Minutes City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Vice Chair Neff called an Adjourned regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, September 15, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Rene Sakala
Charles Umeda

Commissioners Absent: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Guest Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

DRAFT

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff recommended that it might be prudent to continue the discussion on the Hillside Designation to a meeting when all Planning Commissioners were present because of the importance of the issue. There were no other items to add or delete.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Kenneth Hunt, 24661 Barton Frontage Road, Loma Linda stated that he was a member of the Traffic Advisory Committee and that the Committee should have been presented with the document to allow the Committee to provide recommendations, or non-recommendations, in regards to traffic issues. Director Woldruff replied that the project documents were not routed to the Traffic Advisory Committee because they are an advisory group created to review requests from citizens, and institutions pertaining to traffic safety issues. She added that the Public Works Department does the in-house review of project applications.

Mr. Hunt stated that he would like to be kept informed so that the Committee could fulfill its mandate to the City Council. He added that he did have concerns with density.

Gil Prestwood, of Lewis Operating Corporation, 1156 N. Mountain Avenue, Upland, addressed the Commission to express his concerns with Planning Area "D" regarding:

- The limitation to two-story commercial and residential buildings. He stated that in the past few weeks he had discovered some very innovative ideas in the area of residential over retail and live/work settings, which involved more than two stories and that limiting building heights to two stories may restrict the possibility of unique products. He suggested that the Planning Commission consider raising the limit to three stories to take advantage of those opportunities. Commissioner Umeda asked Mr. Prestwood if he could provide pictures and documents in this regard that would provide background documentation if the Planning Commission were to consider increasing building height. Mr. Prestwood replied that the he would do that.
- Density in Planning Area "D" eliminating the density 5-9.1 du/acre, which would affect two areas in particular:
    - Redlands Boulevard – Intent seemed to be to obtain commercial retail in that area along with some related higher density residential;
    - Mission Road – Controversial density issues and what kind of residential would be established there.

Mr. Prestwood suggested the Planning Commission consider creating some type of density limit for the area along Mission Road and increasing it as the developments went north to the commercial area on Redlands Boulevard.

Senior Planner Lamson pointed out some examples of the types of development Mr. Prestwood was referring to in the General Plan Update document featured in figures 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

Vice Chair Neff announced a brief recess to allow staff to retrieve information related to the discussion at hand.

Vice Chair Neff called the meeting back to order and continued with the Oral Reports on Non-agenda items.

Wendy Hamilton, 25777 Mission Road, Loma Linda, commented on the issue of high density. She stated that she read that the population of Loma Linda would increase by 9,307 people and that Mission Road would not be able to handle the increase in traffic and circulation. She asked the Planning Commission consider issues of traffic, roads, police, fire and emergency services, historic landmarks and automobile access onto Mission Road before approving any large developments.

Commissioner Umeda asked Ms. Hamilton if she would support estate type development. She replied that she would only if they did not have outlets onto Mission Road.

Commissioner Christianson told Ms. Hamilton that her concerns were valid and had been addressed in the discussion for the formulation of Ordinance 629, the Historic Mission Overlay District (HMOD) ordinance.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-49 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT

Director Woldruff explained that on September 1, 2004, the Planning Commission discussed the Mixed-Use Designation for Areas A, B and a portion of Area D.

DRAFT

Director Woldruff asked Ms. Larabie to provide topics addressed at the previous meeting.

Mr. Zola then summarized his notes on the same issues stating that his notes reflected the changes that he would make to the text of the Draft General Plan.

In Area B:

The Planning Commission discussed:

- Expanding the area to encompass all of Mr. Rojas' Ahwahnee Principle, do more to address the mixed-use concept and add a provision to investigate access to the south;
- Centralizing the park and adding amenities to the area to get a larger number of small scale uses in mixed-use arrangements;
- Incorporating the Ahwahnee Principle into the Updated General Plan as much as possible along with some of the Loma Linda University's concepts;
- Describing how parking would be handled a little more strictly.

In Area D:

- Emphasize a range of densities from estate to high density to obtain a mix of uses such as one and two story units on the single-family lots and avoiding a repetitive design of the units and developments;
- Emphasize a range of housing product types, lot sizes, variety of architectural styles;
- Emphasize amenities for residents, people shopping at commercial uses and the community;
- Incorporate some provisions of the HMOD ordinance;
- Emphasize provisions of historic site implementation of the HMOD and create the General Plan policy that supports the implementation;
- Ensure low density development along Mission Road to conform to the HMOD with higher densities going north. Create a buffer of low density on the north side of Mission Road;
- Ensure that no roadways connect to Mission Road in Area D, primary access would be from Redlands Boulevard and California Street the one limitation to provide for adequate emergency access;
- Retain the rural nature of Mission Road;
- Emphasize commercial development along California Street, Redlands Boulevard and the northeast portion of Area D.

Vice Chair Neff asked Mr. Zola if traffic on Mission Road would be limited to traffic entering into the development. Mr. Zola replied that the General Plan would allow access for emergency services and provide the realignment of Mission Road to connect to California Street at a right angle.

Vice Chair Neff opened the public comment period at 7:50 p.m.

Ken Hunt, 24663 Barton Frontage Road, Loma Linda commented that in regards to the types of developments that were built, homebuyers did not dictate what type of developments were created by developers but that they bought what was being offered. He added once the development was completed, the city was left with traffic issues and other problems. He suggested that developers offset costs of added patrol deputies until the tax base to support the needs for law enforcement and other public safety issues was adequate to cover the additional

DRAFT

costs. Vice Chair Neff explained to Mr. Hunt that it was not the purview of the Planning Commission to consider financial issues.

Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, Loma Linda commented on the following:

- Text of General Plan in Housing Element contradicted Land Use in regards to the SCAG projected increase in population;
- Land Use was too flexible and would allow for high density that would greatly exceed the projections in the Housing Element;
- Proposal for the University Village and Orchard Park projects in Mixed-use Area "D" to add over 3,000 units;
- How of the addition of all proposed projects plus any future development would greatly exceed SCAG projections until the year 2020.

Ms. Glendrange made the following suggestions:

- Revise the language for mixed-use, it's too permissive and flexible;
- Reduce density;
- Specify minimum percentages for commercial development to bring revenue to the City.

Vice Chair Neff opened the discussion on Mixed-use Area D relative to the proposed range of density starting along Mission Road, limiting vehicular access to Mission Road, and maintaining the rural character of the area.

Page 2-25 d) Implementing Policies for the Redlands Boulevard/California Street Mixed-Use Area D – Strengthen language to address the intent of the Historical Commission to implement policy that would govern the north side of Mission Road.

Page 2-23, Section 2.2.8.4 Mixed-use Area D – Strike the reference to Mission Road in the second sentence so that Mission Road did not become a thoroughfare.

Mr. Zola stated that he could create language that would say "no through route shall be designed from Mission Road to Redlands Boulevard." He added that developers could be required to design their projects so that the fastest route from Mission Road to Redlands Boulevard would be from California Street or from west of Mission Road.

Mr. Zola added that when the realignment of the intersection of California Street and Redlands Boulevard is completed, it will encourage the use of the route for traffic and pedestrian. He continued to say that the General Plan could contain the policy basis extracted from the Historic Mission Overlay District.

Commissioner Christianson requested that the text of the intent of the Ordinance with its four points be inserted in "Guiding Policy for the Redlands Boulevard/California Street Mixed-Use Area D."

Page 2-25 – Implementing Policies for Redlands Boulevard/California Street Mixed-Use Area D - Add a new #a): Commissioner Christianson advocated that all Planned Community uses or development would be required to adhere as conservatively as possible to the HMO Ordinance.

Mr. Zola suggested that the last sentence of paragraph d) be moved to the first policy to encompass all the implementing policies. He added that the Planning Commission might want

DRAFT

to consider clustering all the policies dealing with Mission Road frontage to ensure that the guidelines were consistent with the HMOD.

Attorney Holdaway commented that the reference that already existed in paragraph d) was adequate to address the HMOD.

A discussion ensued regarding the density range in the area of Mission Road and relative to the HMOD. Commissioner Christianson stated that he would like to see the medium density in that area eliminated. Commissioner Umeda stated that he would like to see a proposal to limit the area north of Mission Road to low density for detached residential housing.

Mr. Zola explained that the Planning Commission was not bound by the individual density ranges. He added that the Commission could contemplate language so that varied densities would provide a transition from the frontage of Mission Road with estate-type lots for a rural feel, to higher densities towards the commercial uses at the north end. Mr. Zola explained that could be achieved using one or more of the following: 1) A variation of lot sizes in neighborhood; 2) A variation in setbacks for front and side yards; and, 3) Plotting of housing.

The discussion continued and addressed the establishment of a minimum lot size for detached single dwellings relative to the project on the south side. The Commissioners did not want the project on the north side of Mission Road to mirror the density on the south side and wanted to put in language that would ensure that. Director Woldruff commented that typically, minimum lot sizes and yard setbacks were not appropriate to include in a General Plan but should be addressed through ordinances and specific plans.

Vice Chair Neff wanted to hear the language that would illustrate a range and variety of larger lots that should be appear larger than the ones on the south side that Mr. Zola would add to define low density.

Mr. Zola commented that the Planning Commission was trying to combine two very different ideas because Neo-traditional designs were composed of grid patterns with straight streets, all at right angles with every lot on the block the same size and could not be used if the Planning Commission wanted variety in lot sizes.

A discussion ensued on Neo-Traditional design. Mr. Zola explained that although lot sizes may be the same shape and dimension, placement of the house on the lot would provide a very different feel to the neighborhood.

The discussion continued regarding the elimination of medium density (5.1 to 9 du/ac) from Area D.

Section 2.2.8.4 l) – <u>Implementing Policies for Redlands Boulevard/California Street Mixed-Use Area D</u>. – Page 2-25 – Director Woldruff attempted to summarize what the Commissioners were trying to communicate to staff and the consultant: 1) Detached housing at least larger than what is on the south side, but no detached housing on lots of 2,000 to 4,000 square feet; and, 2) attached housing to maximize open space. She added that the Planning Commission could recommend a policy stating that higher-density development must provide extraordinary amenities and that higher density level of 5.1 to 9 could only be achieved if a developer met very strict policies. Director Woldruff stated that staff would prepare the text for the Planning Commission to review before forwarding it to the City Council.

DRAFT

Mr. Zola commented that the density along mission Road would be even lower transitioning up to 5 units per acre in the internal, no single-family detached products exceeding 5 du/ac allowing medium only density attached products.

Vice Chair Neff stated that before beginning the discussion on Special Planning Area E he would open public comment period at 9:12 p.m.

Wendy Hamilton, 25777 Mission Road, Loma Linda stated that she urged the Commission to consider the community on Mission Road, which as quite unique and reiterated her concerns on traffic.

Vice Chair Neff asked staff to provide the Planning Commission with traffic studies which accompany new project applications placed before the Commission for review.

In response to a comment by Commissioner Christianson, Mr. Zola stated that he would make sure that language would be in place in the text of Mixed-Use in Area D excluding residential uses on California Street and Redlands Boulevard.

Commissioner Umeda stated that there should be a policy statement in the General Plan that the City would encourage commercial development along California Street and Redlands Boulevard. Commissioner Christianson added that if any residential were considered for California Street that it be vertical mixed-use with live/work opportunities.

The discussion opened on Mixed-Use Areas E, G, and J.

Director Woldruff explained that the commercial node on east end in Mixed-Use Area E was the only section remaining for discussion, as Planning Commission had already approved other Land Uses for other parcels.

Mr. Zola explained that the issue was to move the Mission Road intersection with California Street farther north to create a usable parcel of land on the south side and provide for commercial uses along the frontage of California Street from Mission Road south to Barton Road. He added that there would limitations in regards to access to the parcel because the distance between Mission Road and Barton would be too short to allow for a left turn lane in and a left turn lane out.

Roger Peter Porter, 3837 East 7th Street, Long Beach, CA stated that he was concerned about density on the southeast corner of California and New Jersey. He said that his project consisted of 30 homes, a density of 10 units per acre. He continued to say that the plan of the project was to target first time buyers by building affordable homes. However, if the density was lowered, the cost of the homes would be higher and for that reason he opposed dropping density because he felt that changing the density would discriminate against lower income homebuyers. Mr. Porter also commented on the Historic Mission Overlay District. He explained that they had hired a firm from Riverside to do a very extensive study and the report was provided to staff. He study showed that there were no resources of any historic significance.

Director Woldruff suggested that seeing that the Commission had completed their discussion on Area E that they could consider discussing areas G & J at the same time.

Mr. Zola explained that the concept was to provide commercial and office uses along the frontage of California Street, transitioning into high-density residential to the east to take

advantage of the widening of California Street when it occurred. Mr. Zola asked concurrence of the Planning Commission on how to ensure adequate offsite traffic to maintain traffic flow. He added the Traffic and Circulation Element did contain some of the policies.

The discussion continued with Commissioner Umeda stating that he thought that Area G would be reserved for commercial /retail/light industry types of uses, and wanted to know why it was designated high-density residential. Director Woldruff replied that staff had required that the project applicants for the area submit financial feasibility studies to show that there wasn't a large enough population base to support 10 acres of commercial. She added that the studies indicated that it would support 10 acres of neighborhood commercial/retail if the rest of the area was designated high-density residential. Senior Planner Lamson added that there were only two parcels left in Area G that were not already earmarked for the Spanos project or the commercial on the corner of Barton Road and California Street.

Commissioner Umeda expressed concern in terms of the balance between housing and other types of uses. Mr. Zola responded and Director Woldruff concurred that the City of Loma Linda was one of the few cities in the Inland Empire that was a net importer of labor. Therefore the city was looking at diversifying employment, looking at industrial research and development, which made sense in the eastern area of the City. He added that, given that commercial development was occurring north of the city, commercial uses that the city could attract were fairly limited. He continued to say that one of the concerns was that the large part of the potential commercial development along California Street had to do with the bi-county corridor and the ability of having a large volume of traffic to spur commercial development over and above the amount of residential in the community. Mr. Zola stated that in the absence of the bi-county corridor, there wasn't much draw for commercial uses because the neighborhood commercial uses would have to depend on a sizable increase in traffic from the developments to the west.

Mr. Zola continued to say that when studies were done he was purposefully looking at higher density because one of the things that we want to make sure on this area was that we can achieve more of the walkable communities and tie them to the areas where we can get jobs production where we would have commercial and it didn't seem appropriate to have on the east side small isolated residential subdivisions that would end up surrounded by commercial and employment generating uses.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that they had looked at what the City of Redlands was doing in the area, which would allow high density such as apartment developments and small lot subdivisions, both attached and detached. Director Woldruff added that Redlands seemed to be adding more warehousing and business centers interspersed with multi-family housing.

Vice Chair Neff commented that it was difficult to find housing for students and first-time buyers and that Loma Linda was a university town that had many students and professionals that work and study in the area.

Commissioner Umeda stated that he would like to have more information on what the City of Redlands was planning to do to better understand the impact of Redlands' development on the type of development on Loma Linda's east side.

Vice Chair Neff asked Mr. Zola to summarize the intent of development in the area. Mr. Zola explained that the original intent was that the area on the east side of California would be used for commercial and employment generation. He explained that there were three reasons why it was decided to designate the area as high density residential:

- The amount of commercial uses that could be supported;
- The realistic opportunity to attract industrial and business park uses; and,
- Economical feasibility studies required for different projects, which took into consideration more than the Loma Linda area and the surrounding cities, including the City of Redlands to support regional needs;

Director Woldruff added that the Draft General Plan, as well as any project applications, was always forwarded to the City of Redlands for their review, as they forward their projects to the City of Loma Linda for our review.

Vice Chair Neff reiterated that he believed that the City of Loma Linda had a real need for all types and levels of housing.

Commissioner Christianson commented that some sort of monument or sign be placed indicating to a traveler that he/she was entering Loma Linda. Director Woldruff commented that that area of the City, especially Planning Areas G & J, was subject to the requirements of the Historic Mission Overlay District and therefore elements identifying the City and the Historic Mission Overlay District would be in place.

The discussion continued regarding whether the City was willing to reserve certain areas, such as Areas G and J, which lend themselves to development other than residential, for future commercial uses, and concluded with the following motion:

> **Motion by Umeda, second by Sakala, and carried by a vote of 3 to 1, Neff opposed, to continue the discussion on Special Planning Areas G, H & J along with the Hillside Area to a special meeting on September 29, 2004 and to direct staff to provide information on the City of Redlands' development plans in the bordering areas of the east side of the City of Loma Linda. Rosenbaum absent.**

Senior Planner Lamson stated that she would provide the Planning Commission with a copy of the Market Analysis and Fiscal Report that were prepared for the Spanos project, which was approved some time ago.

Director Woldruff informed the Planning Commission that the Chamber of Commerce was in the planning stages of their Community Parade set for October.

Ms. Lamson informed the Planning Commission that she had provided the members with a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the University Village/Orchard Park projects to review in advance of the meeting that would address the item and that the first meeting was tentatively scheduled for October 20, 2004.

REPORT BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were reports presented.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff postponed her report to the next meeting.

DRAFT

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of May 17, 2006.

_____

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\Minutes\04Sept15M-draft.doc

DRAFT