



CITY OF MONTCLAIR
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

REGULAR ADJOURNED MEETING
Monday, January 27, 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER
5111 Benito Street, Montclair, California 91763

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Flores, Commissioners Martinez, Sahagun and Vodvarka, Community Development Director Lustro, City Planner Diaz, Associate Planner Gutiérrez and Deputy City Attorney Holdaway

MINUTES

The minutes of the December 9, 2013 regular meeting were presented for approval. Vice Chair Flores moved, Commissioner Vodvarka seconded, and the minutes were approved 5-0.

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

AGENDA ITEMS

- a. PUBLIC HEARING – CASE NUMBER 2012-5 'A'
- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Project Address: | 5301 Holt Boulevard |
| Project Applicant: | Southeast Statesboro, LLC |
| Project Planner: | Michael Diaz, City Planner |
| Request: | Conditional Use Permit Amendment |
| CEQA Assessment: | Categorically Exempt (Section 15301) |

City Planner Diaz reviewed the staff report.

Commissioner Martinez stated he agreed with all the recommendations of staff, but wondered if the other 7-Eleven stores in Montclair sold hard liquor. City Planner Diaz replied that of the four in the City, the two newest ones (Mission/Monte Vista and Holt/Central) do not sell hard liquor; they only have a Type 20 License. This will be the first of the new stores to sell all three types of alcoholic beverages.

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

Hearing no other comments and no one else being present, Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

Chair Johnson commented that she was a little bit concerned that this particular 7-Eleven did not have the same level of sales they anticipated and she would like to see the Commission help them reach that.

Commissioner Vodvarka moved that, based upon evidence submitted, the project is deemed exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental quality Act (CEQA). Further, the project qualifies as a Class 1 exemption under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, seconded by Commissioner Sahagun, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Sahagun moved to approve an amendment of a Conditional Use Permit under Case No. 2012-5 'A' to permit the upgrade of the existing Type 20 ABC License (Off-Sale Beer and Wine) to a new Type 21 License (Off-Sale General) to allow the sale of beer, wine and distilled spirits in conjunction with the existing convenience market (7-Eleven) in the "Commercial " land use district of the Holt Boulevard Specific Plan at 5301 Holt Boulevard, seconded by Vice Chair Flores, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Deputy City Attorney Holdaway commented that there is a new requirement under the Brown Act that went into effect on January 1, 2014, requiring the action to be stated and the vote of each member of the Commission also be stated. For the record, typically the Chair would announce what the action is that has been taken and, in this particular case, you would simply announce the approval of the case number with the two actions under that and that it was unanimous. If there is less than a unanimous vote, then you should name those in favor and those opposed.

Chair Johnson stated that for the record, Case No. 2012-5 'A' has been approved unanimously with both motions of CEQA and an amendment to a Conditional Use Permit.

b. PUBLIC HEARING - CASE NUMBER 2012-18

Project Address: Citywide
Project Applicant: City of Montclair
Project Planner: Steve Lustro, AICP, Community Development Director
Request: General Plan Amendment for the 2014-2021 City of Montclair Housing Element
CEQA Assessment: Addendum to Mitigated Negative Declaration [Section 15164(a)]

Community Development Director Lustro summarized the process and introduced David Barquist, Vice President for Planning and Design, for RBF Consulting, who put together a brief PowerPoint presentation explaining the Housing Element process.

Mr. Barquist walked the Commission through the presentation, touching on the following major topics:

- The purpose of a Housing Element and why the City needs to update it on a regular basis;
- The steps required in updating the Housing Element, including a review of existing conditions; the public participation process; preparation of a draft Housing Element; environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA; and adoption of the Housing Element;
- Contents of the Housing Element chapters and appendices;
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals developed by SCAG; and
- Comments by the state's Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) and the City's responses.

Commissioner Vodvarka wondered what's going to happen when the City runs out of land to build on. Mr. Barquist replied that in a built-out community, which is typical in Southern California, you will be looking only at infill redevelopment. For example, commercial corridors that aren't performing well and opportunities for such things as mixed-use or residential. Essentially, it is the recycling of your existing fabric. Again, once you start to get build-out conditions, the only way to go is vertical, but you have to look at that in terms of character and what you want in your community. So the answer to that is to review your land use policy to see how you can accommodate that growth and change over time. They are big questions that have to be answered.

Commissioner Sahagun asked how the last housing crash affected the Housing Element that was approved and how will any future housing crash affect the new one? Mr. Barquist replied that going back to the last cycle covering 2006 through 2014, the numbers were very high because it was analyzed based on strong economic conditions. About the time that update and its related policies were starting to be implemented, the market just shot down. So you had more residentially zoned land available than the

market would accommodate. We have places where you have to recycle through your existing stock until you get into a growth mode to where you get that need. If you look at those numbers and how you performed over the past five years, the horizon that you were looking at before was fairly short. With the amount of land you have, the horizon is going to be longer. The question from a planning standpoint is one thing, but the prevailing funding, financing and market conditions are out of the control of local government.

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

John Joseph Ramos, 755 N. Gibbs Street, Pomona, California 91767, wanted to address the Commission in reference to the residential structure at 5399 Holt Boulevard. He believed the Commission was considering demolition and he wanted to see if he could work with the Commission. He was trying to come up with a plan to move the structure to another location. He informally discussed it with the planners, but right now it's just in a preliminary stage, but he did not know where the Commission was with regard to that structure. Chair Johnson replied that since the item was not on the evening's agenda, the Commission could not address it, but she strongly encouraged him to work with staff and if there was anything that could be put on a future agenda. Mr. Ramos stated that he thought the item was on the agenda for that evening. Community Development Director Lustro commented that the Commission was correct, the item was not on tonight's agenda and the information Mr. Ramos had about the item being on that evening's agenda was contained in a newspaper article that was printed in the Daily Bulletin about one and one-half weeks ago after staff had a conversation with a Daily Bulletin staff writer. However, subsequent to that conversation and some conversations with the property owner, the item was rescheduled to February 10. Mr. Ramos stated that because he is in the United States Navy and would be back on orders starting on February 7. Chair Johnson thanked him for his service and commented that in the past the Commission has accepted written statements. So, if he would not be available for the February 10 meeting, he could submit written comments to staff and the Commission would take that into consideration.

Hearing no other comments and no one else being present, Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

Chair Johnson commented that she remembered sitting here ten years ago trying to figure out how we were ever going to come up with enough housing to satisfy SCAG's requirements.

Vice Chair Flores moved that, based on the evidence submitted, a finding is made that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15164(a), an Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2006-2014 Housing Element Update is the appropriate environmental documentation prepared for this project. Since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2006-2014 Update to the Housing Element, there have been no substantial changes proposed in the actions described in the analysis, no substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project was undertaken, and no new information of substantial importance that would require subsequent

environmental review under CEQA §21166 or CEQA Guidelines §15162. Further, the 2014-2021 Housing Element does not contain any new sites that were not previously evaluated in the 2006-2014 Housing Element and Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration concludes the 2014-2021 Housing Element exhibits no demonstrated change in the 2006-2014 analysis conducted and provides the necessary environmental clearance for the adoption of the 2014-2021 Housing Element, Commissioner Sahagun seconded, there being no opposition to the motion ,the motion passed 5-0. Chair Johnson stated the motion regarding CEQA Guidelines has been approved unanimously.

Commissioner Martinez moved to recommend City Council approval of the Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration associated with the 2006-2014 Housing Element and to approve a General Plan Amendment adopting the 2014-2021 Housing Element under Case No. 2012-18, Vice Chair Flores seconded, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0. Chair Johnson stated the motion to recommend City Council approval has been approved unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Community Development Director Lustro said the Housing Element update is scheduled to be considered by the City Council at its regular meeting on February 3, 2014.

Vice Chair Flores asked if staff could give a report on what is happening with the Gold Line. He read an article in the newspaper and wondered if the project is on or off. Community Development Director Lustro commented that what he probably read in the newspaper within the last few days is that the Subcommittee for Rail and Transportation voted to prioritize some projects. The three projects prioritized were the Metrolink rail project that would run from San Bernardino to the University of Redlands; a second project involves some double-tracking of Metrolink; and the third project is the Gold Line extension to Montclair. What came out of that vote and prioritization is that SANBAG has essentially yanked any funding for the foreseeable future from the Gold Line extension. You may have read in the newspaper responses from the City of Montclair, particularly City Manager Starr, with respect to what our concerns are with that. His understanding is that City Manager Starr prepared a fairly lengthy response to SANBAG about their prioritization and having the Gold Line as low as it is on the priority list. So, while the news last week was not good news, we are still, as a City, going to continue to do whatever we can to influence SANBAG and remind them how important the Gold Line extension is, not only to this community, but looking farther into the future, the region and hopefully at some point in time an extension to Ontario International Airport. Vice Chair Flores asked if there was anything the Commission could do. Community Development Director Lustro replied not at this point. He had not had an opportunity to look at it yet, but he understood the City Manager's letter was fairly comprehensive and about 9-10 pages long. He did not think he left anything out.

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Embree
Recording Secretary