

**MINUTES**

**REGULAR MEETING OF  
THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EASTVALE  
Wednesday, March 19, 2014  
6:00 P.M.**

**Rosa Parks Elementary School  
13830 Whispering Hills Drive  
Eastvale, CA 92880**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Valentine called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Commissioners present: Commissioners Charlson, Oblea, Vice-Chairman Tessari and Chairman Valentine.

Commissioners absent: Commissioner Patel.

Commissioner Patel arrived at 6:03 p.m.

Staff present: City Attorney Cavanaugh, Planning Director Norris, Assistant Planning Director Perring, Planner Teague, Senior Engineer Indrawan, Police Deputy Cryder and Assistant City Clerk Hall.

Commissioner Oblea led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

There were no Additions/Deletions to the Agenda.

**4. PRESENTATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

4.1 Presentation by the Police Department on their review of development projects, and the types of changes and/or conditions that the Police Department might recommend.

Deputy Cryder provided a presentation regarding Police Department review of projects.

Commissioner Patel arrived at 6:03 p.m.

There was discussion regarding lighting, security, and camera requirements. There was additional discussion regarding how police conditions were included in a project's conditions of approval.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:**

There were no Public Comments/Citizen Participation.

**6. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**6.1 Approval of minutes from February 19, 2014 meeting.**

Commissioner Charlson asked for a correction to the motion on Item 3.

**Motion: Moved by Daryl, seconded by Tessari to approve the minutes with revisions.**

**Motion carried 5-0 with Charlson, Oblea, Patel, Tessari and Valentine voting aye.**

**7. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:**

**7.1 PROJECT NO. 11-0271 – Environmental Impact Report, General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan, Tentative Parcel Map for subdivision of an approximately 200-acre area into five industrial parcels, one business park parcel, and one commercial parcel, and a Major Development Plan Review for development of approximately 122 acres of light industrial including four industrial/warehouse buildings. An environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this project. (Cathy Perring, Assistant Planning Director) Continued from February 19, 2014 meeting.**

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to take the following actions:

1. Certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Act (CEQA) that designated Alternative 3 as the environmentally superior alternative.
2. Approve a General Plan Amendment to change the land use from High density Residential to Light Industrial, Commercial Retail, and Business Park.
3. Rescind The Resort Specific Plan and adopt the Goodman Commerce Center Specific Plan, dated January 2014, which is consistent with the environmentally superior alternative in the EIR.

4. Approve Tentative Parcel Map No. 36487 for the subdivision of approximately 200 acres into five industrial parcels, one business park parcel, and one commercial parcel, subject to conditions of approval.
5. Approve Major Development Plan Review for the development of four new industrial/warehouse buildings totaling 2,853,654 square feet and associate improvements, subject to conditions of approval.

Assistant Planning Director Perring provided the staff report and PowerPoint presentation for the item.

Ward Mace, with Goodman Birtcher, presented a PowerPoint presentation with proposed changes to the project that had been made after the last Planning Commission Meeting.

Brandon Birtcher, with Goodman Birtcher, reviewed the alternative options for the project. He went on the review potential tenants, logistics career opportunities, modern shipping practices, and the aesthetic details of the project.

Lang Cottrell, with Goodman Birtcher, reviewed the retail/commercial portions of the proposed project. He stated that they would be aggressively marketing the project but could not build until they had tenants lined up. He went on to review the phasing of the project and reviewed the public improvements surrounding the project.

Brandon Birtcher discussed the time spent working with City Staff to come up with the project that was before the Commission.

Assistant Planning Director Perring reviewed the options for making a recommendation to the City Council.

Planner Teague discussed the alternatives and related EIR concerns. He stated that depending on the action taken, Staff would look at any potential significant effects on the EIR document.

The Public Hearing was opened at 6:57 p.m.

Mike Newell, a resident, stated that he was in opposition to the proposed project. He stated that the project was well thought out, aesthetically pleasing, and was good planning, but he was concerned about whether or not the project was the best use for the site. He added that if the project went forward, the hospital should be a requirement, not just an allowed use. He went on to discuss warehouse employment.

Todd Taylor, a resident, inquired how wide Hamner and Cantu-Galleano would be when they were built to their ultimate width. He stated that he was concerned with truck traffic on Hamner and Cantu-Galleano. He stated that he wanted to keep the City aesthetically pleasing. He went on to add that he appreciated that there was no retail on Bellgrave and that there was a planned jogging trail.

Mike Fowler, a commercial real estate broker, stated that he believed in the project, thought that the demand for warehousing was there in the market, and that the project was well designed.

Claudia Kunhardt, a resident, stated that she had concerns with truck traffic near Bellgrave. She felt that the noise would affect nearby home values. She added that the home builder had told her a school was going to be built on the site when she purchased her home.

Rania Hamdy, a resident, stated that she opposed the project. She added that residents near the project site were not able to enroll in the Corona-Norco Unified School District, were not part of the Jurupa Community Services Districts for parks and recreation, and the project was another insult to the residents in that area. She thought that the project was well designed, but not right for the City of Eastvale. She was concerned about the truck traffic in the area. She stated that Eastvale was a bedroom community, and the surrounding area was going to be built into residential and retail, and that that project site would be a good area for a lifestyle center.

Paul Castaneda, a resident and small business owner, stated that he thought the project was a good thing. He stated that he would move his business back to Eastvale if the project was built. He added that he liked working with Birtcher at his current business location.

Randall Lewis, with the Lewis Group, stated that he thought the project would be good for the City. He added that there was a strong demand for this type of use, and that the uses in the project would complement each other. He felt that the project did a good job of buffering between residential and industrial and that Goodman Birtcher had compromised with the City. He was in support of the project.

There was discussion regarding whether or not the Commissioners had ever lived near warehouses, and whether or not the community could support new retail without effecting existing businesses.

There was discussion regarding the widening of Hamner Avenue and Cantu-Galleano, as well as the projects impact on Bellgrave.

There was additional discussion regarding property values, warehousing versus retail uses, and the project's plans for Bellgrave.

Mr. Taylor, resident, suggested that no parking signs be posted along Bellgrave to prevent trucks from parking along the street near residential.

There was additional discussion regarding the previously planned school site, and hospital use needs.

There being no further comments, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:32 p.m.

There was discussion regarding hotel tax in the City, LEED certification, and the natural gas vehicle fueling station that was proposed.

There was discussion regarding Caltrans Freeway ramps in the area.

There was discussion regarding the locations of the various uses of the project and traffic control.

Commissioner Oblea was not in support of the project due to the size of the warehouses. He felt that the project needed more retail and business park use, and smaller warehouses if necessary.

There was discussion regarding the set-backs and landscaping of the project.

There was discussion regarding the differences in the two fiscal impact studies that were presented. City Manager Jacobs was available to answer questions and explain the studies.

There was discussion regarding the generation of sales taxes in the City.

Vice-Chairman Tessari expressed concern about the idea of placing a hospital near distribution centers. He did not feel that there would be a problem supporting retail in the area.

There was discussion regarding the potential job count for the currently approved project and for the proposed project that was being considered.

There was discussion regarding the area being in a Redevelopment Area and how the taxes would be allocated. Finance Director Shea was available for questions.

There was discussion regarding the noticing of the public hearing and any correspondence that was received.

There was discussion regarding screening or a barrier between the retail and industrial sections of the project.

Commissioner Patel stated that she was in favor of the development, and would like to concentrate these types of uses near the freeway and the western edge of the City, away from the middle of the City where the residents, schools and parks were located. She was pleased with the plan that placed business park on both sides of the industrial building fronting Hamner Avenue. She went on to state that the City needed office buildings, and businesses that would create jobs for residents. She added that she would not want the current high density housing project to be built there.

There was discussion regarding the action that could be taken by the Commission.

**Motion: Moved by Patel, seconded by Charlson to recommend that the City Council 1) Certify the EIR pursuant to CEQA that designated the proposed plan with business park use both north and south of the industrial building fronting Hamner Avenue subject to City Staff reviewing and providing any major findings; 2) Approve a General Plan Amendment to change the land use from High Density Residential to Light Industrial, Commercial Retail, and Business Park; 3) Rescind The Resort Specific Plan and adopt the Goodman Commerce Center Specific Plan with the previously mentioned changes to include screening on the industrial side of "Street A" for Building A; 4) Approve Tentative Parcel Map No. 36487 with the previously mentioned changes; and 5) Approve Major Development Plan Review for the development of four new industrial/warehouse buildings and associated improvements with the previously mentioned changes.**

**Motion carried 3-2 with Charlson, Patel, and Valentine voting aye and Oblea and Tessari voting no.**

Chairman Valentine announced that the project would go on for review and action by the City Council if anyone in the public wished to speak on the item further.

**8. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:**

There was discussion regarding the wooden fence that was to be replaced at the New Day Church construction site.

There was discussion regarding signs in the right-of-way on the weekend.

**9. CITY STAFF REPORT:**

There was no City Staff Report.

**10. ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.