



CITY OF MONTCLAIR
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
REGULAR ADJOURNED MEETING
April 11, 2016

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 Sahagun 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 from the March 28, 2016 meeting were presented for approval. Chair Johnson asked that the minutes be corrected to say that Commissioner Vodvarka led the Pledge of Allegiance. Vice Chair Flores moved, Commissioner Vodvarka seconded, and the minutes were approved 5-0, as amended.

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Bruce Culp, 9016 Sycamore Avenue, Unit 110, Montclair, commented that he has been coming to the Planning Commission and City Council meetings for close to one year and

prior to attending the meetings, he usually visits the City of Montclair website to download an agenda so he can get an idea of what is going to be talked about at the meetings. Without fail, the summary and complete agendas for the upcoming meetings are posted on the website the week before a meeting. This allows residents like him time to review the details of any action on projects and informs the public before the meeting occurs. In particular, the complete agenda for the Planning Commission provides a high degree of details of a project, including building heights, parking requirements, setbacks and many more details that inform the public and allow them to form an opinion, either supporting or opposing a project. He regularly reviews these agendas and passes along any pertinent information to his neighbors through a website they use so that they are aware of the new projects in Montclair. However, this past week, the complete agenda for this meeting had not been posted on the website and, as of the day of the meeting, had not been posted, only the summary, as mentioned. It has been his experience that both the summary and complete agendas were normally posted on the website. He also recently made the City aware of his opposition to one of the items on the agenda and reviewed the details of the proposal and informed some of his neighbors. He was going to assume that not posting the complete detailed agenda for the public and the residents of Montclair was simply an oversight and accident. However, it was coincidental that it occurred the same week that opposition to one of the items on the agenda was voiced to the City. He would hope that since the residents of Montclair were not given an opportunity to review detailed plans, that any action on the items on this agenda would be postponed until the complete agenda is posted to the City website and the residents of Montclair have had an opportunity to research those items and form an opinion. He also commented with regard to Item 6.b, no public hearing notices were mailed out to the Montclair residents that reside at the Paseos or within 300 feet of this proposed project. He understands that the City of Montclair may be simply complying with State laws with regard to notifying only property owners. However, he hoped the City would be just as interested in complying with the spirit of the law and would be interested in sending out these public hearing notices to those that would be directly affected by this project, regardless of their status as a property owner or a renter. This would only be fair since the residents at Paseos would be the residents in the City most affected by this project. He encouraged the Planning Commission to vote to postpone any action on any items on this agenda until such time as the public has been sufficiently notified of proposed projects and a complete agenda been posted on the City's website so that Montclair residents can research the projects prior to action being taken on these items. Any other action on today's agenda would otherwise come off as deceptive and without proper input.

Chair Johnson deferred to staff and added that she believed all agendas were available upon request. Director Lustro confirmed that was correct. He also commented that, as Mr. Culp stated, the posting of the complete agenda was an oversight and he took partial responsibility for that. Normally the department secretary will copy the entire agenda to him and he posts it on the website and that did not occur and he apologized for that. With respect to the notification on Item 6.b, the requested entitlement is a Precise Plan of Design, which is not a public hearing item; that is why property owners within 300 feet were not notified. However, it has been the Commission's practice during consideration of PPDs to take public comment, which he was sure the Commission intended to do on the subject item. The property manager at the Paseos was mailed a courtesy notice of the agenda item. City Planner Diaz

clarified that a courtesy notice was sent out on April 1, 2016, to property owners within 300 feet of the project site and a copy of a letter stating the meeting date and time was sent to the Paseos leasing office to the attention of Property Manager Deborah Loughlin, so that she could distribute or publicize it as she saw fit. Subsequent to that, at the end of last week, she was also sent a hard copy of the agenda. He also sent her plans of the proposed project.

Deputy City Attorney Holdaway clarified that the agenda itself is only the three-page document at the beginning of the packet. That is the document that is legally required to be posted according to the Brown Act. The agenda, which is also posted at City Hall, includes a notice that the agenda documents, meaning the supporting documents (the staff reports and so forth) are available for inspection at the City Hall Planning Division counter.

Commissioner Sahagun asked if this was posted in the newspaper. Director Lustro replied that Item 6.b was not posted in the newspaper because it is not required and is not a public hearing item.

Commissioner Martinez asked City Planner Diaz if he would explain to Mr. Culp why the Commission is not responsible for taking the final action on Item 6.b. Commissioner Martinez explained the Commission certainly desires due process and full disclosure and felt perhaps there was a misunderstanding or semantics of the item. City Planner Diaz explained that when the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan (NMDSP) was adopted by the City Council in 2006, it was decided the final reviewing body for any project within the Specific Plan boundaries would be the City Council, but only after review by, and a recommendation from the Planning Commission. As Director Lustro mentioned, this is a Precise Plan of Design, which does not require a public hearing because it does not involve any subdivision of property for a map, a variance, or other land use entitlements. The requested entitlement is purely a design review and review for compliance with the applicable development standards. That doesn't mean that, as indicated by Director Lustro, that we don't take public comment and information so that we can then present it and forward it to the City Council for their final decision. Commissioner Martinez thanked staff.

Commissioner Sahagun asked about the 300-foot radius mailing and asked when we have apartments, could we notify every tenant. Director Lustro replied that in this particular case there is absolutely no requirement to notify neighboring property owners because it is not a public hearing. It has been staff's practice in the past to send out a Courtesy Notice, as was done with this particular project, to neighboring property owners so they could at least be notified of the Precise Plan of Design, but there is no notification requirement for a PPD.

AGENDA ITEMS

- a. PUBLIC HEARING - CASE NUMBER 2016-5
- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Project Address: | 9359 Central Avenue, Suite C |
| Project Applicant: | Montclair, LLC |
| Project Planner: | Silvia Gutiérrez, Associate Planner |
| Request: | Conditional Use Permit to allow the on-premises sale of beer and wine in conjunction with a bona fide eating establishment |
| CEQA Assessment: | Categorically Exempt (Section 15301) |

Associate Planner Gutiérrez reviewed the staff report. As part of the public notification, staff posted a notice in the newspaper and also notified surrounding property owners within a 300-foot radius. Staff received only one inquiry on the project from a resident who was curious about the project and expressed his gratitude for the bollards that were installed in the east-west alley at the southerly end of the project site to restrict access. When staff reviewed the proposal with him, he seemed supportive and happy that conditions regarding security and the operation were included, including requirements for video surveillance. The property owner has indicated his satisfaction with the conditions of approval and is present and available for any questions.

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

Colleen Johnston, 5383 San Jose Street, Montclair, stated she had attended the meetings from the very beginning, starting about seven years ago, and everyone has been very kind and accommodating in answering questions and listening to their concerns having to do with traffic and the routing of traffic for the center and that was appreciated very much. As far as having alcohol served there though, it is still close to a residential area and they have had crime on their block, more so in the last couple years than they have ever had. They are concerned about it and that alcohol could exacerbate that and they wanted to indicate many children live on their street, grandchildren that visit a lot and it's a big concern to have people possibly driving under the influence in that area. It's great that the bollards have been installed but there is still a way to get into the neighborhood so she did not feel it was a good idea. Chair Johnson thanked Ms. Johnston for her comments.

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

Chair Johnson commented that with regard to Ms. Johnston's comments, she recalled in past projects if the Commission approved the project, the owner was obligated to stick to the conditions of approval and, if they did not, then they were sometimes changed. Director Lusto replied that with respect to a Conditional Use Permit, there are standard conditions included in the proposed resolution stating that if the applicant does not comply with the conditions of approval or the use becomes a nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood, the Conditional Use Permit could be brought back to the Commission for modification or, ultimately, revocation. We don't like to pursue that route but it's always an option. The

requested use does not include any kind of a bar operation. Beer and wine would be offered in conjunction with meals. However, the applicant/operator of the business has a responsibility to not only comply with the conditions of approval, but with all ABC regulations up to and including controlling to whom they serve beverages. Chair Johnson noted Condition No. 12: "The on-site manager shall take whatever steps are deemed necessary to assume the orderly conduct of employees, patrons and visitors on the premises." She presumed that to mean that if that does not occur, then there needs to be some further discussion. Director Lustro stated that was correct and also directed the Commission's attention to Condition No. 11, which he covered in summary with respect to complying with the conditions of approval. In addition, Condition No. 13 states the restaurant shall be operated, maintained and open to the general public as a full service eating establishment at all times that it is open for business and that beer and wine are basically incidental to the operation of the business as a bona fide eating establishment.

Commissioner Martinez advised Ms. Johnston that he was a neighbor of hers and he is also sensitive to the consumption of alcoholic beverages. He is very familiar with the area and the primary ingress and egress feeds onto Central Avenue. If the (east-west) alley were not closed off to the public, it would be more problematic. It seemed to him that unless someone is a local and drives around to the south side of Wienerschnitzel to get to the north-south alley, people will be mostly going onto the main feeder streets. It has been his observation that crime is actually decreasing. On the west side of Benson Avenue north of San José Street, the City recently closed off the pedestrian access to Deodar and Caroline Streets by constructing a new masonry wall, which has cut down on the homeless wandering into the neighborhood. Staff and the Commission try to anticipate the potential secondary effects of projects and address them appropriately with conditions. He felt the designing was well done and on a personal note, it sounds like a good restaurant to frequent. Director Lustro elaborated on Commissioner Martinez's comments that Ms. Johnston was correct in her comments except that initial consideration of a project on the subject site was actually 11 years ago. One of the goals of staff from the outset was to prohibit direct access to the alley because staff did not want to exacerbate the alley traffic because of a new commercial project at this particular location. The isolation of this project forcing access from Central Avenue has been on staff's radar for many years and when the current project came to the City a couple years ago, the prohibition of alley access was communicated to the developer of the project. Staff feels they have done everything they can to curtail traffic access to the alley. Unfortunately, we could not require the developer to construct or modify access points on properties not under their control, so if someone wants to access the north-south alley through the Wienerschnitzel parking lot, that is an existing condition that cannot be changed with this project.

Commissioner Vodvarka asked if the servers or waitresses were under age, would they be allowed to sell or serve alcoholic beverages. Associate Planner Gutiérrez clarified there will not be any servers or waitresses. Order-takers at the restaurant counter would be required to undergo ABC training prior to being able to serve alcoholic beverages, including checking the ID of a customer.

Vice Chair Flores commented that during all the years he has lived in Montclair, he doesn't recall any instances of a restaurant being a problem because of excessive drinking by customers.

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, because it is on a fully developed site and involves only minor interior and exterior improvements, seconded by Chair Johnson, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Sahagun moved to approve a Conditional Use Permit under Case No. 2016-5 for the on-premises sale of beer and wine (Type 41 ABC license) in conjunction with a bona fide eating establishment and related tenant improvements at 9359 Central Avenue, Unit C, per the submitted plans and as described in the staff report, subject to the conditions of approval in attached Resolution 16-1857, seconded by Vice Chair Flores, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Martinez commented to Ms. Johnston that in the spirit of this being a good community project, that she please let the Commission know if she becomes aware of problems with any of the new tenants. We hope they will be good neighbors and would be more than happy to react accordingly if necessary.

b. CASE NUMBER 2016-3

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Project Address: | 8949 Monte Vista Avenue |
| Project Applicant: | CFC-Montclair, LLC |
| Project Planner: | Michael Diaz, City Planner |
| Request: | Precise Plan of Design for a 23-unit multi-family residential project |
| CEQA Assessment: | Consistent with the NMDSP EIR; no further analysis required pursuant to Section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines |

City Planner Diaz reviewed the staff report. Subsequent to preparation of the agenda report, staff received, via email, the three letters provided to the Commission. One of the writers of the letters was going to speak regarding his concerns, but mostly they centered upon the issue of parking, the second issue was noise associated with the project and the third had something to do with vistas to the west. The Municipal Code does not identify any view protection corridors. Staff believes the project would actually provide some buffer from the noise of Monte Vista Avenue to the Paseos. The proposed parking for the project is in conformance to the requirements of the Specific Plan. The report includes a table indicating how the project is consistent with the Specific Plan. Overall, staff is pleased with the project, which has been a work in progress for about one year. The owner, Mr. Lee, and his architects have worked hard in trying to achieve a good design. The architecture is well

done, visually attractive and will be a complement to continuing the streetscape envisioned by the Specific Plan, the findings for which are contained in the staff report. Some of the requirements for the project include professional property management and provisions for an Operations Agreement and Parking Management Plan. Staff feels it is a good project and a good design solution to a relatively tight site after turning away several proposals consisting of half-thought-out plans or proposals that did not comply with the Specific Plan.

A "fly-through" video simulation of the project was presented to the Commission.

With respect to the concerns expressed about potential parking impacts to The Paseos, Director Lustro commented that a response memo prepared for the City Council last September on the same subject was included in the Commission packets for reference.

Commissioner Vodvarka commented he was impressed by the design of the project on such a small piece of property. It is well done and he is hoping there won't be a parking problem.

Commissioner Sahagun felt there should be more than one barbecue pit. Parking is a concern but the thought has always been that the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan would be a livable, walkable, transit-oriented community so that there would be less traffic and less cars. He really appreciates Mr. Culp getting involved and he remembered him coming to some of the other meetings. With respect to this project, he felt that staff and the architect did a beautiful job.

Vice Chair Flores asked if the number of required parking spaces is governed by San Bernardino County. Director Lustro replied that the parking standards are driven by the guidelines in the Specific Plan. The minimum one parking space per dwelling unit requirement within the Specific Plan is integral to developing a transit-oriented district because of its proximity to Metrolink, the future Gold Line, and other modes of public transit. We have a multi-modal Transcenter, unique for a city of our size. The goal has been to encourage residential projects to take advantage of that. It has never been staff's expectation that we would see a community with dwelling units of 2,000, 2,200 or 2,500 square feet. The goal has been more compact living spaces consistent with a more urban environment. The reduced parking requirements in North Montclair are consistent with that. In this particular case, 23 units are proposed with 28 parking spaces, so they comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan. The developers of The Paseos and Arrow Station decided, from a marketing standpoint, to provide between 1.75 and two parking spaces per unit. A key element to success and control of parking for any project in North Montclair is adherence to the required Parking Management Plan the City reviews and approves for each project. The Vista Court project before the Commission for consideration will have one as well. It is the responsibility of the property management company to ensure enforcement and compliance with the Parking Management Plan to avoid parking problems.

Vice Chair Flores commented that reviewing a project isn't something the Commission takes lightly. Commissioner Martinez added this is one more piece of the puzzle that is the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan. This project seems like it would fit well, this is something everyone planned and hoped for and what has got to change is Southern California's habits;

there are some big cities where people don't even drive a car, but here in Southern California, we have to have a car to go to the corner store. The parking design, if it is used properly, is going to work just great and the challenge right now at the Paseos is that it is not being effectively used; it's there on paper, but in practice, it is not being enforced. As Commissioner Flores said, we put a lot of thought into this and to make it happen is going to take a lot more work from everyone. It's a beautiful project, it's something that complements the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan and we want this to work for everyone.

Commissioner Sahagun commented that he hasn't mentioned anything about Montclair Place, which the Specific Plan is supposed to tie into. Multiple parking structures were approved last year as part of the expansion of Montclair Place. Not everyone will get rid of their vehicles, but as he understood it, as more development happens, we will get the retail and parking structures constructed. At one of the planning conferences he attended a few years back in Pasadena, he was looking at some of the parking structures, because we don't just want big, square buildings for parking; they should be lined with retail uses. In future developments, we also need to consider bus turnouts as part of livable, walkable communities.

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

Bruce Culp, 9016 Sycamore Avenue, Unit 110, Montclair, thanked staff for providing additional information. He knew everyone has been working hard on the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan and he has been following it ever since he moved here and has read probably every document on the website. Fifteen years from now, we're not even going to own cars. Ford and Uber and GM and Lyft are already partnering to build fleets of autonomous electric cars. Why would you own a car if you can buy a subscription service? Simply having a car pick you up with a phone call may make all these parking issues go away in half a generation, but we have to deal with the here and now and plan for parking and make these kinds of decisions. This project is beautiful, he loved the architecture of it; he's not opposed to high-density living space. Again, he's been reading about transit-oriented space. You need to put a lot of people in a space; it's designed so we can get to bus lines, trains, and the Gold Line. But the reality is that people work outside of where those modes go and they need cars. Rents in these areas require two people to earn enough to live in a one-bedroom apartment, like himself, and they each need a car to get to their different places of employment. He does a lot of walking; he walks everyday to Target, he does his Christmas shopping in two hours by walking to Montclair Place and he spends about three days a week running 20 miles up and down the Pacific Electric Trail so he is very familiar with that and the walkable-livable spaces. He takes the train almost every weekend into Los Angeles so he is very familiar with all the things going on there. He was not opposed to the proposed development and he was not opposed to high-density development in North Montclair. Being designated as a transit-oriented district, North Montclair will have high density development and he considers The Paseos, where he lives, high density. However, he did oppose this development on the small piece of property for several reasons. Primarily, there will be an issue with regard to parking. With 23 units that will probably be priced above the market for the local area, there will most likely need to have two income earners to afford these units, each with their own job and thus, each, with a need for a car. This is going to

require 40 parking spaces. He understood that less than 30 parking spaces are proposed and there will be strict parking restrictions. However, as he is already aware, the reality is that there just is not enough parking available on that small piece of property to support that many units. The next closest parking will be within The Paseos on Olive Street and Sycamore Avenue. As you may already be aware, The Paseos is already experiencing a shortage of parking. Staff will no doubt explain that the parking issues at The Paseos are the fault of the residents and the initial property managers. He was not going to argue that point. However, the reality is that there is a parking shortage and if this project goes through, it will only exacerbate that issue, causing additional tension within the community and animosity towards this new project. So you can put all the restrictions you want on the new development and it may work at first, but over time, more vehicles will arrive, people will get married, their kids grow up, cars will get bought and parking will become scarce and their neighborhood will suffer. The next issue that would be involved is the increase in traffic along Monte Vista Avenue. He lives right next to where he can see the Monte Vista Avenue traffic, there are multiple bus lines, there is emergency vehicle traffic and now there's going to be 30 more vehicles to contend with. Those trying to enter this new development on the southbound Monte Vista will decrease visibility of those exiting the Paseos into Monte Vista, increasing the danger of entering Monte Vista. He believed traffic volume should be researched more to determine all the adverse affects of this development. One other issue is the quality of life issue for Paseos residents once this multi-story building is built. He just took a walk today and counted at least 30 windows, patios, and balconies that all look out west from the Paseos where this building would be located. Many moved into those specific units to be able to look at beautiful sunsets. During the Fourth of July for the past two years, a group of residents would hang out on the second floor of one of the buildings and watch the fireworks in Claremont and Pomona, just above where the former Grease Monkey building currently is. All of this will be taken away from those residents should this high-rise building be put in the way. No one wants to look at the back of the building from their balcony. He knows that City staff has worked hard to review this project. They made sure it met all the technical and legal requirements and he was sure it was going to be a very beautiful development should it be built, but he and other residents of Paseos have to deal with the realities of what this project will bring to us. He thinks there are other pieces of property close by that would be a better fit for this particular project. This piece of property is better suited for a much smaller development. He could see a family-owned restaurant there, which The Paseos residents would fully support, or a bar, or a brewery or a Grease Monkey. All these smaller uses would still be financially beneficial to the property owner and the developer. The City could even purchase the property and build additional parking for The Paseos or a park or a basketball court. Lastly, he noted that no one at The Paseos was sent a letter notifying the residents of this proposed development and maybe because they are not actual property owners, but renters. However, he thought before this project moves forward, it would be best if the City took the step of sending a notice to those that actually live near this project, not just the property owners. Paseos residents are the ones that will be most affected by this development and if the City truly cares about the residents, it should take this extra step and allow time to hear back from them. Then, if they want to proceed with this project, despite the objections, at least their voices were heard. He fully supported some type of development on this property; he was just not in favor of this particular project. He has heard from other

residents of The Paseos and they all share similar concerns and he asked them to contact the City and voice their concerns in the limited time they have been aware of this project.

Deborah Loughlin, property manager at The Paseos, 4914 Olive Street, Montclair, said she was not prepared, having just received the packet this afternoon, but she felt it was important that she attend. She wanted to explain the efforts she has been making to correct the parking situation. They have been managing the project for only one year. They are very excited to be in Montclair; they promote the City and its redevelopment to everyone who they speak to. The new development is gorgeous and complements The Paseos in many ways but she wanted to share their efforts. Prior ownership did assemble a parking management plan, which initially assigned parking spaces for units that had uncovered parking spaces, which would be the two- and three-bedroom units. That plan changed somewhere to where it became non-existent when their company took over. There was a parking management company, Patrol One, that issued permits, but the person living in that unit wasn't given an assigned space. So the assigned space project never took off. When they came in, the property was about 75% occupied. By August, it was up to 93% or 94% occupancy. Every percentage increase represents about four units, so there was a lot of leasing activity occurring. She met with Mr. Lustro early on to discuss the parking issues. In the beginning, they thought they could implement the parking assignment as originally designed, but it was her opinion that some of the assigned parking spaces were located too far from the assigned unit. So rather than doing that, she came up with a parking permit by color; a certain color for those who have a two- or three-bedroom, where they would park within permit parking areas. The studio and one-bedroom units are covered in their respective enclosed garages and guest parking would be taken care of on the public streets. They would like to maintain the parking in front of the leasing office available as future resident parking during the day and allow it to be open parking at night. She has the permits and is currently working with a sign company to determine where the "Permit Parking Only" signs would be installed. They also have a Courtesy Patrol between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. daily to assist with parking enforcement. They have put a lot of effort into this and will be rolling it out to the residents soon. Each resident will be required to acknowledge the rules; it's not a change of terms, it's in everyone's lease. Again, the Parking Management Plan was not implemented the proper way from the beginning and as they grew, it became more of a problem. She wanted to share their efforts thus far. As much effort as they have put in and the fact that they are going to monitor it for their residents, it's still a problem. She felt the new project was beautiful and definitely will add to that area, she was just concerned about what additional parking impacts there may be to The Paseos.

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

Chair Johnson commented that one of the things that is becoming glaringly apparent to her is that there is a huge shift in the type of living spaces and environments people want. Most people who are looking for places to live now don't want a lawn and the things she thinks are important, like wanting to go sit down in the backyard and have a whole barbecue pit to herself. Millennials do not think that way. She realized this when she has visited family members and friends in other cities. Some live in multi-family developments and some in

single-family homes, but the same challenge existed in both. When she goes to visit her daughter, she has to call her in advance so her son-in-law can go out and move his car somewhere so that Nana has a place to park. When she went to visit a girlfriend in a beautiful community in a different city, there was only one of four visitor spots left and it was raining. If that parking space had not been available, she would have to park about three blocks away and hike in. She realizes this is the wave of the future: infill projects, dense communities, and projects that minimize the carbon footprint. It was her hope that if this development is approved, the people who move in to this space will be people for whom automobiles is not important. They will be people who want to live there because the Transcenter is nearby. She knows people who take the train everyday and when they get to where they're going, their company has a shuttle and that's how they get to where they're going. What she's learning about the residents of projects like these is that they are more likely single professionals without children rather than a traditional nuclear family.

Commissioner Sahagun asked if there would be a perimeter wall separating this project from The Paseos. City Planner Diaz stated there is an existing wall along the easterly property line of the subject property. Fire Station No. 1 is to the north, the community building of The Paseos provides the other "wall" to the south, and Monte Vista Avenue is on the west. The existing driveway would provide access to the new project, but not to the interior of The Paseos. Commissioner Sahagun also commented it was his hope this project might appeal to employees at Montclair Place so they could walk to work, reducing the need for cars.

Commissioner Sahagun moved that, based upon evidence submitted, the Planning Commission finds that the application for the proposed 23-unit residential apartment development is substantially consistent with the anticipated impacts evaluated in the previously certified EIR for the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan and its anticipated improvements. The Commission further finds that the project will not have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previously certified EIR, not have more severe effects than previously analyzed, and that additional or different mitigation measures are not required to reduce the impacts of the project to a level of less than significant, seconded by Commissioner Vodvarka, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

Vice Chair Flores moved to recommend the City Council approve a Precise Plan of Design request under Case No. 2016-3 for the site plan, floor plans, elevations, colors, materials, and conceptual landscape plan associated with the proposed 23-unit residential apartment development at 8949 Monte Vista Avenue, and associated on- and off-site improvements per the submitted plans and as described in the staff report, subject to the conditions in Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-1856, seconded by Commissioner Sahagun, there being no opposition to the motion, the motion passed 5-0.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Director Lustro reiterated what was already stated, that the Commission's action on Item 6.b is a recommendation to the City Council, so as with all projects within the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan, this project will move on to the City Council for final consideration.

Commissioner Sahagun asked if the project would be subject to a Parking Management Plan. City Planner Diaz replied in the affirmative and that it is a condition contained in the Resolution.

Commissioner Sahagun asked if staff knew what was going on at the former family planning clinic on San Bernardino Street and Fremont Avenue. Director Lustro replied that there has been renovation work going on at the property located at 5050 San Bernardino Street for a number of months and that it will remain a medical building. There has been some discussion about it potentially being a satellite medical center for the Veterans Administration but to staff's knowledge, that is undetermined at this point.

Commissioner Sahagun asked about the new lighting at Applebee's and thought it looked good, but wondered if they had to get a permit for that. City Planner Diaz replied that Applebee's received approval for exterior changes, including paint, awnings and new lighting fixtures a little over a month ago. It was a long-anticipated improvement and staff is pleased it was finally implemented.

Commissioner Martinez, on behalf of the Planning Commission, thanked Director Lustro for all his hard work and guidance in his service to the City, stated they would all miss him and was grateful for being the lead man in all of this.

Chair Johnson commented that she was responding to a comment made at the previous meeting that someone did not receive information about the Planning Commissioner's Academy. She suggested that everyone check out the California League of Cities' website at www.cacities.org. The next Planning Commissioner's Academy is scheduled for March 1-3, 2017 in Los Angeles. She was hopeful that for this or any other conference that there will be a mailing that comes to the Commission in their packets. She did not see it on the League of Cities website, but in the past there have been smaller Commissioner workshops in surrounding cities and we have always received notice by mail. She apologized for those who did not get the notice, but she was giving them notice for the next conference a year in advance.

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 8:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Embree
Planning Commission Secretary