

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

**MINUTES**

**June 23, 2015**

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	2
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	2
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	2
CONSENT CALENDAR	
A-01. Minutes of May 26, 2015.....	2
A-02. Code Section 65402 .....	2
PUBLIC HEARINGS	
B. File No. PMTT14-006 .....	3
C. File No. PMTT14-007 .....	3
D. File No. PMTT14-019 .....	4
E. File No. PDA15-002 .....	4
F. File No. PDCA11-003 .....	5-10
MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION.....	10
DIRECTOR'S REPORT.....	11
ADJOURNMENT .....	12

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

**MINUTES**

**June 23, 2015**

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

**COMMISSIONERS**

**Present:** Chairman Willoughby, Vice-Chairman Downs, Delman, Gage, Gregorek, Mautz, and Ricci

**Absent:** None.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Planning Director Murphy, City Attorney Rice, Principal Planner Zeledon, Senior Planner Mercier, Principal Engineer Do, and Planning Secretary Callejo

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Gage.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Items B, C and D were asked to be continued. Each Commissioner received an email requesting these items be continued to the next meeting of July 28, 2015.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one responded from the audience.

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

**A-01. MINUTES APPROVAL**

Planning/Historic Preservation Commission Minutes of May 26, 2015, approved as written.

**A-02. GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY FINDING PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65402:** A request to determine that the transfer of the 11-acre property located at the southwest corner of Campus Avenue and Sunkist Street from the City of Ontario to Majestic Realty Co. is consistent with The Ontario Plan Policy Plan (General Plan) (APN: 1049-221-01).

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

*Consent Items were moved by Downs, seconded by Mautz, to approve the Planning Commission Minutes of May 26, 2015 and Government Code Section 65402, as written. The motion was carried 7 to 0. Roll call vote: AYES, Delman, Downs, Gregorek, Mautz, Ricci, Willoughby, and Gage; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried with 7 to 0 votes.*

## PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- B. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PMTT14-006:** A Tentative Tract Map (TT 18978) to subdivide 5.83 gross acres of land into 41 numbered lots and 6 lettered lots, within the Conventional Small Lot Residential district of Planning Area 16 of the Subarea 29 Specific Plan, generally located at the northeast corner of Parkplace Avenue and Merrill Avenue. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport (ONT) and Chino Airport and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for both Airports. The environmental impacts of this project were previously analyzed in an addendum to the Subarea 29 Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2004011009) that was adopted by the City Council. All adopted mitigation measures of the addendum shall be a condition of approval for the project and are incorporated herein by reference. (APN: 0218-022-03); **submitted by SL Ontario Development Company, LLC.**
- C. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PMTT14-007:** A Tentative Tract Map (TT 18977) to subdivide 7.70 gross acres of land into 56 numbered lots and 6 lettered lots, within the Conventional Small Lot Residential district of Planning Area 17 of the Subarea 29 Specific Plan, located at the southeast corner of Parkplace Avenue and Parkview Street. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport (ONT) and Chino Airport and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for both Airports. The environmental impacts of this project were previously analyzed in an addendum to the Subarea 29 Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2004011009) that was adopted by the City Council. All adopted mitigation measures of the addendum shall be a condition of approval for the project and are incorporated herein by reference. (APN: 0218-022-01); **submitted by SL Ontario Development Company, LLC.**

- D. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PMTT14-019:** A Tentative Tract Map (TT 18998) for Condominium Purposes to subdivide 10.39 gross acres of land into 19 residential lots and 3 lettered lots, within the Cluster Homes Residential district of Planning Area 26 of the Subarea 29 Specific Plan, located at the northeast corner of Celebration Avenue and Merrill Avenue. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport (ONT) and Chino Airport and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for both Airports. The environmental impacts of this project were previously analyzed in an addendum to the Subarea 29 Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2004011009) that was adopted by the City Council. All adopted mitigation measures of the addendum shall be a condition of approval for the project and are incorporated herein by reference. (APN: 0218-033-03 (POR), 04 (POR), 05 and 06); **submitted by SL Ontario Development Company, LLC.**

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one responded.

There was no Planning Commission deliberation.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*Items B, C and D were moved by Mautz, seconded by Gage, to continue the Environmental Assessment and Tentative Tract Maps to Planning Commission Meeting of July 28, 2015. The motion was carried 7 to 0. Roll call vote: AYES, Delman, Downs, Gregorek, Mautz, Ricci, Willoughby, and Gage; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried with 7 to 0 votes.*

- E. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FILE NO. PDA15-002:** A Development Agreement (First Amendment) between the City of Ontario and BrookCal Ontario, LLC, to amend Development Agreement File No. PDA 10-002 to update certain infrastructure provisions of the existing Development Agreement for the development of up to 1,146 residential units and 10 acres of commercial on 178.66 acres of land within Planning Areas 9A, 10A, 10B and 11 of The Avenue Specific Plan, located south of Schaefer Avenue, north of Edison Avenue, between Turner Avenue and Haven Avenue. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport (ONT) and Chino Airport and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for ONT and Chino Airports. The environmental impacts of this project were previously analyzed in an addendum to The Avenue Specific Plan EIR (SCH# 2005071109) that was adopted by the City Council on June 17, 2014. This application is consistent with the previously adopted EIR and introduces no new significant environmental impacts. (APN: 0218-201-05, 0218-201-30, 0218-201-39, 0218-201-42, 0218-201-43 and 0218-201-45); **submitted by BrookCal Ontario, LLC. City Council action is required.**

Principal Planner, Rudy Zeledon, presented the staff report. He mentions in August 2014 the Planning Commission approved a tentative map which facilitated the backbone

infrastructure for the community called New Haven and also recommended the Development Agreement to City Council. The Development Agreement was approved by the City Council in June of 2014. The Development Agreement has construction broken into 4 Phases. Phase 1 is currently under construction. In order to continue construction, Brookfield Residential is requesting infrastructure revisions to the Development Agreement including recycled water improvements. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend adoption by City Council for File No. PDA15-002, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

No questions from the Commissioners for Mr. Zeledon.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Derek Barbour appeared and spoke on behalf of Brookfield of Costa Mesa. He stated that there has been some difficulty getting to the site, but they are excited about the current development. September 19, 2015 is the grand opening for three new communities. Mr. Barbour stated this will be the second development for Brookfield in the New Model Colony. Other events may be coming between now and the September date. He stated he would take any questions.

Mr. Gregorek asked what the access will be since Haven is not available.

Mr. Barbour responded that it will be from Milliken and Hamner along Ontario Ranch Road. This will be the primary marketing off the 15 FWY. Haven Avenue is not yet an option. Turner would be a secondary.

Mr. Gregorek questioned the connection of Schaefer to Archibald Ave.

Mr. Barbour replied with Ontario Ranch Road is the better marketing entry.

Mr. Willoughby question if there was a timeframe for when Ontario Ranch Road is scheduled to be open.

Mr. Barbour mentions the stages of paving and landscaping. The hope will be for Ontario Ranch Road will open sometime near their opening; it involves a consortium of agencies working on the roads.

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 Mautz, seconded by Gregorek, to recommend approval of the Development Agreement, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Delman, Downs, Gregorek, Mautz, Ricci, Willoughby, and Gage; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

F. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CODE**

**AMENDMENT REVIEW FOR FILE NO. PDCA11-003:** A comprehensive update to the City of Ontario Development Code (Ontario Municipal Code Title 9) to establish consistency with The Ontario Plan, and various amendments to the Ontario Municipal Code to provide for the logical arrangement of provisions and eliminate duplications and inconsistencies for properties in the City of Ontario. Furthermore, Development Code Amendment provisions will be revised to:

- Establish standards for the orderly physical development of the City;
- Preserve the character and quality of existing neighborhoods;
- Promote good urban design;
- Achieve the proper arrangement of land uses envisioned in The Ontario Plan;
- Provide for the establishment of a full range of residential, commercial agriculture, office, commercial, industrial, public, and transportation-related activities, as envisioned by The Ontario Plan;
- Promote the economic stability of land uses that conform to The Ontario Plan;
- Achieve compatibility between Ontario International Airport and the land uses and new development that surround it;
- Establish comprehensive procedures for appropriate and effective public involvement in land use, development, subdivision, and environmental decisions, and provide for the processing of applications in an expedient manner;
- Establish procedures for the open and transparent processing of applications;
- Establish standards and guidelines that promote and inspire innovative and sustainable subdivision, site, building, landscape, and infrastructure design;
- Promote the preservation and protection of the City's historic character and resources;
- Promote safe and efficient pedestrian and traffic circulation systems, and ensure that new development will not overburden the capacity of existing streets, utilities, or community facilities and services; and
- Ensure that the costs of providing land for streets, alleys, pedestrian ways, easements, and other rights-of-way, and for the improvements necessary to serve new developments, are borne by subdividers and developers rather than by the taxpayers of the City.

The environmental impacts of this project were reviewed in conjunction with an Addendum to The Ontario Plan Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2008101140) and Mitigation Monitoring Program, certified by the City of Ontario City Council on January 27, 2010. This project introduces no new significant environmental impacts. The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport (ONT), and was evaluated and found to be consistent with the policies and criteria of the ONT Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP); **City Initiated. City Council action is required.**

Senior Planner, Chuck Mercier, presented the staff report. Approximately 4 and a half years ago the city began an update to the Development Code. A holistic approach was taken rather than piece-mill it together including changes to federal, state and municipal laws and codes, as well as the adoption of The Ontario Plan. The new Development Code will be established as an independent document that will be maintained by the Planning Department, much like a Specific Plan and will ultimately allow the document to be web-based much like The Ontario Plan. As proposed, the Development Code is made up for 9 chapters, which also include reference documents. Significant changes include name changes to existing zoning districts which may take time to get used to. Two new



business districts and two new overlay districts will also be created within the Development Code. He stated that staff is recommending the Planning Commission recommend adoption by City Council for File No. PDCA11-003, pursuant to the facts and reasons contained in the staff report and attached resolution, and subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Downs ask for clarification on “OH District”.

Mr. Mercier states it’s the “OH District” is a High Density Office District, which allows for office uses at a higher intensity than the Low Density office district.

Mr. Downs asks if that means, multiple story or bigger in area?

Mr. Mercier replies higher floor area ratio.

Mr. Murphy explained by making reference to The Ontario Plan and the I-10 corridor was identified as a very intense urban corridor area; both sides of the freeway were envisioned as intense, which includes intense office areas.

Mr. Downs questions where the rail corridor may be envisioned.

Mr. Mercier states the rail corridor identifies all the existing railroad tracks within the city. At this time, there are no proposals to expand.

Mr. Murphy explains that currently those are all identified as M3 zones.

Mr. Willoughby questions the regional commercial (CR) zone, if this like the Ontario Mills area or something different?

Mr. Mercier states the Ontario Mills is within a Specific Plan, and he explains that at some point those Specific Plans will be built out and in that case the zoning will take over and areas of higher intensity like the Ontario Mills, would fall within this zoning.

Mr. Willoughby also asks the differences of Business Park and Industrial Park.

Mr. Mercier explains that the primary differences are that in Industrial Park zones were created to accommodate automobile car sales in the areas identified in the policy plan, land use plan as Business Park. For example, areas along Mission and Holt.

Mr. Willoughby wants clarification on the 15 FWY area, where car sales are next to Industrial areas.

Mr. Murphy continues to explain that those car sales are within Specific Plan areas, there is no need to identify those areas.

Mr. Gage has a question referencing page 31 of the staff report. GFA, what does it stand for?

Mr. Mercier answers, Gross Floor Areas.

Mr. Gage continues with questioning the parking calculations from the proposed Development Code to the current Development Code. He was unable to do an accurate comparison with the numbers given. He wants to know if there is more or less spaces.

Mr. Mercier and Mr. Murphy try to explain the math equation for the comparison and standards. Ultimately, there is a small reduction, but not significantly where any issues are anticipated.

Mr. Gage's second question is regarding the excess parking of over 10 percent for Planning Commission approval.

Mr. Murphy explains that some developers have asked for more parking, but it is the large amount of asphalt which is being used, that becomes the issue.

Mr. Gage's third question is on standard parking space size in regards to 19 feet long changing to 18 feet long, keeping to 9 feet wide. He questions the motivation in changing the size.

Mr. Mercier explains that the recommendation comes from the Institute of Transportation of Engineers, based on the current dimensions of cars produced. He continues to explain that before the recommendation was made, striping was done on the ground with various size vehicles to see if there was any great change.

Mr. Gage questions the drive-aisle reduction. He questions what the current drive-aisles are and what is being proposed?

Mr. Mercier explains that currently, single drive-aisle are 24 feet and double drive-aisles are 26 feet. He shares that single-loaded will not be changing, but double-loaded will be changing.

Mr. Murphy also shares that at the Ontario Mills Mall outside of the Fire Lanes, all drive-aisles are 24 feet.

Mr. Gage questions the City Hall parking lot, which size is used.

Mr. Mercier says, he believes they are the 26 foot drive aisles.

Mr. Gage again, questions the motivation to re-size the parking spaces and drive aisles.

Mr. Mercier and Mr. Murphy share that drive-aisle and industry standards are used whenever an update is made. Also, one of the goals is to try and use less cement and asphalt. Mr. Murphy continued by saying that the information being brought forth is just recommendations, which each Commissioner has the right to agree with or disagree with.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Or no one responded.

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



Planning Commissioner Comments:

Ms. Mautz commends Mr. Mercier on his hard work and the entire Planning Department. She also states it will always be a work in progress.

Mr. Gage also commends the hard work of Mr. Mercier and the department and thinks it is to the betterment of the City. He also states that he has concerns regarding parking spaces and is of the mind-set of “if it isn’t broke, don’t fix it”. He’s concerned why citizens aren’t saying more. He gives examples of some bad parking situations. The two things he would like to see stay the same are the parking space and aisle width.

Mr. Gage asks if can make a motion approving the recommendation of Development Code without changing the two items of concern – parking spaces and drive aisle sizes.

Mr. Murphy states Mr. Gage is more than welcome to do that, but wants to address his comments before he does. First, compact parking will be eliminated under the new Development Code and everything will become standardized. Secondly, he stated that everything will be double stripped. The stalls will remain at 9 feet wide, so hopefully this will help with vehicles remaining centered.

Mr. Ricci brought up that new technology in vehicles, like back-up cameras and motion sensors may help with some of the parking issues brought up. He also understands that the need to lessen asphalt is also a need with environmental issues. Mr. Ricci shares his appreciation and commends Mr. Mercier’s and the Planning Department’s work on the Development Code.

Ms. Mautz adds onto Mr. Ricci’s comments, stating that she thinks cars are being produced smaller than before for fuel efficiency on top of everything else and the one foot will not make much difference.

Mr. Willoughby shared that he quickly looked up the average length of American cars is 14 feet, 9 inches and the average length of a SUV is 16 feet, 5 inches. Mr. Willoughby states knowing these averages, the length of 18 feet, covers both sizes of the average vehicles. He continues saying the width is where parking can be difficult, but with the 9 feet width remaining and double stripping, that should help people get centered.

Mr. Gregorek stated when meeting on the subcommittee, double-stripping was recommended. He thinks that the way it is written should be good and should reduce the use of building materials.

Mr. Downs states that no matter what the parking space size is, there will be some which will not adhere to the rules. He also commended Mr. Mercier for his hard work on updating the Development Code.

Mr. Delman stated that along with his Model A, he drives a larger vehicle and doesn’t think the one-foot shortage in length would make a difference. He continues that he always tries to park in the middle as parking a larger vehicle affects other cars parked nearby. He would recommend to keep the parking the same as it is proposed.

Mr. Willoughby asks how the Commissioners should move forward or if Mr. Gage has any more concerns. If the Commissioners should move forward with voting on the

Development Code with the two items removed or with it complete with the items in place.

Mr. Murphy states it may be beneficial for the Commissioners to take a “straw vote” on the issues Commissioner Gage raised to see if any others on the Commission concur. If there are no other issues, after the “straw vote” is taken, the Commission can move forward and the formal vote can be taken.

Mr. Gage made another comment that one-foot will be reduced from the parking space, but the aisle will be reduced two-feet. He reiterates that’s a total of three feet.

Chairman Willoughby takes vote by a show of hands for the 9 by 18 with the 24 foot aisle as proposed. (6 Commissioners in Favor)

Chairman Willoughby takes a vote by a show of hands for the 9 by 19 with the 26 foot aisle. (1 Commissioner in Favor)

Mr. Murphy asks the Commission if there are any other scenarios which Mr. Gage has brought up. Also, if Mr. Gage has any other concerns about the parking which may be overlooked.

Mr. Gage questions tandem parking, where parking is back to back. It shows 34 feet (2 – 17s) and going down to 17 feet. Where did the 34 come from?

Mr. Mercier explains the code did not allow tandem parking spaces in a garage, it would only allow it in a subterranean type situation or covered parking lot so an individual garage would not be permitted. For tandem parking, the number does not need to be doubled because you only need 2 feet for space in between the two vehicles, the total does not need to be doubled.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

*It was moved by Delman, seconded by Gregorek, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Development Code Addendum to EIR, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Delman, Downs, Gregorek, Mautz, Ricci, Willoughby, and Gage; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

*It was moved by Delman, seconded by Gregorek, to recommend adoption of a resolution to approve the Development Code Amendment, subject to conditions of approval. Roll call vote: AYES, Delman, Downs, Gregorek, Mautz, Ricci, Willoughby, and Gage; NOES, none; RECUSE, none; ABSENT, none. The motion was carried 7 to 0.*

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

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

**Historic Preservation (Standing):** This subcommittee met Thursday, June 11, 2015

Commissioners Willoughby, Mautz and Delman met for this meeting. At this meeting, the Historic Preservation Committee appointed Commissioner Delman as the Subcommittee Chairman. He talked how they discussed the Development Code as it relates to Historic Preservation and they are planning a Work Program update in the future.

### **New Business**

Mr. Gage brought up articles in the newspaper regarding grocery stores coming in from Washington State into Safeway stores. He mentioned that the City of Ontario did not have one of these stores go in either in the new developing areas or in the northern areas of Ontario. A German store has also come into the area, which is a discount store, which is owned by Trader Joes. Mr. Gage thought it might be compatible with our demographics and our Economic Development agency might be interested in coming to the vacant stores in Ontario.

Mr. Murphy states that Haggens is the grocery store from Washington State, which took over some of the Albertsons stores. The second chain is Albie's and is owned by Trader Joes and is on our radar. The Economic Development agency is aware of this of this chain and aware they are making their way to the West Coast.

### **NOMINATIONS FOR SPECIAL RECOGNITION**

None at this time.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Murphy talked about the article, a commentary which was passed out regarding synthetic turf. There is a misconception about synthetic turf. While there is no watering involved, there are also other consequences which come about because of it. Grass is still cooler and there are many types of grass which may not require as much water. He mentions that he has talked with Mark Chase, the City's Community and Public Service Agency head, and last summer they did some temperature monitoring of the fields at the soccer complex and there were days during the hottest part of the day that the field was hitting 130 degrees. So there are times they have to hose down the fields and try to cool them off.

Mr. Willoughby shares a personal experience about visiting a soccer complex up north where sprinklers were installed where synthetic turf was used. He shared he didn't understand why they were needed at the time. He also brought up that the water was used for cleaning the turf.

Mr. Murphy states bacteria issues and staph infections can be problematic with this type of turf use.

Mr. Murphy also shared that Inland Empire Utilities Agency is experiencing a shortage of

recycled water because people are conserving potable water. He said there is a ripple effect and using recycled water is not the cure-all.


Mr. Gage questions historic homes and lawn replacement/landscaping. How will this affect the city's Historic Neighborhood?

Mr. Murphy replies that's a good question and that will need to be addressed, especially with homeowners. There are many options with various green plants which are low-water. The one message to get across is not to shut off your water all together, because then trees don't get watered and die.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ricci motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mautz. The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary Pro Tempore

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice-Chairman, Planning Commission