

MINUTES of a regular meeting of the Environmental Review Committee of the City of Redlands held on April 20, 2015 at 9 a.m.

PRESENT Patricia Brenes, Development Services
Jeff Frazier, Fire Department
Don Young, Municipal Utilities and Engineering
Chris Catren, Police Department

STAFF Loralee Farris, Senior Planner
PRESENT Sean Kelleher, Associate Planner

I. ATTENDANCE

Mr. Don Young called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. All members were present with the exception of the Quality of Life Department.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of the February 2, 2015 meeting

The minutes of February 2, 2015 meeting were approved with a motion and correction noted from Mr. Chris Catren and a second from Mr. Young. The motion carried with a 4-0 vote.

III. OLD BUSINESS – None

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. DIVERSIFIED PACIFIC, APPLICANT

A recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council on the appropriate environmental process and socio-economic cost/benefit impacts for the following project:

Agricultural Preserve Removal No. 121 to remove a portion of an approximately 32.28 acre site from a City Agricultural Preserve located on the south side of San Bernardino Avenue, approximately 600 feet east of Judson Street in the A-1 (Agricultural) District (Proposed change to R-E (Residential Estate) District.

Zone Change No. 443 to rezone approximately 32.28 acres from A-1 (Agricultural) District to R-E (Residential Estate) District located on the south side of San Bernardino Avenue, approximately 600 feet east of Judson Street.

Tentative Tract No. 18979 to subdivide approximately 32.28 acres into fifty five (55) lots for single family residential use and one (1) lettered lot for open space purposes located on the south side of San Bernardino Avenue, approximately 600 feet east of Judson Street in the A-1 (Agricultural) District (Proposed change to R-E (Residential Estate) District.

Mr. Young requested the following changes to the Initial Study:

- VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions revised to less than significant.
- Modify page twenty five and twenty seven of the initial study to include consistency in the language relating to the handling of hazardous materials on a construction site.
- Mitigation Measure No. 7 revised to include SWPP.
- In-lieu fees located on page 37 require additional detail.

Mr. Fraizer discussed the need to work on a traffic preemption program.

Ms. Patricia Brenes requested revisions to the mandatory finding section a) and b) to less than significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL MOTION

It was moved by Mr. Catren, seconded by Mr. Jeff Frazier and carried on a 4-0 vote that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared.

Socio Economic Cost Benefit Study

Mr. Catren stated revisions to 5a) and 5d) under Police Services should indicate less than significant.

Mr. Young opened up the Hearing. There were no comments forthcoming and the Hearing was closed.

SOCIO ECONOMIC COST BENEFIT MOTION

It was moved by Mr. Catren, seconded by Mr. Frazier and carried on a 4-0 vote that the proposed project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

This included revisions to the Initial Study and Socio Economic Cost Benefit Study as follows:

Initial Study:

- *Page 22, VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions revised to less than significant.*
 - ◇ This was simply changing the box that was checked.
- *Page 28-SWPP needs to be included in MM7*
 - ◇ Revised Mitigation measure below:

“Mitigation Measure No. 7 requires that the project be required to comply with the submitted Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared in

accordance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of Redlands and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared and submitted to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project shall also provide the appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) within the project site to stop “first flush” of accumulated pollutants from entering the City storm drain system. The project-specific BMPs may also incorporate other measures such as bio-swales in planter areas which can also eliminate the “first flush” of accumulated pollutants on street surfaces. BMPs can include onsite infiltration trenches, treatment units and detention basins that will reduce pollutant levels of onsite runoff ~~to meet as defined in Municipal code section 15.54.160.~~ The specific mix of BMPs will be reviewed and approved by the City.”

- *Page 37- In-lieu fee needs more detail*

- ◇ Revised the first paragraph of the Public Services Section as shown below:

~~Adoption of t~~The proposed project is not expected to significantly impact or result in a need for new or altered public services provided by the City of Redlands, the Redlands Unified School District, or other government agencies. Police and fire protection for the project site will be provided by the City of Redlands. The proposed project will not result in the need for new or additional public facilities. The project will not induce significant residential growth requiring additional school facilities, nor will it generate the need for additional park land. The applicant will be required to pay applicable development impact fees including the payment of a Park land in-lieu fee pursuant to Section 17.15.040 of the Redlands Municipal Code. This in lieu fee will be utilized to develop or rehabilitate park or recreational facilities to serve the residents of the subdivision.

- *Chief Fraizer had requested language to reference preempt procedures*

- ◇ This was discussed but no formal direction at the meeting was given to add this information.

- *Principal Planner Brenes had requested corrections to the mandatory finding- section change to less than significant.*

- ◇ Sections XVIII A and B “Mandatory Findings of significance were amended as follows.

XVIII.a) As identified in Section VI, Biological Resources, the project site is not identified in the Biotic Resources Map, Figure 7.1 of the City’s General Plan’s MEA/EIR, as an area potentially containing biological resources. However, properties within the vicinity of the project site have trapped San Bernardino Kangaroo Rats (SBKR). As such, a *Site Reconnaissance and San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat Suitability Assessment*, was prepared for the subject project site by Michael Baker International. A memorandum was prepared addressing the findings on September 23, 2014. A survey of the site was conducted on August 28, 2014 and found no SBKR burrows or signs

of their presence on the property. The memorandum also identified that the property has been weeded for several years and does not support native habitat. Based on the total absence of SBKR Sign noted during the suitability assessment, lack of viable habitat for SBKR, it was determined that SBKR has a very low potential to occur on the subject property. Therefore, it was concluded that there was no need to conduct trapping on-site. Based on the project site not being identified in the Biotic Resources Map, Figure 7.1 of the City's General Plan's MEA/EIR, as an area potentially containing biological resources, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Nor will the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. As designed the project will not result in a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Adoption of the proposed project will not cause a conflict with a Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) or Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard. Adoption of the proposed project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environmental. As previously noted the project is for the subdivision of the 32.28 acre project site into fifty five (55) lots for single family residential use and one (1) lettered lot for open space purposes. As part of the application to subdivide the subject property the applicant is seeking approval of an Agricultural preserve removal to remove approximately 22.68 acres of the 32.28 acre project site from an agricultural preserve, the remaining 9.6 acres is not within an agricultural preserve. As well as, an application to re-zone the subject property from A-1 (Agricultural) District to R-E (Residential Estate) District. The residential lots within the proposed development will range from 14,030 to 17,126 square feet. . The project is not located within valued habitat, or within an area containing archaeological or paleontological resources. No impacts to the existing environment are expected. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

XVIII.b) Through the analysis of the Sections above no cumulative impacts were identified as part of the proposed project. The project will not significantly impact the environment by itself and with the mitigation measures identified within this document will not be cumulatively significant. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Socio Economic Cost Benefit Study

- *Chief Fraizer recommended language for response time. 4) Under Fire /Paramedic Services*
 1. This was discussed but no formal direction at the meeting was given to add this information.

- *Chris Catren recommended under Police Services: 5) A & B less than significant.*

1. Please note change

B. LA VERIZON WIRELESS SMSA, APPLICANT

A recommendation to the Planning Commission on the appropriate environmental process for **Conditional Use Permit No. 1041** to construct a wireless telecommunications facility with a sixty foot (60') tall tower disguised as a eucalyptus tree within a nine hundred (900) square foot lease area enclosed within an eight foot (8') tall block wall on a 7.95 acre parcel of land located at the northwest corner of San Bernardino Avenue and Wabash Avenue, in the C-M (Commercial Industrial) District.

Ms. Brenes requested modifications to Section 18, mandatory findings, to allow for consistency when referencing mitigations incorporated.

Mr. Young opened the Hearing

Ms. Sunshine Schupp, Representative, stated she was available for questions and concurred with the proposed mitigation measures.

Mr. Young closed the Hearing

It was moved by Mr. Catren and seconded by Mr. Frazier, and carried on a 4-0 vote that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

At this time, the Environmental Review Committee will provide an opportunity for the Public to address them on a matter not already scheduled for this agenda (please limit your comments to three minutes).

Mr. Young opened the Public Comment period. There were no comments forthcoming and the Public Comment period was closed.

VI. ADJOURNMENT TO APRIL 20, 2015

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m. to the April 20, 2015 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joni Mena
Sr. Administrative Assistant

Loralee Farris
Senior Planner