

MINUTES

**REGULAR MEETING OF
THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EASTVALE
Wednesday, July 16, 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 6:03 p.m.

2. *ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:*

Commissioners present: Commissioners Charlson, Oblea, Patel, Vice-Chairperson Tessari, and Chairperson Valentine

Staff present: City Attorney Cavanaugh, Assistant Planning Director Perring, Senior Engineer Indrawan, and Recording Secretary Wuence

Commissioner Oblea led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. *ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA:*

Item 4.1 was removed from the Agenda and continued to the next meeting.

The order of the Agenda was changed, and Item 5 was addressed at this time.

5. *PUBLIC COMMENT/CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:*

Sharyn Link, Executive Director of the Eastvale Community Foundation, invited everyone to the Golf Tournament on Friday, August 15. Commissioner Valentine noted that the Planning Commission would have a team and challenged the Public Safety Commission, City Council, and City staff for a “Commander’s Cup” at the Tournament.

At this time, the Commission returned to address Item 4.

4. *PRESENTATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:*

4.1 *Police Power and the Planning Commission*

Discussion and presentation about the Planning Commission's ability to approve/deny/modify projects under the City's police power (John Cavanaugh, City Attorney).

This item was pulled from the agenda and continued to the next meeting.

4.2 **Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan**

The Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and its effect on land uses and land use planning (ALUC staff).

Assistant Planning Director Perring introduced representatives from the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), who provided a PowerPoint presentation on the item.

Ed Cooper, Director of the Airport Land Use Commission, provided an overview of ALUC's role in the development review process. He noted that the ALUC's mission is to protect airports from people and people from airports and to promote compatible land use around airports based on safety and noise using the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).

John Guerin, Principal Planner, noted that Eastvale is affected by aircraft proposing to land at or take off from Chino Airport. He reviewed the compatibility maps and various zones of the airport influence area over Eastvale.

He noted that Eastvale's proposed General Plan was submitted to ALUC for review in 2012 and was found to be consistent with the Compatibility Plan. As a result, the ALUC Mandatory Review of Projects was limited to General Plan Amendments, Specific Plans, Specific Plan Amendments, Changes of Zone, and Ordinance Amendments that are citywide or affect portions of the city within the airport influence area. He presented slides with concerns and future considerations of the ALUC for the area.

Commissioner Oblea inquired whether there was a chart that shows the maximum densities of the different zones. Mr. Guerin noted that the information could be found at www.rcaluc.org under Plans/Countywide Policies (Table 2A).

Commissioner Tessari inquired about the difference between Zone D and Zone E. Mr. Guerin noted that Zone D is more heavily traveled by aircraft. There was discussion about zoning in Eastvale based on the area being primarily vacant agricultural land and how that zoning changed as the area was developed.

There was discussion about the compatibility zones being based on a combination of safety factors and noise levels and the possibility that compatibility plans would change based on improved GPS and noise reduction technology in aircraft as well as use of different aircraft type or changes in air traffic volume.

The commissioners discussed the possibility of increased or decreased use of the Chino Airport.

It was noted that the ALUC does not have jurisdiction over San Bernardino County; therefore, municipalities in that county would have different restrictions and criteria than those in Riverside County.

Commissioner Patel inquired about the density limits for Zone D. It was noted that Zone D does not have upper limits, and urban residential is fine for that zone. It was noted that churches, theatres, and restaurants are not encouraged within 14,000 feet of the airport (portion of Zone D), as the average intensity for that area is 150 units per acre.

Commissioner Patel inquired as to whether the Compatibility Plans coordinate with the 2040–2050 countywide plans on a national level. Mr. Cooper responded that they did not coordinate. He noted some challenges for ALUCs, namely that they are subject to the CEQA process and the availability of state funds.

There was discussion about the level of coordination ALUC has with SCAG. It was noted that since airports are considered mass transit, there is some coordination on that level with SCAG as part of the countywide general plan.

Mr. Guerin stated that the March Air Reserve Base Plan and the Hemet Plan are in the process of being updated to be more consistent with the new countywide systems of zoning.

Commissioner Charlson commented that as the plans are only being updated every 5–10 years, Eastvale would build based on existing rules. He said that an advantage to that would be that if rules are made stricter, Eastvale would be grandfathered in and if restrictions are relaxed, commercial buildings with small numbers of employees could be converted to something else.

Chairperson Valentine asked if there were any current projects along Archibald that the ALUC may be reviewing and having problems with. Mr. Guerin noted that while not all projects require mandatory review by ALUC, they are available to assist City staff if necessary and to address concerns on all projects.

There was discussion about the possible use of solar power on development in the Leal Property and the concern that solar projects could produce glare and glint that would affect pilots. It was noted that the Leal Property is not in any of the airport influence zones.

It was noted that the area with the most concern was Zone C, which currently appears to be mainly planned for industrial uses.

Brian Bentrout, developer of The Ranch at Eastvale, stated that his project falls in Zones B1, C, and D and asked how skylights should be designed in industrial buildings for Zones B1 and C. Mr. Guerin indicated that the only reference to skylights in the Compatibility Plan was that the absence of skylights could be part of a risk-reduction design bonus. There was discussion about the type of landscaping to use in the required detention areas in order to not attract birds.

There was discussion about the standard used by ALUC for employee density in industrial buildings. Mr. Guerin noted the ALUC is more concerned with turnover of projects from industrial use to multi-tenant facilities such as churches, schools, and restaurants.

Discussion ensued about the use of netting and noise sirens to deter birds from the detention basins and the amount of time required for the basins to drain.

There was discussion about a recent issue at the Van Nuys Airport and restriction of flights in the area due to overgrowth of the community. It was noted that local communities and jurisdictions cannot make changes to airport operations. The ALUC works proactively with communities to prevent overgrowth of areas.

Commissioner Patel initiated discussion about possible economic development at Chino Airport and the potential opportunity for Eastvale to market and utilize that as an asset.

Chairperson Valentine started a discussion about certain types of projects that are recommended for review by ALUC but not mandatory. It was noted that if a project is in Zone D or E, staff would suggest that the developer submit to the ALUC anyway.

Commissioner Tessari initiated discussion about the possibility of submitting a zone change to the ALUC prior to development to avoid undue scrutiny. It was noted that any approval from ALUC could be conditional and may have to go back to ALUC for review of any development plans.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR:

6.1 Approval of minutes from May 21, 2014, meeting.

Motion: Moved by Oblea, seconded by Charlson, to approve the minutes as presented.

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

7. NEW BUSINESS ITEM:

There were no New Business Items.

8. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Patel inquired about the traffic patterns for facility drive-throughs. Specifically, she noted that parked vehicles are being blocked by vehicles in the drive-thru queue at Starbucks on Schleisman. Staff will look into distance requirements and standards for any drive-thru in parking lots of commercial developments. Staff will also look into the possibility of closing some parking stalls in that shopping center to avoid vehicles being blocked.

Commissioner Patel expressed concern about fuel tankers blocking the egress at the Vons fueling station being blocked by the fuel tankers when they replenish the fuel tanks. Staff will review the conditions placed on that project.

There was discussion about whether the Planning Commission reviewed the application for the Vons fueling station.

Commissioner Charlson noted that AutoZone may be violating their Conditional Use Permit by changing customer batteries in their parking lot. Code Enforcement should be notified when such violations occur.

The commissioners discussed signs being posted throughout the City in violation of the Sign Ordinance.

Commissioner Oblea noted the need for pedestrian access alongside the driveways at Eastvale Community Park for residents to safely enter the park. Engineer Indrawan noted that pedestrian access to the park was located on Hamner due to the steep driveways on Citrus and the possibility of pedestrians being obstructed from the view of motorists. Staff will look into adding a sidewalk for pedestrian access.

Clint Lorimore, a resident, noted that he agreed with Commissioner Oblea and felt unsafe walking down the driveway off Citrus to enter the Community Park during the Picnic in the Park. He suggested that a zigzag walkway would be beneficial, especially with the proximity of the high school to the park and students congregating there.

9. CITY STAFF REPORT:

There was no City Staff Report.

10. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:39 p.m.