



**CITY OF MONTCLAIR  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**REGULAR ADJOURNED MEETING  
Monday, February 13, 2006**

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
5111 Benito Street, Montclair, California 91763**

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Flores called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Johnson led those present in the salute to the flag.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Chairman Flores, Vice Chairman Lenhart, Commissioners Johnson, Sahagun and Vodvarka, Community Development Director Clark, City Planner Lustro, Associate Planners Lai and Frazier-Burton, and City Attorney Robbins

**MINUTES**

The minutes of the January 23, 2006 Planning Commission meeting were presented for approval. Commissioner Johnson moved to approve, Commissioner Vodvarka seconded, there being no opposition to the motion, the minutes were approved 5-0.

**ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

## AGENDA ITEMS

The Commission, by consensus, chose to change the order of the agenda and elected to review item 6.b first.

### **6.b CASE NUMBER 2006-2**

Project Address: 5060 Saddleback Street  
Project Applicant: Sergio Torres  
Project Planner: Jim S. Lai, Associate Planner  
Request: Precise Plan of Design for the construction of a one-story, single-family residence  
Staff Recommendation: Approve Precise Plan of Design

Associate Planner Lai reviewed the staff report.

Commissioner Sahagun asked how the property will be accessed. Associate Planner Lai replied that the access will be from a new Saddleback Street off Fremont Avenue.

Commissioner Johnson moved that, based on the evidence submitted, a finding is made that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Section 15303(a), Class 3, in that the project involves construction of three or less single-family residences in a completely urbanized area, seconded by Commissioner Sahagun, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Vodvarka moved to approve the Precise Plan of Design request under Case No. 2006-2 and as described in the staff report, for the construction of one (1) single-family residence at 5060 Saddleback Street, on Lot 2 of Parcel Map No. 16740 and the plot plan, floor plan, elevations, colors, materials, and all associated on- and off-site improvements per the submitted plans subject to the 30 conditions of approval, seconded by Vice Chairman Lenhart, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

1. This approval is contingent upon final City approval and recordation of Parcel Map No. 16740 with the San Bernardino County Recorder's Office.
2. This approval is for a Precise Plan of Design to construct a single-story, 3,211 square-foot single-family dwelling with attached 3-car garage on the parcel as depicted on the plans submitted under Case No. 2006-2. Exterior building colors, materials, window treatments, and roofing materials shall be subject to the review and approval of the City Planner.
3. Precise Plan of Design (PPD) approval shall be valid for a period of one year and shall automatically expire on the anniversary date of Planning Commission approval, unless the applicant is diligently pursuing building plan check toward eventual construction of the project. The applicant and/or property owner shall be responsible to apply for a time extension at least 30 days prior to the approval's expiration date. No further notice from the City will be given regarding the project's PPD expiration date.

4. The applicant and/or property owner shall ensure that a copy of the Planning Commission approval letter, including all conditions of approval, be reproduced on the first page of the construction drawings and shall be distributed to all design professionals, contractors, and subcontractors participating in the construction phase of the project.
5. Prior to submittal of grading plans or other improvement plans, the applicant shall receive approval from the NPDES Coordinator for a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) in accordance with the State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Guidelines for San Bernardino County. WQMP Guidelines may be purchased from the City of Montclair or are available for review on-line at: [www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/html/san\\_bernardino\\_permit.html](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/html/san_bernardino_permit.html). The WQMP shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer or other qualified professional as may be authorized in the guidelines.
6. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall:
  - a. Submit five complete sets of architectural plans for the project, including building elevations, colors and materials, electrical, plumbing, mechanical, landscaping, lighting, and accessibility details, plus two sets of soils, structural and Title 24 calculations for review and approval by the Building and Planning Divisions. Contact Rudy Gomez, Senior Building Inspector, at 909/625-9437 for an appointment to submit plans.
  - b. Prepare and submit plans for erosion control and storm water pollution prevention to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. A general construction permit may be required. Contact Joe Rosales, NPDES coordinator, at 909/625-9470 for requirements.
  - c. Submit a detailed landscape planting plan for the front yard of the residence, including the following:
    - i. Three (3) Lagerstroemia indica 'Rubra' (Crape Myrtle) street trees, 25 feet on center. Street trees shall be a minimum 24-inch box size.
    - ii. Sod or hydroseed turf, a variety of shrubs and at least one, 15-gallon container size accent tree.All trees shall be double-staked per City standards.
  - d. Submit three (3) complete sets of plans for an approved, automatic fire sprinkler system for each residence directly to the Fire Marshal's office for review and approval, including two sets to be microfilmed/digitally imaged. The system shall conform to national standards.
  - e. Pay all required Montclair Fire Department fees.

- f. Pay adopted parkland development fee. (Currently adopted fee as of January, 2006, is \$2,700 per dwelling unit.)
  - g. Pay adopted transportation impact fee, if in effect at the time building permits are obtained. (It is anticipated that the City will adopt said impact fee in late 2006.)
  - h. Pay all required school fees directly to the Ontario-Montclair School District and the Chaffey Joint Union High School District.
7. The street address of the new single-family residence shall be 5060 Saddleback Street.
  8. Prior to commencement of the framing stage or delivery of lumber to the project site, the applicant shall provide an all-weather access within the adjacent street right-of-way. An all-weather access is defined as base course A.C. pavement to a minimum depth of 2½ inches and having a minimum width of 26'-0". This 26-foot width shall be maintained free and clear of construction equipment, materials and debris at all times during construction.
  9. All landscape areas shall have 100 percent irrigation coverage by an automatic irrigation system.
  10. Maintenance of landscape areas in the front yard shall be the responsibility of the developer until the residence becomes occupied, at which time the responsibility for maintenance shall transfer to the property owner.
  11. The applicant shall incorporate sufficient sound attenuation measures (i.e., dual-paned glazing, upgraded insulation, etc.) in the residence to achieve a maximum interior noise level of 45dBA.
  12. Elevations of the proposed dwelling shall reflect the inclusion of enhanced glazing (full divided-lights or divided-lights over single-light) and window surrounds and/or enhancements (wood, stucco-over-foam, shutters, pot shelves or similar) on all elevations.
  13. The address of the new residence shall be displayed in minimum four-inch (4") tall numerals on a contrasting background and backlit with a low-voltage illumination source.
  14. All large mechanical devices, such as air conditioning condensers, shall be located on the ground within interior yard areas not visible to the public right-of-way. All wall- and roof-mounted exhausts and vents shall be designed to be compatible and blend with the architectural design of the residence.
  15. Fences and walls within front yard setbacks shall not exceed 48 inches in height. Chain-link is expressly prohibited for property fencing.

16. No construction within the public right-of-way shall commence until a public works permit is obtained from the City's Public Works Department and all applicable fees paid. All utility lines installed to serve the new residence shall be underground. The sewer connection improvements may be shown on either the street improvement or grading improvement plans.
17. Residential drive approach ("W") and driveways (as measured at front property line) shall be a minimum of 12'-0" and a maximum of 18'-0" in width. Top of "X" shall be no closer than 5'-0" to property line. Private driveway width at the back of the sidewalk shall match the drive approach width.
18. Discharge of wastewater into the sanitary sewer system shall conform to Chapter 9.20 of the Montclair Municipal Code.
19. Regional Sewerage Supplemental Capital Outlay fees are required in accordance with Section 9.20.430 of the Montclair Municipal Code and the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA).
20. Payment of all sewer connection fees and outstanding sewer reimbursement fees as imposed by a district, if any, or any assessments shall be required. Contact Bruce Taylor, Environmental Control Specialist at 909/625-9446 for fees/assessments.
21. No soil shall be imported or exported without first obtaining approval from the City Engineer. A plan satisfactory to the City Engineer shall be prepared showing the proposed haul route within the City. Subject plan shall include provisions for street sweeping and cleanup.
22. Underground Service Alert shall be notified 48 hours prior to any excavation at (800) 422-4133.
23. All off-site and on-site trenching and excavation shall conform to CAL-OSHA standards. Excavations that exceed five feet in depth require a CAL-OSHA permit.
24. Construction drawings submitted to the Building Division for plan check review shall comply with Montclair Security Ordinance No. 357.
25. The applicant/developer/general contractor is responsible for reasonable periodic clean-up of the construction site to avoid hazardous accumulation of combustible trash and debris.
26. A final release of occupancy is required for the residence. Final release by the Building Official shall be contingent upon Fire Department inspection and approval of all conditions.
27. Prior to release of occupancy for the dwelling unit, the person or corporation responsible for the preparation of the WQMP shall certify in writing to the Building Official that all conditions and requirements of the WQMP have been

implemented or complied with. For projects, developments, or properties intended to be leased or sold, developer shall also submit evidence to the Building Official that lessee or purchaser has been advised in writing of lessee's or purchaser's on-going maintenance responsibilities with respect to the requirements of the WQMP.

28. Prior to the final release of occupancy, the applicant shall:
  - a. Submit to the Building Division electronic images of all plans and records for the purpose of obtaining a building permit. Electronic images shall comply with the City's Electronic Archiving Policy.
  - b. Install all approved landscaping and permanent, automatic irrigation system within the front yard of the residence.
  - c. Install the numeric address of the residence on the street-facing elevation of the dwelling in numerals measuring at least four inches (4") in height.
  - d. Install and complete all required public right-of-way improvements in accordance with conditions of approval for Parcel Map No. 16740 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
29. To ensure compliance with the provisions of this Planning Commission approval, a final inspection is required from the Planning Division when work has been completed. The applicant shall inform the Planning Division and schedule an appointment for such an inspection.
30. The applicant shall agree to defend, at his sole expense, any action brought against the City, its agents, officers, or employees because of the issuance of this approval; or, in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers, or employees for any damages, loss, court costs and attorney fees that the City, its agents, officers, or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action, but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition.

**c. CASE NUMBER 2006-8**

Project Address:	5183 Montclair Plaza Lane
Project Applicant:	General Growth Properties
Project Planner:	Steve Lustro, AICP, City Planner
Request:	Precise Plan of Design for a single-tenant sign program for Barnes & Noble Booksellers
Staff Recommendation:	Approve Precise Plan of Design

City Planner Lustro reviewed the staff report.

Commissioner Johnson asked for clarification regarding the size of the letters and whether they were in compliance. City Planner Lustro stated that what is presently affixed to the building façade is a mock-up of what staff is recommending for approval. The primary line of copy is five feet tall and the secondary line of copy is 23 inches tall.

Commissioner Sahagun moved that, based on the evidence submitted, a finding is made that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Section 15303, Class 3, in that the project involves the approval of a sign program to govern the installation of building-mounted signs, seconded by Commissioner Vodvarka, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Johnson moved to approve the Precise Plan of Design for sign program under Case No. 2006-8, subject to the six conditions of approval, seconded by Chairman Flores, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

1. This Precise Plan of Design (PPD) approval is for a single-tenant sign program at 5183 Montclair Plaza Lane. The approved components of the sign program include one (1) wall-mounted major identification sign on the entry façade over the store entrance. The top line, "BARNES & NOBLE", is proposed to be 60-inch tall individual channel letters with white faces, 35 feet in length. The lower line, "BOOKSELLERS", is proposed to be 23-inch tall channel letters, 28 feet in length. Channel letters will have white returns and trim caps.

Sign copy shall be installed in the location illustrated on the applicant's submittal.

2. Precise Plan of Design (PPD) approval of the sign program shall be valid for a period of 12 months and shall automatically expire on the anniversary date of Planning Commission approval, unless the applicant is diligently pursuing building plan check towards eventual construction of the project. The applicant and/or property owner shall be responsible to apply for extension of time at least 30 days prior to expiration date. No further notice from the City will be given regarding the project's PPD expiration date.
3. Any future changes to the approved sign program shall require City review and approval prior to implementation.
4. Building permits shall be obtained from the City of Montclair prior to installation of signs.
5. To ensure compliance with the provisions of this Planning Commission approval, a final inspection is required from the Planning and Building Divisions when work has been completed. The applicant shall inform the Planning and Building Divisions and schedule appointments for such inspections.
6. The applicant shall agree to defend, at its sole expense, any action brought against the City, its agents, officers, or employees because of the issuance of this approval; or, in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers, or employees for any damages, loss, court costs and attorney

fees that the City, its agents, officers, or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action, but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition.

**a. PUBLIC HEARING – CASE NUMBER 2006-6**

Project Address:	±370 Acres With the City's Sphere of Influence
Project Applicant:	City of Montclair
Project Planner:	Steve Lustro, AICP, City Planner
Request:	Establish prezone designations to various areas within Montclair's adopted Sphere of Influence for the purpose of adding said areas to the City's Official Prezone Map in accordance with Chapter 11.14 of the Montclair Municipal Code
Staff Recommendation:	Approve proposed prezone designations and recommend City Council approval

Chairman Flores welcomed everyone in attendance and stated that there were guidelines that needed to be followed, to wit: (1) all cell phones must be turned off providing no interference with the meeting; (2) a speaker's card must be filled out if someone wants to speak, but he added that even if a speaker's card was not filled out and someone feels they have something they need to say, the Commission would try its best to fit everyone in; and (3) each speaker will be limited to three minutes, especially since there were so many cards filled out and people waiting to speak. He commented that the Commission would like to not have any repetition of things that have been said before and that the Commission is not trying to keep anyone quiet, the Commission wants the input, and, by the same token, they want everyone to see what the Commission is all about.

City Planner Lustro reviewed the staff report.

Commissioner Sahagun asked staff where the zoning inconsistencies are. City Planner Lustro replied that the inconsistencies primarily exist in the area north of Mission Boulevard, including portions of the blocks on Rose, Grand and Vernon Avenues, where the General Plan designation is primarily for industrial uses. While staff believes that the General Plan designation is largely satisfactory for the northerly portions of those blocks which have largely transitioned into industrial uses, the southerly portions of those blocks, to varying degrees, have maintained a residential character and staff believes that even though they are sandwiched between the commercial uses along Mission Boulevard and the more industrial-type of uses along the north end of those blocks, there is some cohesiveness and character that staff thought should be preserved. It is a very modest neighborhood, but we believe that we should try to do what we can to encourage investment and preservation in that neighborhood. If the residents desire to live there and would like to maintain it as residential, we should not allow further encroachment of industrial uses into those portions of the block. Commissioner Sahagun stated that it was mentioned in the report that if a landowner wanted to convert to industrial or commercial they would have to do an assemblage of at least three lots. City Planner Lustro responded that in the future if the land were to be annexed into the City and at some point beyond that a developer or property owner came in and wanted to

assemble land to do an industrial or business park or something similar, not only would some land assembly be required but they would probably have to process a General Plan amendment and zone change. Those designations are not permanent and can be changed, but staff felt for the short term that some thought should be given to the existing development in those neighborhoods and try to preserve that as best as possible. Commissioner Sahagun asked if there were any other areas of inconsistency. City Planner Lustro said that that was the primary one and the other areas are scattered around. There are some issues where the General Plan designation is low-density residential and it should be changed to medium density where we have gone from an R-1 to an R-2, but that involves only a handful of lots. There are some General Plan designations that are leaning more toward commercial whereas they should include Business Park or Industrial Park type uses and staff will need to analyze, in detail, the areas in question and if the pre-zone designations are adopted, go back and make those amendments.

Chairman Flores opened the public hearing.

Sue Mabery, 5458 Howard Street, Ontario, stated that she understood the Commission wanted to keep the comments limited to the issue of pre-zoning but it would be difficult for her. She wanted to know why her area got changed because she is the only horse property on Howard Street and felt like she was being penalized. She is now proposed to be R-2. She would like to have special zoning. She also wanted to know why the City of Montclair was against large animal owners and against people who bought their properties so they could have the freedom to use it. She did not think a lot of the people in attendance would be there if this was a different city attempting to annex. Her question is they are being pre-zoned but they do not get to give any input on it. She spoke with Mr. Lustro at the workshop about being grandfathered and he told her that if something happens to her horse she could not replace it. As far as she knows, Montclair is the only place that does that and it was the only reason that gave her the reason to fight the pre-zoning. She also got conflicting information about the development that happened next to her property. She has a piece of paper that says that staff knew about it. Mr. Lustro told her he knew nothing about the size of the lots or even the blueprinting. There has definitely been some inconsistencies from what she has heard, the information people are getting when they call Mr. Lustro is inconsistent. She asked for an answer on the spot as to why Montclair is against people having large animals. As far as she knew, Ontario is tolerant of it and so is Chino. Why should they lose the freedom of the use of their land? She understands the changes that would occur once she moved and she thought that was what grandfathering was, but why should she lose that? She has nine-tenths of an acre and all she can do is keep 2 dogs and 2 cats on it, she cannot park any vehicles where there is no cement pad at and felt it was wrong. Grandfathering means nothing. She wanted someone to tell her why Montclair is against the freedoms of why they bought their land. Why can't they exist together? Just because they want a rural lifestyle, they are not stopping anyone who is developing next to them, but their rights are not more important than they are. Some of them have been living in the area much longer than the people in the new developments that think this is the greatest thing that they are going to get better police service, better graffiti clean-up and get their streets cleaned. They know development is going to happen but why do they have to lose so much, why can't they co-exist with the plan? That is why so many people showed up at the meeting – because they do not want to give up their freedoms. She felt like they were the big losers. She just thought it was so unfair for people's rights to be ignored.

Chairman Flores stated that the meeting was only to pre-zone the area and for the people against that, there would be an appropriate time to address the City Council. The pre-zone was just a very preliminary thing.

City Planner Lustro stated that he would address the comments and concerns. First issue - large animals. The City's development standards for residential properties that are at least 20,000 square feet in size are the same as the County's with regard to large animals. The County code requires that for residents to keep large animals, a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet is required, with one large animal permitted for every 10,000 square feet lot area. For example, if you have a property in the County that is 30,000 square feet, you'd be entitled to keep three large animals. Under the City's code, the minimum lot size required for large animals is 20,000 square feet and the City's criteria for keeping large animals is one animal for every 10,000 square feet. So, if you have a 30,000 square-foot lot in the City, you are allowed to keep three large animals. No difference. Director Clark added that he heard Ms. Mabery say that she has nine-tenths of an acre. If she has a lot that size and she was annexed to the City, she could keep her animals. With regard to her proposed pre-zone designation, staff was approached after the workshop by a number of her neighbors and there appeared to be a consensus that they wanted to be R-2. Staff looked at that request and had to decide where to draw the line, to include her property or not. Ms. Mabery asked if her lot could be dropped from the R-2 pre-zone. Director Clark advised that if that is what she was requesting, she could be changed back to R-1(11). Ms. Mabery responded that she would like to keep the same zoning that she has now because grandfathering does not mean anything and she wanted to know if the City allows large animals, how come she could not find it anywhere on the website? It seemed to her that the history of horse properties that were previously annexed, the City just tolerates them long enough until the people die or they get rid of their horses. Director Clark advised that there is an estate area that was built in the late 1970s, probably 200 estate homes. When residents first moved in, those people had a lot of horses. If you go today, there are probably only 15 in the neighborhood. Ms. Mabery stated that she would like to keep the RS-20 zoning for as long as she lives on the property and appealed to the Commission to not think that it is not just one type of place and throw away what some of them are living there for. She asked about the motto of exceptional service for exceptional citizens and asked if that was only for some citizens. Director Clark advised that Ms. Mabery's property is on the edge of the R-2 zone and it would really not make a difference if she wanted to be in the R-1(11) and staff would be happy to recommend it.

Chairman Flores reminded everyone that the meeting was strictly for pre-zoning and that no annexation action was being taken.

Barbara Nelson, 5516 Howard Street, Ontario, stated that she was against pre-zoning, has lived in her house for 19-20 years and the main purpose of moving there was to get a horse for her son, be able to have animals and not have her rights infringed upon. She washes her car on the front lawn so she can water her lawn as well as washing her car. If she was in the City, she will be unable to do that because it's against the law to do anything. Property taxes are going to go up and she was against pre-zoning.

City Planner Lustro stated that he did not know where Ms. Nelson's property is with regard to the question on the animals but the answer would be the same as it was for Ms. Mabery. If Ms. Nelson has a lot that is at least 20,000 square feet in size, she would be permitted to keep large animals pursuant to the City's code. With regard to washing cars on the lawn, as the Commission is aware, the City does allow that, but does not allow parking on the lawn. There are many residents who wash their cars as Ms. Nelson does and the City has no problem with that.

Commissioner Sahagun asked about being grandfathered in. For example, someone has a horse and the horse dies, what is the time limit that you have to keep the property the same zone. Do we have a time limit on the legal non-conforming zoning of a property once you either get rid of your animal or the property has been vacant for a while? City Planner Lustro says the City's code section on non-conforming uses does not specifically address that because it has not been an issue in the past. As was discussed, he believes may not be an issue if their properties meet the minimum lot size for large animals. If they have one-half acre or more, grandfathering does not even come into play, they can keep large animals. With regard to lots that are smaller than 20,000 square feet and there is currently the keeping of large animals, those properties are in violation of the County code. The City would be very hard-pressed to say there is some kind of timeframe for the grandfathering or allowance of a legal non-conforming use. When it is not legal and it's not non-conforming, it is illegal.

Commissioner Sahagun stated that if a resident is keeping large animals illegally in the County, it will likely be illegal in the City. He then asked about the time limit regarding Ms. Mabery's property. If there is no horse there for six months and then she sells the property, does the new property owner keep the same zoning designation or does that go away? City Planner Lustro said that it will stay because it is currently conforming to the County code and, based on the size of her lot, the lot is more than large enough to keep large animals under the City's code. There is not an issue of nonconformity. If she sells the property and a new property owner comes in, they are subject to the same guidelines under the City code. If the code has not changed (and probably will not) they would be allowed to keep large animals.

Commissioner Sahagun commented that taxes are based on the County you live in, whether you live in the city limits or the county, unless you have a special tax within that City. For example, here in Montclair we voted to raise our taxes for the schools through a bond. City Planner Lustro interrupted to clarify. The general obligation bond that Commissioner Sahagun is referring to was approved district-wide, not just within the city limits of Montclair. The City's sphere of influence is served by the same two school districts as the City, so the indebtedness for the approved school bond is assessed equally in the City and County areas falling within the school district's boundaries. Again, the City of Montclair has no bonded indebtedness that it would pass on to new residents who buy new houses or residents that are annexed at some future date. The City's tax rate is the same as the County of San Bernardino. The tax rate will not change.

Commissioner Sahagun commented that he believed the property tax issue is a common misconception – that you're taxes are going to go up.

Rick Gallagher, 11160 Benson Avenue, Ontario, commented that he felt the City put it all in a box with a bow on it and it has been shoved down their throat. He has lived on Benson

Avenue for 28 years, he has had his business there, his animals there, raised a family there and the City is telling him that it is changing the zoning. He said that the City is not going to shove this at the people in the County without listening to them. He does not want to be told to hook up his sewer or how many animals or tell me what to do with his business. The City is not going to sugar coat it. In a few short minutes the people from the County tore apart the paperwork and the website, it's not accurate. The City has no right to change the zoning.

Jerry Croswell, 4125 State Street, Montclair, commented that he has had a business in the City of Montclair sphere of influence for the past 29 years and specifically moved into the County to get away from the city 14 years ago because of the continuing rules, regulations and unplanned visits from officials supposedly to make sure that his business was being run safely and properly. In 29 years he has never been cited for anything so he finally got a chance to buy property. He has had the privilege going to similar meetings between California Resources Air Board, South Coast Air Quality Management and he found out, unfortunately, that the City's mind is already made up and they have attended to watch the City provide this exercise in futility.

Robert T. Trevino, 4284 Phillips Boulevard, Pomona, was called upon but failed to respond.

Ted Schneider, 11063 Roswell Avenue, Pomona, was called upon but failed to respond.

Floyd Hughes, 4168 Howard Street, Pomona, was called upon but stated that he would let someone else speak.

Joseph Hale, corner of Vernon Avenue and Phillips Boulevard, commented that he has lived there for about 20 years and has heard about Code Enforcement coming around and giving out citations when the City cannot even get someone to come and remove the graffiti. He called and the City passed the buck. Chairman Flores asked for clarification that Mr. Hale lives in the County area and was stating that he cannot get graffiti removal. Chairman Flores stated that if the graffiti is located on property in the County, the City would not remove the graffiti. Mr. Hale stated that the graffiti faced the City and he still could not get the City to come and remove the graffiti. Mr. Hale stated that he liked the way they lived, fire pits, kids, noise, and no complaints from the neighbors. When he hears what is going to be done and that it increases taxes, to him the sewer bond is a tax and he opposes it.

Clarine Wiersma, 5634 Howard Street, Ontario, stated that she lives on Howard Street near Benson, and they bought their property in 1989 knowing that she was within the County and never realized that she was within the sphere of influence of the City of Montclair. Around 1994 something like this came up and they had Council meetings at that point and there was a lot of opposition. She has letters that LAFCO wrote her at that time and she wrote and corresponded with the City. The mayor at that time assured them that it would never happen unless the majority of people wanted it and now here we are again. Today she talked to Kathleen Rollings-McDonald at LAFCO and said that there are five criteria and if our area meets those criteria, the City can take it (annex) and there is nothing we can do about it. City Planner Lustro stated that what he believed Mrs. Wiersma was referring to is Government Code Section 56375.3, which is the island annexation law that Mrs. McDonald was likely describing to her. Under that Government Code section there are certain criteria under which an area qualifies for an island annexation and, as this Commission knows, staff has

provided information to the Commission in the past. That law sunsets in 2007 and the reason for its establishment is basically to encourage cities across the state to annex substantially or completely surrounded islands within their spheres of influence because of the belief that cities can provide more efficient services to those areas than can the County. One of the components of the island annexation process is that protest by property owners or registered voters at the end of the process is eliminated. While the City Council has not given specific direction for annexation associated with the areas to be pre-zoned at this time, they have asked staff to look at areas that might qualify under that Government Code section and the area in which Mrs. Wiersma lives does qualify under that Code section.

Mrs. Wiersma stated that she was also told her that the current sphere of influence was established in 1972 by LAFCO, but there are four lots on the west side of Benson Avenue that are in Ontario. Her area is much more akin to what it's like in Ontario or Chino than Montclair. Montclair is residential, it's a shopping mall, it's not the same country atmosphere. We have a business, a big building and as long as they are there, they are grandfathered in. They have an acre with a building, they have their construction business, they do not manufacture or do anything there, they store there and they bought there for that very reason. You put them in the City limits and they cannot do what they do and they are not doing anything bad. Director Clark commented that there is a four-lot area of Ontario within the Montclair sphere of influence that is referred to as the Barney Jewett annexation. He promoted it through the County and it was annexed to Ontario prior to LAFCO doing the sphere of influence studies throughout the County. So, despite the fact that there is a little piece of Ontario intruding into our sphere; LAFCO decided that the best boundary was Benson and that was adopted in 1972.

Foster Holt, 4080 Grand Avenue, Pomona, stated that he hoped that everyone would forgive his digression to the annexation issue for a moment. The master plan for all of San Bernardino calls for unincorporated areas within the sphere of influence within the City of Montclair to be eventually annexed by the City. This would eliminate any confusion over the boundaries and who is responsible for providing vital services such as fire, police protection as well as road maintenance. The City of Montclair is anxious to annex this area to broaden its tax base as well as have room to expand and perhaps justifiably claim that it is already providing services to the area. The Fire Department provides fire protection. Establishing pre-zone designations in unincorporated areas within the sphere of influence of the City and adding those to the City's official pre-zone map would definitely smooth the transition between County and City control of the area. However, this is where he becomes concerned. Pre-zone means "before zoning"; in other words, it establishes what zones the City plans to establish once the City's official pre-zone map becomes a zoning map. Precedent in a court of law lends a lot of weight to the eventual judgment. Pre-zoning will enhance the probability of the zones that the City wants to establish do indeed become a reality. There is no doubt where the County of San Bernardino and the City of Montclair is concerned that the unincorporated area within the City's sphere of influence will eventually become part of the City. Every time a parcel is sold, the new owners are encouraged to join the City. He does not doubt this eventuality either. However, he strongly argues against the establishment of pre-zone areas. Pre-zoning gives much less opportunity for the parties interested and most concerned with the zone change to speak against possible bad zoning changes. It is difficult enough to oppose a zone change when it is imminent without establishing precedence for zoning changes that may not be made until one year later. In a sense, it puts an individual's

rights in double jeopardy. You have to fight pre-zoning changes, then zoning changes and he feels it is unfair and should be an issue faced when the time comes and not establishing something far in the future where we can wait to see the hammer fall.

Steven J. Stage, 11217 Bolton Avenue, Ontario, commented that they have done this so many times and said that the City does not need to pre-zone, taking the responsibility of the County into finding out what their use is going to be, the County has already done that, the City is wasting its time and money. The City is coming through all the hoopla and stating that it is pre-zoning when it is pre-annexation.

Cheryl Wiseman, 5445 Morgan Street, Ontario, commented that she lives on Morgan Street between Phillips and Howard and has a 57,000 square-foot lot, on which she taught and trained handicapped children to ride horses. She was told by Tina Twing at the County of San Bernardino that she could sell her property as horse property. She is concerned that the pre-zoning and the grandfather clause that she will not be able to do that. She has been there for 26 years and does not trust the City. Most of the lots are on septic tanks and are all maintained fine. In fact, she does not even know where the sewer is because it is a long way from her property. There is something that is really wonderful down there; it's a rural area where people want to come into this area because they can have the animals, the horses, a rural and nice area and now it's becoming a concrete jungle. She looked at the corner of Howard and Vernon where there are big houses on postage stamp lots, impacting the area with more people, more traffic, less land. This is a nice area that they want to keep rural. When she moved there, her property was zoned A-1 and all of a sudden they are an R-1 and they were not notified. Now the City wants to make them into an R-1. Too many things over the years that have been changed, they were told one thing, and she does not trust the City.

Lisa Perales, 11195 Surrey Avenue, Ontario, stated that they are blessed to live where they are at. There are not many areas around here. Chino has changed. They are blessed that they still have it and they want to hold on to it. She has lived in her home for 30 years and there is nothing broken here and do not want anyone coming in and trying to fix it. Yes, there are nice new homes and they look beautiful but it is not the area they live in. They want to keep the area the way it is.

Mr. A. Gratson, 5611 Mission Boulevard, Space 4, Ontario, stated that he is a 13-year resident of the Palms Mobile Home Park. They experienced, on January 1, a rent raise of \$100 per month and as a consequence, feel that what will happen with the pre-zoning, which will lead to the next step, will mean that our rent raises will go up again. He sent a letter on February 2 to Mr. Lustro regarding the fixed income that most of them are living under. He is very concerned, since he is on such a fixed income and tight budget and his neighbors likewise, that the move on the part of Montclair, they are in no position to support this through the raising of our rents which shall occur should the pre-zoning continue. As I explained in the letter, if it continues, he would probably have to relocate to the closest bridge if he has to leave this park. Director Clark commented that he was not sure if Mr. Gratson is aware or not that the City of Montclair is one of the few cities that has mobile home rent control. If the property were to be annexed to the City at some point, rent raises would be controlled by an ordinance that regulates them not to exceed 80% of whatever the cost of living increase is per year. So there is some control on rents in mobile home parks in the City but not in the County. In the County, the park's owner may raise rents as they see fit.

Chris Caballero, 10731, 10733, 10741, and 10743 Ada Avenue, Ontario, stated that he had one question and one request. He wondered who required the City to do this pre-zoning and if it is a written law, is it possible that a copy could be sent to all of them. Director Clark stated that the City is pursuing the pre-zoning at the direction of the City Council; it is not mandated by law. The City Council gave staff direction to develop the pre-zone plan in the sphere of influence. Mr. Caballero asked if it had anything to do with the County, State or otherwise because it's a City thing. Director Clark stated that part of our Municipal Code allows them to do it by preparing the pre-zone map for the entire sphere.

Louise Roccatani, 11207 Bolton Avenue, Ontario, stated that they do not want to be pre-zoned, re-zoned or O-zoned into the City of Montclair. Have you gotten the point yet? Pre-zoning shall be initiated concurrently with the initiation of annexation, that's on your website. They have a petition going and they are at 451 names who do not want to be pre-zoned or annexed into the City of Montclair.

Lenora Farrar, 5234 Phillips Boulevard, Chino, stated that has lived near the corner of Central and Phillips for 38 years, raised her family there, she has one-half acre of land where they run, play, scream and do not want to change because the neighbors are going to complain to the City. Her children raise all kinds of pets there and if they were pre-zoned, it would take care of that. She has a lot of room and her neighbors are all there and none of them want this. If the City cannot raise their taxes by annexing into the City, then why does the City want them?

Aleene Brutsche, 5200 Phillips Boulevard, Chino, stated that she wanted to tell a story. Back in 2004, they were going to be pre-zoned. The gentleman to her left had lots of meetings with them, they came to a compromise and the City did annex nine acres to the north of them and now you see those monstrosity homes being built. They thought the event was over and little did they know that it was a multi-step process, but it was. They got the notice in 2006 that the City has locked them into an even bigger pre-zone proposal – 370 acres. She does not want to be pre-zoned, she has horse property, she travels 60 miles one way to work and she wants her animals, rural character and neighbors. One neighbor does chickens and one neighbor runs trucks and they live in harmony. The Commission can let that harmony exist or they can break it. You have 451 votes saying no; you only sent out 900 notices, count. They do not want to be pre-zoned. She commented to City Planner Lustru that he was rude for writing while she talked.

Linda Stuvenga, 3930 Grand Avenue, Pomona, stated that she has lived in the County area for 31 years. She asked if any of the Commissioners come down to her area. She commented that the Commissioners chose to live within the City and they chose to live where they are. Her kids grew up in her home, they shop in Chino, go to Wal-mart in Chino, buy their gas in Chino. They belong in a rural area, they do not belong to Montclair, they do not come to Montclair to shop, the schools cannot even educate her autistic grandson who lives with her. Montclair High School has to send him to Buena Park every day to be educated. Montclair has nothing for them, they do not fit with the City, they are rural.

Shellie Nedeau, 11211 Fremont Avenue, Montclair, stated that she lives on Fremont north of Phillips Boulevard, and was also present last year regarding that little island and they were

told that was it, they would leave our little area alone, they put a line right behind their property. They fought it once and all of a sudden here they are again. This would really change her life if the City changes things. Her husband is self-employed. They looked for a house for one and one-half years and chose to live there. They left Covina because they changed things.

Thomas Nedeau, 11271 Fremont Avenue, Montclair, stated that he was the first one to put his card in the box and the last one to talk, and asked why they are back here again. Back in October, 2004, he thought LAFCO said it was fine and they left their 12 lots alone. Did the Mayor and the Council lie to them because the Mayor told them that they would leave us alone? With the land use from San Bernardino County as to what he can have on his property and they went through this the last time and it would change dramatically. There was a lady who would not be allowed to have her six horses on her acre and one-half. You cannot have as many roosters, dogs, and he wanted to know why everyone is here again. Chairman Flores stated that it is for a pre-zone. Mr. Nedeau commented that they went through this 15 months ago and were told that we'd be left alone. What did they mean that they were going to leave us alone for 2004 and that was it? City Planner Lustro stated that what changed in between the time that Mr. Nedeau and his neighbors were here last in 2004 was the change to the Government Code section that he referred to earlier with respect to island annexations. As Director Clark indicated earlier, based on that change in the law, the City Council has given staff direction to prepare this for the Planning Commission's consideration and ultimate consideration of the City Council. Mr. Nedeau asked whether it was going to be pre-zoned anyway, even though 50% of them said no and the City Council told them that they would not do it. City Planner Lustro replied that the direction that staff was given was to prepare proposed pre-zone designations for the areas that is being considered tonight and it is the City Council's decision as to whether they will adopt it.

Jaime Vasquez, 11236 Benson Avenue, Ontario, recently purchased a property near Phillips and Benson and the reason he purchased it was because he liked the rural surroundings. He has a 100,000 square foot lot and now he is being told he has to conform to all these things that are coming under the annexation. Pre-zoning is nothing more than a notice of necessity. Nothing different than eminent domain because the first thing you do is a notice of necessity, which is pre-zoning. The City is telling us that the state will stick to the pre-zoning and they all know what the City is doing. They are against pre-zoning, the annexation. Pre-zoning leads to annexation and is no difference than a notice of necessity.

James Williams, 5444 Howard Street, Ontario, stated that his issue is a little bit different. He lives on Howard Street between Vernon and Central. He has a letter which was signed by four of the property owners on his street, north side. Seventy-five percent of those properties are duplexes or multiple-family homes. The four signatures that he has on the north side constitute a major portion of the land on that side of the street. Three of the signatures are landowners and already have multiple units on their land. He does not, he has a single-family residence and he lives next door to the Maberys and he appreciates their horse too. If she can be left out of the rest of the street to be zoned for R-2, then he can go ahead and either leave his property as a single residence or build in the back of his property because he has 26,000 square feet. He apologized for what he has said about wanting to develop his property, but if there was some way that portion of the street could be pre-zoned differently, he would be all for that too. Director Clark commented that Mr. Williams was at

the workshop and the City is proposing that his property be R-2. With the recommendation that Ms. Mabery's property be changed to R-1(11), he thought that satisfied all the issues on that street as well as possible.

Glen Krause, 10732 Rose Avenue, Ontario, asked what the M-1 designation is and did it allow a residence. City Planner Lustro stated that the M-1 is Limited Manufacturing and allows a variety of industrial-type uses. However, the M-1 zone does make provisions for a caretaker's residence in conjunction with an associated use. So, if he is operating a business there and needs to have a caretaker stay there for security, etc., that is allowed in the M-1 zone. Mr. Krause asked what does the City of Montclair have to benefit from the situation of taking this County area over and what is the benefit to the citizens. City Planner Lustro stated that one of the things that staff has heard from the City Council is that it is not pleased with the development or lack of development controls that have been allowed by the County in this particular area and the City Council has indicated an interest in the general overall improvement of the area, particularly along the Mission Boulevard corridor. The City has begun to make a multi-million dollar investment in the streetscape along Mission but the City is very interested in taking over the reins of development to make sure that the properties there now are enhanced, the property values are enhanced through quality development, good land planning, those types of things. It was discussed earlier in the meeting about the increased property tax base that would be realized if annexation would occur in this area. It is fairly common knowledge that the property tax base increase that might be realized through annexation through all or part of this area would not be sufficient to cover City services. However, the City Council feels it is important enough for the future of the area to be able to control the development and future land use controls in the County area to ensure quality development is consistent with the surrounding area.

Cindy Pallas, 4300 Phillips Boulevard, Pomona, asked if they are stuck with those colors (on the pre-zone map) and can they make a pretty new color and then everyone who has agriculture or has a lot of horses could be put in that. City Planner Lustro stated that what the City is trying to do is to try to keep the pre-zone designations consistent with the current County land use designations. The one theme he has heard from the speakers is with regard to the rural nature of the southeast corner of the sphere, generally in the area surrounding the intersection of Howard and Vernon Avenues and all the way south to Phillips. The City recognized the uniqueness of that area and that it is considerably different than other areas of the City. That was precisely the reason that the recommended pre-zone designations are the least dense residential zone the City has. Because staff recognizes that the area is distinctive in its character, a lot of residents have animals under the R-1(20) designation and based on the size of many of those lots, they can continue to keep animals. As hard as it may be for some to believe, the City also looks at that area as one with a rural character that we would like to see maintained for the long term as well. Irrespective of the conversation and input that has been heard tonight, staff has done what it can (through pre-zoning) to try to help residents in those areas maintain that lifestyle as best they can.

A question was asked from the audience for clarification regarding whether the City Council had asked staff to do the pre-zoning and how did they become the sphere of influence of Montclair, why not Chino, or Ontario? City Planner Lustro replied that there is a LAFCO in every county in the state of California that oversees annexations, reorganizations, incorporations, dissolutions of cities, etc. Kathy McDonald, the executive officer of the San

Bernardino County LAFCO, has indicated to staff that the ground work for the City's existing sphere of influence, Benson Avenue on the east, Phillips Boulevard on the south, and the County line on the west, began to materialize in the 1960s when LAFCO was asked to mediate some land disputes among Montclair, Ontario, and Chino, and their decisions at that particular point in time established an informal boundary as it largely exists today. In 1972, as Director Clark indicated earlier, LAFCO formally adopted the existing sphere of influence. An unidentified member of the public asked who gave LAFCO that power. City Planner Lustro responded the California Legislature. It was further asked if the sphere of influence could be changed so that residents could be annexed to Chino or Ontario, which are more conducive to them. City Planner Lustro stated that the only way a sphere of influence could be changed is by LAFCO and subject to agreement among all the cities involved. Director Clark added that residents can request that LAFCO review the sphere boundary. However, sphere boundaries have been generally established in response to abuses that occurred in the 1950s and '60s, where cities were allowed to gerrymander odd boundaries. The California Legislature mandated that LAFCO establish logical spheres of influence with orderly boundaries. One of the things they look at is which city is, or could, provide the most efficient services. If they reviewed it today, LAFCO would consider who has sewers in the areas, who has made capital expenditures, and where the logical extension of the boundaries would be based upon economies of service. An unidentified speaker stated that she felt a better southern boundary would be Mission Boulevard. Director Clark stated he wouldn't get his hopes up for that, because in the early 1980s, Ontario made a move to take that area and LAFCO would not hear of it nor change the boundaries.

Janet Hastings, 5611 Mission Boulevard, Ontario, a resident of The Palms Trailer Court, asked who LAFCO answers to. Director Clark replied the state legislature. She asked who the City Council answers to. Director Clark answered that the City Council is elected by the voters. So, if they ever did become part of Montclair, they would have an opportunity to vote for someone to represent them.

Commissioner Vodvarka commented that he moved here from the City of Ontario 50 years ago and they had hopes at that time that this was going to become Ontario. He moved into the County area of Monte Vista, which is now Montclair. He is not unhappy, but felt for the County residents because he loved the orange groves and it was like living in the country. Times do change.

Chairman Flores apologized for being perceived as rude. He commented that it was one of the best meetings that they have had. Several people received answers to their particular problems and he advised that they have other venues to go to. Go to LAFCO, go to the City Council. The Commission has a job to do and it is very difficult to do because we feel the same as the residents. When he moved here 43 years ago and an orange grove was removed to build his house, he felt the changes. He surveyed in the area for the same company for 43 years and he has seen some changes and the Commission feels for the residents.

Vice Chairman Lenhart commented that it is human nature to resist change; time moves on. He was here before Central Avenue had curbs, when Mission Boulevard was a two-lane strip of pavement. If you think things will stay the same, they will not. The Commission is just doing the job of planning for the future. Everybody plans for the future and this is what the

Commission is going to have to decide. If this area is annexed and becomes part of the City what do we want it to be? We are not trying to change anything or force anything down anyone's throat, they are just trying to do the job we were appointed to do.

Commissioner Johnson thanked all the residents for attending the meeting. She heard some passionate and eloquent speakers and also some profound statements, one being that people chose to live where they live. She is not a horse person or an animal person and that is why she did not choose to live in the County, but the County residents have a right to choose where they live. She hears that, it is very profound, and she understands what they are saying. She added that there are some advantages to being in the City. If you came to her house on a Saturday morning, you would see four cars parked on her lawn and the water hose going. In terms of graffiti, when she is driving to work, she calls and reports it and when she comes home from work, it is gone. She knows there are some areas where no one is sure whether it is City or County. She once was driving by and saw a group of vandals doing graffiti and she called Code Enforcement and was told that it was County, then she called the Sheriff, and by the time she called 15 different agencies, she was very frustrated and knew that if that were within the City, that would have been gone by the next day. She commended staff for the steps they have taken because it is her perception that there has been quite a bit of effort made to ensure that whatever currently exists will still exist. She recalled from another pre-zone that at the end of the process there was an opportunity for the impacted residents to vote on it and what she is hearing is that there was 900 notices mailed out and that 451 people have signed a petition. So, regardless of what the Commission does, could staff clarify what rights the residents have, what percentage do they need, etc. City Planner Lustro stated that when staff brings a pre-zone proposal to the Commission for consideration, we are looking for input and comment similar to what we've heard from two or three residents tonight. They were good enough to contact staff because they did not agree with the original pre-zone designation for their particular neighborhood, they made good arguments why it should be something other than what we originally designated. By his count, we have accommodated or are going to accommodate all of them. That is the purpose of this process, to flesh all of that out. Has staff done all the right things with their designations and if not, let them know where there is a mistake and staff can review it and make a correction. The process from here, if the Planning Commission recommends for this to go on to City Council, will be to present the proposal to City Council with the changes incorporated. It would be up to the City Council whether they want to consider a petition that has 451 signatures on it as to whether they want to move forward with the pre-zone designations or not. There is no legal requirement or magic number as it relates to pre-zoning. That decision falls upon the City Council at such time that they consider this proposal. They can choose to adopt the pre-zone designations, change them, modify them, only adopt a portion of them, etc. That ultimately is their decision. The Planning Commission is an advisory body to the City Council; the City Council can choose to take their recommendation or modify it in some way, shape or form. All of the correspondence that was received from area residents since the workshop conducted in January has been provided to the Commission. While most of those pieces of correspondence spoke to annexation more than pre-zoning, staff nevertheless has provided them to the Commission so the Commission knows what the feelings of the individuals in the community are. If this does go on to City Council, staff will provide copies of the correspondence to the City Council as well. Commissioner Johnson commented that City Planner Lustro spoke clearly, but she did not get the answer to her question. Director Clark advised that it is up to the City Council as to what they want to do on

this matter, just like adopting an ordinance or a zone change. With respect to pre-zoning, it is entirely the City Council's vote and there is not a protest or vote of people in the area, it is strictly the City Council's decision. He thinks City Planner Lustro is saying that it is based upon the information the City Council is provided. If somebody gives us a petition with 451 signatures, fine, we will make sure the City Council receives it.

Commissioner Sahagun asked if we have a copy of the petition. City Planner Lustro responded that we do not yet have it. This item is tentatively scheduled to be heard by the City Council on March 6, and staff recommends that the petition be turned in to staff about a week and a half before that meeting in order for us to make copies for each City Council member. If this moves on to City Council, all the property owners who are on our mailing list who received notices for the workshop in January and tonight's meeting will receive written notice of the March 6 meeting.

Commissioner Sahagun asked how many property owners there are in this areas proposed to be pre-zoned. City Planner Lustro replied that there are approximately 908 different property owners for just over 1,100 parcels in the 370+/- acres. Some property owners own multiple parcels. Commissioner Sahagun asked if we have sent notices to property owners within any kind of a radius surrounding the boundaries. City Planner Lustro replied no, because that would just create confusion. Staff has simply focused the noticing on property owners within the boundaries of the area that we are considering.

Vice Chairman Lenhert moved that, based upon evidence submitted, there will be no significant impact on the environment as a result of the proposed pre-zoning designations, and that a DeMinimis finding of no impact on fish and wildlife and Negative Declaration have been prepared, seconded by Commissioner Vodvarka, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Johnson moved to approve the following pre-zone designations located in unincorporated County territory generally bounded by State Street on the north, Benson Avenue on the east, Phillips Boulevard on the south, and parcel lines and Pipeline Avenue on the west, as depicted in Exhibit "A" by adopting Resolution No. 06-1623, and forward to the City Council for its consideration, changing the pre-zone designation of the property at 5458 Howard Street from R-2 to R-1(11), changing the pre-zone designation of identified properties in the 10700 block of Ada Avenue from MIP to R-2, and adjusting the various acreages within each pre-zone designation accordingly, seconded by Commissioner Sahagun, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

- M-1 (Limited Manufacturing) – 55.58 acres
- MIP (Manufacturing Industrial Park) – 34.19 acres
- C-3 (General Commercial) – 61.44 acres
- R-1 (Single-Family Residential) – 117.62 acres
- R-1(11) (SFR, minimum 11,000 square-foot lot area) – 1.93 acres
- R-1(20) (SFR, minimum 20,000 square-foot lot area) – 71.92 acres
- R-1(SL) (SFR, small-lot detached housing overlay) – 1.32 acres
- R-2 (Two-Family Residential) – 27.61 acres

## INFORMATION ITEMS

Commissioner Sahagun was asked by a citizen regarding maintenance of the I-10 off-ramps, specifically Central Avenue, and he explained that he usually calls City Planner Lustro. Commissioner Sahagun requested that staff call Caltrans and ask them to please clean up the trash on the Central Avenue off-ramps.

Commissioner Sahagun stated that he would like to attend the Planners Institute in Monterey if the other commissioners are not interested in going.

Vice Chairman Lenhert asked whether the traffic signals at Montclair Plaza are set up special during the Christmas season. The green phase for Fremont Avenue at Moreno Street seems to last a long time and there is no traffic. Director Clark replied that the traffic signals do get adjusted for the Christmas season and they do have the ability to override them and maybe that one is out of sync.

Vice Chairman Lenhert added that the traffic signal at Orchard and Monte Vista changes so quickly that you cannot get across the street before it is red. Director Clark stated that he will report it to Engineering and ask them to look at both.

Commissioner Johnson stated that she spotted the new bus bench at the northwest corner Palo Verde and Central and it is beautiful; it took a long time but it finally happened. One of the streetlight poles on the west side of the street seems to be tilting at an unnatural angle. It is near the driveway closest to the gas station. City Planner Lustro responded that the City Engineer is aware of it. The pole was the victim of an errant vehicle. The replacement pole has been on order but there is a shortage of those steel poles. There are some standard configurations and sizes and this is not one of them, so it has to be specially made.

Commissioner Johnson also observed that the Penske Service Center has their sign up and look like they are ready to move in.

Commissioner Johnson commented that she loves the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary banners and would love to obtain one and wondered what happens to them afterwards. Director Clark stated that you can buy one through the Chamber of Commerce. It flies for a year and at the end of the year, it's yours. Director Clark stated that we have had a number of businesses buy one for themselves and individuals too.

Chairman Flores stated that he saw a survey crew on the property at the southwest corner of Mission and Ramona. City Planner Lustro replied that staff has had numerous discussions with the new property owner and his architect on that particular site, but it has probably been at least 3 or 4 weeks since we last heard from them. Staff has seen some conceptual designs for the building and the site plan seems to work, but they have not submitted formally to the City.

Chairman Lenhert commented that he saw earthmoving equipment at Monte Vista and Richton doing some substantial grading and wondered what was happening. City Planner Lustro stated that just to the south of the new water well that is being drilled, the City is

constructing a parking lot to replace the former Park-and-Ride that will be demolished to make way for the new Police Department.

Chairman Flores adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Berke  
Recording Secretary