17-001	20
MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.....	21
DIRECTOR’S REPORT.....	22

ADJOURNMENT 22

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

MINUTES

July 23, 2019

REGULAR MEETING: City Hall, 303 East B Street
Called to order by Chairman Willoughby at 6:35 PM

COMMISSIONERS

Present: Chairman Willoughby, Vice-Chairman DeDiemar, Gregorek,
Reyes and Ricci

Absent: Downs and Gage

OTHERS PRESENT: Planning Director Wahlstrom, Assistant Planning Director Zeledon, City Attorney Graham, Development Administrative Officer Womble, Senior Planner Ayala, Senior Planner Batres, Senior Planner Mejia, Associate Planner Aguilo, Associate Planner Chen, Traffic Manager Jay Bautista and Planning Secretary Berendsen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner DeDiemar.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Wahlstrom stated the applicant for Item C has requested a continuance to the August 27, 2019 meeting to work out some site plan issues and there is new correspondence from Lozeau Drury and applicant Scott Denham for Items F-H and those items are before them.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one responded from the audience.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

A-01. MINUTES APPROVAL

A-02. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV19-037: A Development Plan (File No. PDEV19-037) to construct 3.5 acres of park land for the previously approved Tentative Tract Map 20081 (File No. PMTT17-003) located at the northeast corner of Ontario Ranch Road and Haven Avenue, within the Mixed Use District Planning Area 6A of the Rich Haven Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously analyzed in an

addendum to The Rich Haven Specific Plan File (No. PSP05-004) EIR (SCH# 2006051081) certified by the City Council on December 4, 2007 and an Addendum to The Ontario Plan (File No. PGPA06-001) EIR (SCH# 2008101140) certified by the City Council on January 27, 2010. This application is consistent with the previously adopted EIR and introduces no new significant environmental impacts. All previously adopted mitigation measures shall be a condition of project approval and are incorporated herein by reference. 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: 218-211-02 and 218-211-05) **submitted by Brookfield Residential.**

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Ricci, to approve the Consent Calendar including the Planning Commission Minutes of June 25, 2019, as written and the Development Plan, File No. PDEV19-037, subject to conditions of approval. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ITEM

- B. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PHP19:006** A request to install up to 3 monument entry signs on the Euclid Avenue median near the I-10, and the SR-60 on/off ramps. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15331 (Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation) and Section 153311 (Accessory 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); **City initiated.**

Senior Planner Ayala, presented the staff report. She described the existing signs, the current locations and the proposed design for the new signs. She explained why a certificate of appropriateness is required for the replacement of the signs. She stated that staff is recommending the Historic Preservation Commission approve File No. PHP19-006, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know if the sign replacement would include any landscaping or lighting improvements.

Ms. Ayala stated no landscape is proposed but the signs will include some up-lighting.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification regarding the up-lighting and if the signs are one sided and a little wider and higher than the existing.

Ms. Ayala stated there is no up-lighting on the current signs and yes they will be one sided and wider and higher than the existing signs.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one responded.

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

Mr. Reyes stated the lighting should be better than what is there now and he is glad about the height and would like to see some nice landscaping or shrubberies included.

Mr. Ricci stated it is an excellent design and is happy they are upgrading the existing signs, as it will bring character and shows we care about our city.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION

Acting as the Historic Preservation Commission, it was moved by Ricci, seconded by DeDiemar, to adopt a resolution to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, File No., PHP19-006, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

- C. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PMTT19-001 (PM 19993) AND PDEV19-004:** A Tentative Parcel Map (File No. PMTT19-001/PM 19993) to subdivide 10.68 acres of land into two parcels, in conjunction with a Development Plan (File No. PDEV19-004) to construct one multitenant commercial building totaling 5,000 square feet, located at the southwest corner of Via Turin and Fourth Street, at 4170 East Fourth Street, within the Retail land use district of the Piemonte Overlay District of the Ontario Center Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with File No. PSPA16-003, a Specific Plan Amendment for which a Mitigated Negative Declaration was previously adopted by the City Council on May 16, 2017. This application introduces no new significant environmental impacts and all previously-adopted mitigation measures are a condition of project approval. 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: 0210-204-27) **submitted by Ontario Covenant Group, LLC.** This item was continued from the June 25, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated this item is requested to be continued to the August 27, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one responded.

There was no Planning Commission deliberation.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

As the public hearing was still open on this item, Mr. Willoughby asked for a verbal approval to continue File Nos., PMTT19-001 and PDEV19-004, to the August 27, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

- D. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PMTT18-010:** A Tentative Parcel Map (File No. PMTT18-010, TPM 20087) to subdivide 17.92 acres of land into two parcels, for property located at 4900 East Fourth Street, within the Commercial/Office land use district of the California Commerce Center North/Ontario Gateway Plaza/Wagner Properties (Ontario Mills) Specific Plan. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15315 (Class 15: Minor Land Divisions) 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: 0238-014-05) **submitted by Retail Properties of America Inc.**

Associate Planner Chen, presented the staff report. He described the location, the surrounding area and the history of the property. He described the parcel sizes, the future development proposed and the access and parking. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File No. PMTT18-010, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Gregorek wanted to know what was anticipated for the new parcel.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that it is anticipated to be a sit down restaurant.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. John Jennings representing the applicant, appeared and stated he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if there was a potential tenant.

Mr. Jennings stated they are currently in negotiations with a national restaurant.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if there was a build out time line.

Mr. Jennings stated they anticipated it to be approximately one year to completion.

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

There was no Planning Commission deliberation.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Reyes, seconded by Ricci, to adopt a resolution to approve the Tentative Parcel Map, File No., PMTT18-010, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

- E. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND VARIANCE REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PMTT17-004, PDEV17-015 AND PVAR17-004:** A request for certain entitlements that include: 1) A Tentative Tract Map (File No. PMTT17-004/TT18373) to subdivide 1.42 acres of land into a single parcel for condominium purposes; 2) a Development Plan (File No. PDEV17-015) to construct 17 multi-family residential units; and 3) a Variance (File No. PVAR17-004) to reduce the required building side yard setback from 10 feet to 5 feet, reduce the building separation requirements for garage to garage from 30 feet to 26 feet, and dwelling front to front from 30 feet to 23 feet. The project is located at 920 South Cypress Avenue within the MDR18 zoning district. The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15305 (Class 5, Minor Alterations in Land Use) and Section 15332 (Class 32, Infill 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). (APN: 1011-401-07) **submitted by SKG Pacific Enterprises, Inc.**

Senior Planner Mejia, presented the staff report. She described the location and the surrounding area. She explained what is currently there and what is proposed. She described the 17 units and seven buildings including the architectural design being proposed. She described the proposed access, park amenities, parking and landscaping. She explained the changes in the development code that require these variances. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File Nos. PVAR17-004, PMTT17-004 and PDEV17-015, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Gregorek wanted clarification of what is to the south of the project.

Ms. Mejia stated there is existing multi-family to the south.

Mr. Gregorek wanted to know if there were separate land owners for the properties.

Ms. Mejia stated that was correct.

Mr. Reyes wanted to clarify that it is going to be gated.

Ms. Mejia stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to verify that there are 34 garage parking spaces and 12 open parking spaces.

Ms. Mejia stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that the CC&Rs reflect storage in the garage, so that the tenants won't be using the open space parking, because they are using the garage for storage.

Ms. Mejia stated yes this is standard in the CC&Rs and the proposed floor plans have additional storage for the tenants to use.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify the color in the artist rendering which looks bright yellow.

Ms. Mejia stated it is more of a light beige sandy color being proposed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ray Allard with Allard Engineering, representing the applicant appeared.

Mr. Reyes asked if the WQP would be underground or in the park area.

Mr. Allard stated it would be underground. He stated that he agrees with the COAs and would make sure the CCRs would be followed in regards to no storage in the garages. He also thanked staff for working with them on this difficult narrow property.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification if the trash would be in a community dumpster or individual.

Mr. Allard stated it would be individual.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know where the trash cans would be kept.

Mr. Allard stated the proposed garages are widened by 2 feet to accommodate them.

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

Mr. Reyes commended the developer for making the site work and that the benefits far outweigh the slimness of the lots, with the landscaping and park.

Mr. Willoughby stated that sometimes infill projects are a challenge and this is a great job on design working with the lot.

Mr. Reyes stated he is for the variance approval as they are minimal compared to what this project brings to the community.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Reyes, to adopt a resolution to approve the Variance, File No. PVAR17-004, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by DeDiemar, to adopt a resolution to approve the Tentative Tract Map (TM 18373), File No. PMTT17-004, and the Development Plan, File No., PDEV17-015, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

F. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT FOR FILE NO. PGPA19-002:

An Amendment to the Policy Plan (General Plan) component of The Ontario Plan to: [1] modify the Land Use Plan (Exhibit LU-01), changing the land use designation for 7.85 acres of land, from General Commercial to Industrial, located at the 1155 South Wanamaker Avenue, within the Light Industrial land use district of the California Commerce Center Specific Plan; [2] modify the Land Use Plan (Exhibit LU-01), changing the land use designation for 2.8 acres of land, from General Commercial to Industrial, generally located at the northeast corner of Wall Street and Wanamaker Avenue, within the Light Industrial land use district of the Pacific Gate-East Gate Specific Plan; and [3] modify the Future Buildout Table (Exhibit LU-03) to be consistent with the land use designation changes with the Policy Plan. Staff is recommending the adoption of an Addendum to The Ontario Plan (File No. PGPA06-001) Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2008101140) certified by City Council on January 27, 2010. This application introduces no new significant environmental impacts, and all previously-adopted mitigation measures are a condition of project approval. 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: 0238-221-36 and 0238-221-23) **City Initiated. City Council action is required.**

G. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV18-041:

A Development Plan to construct one industrial building totaling 178,462 square feet on 7.85 acres of land, located on the southeast corner of Wall Street and Wanamaker Avenue at 1155 South Wanamaker Avenue, within the Light Industrial land use district of the California Commerce Center Specific Plan. Staff is recommending the adoption of an Addendum to The Ontario Plan (File No. PGPA06-001) Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2008101140) certified by City Council on January 27, 2010. This application introduces no new significant environmental impacts, and all previously-adopted mitigation measures are a condition of project approval. 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: 0238-221-36) **submitted by Bridge Acquisition, LLC.**

H. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV18-042:

A Development Plan to construct one industrial building totaling 90,291 square feet on 4.05 acres of land, located on the northeast corner of Wall Street and Wanamaker Avenue, within the Light Industrial land use district of the Pacific Gate-East Gate Specific Plan. Staff is recommending the adoption of an Addendum to The Ontario Plan (File No. PGPA06-001) Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2008101140) certified by City Council on January 27, 2010. This application introduces no new significant environmental impacts, and all previously-adopted mitigation

measures are a condition of project approval. 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: 0238-221-23) **submitted by Bridge Acquisition, LLC.**

Associate Planner Aguilo, presented the staff report. She described the location and the surrounding area with their uses and the need for the General Plan Amendment. She described the site and access and the proposed architectural design, landscaping and parking. She stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval for the Addendum and File No. PGPA19-002, and approval for the Development Plans, File Nos. PDEV18-041 and PDEV18-042, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification that the finishes in the renderings are accurate in regards to design.

Ms. Aguilo stated that is correct.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know if the design is painted material or something else.

Ms. Aguilo stated they are paint material and the form liners are along the whole building wrapped around.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know if there are employee areas.

Ms. Aguilo stated yes they are located closer to the office entries.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know if additional screening was requested along the freeway to buffer truck docks.

Ms. Aguilo stated the screens walls are proposed at 12 feet for building A and 8 feet for building B so that all the dock doors are adequately screened.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if the screen walls for building A, are 12 feet high so the docks aren't visual from the freeway.

Ms. Aguilo stated yes they reflect what is needed to adequately buffer the dock doors, according to the line of sight analysis done from the middle of the closest lane of the freeway.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Scott Denham with Bridge Acquisitions, appeared and stated this project conforms with the light industrial zoning and the Pacific Gate-East Gate Specific Plan. He stated he is looking forward to bringing these state of the art, class A buildings, which will bring more jobs and help the robust economic growth within the city. He stated they have enjoyed working with the staff, who were all very professional and thorough and he is looking forward to starting the project and doing more in the future within the city. He stated he has reviewed the very thorough and comprehensive COAs.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification if the landscaping for building A was proposed inside the screen wall or outside.

Mr. Denham stated the landscaping would be on the outside of the wall outside the truck court area and showed a presentation board that represented the type of trees and shrubbery proposed.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification that the green belt of landscaping is on the outside and the wall is on the inside.

Mr. Denham stated yes.

Mr. Reyes stated that he just wanted to make sure there was enough landscape buffer for the screening of even the wall from the freeway, with the elevations.

Mr. Gregorek wanted to know if there were any perspective tenants.

Mr. Denham stated not at this time but there is a tremendous demand and once they get started on the project they anticipate a lot of interest.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know if the architect is working with staff on final color selections.

Mr. Denham stated they will continue to do that and have provided color and material boards to the staff and have gotten great feedback.

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

Mr. Denham stated the interior clear height would be 32 feet and 45 feet on the outside for both buildings.

Mr. Ricci wanted clarification if the building uses were designed for more than one tenant.

Mr. Denham stated that it was designed for one tenant but building A could have the potential for a second tenant.

Mr. Ricci wanted clarification on there being only one office entrance.

Mr. Denham stated single tenants are the most likely potential with the layout of the site, but they have run the sewer lateral so that restrooms or offices can be added later if the need arises.

Mr. Brian Flynn, Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility, stated they had submitted some written comments today and the applicant had provided a response, however the applicant's response focused on if the 2010 EIR analyzed this project as industrial. He stated they were able to go back and see that it was industrial but he would rather focus on the other items stated within the letter that stated an addendum is inappropriate regardless of whether the 2010 EIR considered the site industrial. He stated that the city is required to prepare a tiered EIR or Negative Declaration instead of an addendum for the project. He stated the city has incorrectly applied the CEQA guidelines section 15164 which applies to preparing an addendum for a project specific EIR. However, the 2010 TOP EIR is basically a General Plan EIR that potentially governs the whole city and is not a project specific EIR. He stated staff should have

used section 15168 to do a subsequent analysis for a program EIR or Negative Declaration to analyze the specific effects for this specific industrial project. He further stated that the 2010 EIR concluded there would be many significant unavoidable impacts on agricultural resources, air quality, climate change, cultural resources, noise and traffic which would require a tiered EIR to mitigate these impacts. He stated a second tiered EIR is needed to mitigate these impacts that are not adequately addressed in the first tiered EIR. He stated that for these reasons the addendum to the EIR is inappropriate and they should follow the CEQA tiering provisions, which provides for project specific analysis of impacts related to this project.

Mr. Alfred Barrett with Labor Local 783, stated that he urged the city to require an EIR for the Bridge Acquisition project, as the project wasn't analyzed at all in the 2010 EIR. He stated the project is very different than the Scandia that is currently on the project site.

Mr. Jaime Mendoza with Labor Local 783, stated an EIR is required for the Bridge Acquisition project to analyzed and mitigate the projects impacts such as truck traffic, air pollutions, and construction pollutions.

Mr. Denham stated he has reviewed the letter and the EIR did review this site as light industrial. He stated the overall Ontario General plan EIR and the California Commerce Center and the Pacific Gate-East Gate Specific Plans, all analyzed this as light industrial and the environmental impacts were analyzed, and the project mitigation measures that address these impacts are added into our COAs and we agree to meet them.

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

Mr. Gregorek wanted clarification on whether a new EIR is needed.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that when she worked on the 2010 TOP EIR, this area was envisioned as industrial and that was what was evaluated through the EIR and what was taken to city council. She stated that through public comments and the request of the Scandia property owner it was requested to be maintained as general commercial, which was what was ultimately approved.

Attorney Graham looked at the letters and they are stating the EIR with the Ontario plan did not analyzed this area as industrial. Mr. Graham stated that the TOP EIR analyzed this property as industrial uses, as well as under two other EIRs (California Commerce Center and Pacific Gate-East Gate Specific Plans) and he agrees with staff that CEQA is adequately covered.

Mr. Reyes stated he will miss Scandia and the park, but when looking at the surrounding area, industrial seems the best use for this site, as it is great freeway frontage but difficult to maneuver to. Mr. Reyes added that he supports the use of local labor.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted clarification on what the environmental dangers are and what is being mitigated and what remains that hasn't been addressed.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that environmental impacts are looked at in a number of ways and with this case we looked at equivalencies in terms of potential impacts and determined that this change would not result in additional impact beyond what was already analyzed in the TOP EIR.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know if it was traffic car trips versus truck traffic or what sort of impacts are looked at.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that the impact analysis is based on the land use change and if that change would result in additional impacts such as the number and type of trips and air quality, and if those impacts were equivalent to or less than what was previously analyzed. Scandia, being a commercial use, had different hours of operations and different types of trips, so the impacts were looked at in terms of equivalencies.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted clarification that the original EIR looked at this as industrial and it was later changed.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that was correct.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know if the change of land use would have more, less or equivalent impact.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated it would have equivalent impact.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to clarify that it was first analyzed as industrial and that the Scandia use was deemed equivalent.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated it would be equivalent or less than significant but in different ways.

Attorney Graham stated that there will clearly be some differences versus a general commercial use and light industrial use. However, it was analyzed as light industrial in the TOP EIR, and even though it has been 9 years they are trying to make the property consistent to the TOP.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that Scandia was an existing use and in the end we decided to leave it general commercial, therefore this change didn't need to be evaluated because it was an existing condition.

Mr. Willoughby stated that Scandia was a project already 20 years old and the TOP going in 10 years later. He thanked Attorney Graham for clarifying that environmental analysis was done with the two specific plans so there are three EIRs that covered the property and stated all the surrounding area is industrial.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Reyes, to recommend adoption of the Addendum to a previous EIR, Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Ricci, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the General Plan Amendment, File No., PGPA19-002, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

It was moved by Ricci, seconded by Reyes, to approve a resolution for the Development Plans, File Nos., PDEV18-041 and PDEV18-042, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

- I. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT FOR FILE NO. PSPA18-010:** An Amendment to the Ontario Gateway Specific Plan (File No. PSPA18-010) to: 1) change the land use designation for 3.9 acres of land from Office to Mixed-Use and; 2) reduce the rear parking/landscape setback adjacent to the railroad tracks from 20-feet to 10-feet. The project is located on the south side of Guasti Road, approximately 1,000 feet east of Haven Avenue. Staff is recommending the adoption of an Addendum to The Ontario Plan (File No. PGPA06-001) Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2008101140) certified by City Council on January 27, 2010. This application is consistent with the previously adopted EIR and introduces no new significant environmental impacts. All previously adopted mitigation measures shall be a condition of project approval. 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: 210-212-57); **submitted by Prime A Investments, LLC. City Council action is required.**
- J. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT & DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDEV18-039:** A Development Plan (File No. PDEV18-039) to construct a 136,342 square foot single story retail building (Costco Business Center) on 10.9 acres of land, within the Mixed-Use land use designation of the Ontario Gateway Specific Plan, located on the south side of Guasti Road, approximately 500 east of Haven Avenue. Staff is recommending the adoption of an Addendum to The Ontario Plan (File No. PGPA06-001) Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2008101140) certified by City Council on January 27, 2010. This application is consistent with the previously adopted EIR and introduces no new significant environmental impacts. All previously adopted mitigation measures shall be a condition of project approval. 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: 210-212-56 & 210-212-57) **submitted by Prime A Investments, LLC.**

Senior Planner Batres, presented the staff report. He described the surrounding area and the location of the project site and the current land use of Office and change being requested to Mixed-Use. He explained site layout, the parking study, architectural design, landscape, access, and the truck court area. He explained the differences between a regular Costco Center and a Business Costco Center. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval of an Addendum to a previous EIR and the Specific Plan Amendment, File No. PSPA18-010, and that the Planning Commission approve the Development Plan, File No. PDEV18-039, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification on truck access.

Mr. Batres stated the goal is to separate truck vehicles from regular traffic and to take truck trips away from Haven Ave., so access from Milliken will be exclusively for Costco trucks.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if the truck entrance would be from Milliken or Haven.

Mr. Batres stated trucks would access through Milliken Ave.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification that the cul-de-sac would be opened onto Milliken Ave.

Mr. Batres stated this entrance would be gated and only Costco trucks will have access.

Mr. Willoughby clarified that if you come down that street there would be a gate and the general public won't have access.

Mr. Batres stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that the delivery vehicles will use that gate and proceed to Milliken.

Mr. Batres stated that is correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification if the signalized intersection will line up with any of the existing businesses to the north.

Mr. Batres stated it would line up with the existing road between the Embassy Suites Hotel and the Springfield Suites.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know how this center compares in size to a regular Costco building.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated generally they are larger.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Sean Asmus with Prime A Investments and Mr. Mike OKuma with Costco stores, appeared and spoke.

Mr. Gregorek wanted to know if there would still be refrigerated and frozen food areas.

Mr. OKuma stated yes as they cater to business owners, they would have frozen and cold goods.

Mr. Gregorek asked if they would have free food tasting.

Mr. OKuma stated no but what is unique about the frozen section here is how large it is and that it is divided into three sections; cold, colder, and coldest where they provide a jacket to go into it.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know the size of a regular Costco building.

Mr. OKuma stated the normal Costco building runs around 148,000 square feet and this is a little

smaller.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know being that there is a larger frozen food section would they still have a butchers and fresh cut meats.

Mr. OKuma stated they don't sell traditional size meats, but on a larger scale. He gave the example if you would normally buy a rump roast, here you would get a quarter of a lamb. He stated they cater to restaurant businesses, which is why their hours of operations are earlier and they will be closed on Sundays.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if regular membership gets you in.

Mr. OKuma stated yes, but they have unique items that you wouldn't find at a regular Costco, because they cater to restaurants and businesses.

Mr. Willoughby clarified that they would have more office furniture and items like that.

Mr. OKuma stated that was correct.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know where the current closest location is.

Mr. OKuma stated most likely Westminster, but they currently have five business center locations.

Mr. Ricci wanted to know what type of delivery trucks are used.

Mr. OKuma stated there are two types, large semi trucks and the box trucks that will leave the facility.

Mr. Ricci wanted clarification on if Costco has a fleet of trucks or are they third party trucks.

Mr. OKuma stated they are mostly their trucks, just a few deliveries from like Coke and Pepsi that would use their own delivery trucks.

Ms. DeDiemar wanted to know why a location in Ontario.

Mr. OKuma stated this would most likely be the last business center in Southern California and that this is the perfect location because they can serve the whole Inland Empire and it's close to several freeways and close to their depot in Mira Loma and the airport. He stated it's the most convenient from all aspects. He stated that mostly they do remodels of existing buildings and this is very rare and will be one of the few ground up buildings.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know if the corner retail area is also being developed by Costco.

Mr. Asmus stated that they own both of the parcels and are doing a lot line adjustment to allow them to retain that portion and develop it themselves.

Mr. Willoughby stated he didn't know there was a business center for Costco.

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

Mr. Reyes stated the difficult part is to change land use designation especially close to Haven and the airport. He stated his thought is always are we going to have enough office and it's an ideal location, but what balances this is the retail portion, coming up next, and because it is such a strong corner. He thanked staff for working with Costco to articulate the design and to develop the site and elements.

Mr. Willoughby stated the two products when looked at together are a great fit and with the jobs Costco will create and the sales tax revenue, this makes it a win, win for Ontario.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Reyes, seconded by Gregorek, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Addendum to a previous EIR. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by Ricci, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Specific Plan Amendment, File No., PSPA18-010, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

It was moved by Gregorek, seconded by DeDiemar, to approve a resolution for the Development Plan, File No., PDEV18-039, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

Mr. Gregorek recused himself from Item K

- K. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REVIEW FOR FILE NOS. PDEV18-040 AND PCUP18-041:** A Development Plan (File No. PDEV18-040) to construct three retail buildings totaling 19,000 square feet, in conjunction with a Conditional Use Permit (File No. PCUP18-041) to establish drive-thru facilities on two buildings (Building A & C), on 4.3 acres of land located at the southeast corner of Haven Avenue and Guasti Road, within the Mixed-Use land use designation of the Ontario Gateway Specific Plan. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with an Addendum to The Ontario Plan (File No. PSPA17-001) Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2008101140) certified by City Council on January 27, 2010. This application introduces no new significant environmental impacts, and all previously-adopted mitigation measures are a condition of project approval. 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: 210-212-57) submitted by Prime A Investments, LLC.

Senior Planner Batres, presented the staff report. He described the location and the proposed development plan, the building sizes and the proposed uses, architectural design, landscaping, conceptual plaza areas, parking, and access to the site. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve File Nos. PCUP18-041 and PDEV18-040, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification about the corner sign, the existing landscaping or the parkway along Haven, if there would be any enhancements with this project.

Mr. Batres stated the proposed project will work behind the landscape that is already there and is proposing to cancel one existing driving apron that will make way for landscape and sidewalk for the Costco project. He stated they are both required to submit sign programs and staff will work with them on the detailing of that wall and the shade structures.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that the palm trees and the Ontario Gateway sign at the corner of Haven and Guasti will remain.

Mr. Batres stated yes that is correct.

Mr. Ricci wanted to know if any monument signs more visible, further north off the freeway or more elevated signs are proposed.

Mr. Batres stated in addition to the sign program that needs to be submitted and will be reviewed by staff and Ontario Gateway SP includes the conceptual freeway sign that is for all the tenants in this area to utilize this sign, along the 10 freeway.

Mr. Ricci wanted to clarify that it would be located in the empty lot north of the Springhill Suites.

Mr. Batres stated the proposed sign area is in the Caltrans right-of-way and is a conceptual freeway sign.

Mr. Reyes wanted to know what the land use on the parcel is where the sign is proposed and will it interfere with any future build out

Mr. Batres stated it is zoned office and that the conceptual idea is included in the CC&Rs that they would need to go through the association that includes all the businesses and they would have a say as to what the sign would be.

Mr. Reyes wanted clarification on what is in the middle of the open space in the center of building A and B.

Mr. Batres stated it is trash enclosures at each end.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarification that the trash enclosures are covered typically like in other

projects of this nature.

Mr. Batres stated yes.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to clarify that signage on the building would be allowed for the businesses in the individual suites.

Mr. Batres stated yes.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if there would be a crossover from the northern hotels at the signalized intersection.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated yes the intersection is signalized and will have crosswalks.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Sean Asmus with Prime A Investments stated they own the parcel where the pylon sign is proposed and he is a board member on the association for this area and in the next 30 days or so they will be submitting a comprehensive sign program and Springhill Suites and Embassy Suites have expressed interest in being on the sign. He stated that being that Costco is more of a destination retail they have no intention of being on the sign, at this time. He stated the association has been working on landscape update coordination so it looks seamless, as they do recognize the importance of the corner.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if the plaza between A and B would have any water features.

Mr. Asmus stated on other properties they have had these and they are a liability and maintenance nightmare, so they are not proposing any sort of water feature. He stated they have an aggressive schedule and was complimentary to the staff on working on the elevations for the plaza and that they aren't really thrilled with the sail shade structures, but wants to bring a sense of community and have tabled the design in favor of the schedule.

Mr. Willoughby wanted to know if they have potential tenants.

Mr. Asmus stated he can't reveal specifics but has coffee, sandwich, juice and pizza in the works and wants to bring amenities to the area, especially for the hotels across the street.

Mr. Willoughby asked if they are looking at larger sit down restaurants.

Mr. Asmus stated that the demographics for the area shows this will get more of the morning, lunch and maybe happy hour crowd, but wouldn't really support a full size restaurant.

Mr. Reyes clarified that the users for A & B would more likely be a food court area, and stated the building details and elevations have good detail but the site plan is short and can they give more detail regarding the amenities for the plaza area. He also asked if they have thought about relocating the trash enclosures.

Mr. Willoughby wanted clarity that the plaza area would continue to be worked on with staff and

will be based on the tenants needs but that nothing is set.

Mr. Batres stated yes the applicant will continue to work with them once we know the tenants.

Mr. Willoughby stated this is just conceptual and nothing is locked in.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated that this is correct, we are not there yet, these thoughts will be taken into consideration, and we understand you want robust amenities.

Mr. Scott VonKaenel stated they are currently working with engineering for a new location for the trash enclosures and the trash truck radius required.

Mr. Reyes wanted comments on the corner awnings and the courtyard area.

Mr. VonKaenel stated they would like to have an active space so they can draw people in, but at this time aren't sure what that would include or look like.

Ms. Wahlstrom stated they will continue to work with staff and come back to briefing with the details.

Mr. Willoughby stated he is comfortable with staff working out the details and this will be a very nice project.

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

Mr. Reyes stated that he wants the best for this retail, just as he would for any office building. He wants to see more detail on landscaping and lighting and amenities, because he wants a high quality project for this prime area and would really like to see a water feature at the corner.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by Reyes, seconded by Ricci, to approve a resolution for the Conditional Use Permit and the Development Plan, File Nos., PCUP18-041 and PDEV18-040, subject to conditions of approval and the condition that staff will continue to work with the applicant regarding the details for the courtyard area. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Reyes, and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, Gregorek; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 4 to 0.

L. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDA17-001:

A Development Agreement Amendment (**First Amendment – File No. PDA17-001**) between the City of Ontario and Ronald and Kristine Pietersma Family Trust and Loyola Properties I L.P., to modify certain provisions related to the second installment of the Phase 2 Water Participation Fee, for Tentative Parcel Map 19787 (File No. PMTT16-021), within the High Density Residential (Planning Areas 7 and 8) land use designation of the Grand Park Specific Plan, located at the southeast corner of Ontario Ranch Road and Archibald Avenue. The environmental impacts of this project were previously reviewed in conjunction with the

Grand Park Specific Plan, for which an Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2012061057) certified by the City Council on February 4, 2014. This application introduces no new significant environmental impacts, and all previously-adopted mitigation measures are a condition of project approval. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport, and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). (APN: 0218-241-32) **submitted by RCCD, Inc. City Council action is required.**

Development Administrative Officer Womble, presented the staff report. He stated the reason for the Amendment was to defer the second installment of the Water Participation Fee. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend for approval File No. PDA17-001, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

No one responded.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one responded.

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

There was no Planning Commission deliberation.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved by DeDiemar, seconded by Ricci, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Development Agreement Amendment, File No., PDA17-001, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, DeDiemar, Gregorek, Reyes, Ricci and Willoughby; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, Downs and Gage. The motion was carried 5 to 0.

MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Old Business Reports From Subcommittees

Historic Preservation (Standing): This subcommittee met on July 11, 2019.

- The monument signs were discussed.

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

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

New Business

NOMINATIONS FOR SPECIAL RECOGNITION

None at this time.


DIRECTOR'S REPORT

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

ADJOURNMENT

Gregorek motioned to adjourn. All in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 PM.


Secretary Pro Tempore


Chairman, Planning Commission