Minutes City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, September 1, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

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

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

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff requested that Item 2 for Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 16650 be taken out of order and heard first. Chair Rosenbaum allowed the change.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Bruce Bradley, 24282 Khan Drive, Loma Linda commented on the proposed change to the General Plan designation for the area north of the Laurel Heights tract on Oakwood Drive to a high-density designation stating that he was not in favor of the change.

Director Woldruff explained that the portion of the General Plan Land Use designation related to that issue had already been forwarded to the City Council for their review and that public testimony would be taken during the public hearing at the selected City Council meeting. She added that all proper studies had been performed through the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Mr. Jim Fansaka, 24214 Kahn Drive, Loma Linda stated that he supported Mr. Bradley's objections to the high-density designation.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-47 - ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-03, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TT 03-03) NO. 16650, AND PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-07

Assistant Planner Colunga reported that Trimark Pacific Homes L.P. was requesting to change the Zoning Map from Agricultural (A-1) to Single Family Residence (R-1) in order to subdivide the property into 36 lots as part of TTM No. 16650 and that a R-1 Zoning standards was applicable to this project. He added that the applicant had submitted the design, site design and landscaping for the 36 residences. He continued to say that the subject site, located at the southeast corner of Bryn Mawr Avenue and George Street in the southeast portion of Loma Linda was 9.1 acres and was sloped from the southeast to the northeast.

Mr. Colunga described the project as having the following characteristics:

- A density of 4 du/ac falling within the Low Density designation of 2.1 to 5 du/ac
- A minimum lot size of 7,200 square feet with an average lot size of approximately 8,700 square feet
- The traffic analysis for the project indicated the project would generate 345 vehicle trips per day;
- Grades lower than the houses adjacent to the project site along St. Andrews Place, Westminster Court, and Landsdown Road;
- Two new 36-foot wide streets (60 ft Right-of-way);
- Access off of George Street
- No common area or park space - The applicant would be required to pay in-lieu park fees for the development of parks in other areas of the City of Loma Linda;
- A Landscape Maintenance District (LMD) proposed along the project boundary. Condition 1.28 added to require the applicant to provide minimum 36-inch box size trees in the LMD;
- An area behind Lots 5 & 6 along Bryn Mawr Avenue to be the site for the Loma Linda Connected Communities Hub.

Mr. Colunga discussed the landscape plans for the front yard and the side yard fences stating that the tract was designed to have the sidewalks next to the curb and that the applicant was proposing street trees in addition to the required two 24-inch box trees.

Mr. Colunga continued to say that the Plan 1 Model had a side loaded single car garage. He added that the Municipal Code allowed a minimum front yard setback of 20 feet where averaging occurred and Attachment E from the applicant showed that the average front yard setback for the entire tract was 25 feet, which complied with code. He added that this situation occurred on six of the 36 lots.

The applicant is proposing two models with four different architectural designs featuring:

- Plan 1 - two stories with approximately 3,400 square feet;
- Plan 2 - two stories with 3,800 square feet;
- Modern adaptations of Spanish, Monterey, Cottage and Traditional design.

Staff was recommending improvements:

- The brick veneer on Plan 1B should be continued on the left side to the front door - Condition 1.19 added to require this modification.
- The stone veneer on Plan 1C should be continued to the side yard fence line on the right side and to the front door on the left side - Condition 1.19 added to require this modification;

- The wood siding On Plan 1D at the front of the house on the second floor should be extended down to cover the blank front space of the side loaded garage next to the brick veneer. Staff was also concerned about the blank space on the right side elevation towards the back of the house. Another window was suggested for both floors to address this concern. Conditions 1.20 & 1.21 added to require these modifications.
- Where appropriate and where space permits, shutters should be provided on all four sides to provide four-sided architecture. Porch columns where provided shall include both 6 inch and 8 inch widths. Conditions 1.22 & 1.23 added to require these modifications.
- The applicant provided two elevations with a wrap-around porch. However, the R-1 Zoning Standards require a five and 15 foot side yard setback. Lot 18 with a 20-foot street side yard setback would be the only lot out of the 36 to accommodate a five-foot deep wrap-around porch. Condition 1.24 could be added to require this modification.
- Garage doors - Staff provided Condition 1.25 requiring a variety of garage door styles with the top panels windows for consideration.

Staff provided the findings for the Zone Change and the Precise Plan of Design in their report.

Assistant Planner Colunga concluded his presentation stating that with the recommended design changes described above and included in the Conditions of Approval, staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Zone Change No. 03-03, Tentative Tract Map No 16650 (03-03) and Precise Plan of Design No. 04-07.

He added that after the public discussion and prior to reviewing the Conditions of Approval, staff would like to make a few comments about revisions to the Conditions.

The Planning Commission commented on one-story houses, houses facing existing streets, and connectivity within the tract.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Dereck Hanson, 3400 Central Avenue, Riverside, CA introduced himself as the project manager and thanked staff for their assistance and stated that they would address the issues of the Planning Commission. He introduced the architect Mr. Hans Anderly, Newport Beach CA.

Mr. Anderly pointed out some of the features of the development:

- A 20-foot separation between the homes;
- A variety of roof lines;
- A variety of materials and colors;
- A variety of shapes and silhouettes as depicted in his presentation of each model with different designs and features.

Mr. Hanson spoke to the issue of one-story homes. He stated that they looked at the market study that was prepared for the project and proposed to have an extra room downstairs that could be used as an office or granny flat.

Commissioner Christianson asked if staff had explained the Commission's request for one-story homes. Chair Rosenbaum reminded Commissioner Christianson that Ms. Lamson told the

Commission that the applicant had elected to design two-story homes. She added that financial considerations were not the Commission's purview but the City Council's.

Chair Rosenbaum provided her comments stating that she considered the rooflines too flat and that not enough variety in the rooflines had been provided.

Commissioner Umeda commented on the placement of trees and stated that he would like to see more of a traditional look with tree-lined streets. He asked if it was possible to have one street tree and one parkway tree. Associate Engineer Peterson replied that it was feasible.

Commissioner Umeda went on to discuss houses on the corner lots. He asked if they could be side-loaded. Ms. Lamson explained that the houses would look awkward because they would be the only ones that would be facing George Street. Mr. Peterson added that there would also be a traffic issue because cars would be backing from the driveway into a busy street. Ms. Lamson suggested that maybe adding wrap-around porches would give the appearance of a side-loaded lot.

Commissioner Neff also commented on the absence of wrap-around porches and added that he thought that the lot sizes were too small for the size of the houses and suggested that the applicant reduce the number of houses. He stated that he would like windows to be added to Plan 2, that the west cul-de-sac be similar to the east side of the project, and that a walkway be added to get to the side yard trash enclosures.

Commissioner Christianson commented on the proposed block wall, fencing materials wood vs. polymer and porches and design.

On the issue of the Tract Map, the Commission had concerns regarding the orientation of lots 27 and 26 to Street B, the mass of the block wall, the corner cutback on George Street and Bryn Mawr Avenue, lots sizes, larger setbacks for a more custom look, and reducing the density by removing a few units. They continued their discussion addressing the density and touching on the lack of one-story houses.

The Planning Commission addressed the Precise Plan of Design (PPD) commenting that the arched windows on the Spanish style should carry throughout the front of the house or any area viewed by passers by.

Chair Rosenbaum asked if Senior Planner Lamson would summarize the discussion of the various issues regarding this project. Ms. Lamson summarized as follows:

- The right-of-way should be redesigned to allow for a landscaped parkway adjacent to the curb rather than the sidewalk located adjacent to the curb.
- Redesign the cul-de-sac of the easterly street so that it is similar to the design of the shorter westerly street. There was objection to the side yards of the new lots being adjacent to the rear yards of the existing lots to the south.
- The proposed southeast corner of George and Bryn Mawr should be designed similarly to the existing northeast corner. This would provide addition space for landscaping.
- Consider reducing the size of the homes so that they are not as massive appearing on the site. Or consider increasing the size of the lots so that the massive appearance in proportion to the lot is reduced.
- A single story plan should be designed and integrated with the two other two-story plans.

- Provide a side loaded lot concept or provide wrap around porches on all the corner lots, to provide the appearance of side loaded lots.
- Front porches of eight feet in depth should be provided on all homes.
- Consider redesigning Plan 1 so that the front door is more of a dominant feature and not hidden or tucked away on the side of the house. Consider removing or altering the one car garage element.
- Consider redesigning Plan 2 so that the garage does not extend further than the second floor towards the property line. On the Monterey plan, the front balcony should be continued across the front elevation.
- Additional windows should be added, as follows:

  Plan 1: Consider placing a window on the right elevation in the garage and on the second floor in the M. bedroom.

  Plan 2: The second floor on the left elevation should have a window in the blank area and also on the rear elevation in this area. A decorative window should be placed in the stair well. However, refrain from locating a window in the walk-in closet. There should be a window in the garage on the left elevation. A window should also be provided in the blank area of the first floor on the right side. A window should be provided in the kitchen on the side elevation.

- Arched window should be provided on the Spanish style homes that have front archways. These arched windows should be provided on the front and side elevations visible from public view.
- A pedestrian walkway should be provided from the side yard where the pad for the trashcans is located. Additionally, a walkway should be provided from the front door to the sidewalk without using the driveway.
- Large species of shade trees should be provided in the parkway. Consult the City's Street Tree list. An additional tree should be provided in the front yard.
- Provide vinyl fencing between all homes.

The discussion resulted in the following motion:

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously carried to continue the discussion on Zone Change (ZC) No. 03-03, Tentative Tract Map (TT 03-03) No. 16650, and Precise Plan Of Design (PPD) No. 04-07 to the regular meeting of October 6, 2004 to allow the applicant time to incorporate the changes required by the Planning Commission.

PC-04-48 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT

Director Woldruff stated that she would not have a staff report as no new information was available, since the last meeting although staff had located the program boards for Mr. Miguel Rojas' Ahwahnee Principle conceptual plan for the North Central Neighborhood to aid in the discussion.

Director Woldruff pointed out to the Commission that the discussion would include Mixed-Use areas B, D, G, and F. However, Planning Area E, the residential area on the south side of Mission Road had already been approved and forwarded to the City Council as a General Plan Amendment for a specific project and the designation could not be changed. She continued to

say that the Commission could discuss the commercial node at the east end of the area and the Commission concurred.

The Planning Commission discussed Mr. Rojas's Ahwahnee Principles. Mr. Zola explained that Mr. Rojas had intended for the project to cover all of area B as well as land to the east of Area B. Commissioner Umeda explained that there had been discussion on how to connect the south and the north sections of the city divided by the railroad tracks. He added that Mr. Rojas had been proposing a surface or grade crossing, which were now being discouraged by the railroad companies because of safety reasons.

Chair Rosenbaum commented that what she could see in the plan was residential uses, a lot of recreation opportunities and open space, some commercial on Anderson and asked if these designations were consistent with the proposed General Plan Update. Mr. Zola replied that the major difference was that the area was a little larger than in the draft General Plan Update.

Commissioner Umeda commented that the plan could potentially create a town center, attract investors and improve neighborhoods. Director Woldruff commented that Loma Linda University had been involved in the committee that worked with Mr. Rojas on his plan and that their goal was to provide housing opportunities for students and employees.

Page 2-21 – Implementation Policies, language would be added that would say:

> Expand area B and investigate pedestrian and/or vehicular access from the south side of Loma Linda to the north side; create a safe pedestrian and/or vehicular crossing to access the Loma Linda Academy for parking area for staging.

Director Woldruff explained that the Bailey bridge removed from Beaumont Avenue had been divided into two parts with one section to be placed on Ohio Street over the creek, and the other at the Edison easement for pedestrian connectivity from the North Central Neighborhood.

A discussion ensued regarding the concept of live/work where Mr. Zola explained that in his conversations with the University they were considering was a building with commercial or classroom space on the ground level and student housing on the upper floors.

Director Woldruff pointed out that the label for Area B in the Draft General Plan, University Village should be changed to avoid confusing it the University Village project planned for the north side of Mission Road.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period for Area B at 9:16 pm.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda spoke positively about Mr. Rojas' Plan stating that it was the true concept of new urbanism and Livable/Walkable. He commented that there was a feeling of more open space because the density was concentrated to one or more areas instead of having many single dwellings that gave the appearance of less open space.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda commented that if the City went with the concept of lecture halls on the ground floor and students housing above it was important to remember to plan parking areas for faculty and students. Mr. Zola explained that one of the features of the area was a parking structure and/or a concept of annex buildings connected by a shuttle system.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda provided general comments stating that the proposed mixed-use areas would create radical changes to Loma Linda. He expressed certain concerns regarding Mr. Rojas' plan related to traffic and parking in too small an area. He encouraged the Planning Commission to reduce mixed-use areas and cautioned them not be overly excited by Mr. Rojas' concept.

Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, Loma Linda stated his concerns on the concept of bringing Benton Street to Redlands Boulevard and adding a signal light at Richardson Street, as this would impede the flow of traffic because of the successive traffic lights on Redlands Boulevard.

Director Woldruff clarified that the concept of extending Benton Street as shown on the program boards was not in the Circulation Element of the General Plan but was a concept of Mr. Rojas' Ahwahnee Principle.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the discussion on Mixed-Use Area D, located south of Redlands Boulevard, and east of California Street.

Commissioner Christianson stated that he had just received an emergency call and asked if he could provide his comments and leave the meeting. Chair Rosenbaum agreed. Mr. Christianson made the following comments:

- Page 2-26 – Reduce the medium density in Area D from 5.1-9 to 5.1-6.5 - Director Woldruff replied that the densities in the General Plan were ranges and that not every project would be approved for the maximum density. She added that staff had never led any applicant to believe that they would be getting the maximum density for a project.

Mr. Zola explained that it was important for Commissioner Christianson to identify the objective for the request to change a particular density range. Commissioner Christianson replied that he was looking for a large mix of densities in Area D.

Director Woldruff replied that language could be added to say that amenities such as open space, parkland, recreation facilities, and trails could be a trade-off for the approval of a higher density. She added that the Planning Commission could tool policies to mirror the policies of the Historic Mission Overlay District that would not allow anyone to get the highest density unless the project met those policies.

- Page 2-27 d) – Limiting the height of residential building to two-story. Add policy to designate a percentage of a project to obtain a mix of one and two story. – Director Woldruff pointed out that the section he was quoting was the Implementation Policies for Area E. She added that the Policy for Area D already addressed a mix of one and two story building.

Commissioner Umeda suggested that a clause be added in section 2.2.8.4 k) that stated that residential buildings should have a mix of one and two story structures for detached single-family residences. Mr. Zola and Director Woldruff concurred.

Commissioner Christianson left the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 9:53 p.m.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda stated that she appreciated the Commission's consideration of low density for the area north of Area E to conform with the Historic Mission Overlay District and their attempt to make the population happy. She complimented Commission Umeda on his efforts.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda commented that he concurred with Commissioner Umeda and encouraged the Commission to plan for a large buffer along Mission Road and to keep traffic on Redlands Boulevard although it may not create a neo-traditional style project.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda concurred that it was very important to provide a large buffer north of Mission Road. He commented that there were already two major north-south corridors, Mountain View Avenue and California Street and that another north-south artery for the local residents to relieve traffic on Mission Road would be appropriate. He added that in his opinion the area south of Redlands Boulevard would be the last hope for a second downtown for Loma Linda.

Gil Prestwood, Lewis Operating Corp. 1156 N. Mountain, Upland stated he had three concerns:

- Density range for Area D – Commissioner Umeda replied that the Planning Commission would be proposing low density, 2.1 to 5 du/acre and no medium density for detached single-family dwelling;
- One-story houses – Would the Planning Commission allow the addition of a second story by the homeowner;
- Possible ways to create connections to both Planning Areas D and E along Mission Road.

Mr. Prestwood remarked that commercial uses would benefit from a gradual increase in density north from Mission Road ending with the highest density mixed-uses at Redlands Boulevard.

Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, Loma Linda suggested planning major traffic arteries and place apartments and row homes away from Mission Road.

John Snell, Richmond American Homes, proposed that the Planning Commission limit the medium density to a certain percentage (%) through the area instead of eliminating that density all together.

Mr. Zola summarized the comments stating that it sounded like what the Commission would like would be a gradation of density from low density at Mission, getting progressively higher as it moved north so that the high-density would be concentrated towards Redlands Boulevard close to the commercial uses with traffic being the heaviest at the north end of the planning area.

Chair Rosenbaum stated that the Commission would be open to a mix of all the density throughout the Planning Area.

During a discussion regarding the Historical Mission Overlay District, Director Woldruff suggested that more specific language be added referencing historic resources to strengthen the importance of the Overlay District. Mr. Zola agreed stating the General Plan must acknowledge the Ordinance and provide policies to support the ordinance to ensure that it its implementation.

Glenn Elssmann, 25814 Business Center Drive, Ste C, stated that the Planning Commission and the City Council recognized that standard lot or conventional subdivision did not afford the amenities that new urbanism or traditional neighborhood design could offer. He commented that connectivity must exist between the projects on the south side of Mission Road and any proposed development on the north side especially if a school or library were being discussed to ensure that the residents on the south side could get to those potential amenities and/or commercial uses up to Redlands Boulevard. Mr. Elssmann also commented that to sustain mixed-use commercial uses, the placement of those uses along California Street, Redlands Boulevard and Anderson Street did seem to be the reasonable areas for commercial mixed-use.

Mr. Zirkle returned to the podium to comment that if commercial uses were located along California Street and Redlands Boulevard it would not conform to the neo-traditional. He added that to connect the two sides of Mission Road, trails running through the green belts would encourage people to walk to their destination.

Because of the late hour, Director Woldruff proposed that the Planning Commission continue the discussion of Planning Areas a small portion for commercial in Area "E", and Areas "G" and "J" to September 15, 2005.

Vice Chair Neff suggested that a summary be provided of the discussions for Planning Area "D" and some input from Mr. Zola.

> **Motion by Neff, seconded by Umeda, and carried by a vote of 4-0, Christianson absent for the motion, to continue the discussion of the Draft General Plan for small portion of commercial use in Area "E", and Areas "G" and "J" to the Adjourned meeting of September 15, 2004 meeting.**

Director Woldruff announced that Southern California Edison was hosting an Open House in the Senior Center on September 7, 2004 from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. in regards to their transmission lines through the South Hills. She added that post card invitations were mailed out and an email sent to the City's email distribution list.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

No reports were given.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Senior Planner Lamson stated that a Planning Commission meeting would be required for October 20, 2004 to discuss University Village/Orchard Park and added that she would be providing them with copies of the Specific Plans and the EIR for both projects. She informed the Commission that the public review period would beginning on September 8, 2004 for 45 days and that the meeting would occur two days before the 45-day review period ended. After the meeting of the 20th, the Planning Commission would meet again to discuss the EIR and the responses received, take additional public testimony and give a description of the project.

Director Woldruff reported that the Community Development Department had added Code Enforcement to the Department as of July 1, 2004. She explained that the Code Enforcement Division was, in other cities, typically in the Community Development Department because the Officers enforced issues related to the Zoning Code. She added that a program focusing on problems on Redlands Boulevard was being formulated.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of August 3, 2005.

_____

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04OSept01M-app.doc