CITY OF WILDOMAR
PLANNING COMMISSION
Commission Members
Chairman Robert Devine · Vice-Chairman Harv Dykstra
Gary Andre · Scott Nowak · Miguel Casillas

REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2009 AT 7:00 P.M.
Council Chambers, Wildomar City Hall, 23873 Clinton Keith Road, Wildomar, CA 92595

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Prior to the business portion of the agenda, the Planning Commission will receive public comments regarding any agenda items or matters within the jurisdiction of the governing body. This is the only opportunity for public input except for scheduled public hearing items. The Chairperson will separately call for testimony at the time of each public hearing. If you wish to speak, please complete a "Public Speaker/Comment Card" available at the door. The completed form is to be submitted to the Chairperson prior to an individual being heard. Lengthy testimony should be presented to the Planning Commission in writing (8 copies) and only pertinent points presented orally. The time limit established for public comments is three minutes per speaker or less if a large number of requests are received on a particular item.

AGENDA

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

1.1 Roll Call

1.2 Pledge of Allegiance

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT: Members of the audience may comment on matters that are not included on the agenda. Each person will be allowed three (3) minutes or less if a large number of requests are received on a particular item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under "public comment" until the matter has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.

3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

3.1 Approval of the July 15, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes.

3.2 Approval of the August 5, 2009 Regular Meeting Minutes.

4.0 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS: The Planning Commission will review the proposed request, receive public input and consider action for the following items:
4.1 **VARIANCE NO. 08-0179:** A request to construct a sign larger than 45' for a previously approved project. The proposed project site is located south of Bundy Canyon Road East of I-15 and west of Monte Vista Drive, APNs: 367-100-019 & 367-100-020.

Environmental Determinations: The proposed sign variance is within the scope of the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration developed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

5.0 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:** The Planning Commission will review the proposed request, receive public input and consider action for the following items:

None.

6.0 **GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:**

None.

7.0 **ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS REPORT:**

None.

8.0 **PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT:** This item is reserved for the Planning Director to comment or report on items not on the agenda. No action will be taken.

9.0 **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:** This portion of the agenda is reserved for Planning Commission business, for the Planning Commission to make comments on items not on the agenda, and/or for the Planning Commission to request information from staff.

10.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

The next scheduled Regular Meeting of the City of Wildomar Planning Commission is September 2, 2009 at 7:00 P.M.
Lengthy testimony should be presented to the Planning Commission in writing (8 copies) and only pertinent points presented orally. The time limit established for public comments is three minutes per speaker.

**ADDITIONS/DELETIONS:** Items of business may be added to the agenda upon a motion adopted by a minimum 2/3 vote finding that there is a need to take immediate action and that the need for action came to the attention of the City subsequent to the agenda being posted. Items may be deleted from the agenda upon request of staff or upon action of the Planning Commission.

**ADA COMPLIANCE:** If requested, the agenda and backup materials will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Any person who requires a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in the public meeting may request such modification, accommodation, aid or service by contacting the Planning Department either in person or by telephone at (951) 667-7751, no later than 10:00 A.M. on the day preceding the scheduled meeting.

**POSTING STATEMENT:** On August 14, 2009, a true and correct copy of this agenda was posted at the three designated posting places: Wildomar City Hall, 23873 Clinton Keith Road; U. S. Post Office, 21392 Palomar Street; and the Mission Trail Library, 34303 Mission Trail Blvd.
1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Wildomar Planning Commission was called to order by Planning Commission Chairman Devine at 7:05 P.M. at Wildomar City Hall, Council Chambers.

1.1 ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Robert Devine, Chairman
Miguel Casillas, Commissioner
Gary Andre, Commissioner
Scott Nowak, Commissioner

Absent: Harv Dykstra, Vice-Chairman

Staff Present: David Hogan, Assistant Planning Director
Thomas Jex, Assistant City Attorney
Jon Crawford, Supervising Engineer
Alia Kanani, Planner
Sean del Solar, Planner

1.2 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Commissioner Nowak led the flag salute.

2.0 COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Commissioner Andre moved to approve the Minutes of June 3, 2009. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Casillas. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Nowak, Casillas, and Andre.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Dykstra.
ABSTAIN: None.
4.0 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

4.1 PARCEL MAP NO. 32257, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (3403) AND VARIANCE (1757), 08-0179.

Applicant: Bundy I-15, LP
Location: Southeast corner of Bundy Canyon Road and Interstate 15 (APNs: 367-100-019 & 367-100-020).
Proposals: Construct retail space and subdivide 6.64 acres into 7 commercial lots.
Environmental Action: In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a mitigated negative declaration has been recommended for approval.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan made the staff report.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan concluded his staff report by referencing comment letters received from the California Department of Fish and Game, the County Solid Waste Department and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Chairman Devine asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Staff.

Commissioner Andre asked if staff had reviewed the Walmart Conditions of Approval.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan responded that the Walmart Conditions of Approval were not reviewed because the two projects were different.

Commissioner Andre stated that there were flooding issues raised at the County Hearing for the Walmart project and that County staff was directed to create a flood control map of the area. Mr. Andre went on to describe past flooding events that affected Elsinore High School and noted that no actions have been taken to correct the flooding problems. Commissioner Andre concluded by stating that it would not have an impact on this project.

Chairman Devine asked Commissioner Andre if the Walmart project and the current project were reviewed together at the County. Commissioner Andre responded that they were, and in the original proposal that the County reviewed, the Walmart project and the current project shared stormwater infrastructure. Commissioner Andre also noted that because the Walmart was not a part of the current project, the original stormwater issues had changed and stated that flooding issues in the community need to be addressed in the future.
Commissioner Nowak asked if the commission could take an action without the applicant verifying whether or not there was a Jurisdictional waterway on the property, and if the drainage from the proposed project had been reviewed.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan replied in the affirmative and went on to explain that runoff from the site would be treated on site and that stormwater currently flowing through the site would be collected and piped under the site discharging in the same place it does currently. He went on to explain that runoff created by the proposed project was evaluated in the WQMP and the project had sufficient treatment measures and facilities to accommodate stormwater runoff generated by the site. Mr. Hogan then discussed the letters received from the resource agencies. He stated that in the original letters, there was confusion about the location of the project site, but that staff had added a condition of approval which would address jurisdictional water issues on the project site. Mr. Hogan then concluded by stating that if the Commission was comfortable with the condition of approval created to address this issue, then staff recommends the approval of the environmental document for this project.

Commissioner Casillas suggested that further study may be required.

Chairman Devine asked how the conditions of approval would be implemented.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan responded that they would be attached to the project so grading could not be conducted until the jurisdictional water issue had been adequately addressed.

Chairman Devine opened the Public Hearing.

Applicant Jack Kofsarali thanked staff and the Commission and discussed his business and the project. Mr. Kofsarali then discussed the sign variance which he had requested, citing several unique challenges posed by the site limiting visibility from the south bound lanes of Interstate 15.

Commissioner Andre asked about the base elevation of the sign and whether relocating it could remedy the visibility challenges.

The Applicant responded that because of the significant structure of the sign, they wanted to locate it in the rear of the property to minimize the visual impact from the ground level and maximize visibility from the freeway level.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan added that the proposed location of the sign was at an elevation of 1,387 feet, and that the building pad was at an elevation of 1,405 feet.
Commissioner Andre clarified the flooding issues for the applicant by explaining that they were not created by the project site but in the area east of the project site, however the floodwaters did pass through the project site.

The applicant responded that when the project is complete, it will collect all the stormwater runoff from the site and detain it, effectively eliminating the stormwater runoff from the project site.

Commissioner Nowak stated that he liked the placement of the sign in the rear of the property.

Chairman Devine asked if the Applicant had received the conditions of approval and if they agreed to them.

The applicant indicated that they did agree to the conditions but had questions pertaining to bonding for the completion of the map.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that the Subdivision Map Act allows for bonding in lieu of construction for securing the street improvements, but then providing improvements prior to occupancy.

The applicant responded that he understood and was in agreement with the conditions.

Commissioner Casillas asked about the design of the sign.

The applicant responded that it would be similar to the Stater Brothers sign on Clinton Keith and Interstate 15.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan added that the total sign area would be in conformance with the municipal code.

Resident Martha Bridges addressed the Commission. Ms. Bridges referenced a letter she had distributed to the Commission and then discussed her concerns, beginning with the lack of an Environmental Impact Report and the use of an environmental document prepared by Riverside County. She also expressed concern that the environmental document was not posted with the agenda and she had to request to request a copy. In addition, Ms. Bridges stated that the 20 days provided for public review was not adequate. She concluded by recommending that the Commission delay their decision.

Civil Engineer for the applicant Andrew Koltavary addressed the Commission and described the stormwater runoff capture and detention systems utilized by the project.
Commission Andre asked about how the water would drain to under the freeway.

Applicant Engineer Koltavary described how the project would capture water from Sellers Road and discharge it in the same place it is currently.

Commissioner Andre reiterated his concern that the water that will flow under the freeway, flow across the field and then onto Orange Street where it will flood homes near the High School.

Resident Jeanne Weiler addressed the Commission. She stated that while although the project would not contribute to the flooding problems it may be a good opportunity to try and correct the flooding problems. She then expressed concern over the addition of 3 more drive-through restaurants.

Resident Dana Martin addressed the Commission. He expressed concerns with stormwater issues and the development along the 3 thoroughfares in the City, citing a desire for unique and quality projects in Wildomar.

Applicant Jack Kofsarali again addressed the Commission. He stated that the development of the project would be consistent with all rules and regulations and reiterated the fact the application was under review for 5 years with the County. Mr. Kofsarali also agreed with resident’s desires for sit-down restaurants; however he could only provide what the market could support. He then described the hardship the development process had created in attracting tenants for the project.

Chairman Devine closed the Public Hearing.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan responded to concerns raised in the Public Hearing. He began by stating that the City prepared the Environmental Document for the project and that it was available in the lobby of City Hall during the review period. The review process was consistent with State regulations and that the adoption of the document would be lawful.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded to concerns raised in the Public Hearing. He distributed flood maps to the Commission and discussed the map. After discussing the drainage patterns in the area, Mr. Crawford explained that the stormwater from Sellers Road would be collected in the northeast corner of the project and discharged in the same place on the west side of the project adjacent to the Bundy Canyon off ramp. He went on to explain that while although major improvements to the system at large are needed, there must be a nexus and the proposed project is making improvements to the system at large.
Chairman Devine asked if the flooding issues would continue to occur if the project is not built.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded in the affirmative.

Chairman Devine then asked if the flooding issues would be improved if the project was built.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that if flooding issues improved, it would be minimal. He explained that the project would only eliminate stormwater runoff created by the site. Mr. Crawford went on to describe the Sedco drainage basin system.

Chairman Devine asked about the blue line channel which is located near Wesley Street.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that the channel is question was not a part of this watershed, but rather in the Santa Margarita Watershed.

Commissioner Andre again described the flooding problems which occur near the High School.

Chairman Devine begged the question if the project was built, would it change the issues being described.

Commissioner Andre responded in the affirmative, adding that it would divert drainage to the west side of the property.

Commissioner Nowak asked for confirmation that the stormwater created by the project would be retained on the site.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Nowak then asked if the diversion of water from a trench along Bundy Canyon into a pipeline under the project would change the direction, quantity or velocity of the water.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that it would not change the point of crossing under the freeway, the volume of water, nor the constituents contained in the water when it enters the project site from Sellers Road.

Commissioner Nowak then asked for confirmation that the point at which the water enters the project site on the east, the outlet point from the project site, and the quantity would all be the same.
Supervising Engineer Crawford replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Andre disagreed.

Commissioner Nowak asked if the proposed project should be required to correct the area’s flooding problems.

Commissioner Andre described flooding problems in the area and the lack of proper maintenance of flood control devices and suggested that if the project is approved, there needs to be a major flood plan developed to address flooding issues in the area.

Chairman Devine asked if there would be a difference in the flow through the property if the proposed project was not built.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that there would be no change. Mr. Crawford also explained that the position of staff was based upon the information provided in the preliminary plans created for this project. Staff would continue to review the information as more detailed plans were created by the applicant.

Commissioner Nowak asked if there were easements for the drainage shown on the flood map provided to the Commission.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that there were no easements and that the drainage patterns shown on the map were all naturally occurring drainages across private properties. Mr. Crawford went on to explain some of the challenges of the stormwater drainage system in the community.

Assistant City Attorney Jex clarified that the City has the ability to require the applicant to deal with the water which comes onto its property. The City does not have the ability to require this project to address flooding problems not on the property; those issues must be addressed by those property owners.

Commissioner Nowak asked if the applicant needed to get permission from property owners downstream before development of the project could occur.

Assistant City Attorney Jex responded that the applicant did not because the project would not change the amount or direction of the water as it currently interacts with the project site.

Commissioner Nowak asked when the last study occurred on the drainage basin.
Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that the map given to the Commission was from 1956.

Chairman Devine asked about the involvement of outside agencies in the preparation of the environmental document.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan responded that the City of Wildomar was the lead agency in the creation of the document. The California Environmental Quality Act establishes guidelines for the creation of environmental documents but the implementation of the act is left to communities. Mr. Hogan went on to describe the role of CEQA documents in the public decision making process.

Commissioner Nowak asked if County Flood Control would be consulted when the City approved the street improvement plans.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that County Flood Control is consulted whenever pipes in excess of 48 inches are used and would be consulted for this project.

MOTION: Commissioner Nowak motioned to adopt mitigated negative declaration 08-0179 with resolution PC09-007. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Casillas. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Nowak, and Casillas.
NOES: Andre.
ABSENT: Dykstra.
ABSTAIN: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Casillas motioned to approve Conditional Use Permit number 08-0179, a request to construct and operated a commercial retail center on a 6.64 acre site with resolution PC09-008. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Andre. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Andre, Nowak, and Casillas.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Dykstra.
ABSTAIN: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Andre motioned to approve Tentative Parcel Map number 32257, a request to subdivide a 6.64 acre site into 6 parcels with resolution PC09-009. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nowak. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:
Commissioner Nowak discussed postponing the decision on the variance until more information could be made available on the proposal.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan clarified the information the Commission wanted and also obtained authorization from the Commission to work with Commissioner Nowak to ensure that sufficient information would be provided.

MOTION: Commissioner Nowak motioned to continue Variance number 08-0179 to the August 19, 2009 Planning Commission meeting and to authorize staff to work with Commissioner Nowak on a complete submittal. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Andre. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Andre, Nowak, and Casillas.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Dykstra.
ABSTAIN: None.

5.0 PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

5.1 CONDITIONAL (PUBLIC) USE PERMIT NO. 08-0214.

Applicant: Ann Sullivan Nursery School
Location: 21776 Palomar Street (APN: 380-050-005).
Proposals: The project proposes the addition of 8,048 square feet of floor area to an existing facility, including the addition of three new classrooms and other minor facilities, and the conversion of existing space to create a new multipurpose room and new administrative facilities.

Environmental Action: In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a categorical exemption has been recommended for approval.

Chairman Devine made a statement that he lived next to the School for 18 years prior to recently moving, visited the site and viewed preliminary plans for the project.

Commissioner Andre also made a statement that he had met with the applicants and visited the site.
Planner Alia Kanani made the staff report.

Commissioner Andre read a letter received from the project Architect Christopher Campbell which discussed the inclusion of a multiuse trail in the project.

Chairman Devine opened the Public Hearing.

Applicant Walt Allen addressed the Commission. Mr. Allen raised questions about conditions of approval numbers 41 & 42 and asked staff for clarification.

Supervising Engineer Crawford explained that condition of approval number 41 addressed improvements to the parkway. Mr. Crawford went on to explain that because the school had already completed some street improvements, they had met the requirements for the street portion of the improvements but that parkway improvements were different. He also explained that condition of approval number 42 is a standard fail safe condition.

Applicant Allen indicated that he understood the purpose of the conditions.

Commissioner Andre stated that the trail runs on the northeast side of Palomar Street from Corydon Street to the Creek bed, and then the trail switches sides.

Resident Gina Castanon addressed the Commission. She stated that she was in favor of the proposed project.

Chairman Devine closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Andre stated his support for the project.

Chairman Devine expressed content with the project.

MOTION: Commissioner Nowak motioned to approve Conditional Use Permit number 08-0214, a request to construct and operated a nursery school expansion with resolution PC09-010. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Casillas. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Andre, Nowak, and Casillas.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Dykstra.
ABSTAIN: None.
5.2 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 09-0374.

Applicant: Andonian Investments/Discount Tire
Location: 23885 Clinton Keith Road (APN: 380-240-046).
Proposals: The project proposes the installation and operation of a tire sales and repair facility in an existing commercial space designed for an automotive use.

Environmental Action: In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a categorical exemption has been recommended for approval.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan made the staff report.

Chairman Devine opened the Public Hearing.

Applicant Steve Warfield addressed the Commission.

Commissioner Nowak noted the presence of a message clinic adjacent to the proposed tire store and asked the applicant what was being done to address potential sounds that would emanate from the tire store.

Applicant Warfield explained that in addition to insulation, the facility was originally designed to place the office in between the repair bays and wall of the message clinic to minimize any nuisance sound.

Commissioner Andre stated he spoke with the applicant.

Business Owner Larry Ferguson addressed the Commission. He described the operations of the Message Clinic and also requested that the doors between the repair bays and the office could remain closed to minimize sound. Mr. Ferguson also asked where used tires would be stored.

Commissioner Andre described building materials that could be used to dampen sound.

Applicant Warfield agreed that the office door would be kept closed. He also stated that the storage of all tires would be within the tenant space.

Commissioner Andre asked if a pneumatic gun could be tested in the space to determine if the sound would be a problem.

Applicant Warfield explained that keeping both tenants happy was in his best interest and that he would be working with both tenants to ensure compatibility.
Chairman Devine closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Andre stated that he wanted to ensure that Message Envy was satisfied with the Project.

Assistant Planning Director Hogan noted that there is a condition of approval which would allow staff to reopen the conditional use permit should there be any problems.

MOTION: Commissioner Casillas motioned to approve Conditional Use Permit number 08-0374, a request to construct and operated a tire sales facility in the Oak Creek Shopping Center with resolution PC09-011. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nowak. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Andre, Nowak, and Casillas.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: Dykstra.
ABSTAIN: None.

6.0 GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:
None.

7.0 ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS REPORT:

7.1 REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN AT DIRECTORS HEARING

Assistant Planning Director Hogan reported on the approval of Extension of Time No. 2 for application number 09-0344 at a Director Hearing on July 1, 2009.

8.0 PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT:

8.1 REPORT ON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STATUS

Assistant Planning Director Hogan informed the Commission that the City Council would like to proceed with a General Plan update; however the Council cited a lack of funds inhibiting work on an update. Mr. Hogan went on to report that the Council provided direction to staff to explore grant and funding opportunities which could pay for an update.

Chairman Devine asked where funding may come from for the work.
Assistant Planning Director Hogan explained that there are agencies and foundations which provide funding for several elements of the general plan. He went on to state that the Council understood the importance of an update and wanted to move forward.

8.2 PLANNING COMMISSION CONFLICT OF INTEREST RADIUS MAPS

Assistant City Attorney Jex explained that the maps contained a 500 foot radius around each of the commissioners’ homes and that the maps were provided to help Commissioners decide if an item up for a decision could pose a conflict of interest.

9.0 PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Andre asked if local contractors could review projects taking place in the City so that they could bid on them.

Chairman Devine asked the City Attorney if it would be possible to list Contractors.

Commissioner Nowak asked when a permit would become public record so a potential contractor could bid on a private project.

Supervising Engineer Crawford responded that the Planning Commission agendas are the best sources of information on upcoming private building projects.

Commissioner Andre noted that in 1987, the County had a trailer located in Murrieta that contractors could go and view plans and collect information.

10.0 ADJOURNMENT:

The July 15, 2009 regular meeting of the Wildomar Planning Commission adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:

David Hogan
Commission Secretary
1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Wildomar Planning Commission was called to order by Planning Commission Chairman Devine at 7:05 P.M. at Wildomar City Hall, Council Chambers.

1.1 ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present:  Robert Devine, Chairman
          Gary Andre, Commissioner
          Harv Dykstra, Vice-Chairman

Absent:  Scott Nowak, Commissioner
          Miguel Casillas, Commissioner

Staff Present:  David Hogan, Planning Director
                Thomas Jex, Assistant City Attorney
                Jon Crawford, Supervising Engineer
                Sean del Solar, Planner

1.2 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Chairman Devine led the flag salute.

2.0 COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Assistant City Attorney Jex advised that a quorum of Commission members from the July 15 meeting were not present at the current meeting and the approval of the July 15, 2009 Minutes would have to be postponed.

4.0 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

None.
5.0 PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

5.1 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 09-0462.

Applicant: Sycamore Academy Charter School
Location: 32326 Clinton Keith Road (APNs: 380-130-015 & 380-130-016).
Proposals: The project proposes the operation of a charter school with 342 to 372 students in the C-1/C-P zone in a space consisting of 20,076 square feet.

Environmental Action: In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a categorical exemption has been recommended for approval.

Planner del Solar made the staff report.

Chairman Devine opened the Public Hearing.

 Applicant James Bach thanked staff and made himself available to answer questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Andre asked how students would access the playground.

Charter School Official Edie Esquivel responded that lower grades would have classrooms that provide direct access to playground and higher grades would have to access the playground by going down the western staircase and proceeding to the playground. Ms. Esquivel went on to explain that Physical Education classes would be staggered throughout the day so all classes could be conducted in the fenced play area.

Commissioner Andre commented favorably on the inclusion of a fence in the front of the school.

 Applicant Bach indicated that a fence in the front was suggested by Planning Director Hogan.

Commissioner Andre raised concerns about traffic associated with the proposed school.

 Applicant Bach responded that the school is working with Staff to develop a pick-up and drop-off plan to address traffic issues.
School Official Esquivel added that a parent handbook would provide detailed instructions to parents on the pick-up and drop-off procedures established in the pick-up and drop-off plan as well as encourage carpooling.

Commissioner Andre asked if drop-off would be in the front or the back of the school.

School Official Esquivel responded that it would be in the back. Ms. Esquivel went on to explain that school staff would also be involved with the pick-up and drop-off.

Chairman Devine asked about the locations of driveways into and out of the shopping center and how traffic from the school would enter and exit the center.

Applicant Bach responded that there were two entrances and exits from the shopping center, one with limited right-turn only access and another with a signal. Mr. Bach went on to explain the routes parents would take when exiting the center.

Chairman Devine asked about the number of parking spaces available in the center.

Applicant Bach responded that he could not recall the exact number of spaces in the center, but explained that the school would have a significantly reduced demand for parking than the office uses originally proposed, therefore there would be sufficient parking available.

Chairman Devine closed the Public Hearing.

Planning Director Hogan informed the Commission that there were revisions to the resolution and conditions of approval and that the updated documents were distributed to the Commission. Director Hogan then recommended the adoption of the amended resolution and conditions of approval.

MOTION: Vice-chairman Dykstra motioned to approve Conditional Use Permit number 09-0462, a request to operate the Sycamore Academy Charter School with resolution PC09-012. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Andre. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Andre, and Dykstra.
NOES:
ABSENT: Nowak and Casillas.
ABSTAIN:

5.2 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 09-0478.
Applicant: Barons, the Marketplace
Location: 32310 Clinton Keith Road (APNs: 380-130-015 & 380-130-016).

Proposals: The project proposes the sale of alcoholic beverages in conjunction with the operation of an 18,000 square foot grocery.

Environmental Action: In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a categorical exemption has been recommended for approval.

Planner del Solar made the staff report.

Chairman Devine opened the Public Hearing.

Applicant James Bach addressed the Commission and provided additional information about the tasting room.

Chairman Devine asked if the School had concerns with the sale of alcohol conducted from the adjacent business.

Applicant Bach responded that there was none and deferred to the Sycamore Academy School Official.

School Official Esquivel responded that the school did not have an objection to the sale of alcohol at the Barons grocery store.

Chairman Devine closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Andre stated that he wanted to ensure that wine tasting would not occur during school hours.

Applicant Bach responded that in the Statement of Operations, the tasting room would not be utilized until the afternoon and weekends.

MOTION: Commissioner Andre motioned to approve Conditional Use Permit number 09-0478, a request to permit the sale of alcohol in conjunction with the operation of the Barons grocery with resolution PC09-013. The motion was seconded by Vice-chairman Dykstra. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Andre, and Dykstra.
NOES: 
ABSENT: Nowak and Casillas.
ABSTAIN:

5.3 ZONING CODE AMENDMENT ZOA 09-01

Planning Director Hogan provided a background on the zoning code and introduced the item by explaining that the staff report would be delivered in several segments with opportunities for the Commission and the public to provide discussion and input during the staff report.

Planning Director Hogan discussed the portion of the staff report addressing streamlining.

Chairman Devine noted that there were several references to “the County” in the municipal code and asked if those references would be removed.

Director Hogan responded that when the codification of the municipal code is complete, all the references to the County will be removed.

Commissioner Andre added that any effort to make the code easier to use would be helpful.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra agreed.

Director Hogan provided a portion of the staff report addressing lot area requirements for second units.

Chairman Devine asked about situations where the maximum second unit size would prohibit the construction of a new unit on a property.

Director Hogan responded that if an existing unit on a property was larger than 1,800 square feet, a second unit at the property would not be possible.

Chairman Devine indicated that he had difficulty with the maximum unit size established in the second unit permit changes.

Director Hogan responded that he understood the Commission’s concerns and suggested some possible solutions to the unit size limitation. Mr. Hogan responded that the unit size maximum could be increased or property owners may opt to subdivide their property. Director Hogan suggested creating a fourth tier to allow larger second unit sizes for larger lots.
Chairman Devine indicated that he did not want to limit the building area on large parcels and suggested a system for analyzing properties on a case by case basis. Vice-Chairman Dykstra expressed dissent.

Director Hogan clarified that the original philosophy of allowing second units in the State was a way to increase the supply of housing units. He added that it would not limit the size of the primary unit.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra noted ambiguity in a requirement for recreational space to be maintained on the property, and asked staff if the requirement could be quantified.

Director Hogan responded by describing the process involved with the development of the guidelines and described potential inequities. He then went on to suggest that the vague nature of the recreational space requirement could prevent further hardship on property owners developing a second unit.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra expressed concern that second units could be rented to non family members of the primary unit and impacts to traffic and the community created by the added density from second units would not be mitigated. He added that large second units would not be affordable to seniors and that neglect the original intent of allowing second units or granny flats. He then recommended decreasing the minimum and maximum unit sizes to 600-1,200 square feet for parcels 1.9 acres or less and, 750-1,500 square feet for parcels 2 acres or larger. Mr. Dykstra added that a minimum lot size of a half acre should be required for a second unit.

Director Hogan explained that second units and granny flats were not the same and discussed the differences.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra expressed concern with the density second units would bring to the community.

Commissioner Andre shared an experience he had in Cypress with second units and described the issues he observed. He went on to express disapproval of using second units for rental purposes, but felt favorably about granny flats.

Chairman Devine again expressed concern over the ability of homeowners to develop another unit on their property when the existing unit already exceeds the second unit size limitation. Chairman Devine suggested that the City should individually evaluate each request for a second unit.

Director Hogan then asked the Commission under what conditions would second units be appropriate and inappropriate.
Commissioner Andre indicated there are places where second units could not be placed on a property, discussing typography as just one limiting factor.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra again expressed concern with the rental of large homes developed as second units if the size was not properly limited.

Chairman Devine suggested that the issue of second unit permits may need to be studied further.

Assistant City Attorney Jex suggested that the issue of second units could be left out of the recommendation that the Commission makes to the City Council.

Commissioner Andre added that the minimum unit size was structured by the County to prohibit the use of single wide mobile homes as second units. He also described a property in the Sedco area with fifteen mobile homes.

Assistant City Attorney Jex noted that the State of California has a series of laws which encourage and protect second units. He went on to explain that the City’s ability to regulate second units is limited.

Planning Director Hogan presented the portion of the staff report addressing public use permits.

Commissioner Andre expressed concerns with second units in the Ranch Community.

Chairman Devine indicated that the Commission had no objections with the changes to the public use permit process proposed.

Planning Director Hogan presented the portion of the staff report addressing trash enclosures.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra stated that in several areas of the city, trash bins were placed in the street and asked if provisions could be added that would prohibit the placement of trash cans in the street.

Planning Director Hogan responded that he would need to discuss that request with the trash companies before he could make a recommendation.

Assistant City Attorney Jex clarified that the proposed changes would only apply to new projects and would not affect existing situations.
Supervising Engineer Crawford added that the contracts with the collection companies only allow trash receptacles to be placed out on the day of the pick-up. He also explained that in some places of the city, trash bins must be placed on the street because it is not possible to get a truck to the location of the trash enclosure. He went on to indicate that he would inform the Code Enforcement Division of the problems and follow-up with the issue.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra asked if the requirements being discussed were only for new development.

Planning Director Hogan responded that the changes would be to the development standards and would not affect existing situations.

Planning Director Hogan presented the portion of the staff report addressing fence materials.

Chairman Devine, Vice-Chairman Dykstra and Commissioner Andre all agreed.

Planning Director Hogan presented the portion of the staff report addressing compact parking spaces.

Chairman Devine indicated that he favored a total elimination of the compact parking allowances.

Vice-Chairman Dykstra agreed with the Chairman, but also wasn’t opposed to allowing the development of compact parking spaces above and beyond the required parking.

Commissioner Andre asked about the size of a standard compact parking space.

Planning Director Hogan responded that compact spaces are about a half foot narrower and two feet shorter.

Chairman Devine, Vice-Chairman Dykstra and Commissioner Andre agreed with the prohibition of compact parking spaces.

Planning Director Hogan then recapped the Commission’s consensus as approving the proposed amendments to streamlining, public use permits, trash enclosures, fence materials and prohibiting compact parking spaces. He added that second units would need further research and would return to the Commission in the future.

Commissioner Andre asked about motorcycle parking. Director Hogan responded that Staff could research that and bring information back to the Commission.
Chairman Devine asked for a motion.
MOTION: Vice-chairman Dykstra motioned to approve Zoning Code Amendment 09-01, as amended at the hearing (to exclude second unit permits) with resolution PC09-014. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Andre. Motion carried, the following vote resulted:

AYES: Devine, Andre, and Dykstra.
NOES:
ABSENT: Nowak and Casillas.
ABSTAIN:

6.0 GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:

None.

7.0 ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS REPORT:

7.1 REPORT ON ACTIONS TAKEN AT DIRECTORS HEARING

Assistant Planning Director Hogan reported on the approval of an Extension of Time for application number 09-0270 at a Director Hearing on July 22, 2009.

8.0 PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT:

Director Hogan updated the Commission on the progress of the Department and announced that he would be officially serving as the Planning Director now.

9.0 PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:

None.

10.0 ADJOURNMENT:

The August 5, 2009 regular meeting of the Wildomar Planning Commission adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:

David Hogan
Commission Secretary
CITY OF WILDOMAR – PLANNING COMMISSION
Agenda Item 4.1
PUBLIC HEARING
Meeting Date: August 19, 2009

TO: Chairman Devine, Members of the Planning Commission
FROM: David Hogan, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Canyon Plaza (J & R Oil), Planning Application 08-0179

Variance 1757 – to increase the height of a freestanding freeway sign from 45 feet to 71 feet because of unique site conditions.

APN: 367-100-019 and 367-100-020

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt a resolution entitled:

“A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WILDOMAR APPROVING VARIANCE 1757 TO CONSTRUCT A 71 FOOT TALL FREESTANDING SIGN AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF BUNDY CANYON ROAD AND INTERSTATE 15 (PROJECT NO. 08-0179)”

BACKGROUND:

Application 08-0179 would allow the construction and operation of a gasoline service station with carwash, three drive-thru restaurants pads, and two retail buildings (totaling approximately 36,990 square feet of floor area), a freeway sign that exceeds the height in the zoning code, and to allow the subdivision of the two existing parcels into six commercial parcels and one access road parcel. The project consists of three separate applications: a conditional use permit, tentative parcel map, and variance. An environmental assessment was also prepared the project. The Planning Commission first considered this project on July 15, 2009. At that public hearing the Commission adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration, approved the Conditional Use Permit 3403 and Tentative Parcel Map 32257, and continued Variance 1757 for further study to the August 19, 2009 meeting of the Planning Commission.
DISCUSSION:

The Canyon Plaza project proposes to develop a travel-oriented commercial site adjacent to Interstate 15 and Bundy Canyon Road. Bundy Canyon Road is a major regional arterial connecting the Cities of Wildomar and Menifee. The proposed freestanding sign is located along the western edge of the site adjacent to Interstate 15. The applicant originally applied for a variance to allow for an 80-foot tall freestanding sign with 600 square foot of signage are per side. However, during subsequent meetings with staff the applicant agreed to request a shorter and smaller sign. This assessment of the variance request is based upon the results of an additional flag test which evaluated the unique topographic factors on the site and in the project vicinity. The unique topographic factors include the elevation of the site below the existing freeway and the increase elevation of the northbound freeway lanes (and the lower elevations of the southbound freeway lanes).

The City of Wildomar’s Zoning Ordinance, Title 17 of the Municipal Code (formally Ordinance 348), has specific provisions for free-standing signs. According to Section 17.252.040.A, freeway oriented free-standing signs located within 660 feet of the nearest edge of a freeway right of way line, shall have a maximum height not to exceed 45 feet, and a maximum surface area not to exceed 150 square feet of signage area. Based upon the evaluation of the unique site conditions and the unusual conditions of the freeway travel lanes, staff believes that an adjustment to the height of the center sign is appropriate.

To verify the appropriate height, a flag test supervised by City Staff was conducted on August 11, 2009. The test consisted of a 7½’ X 8’ (60 square feet) simulated sign area suspended by straps from an 80-foot truck-mounted boom. The size of the simulated sign panel in relation to the proposed freestanding sign is shown as a gray box on left side of the picture of the proposed sign contained in Attachment D. The height above the ground surface was measured with a 100 foot tape measure attached to the top of the sign panel. Freeway viewpoints north and south of the Bundy Canyon Road undercrossing were established approximately ¼ mile from the beginning of the off-ramps. The quarter mile point was selected since it provided the driver with between 10 and 12 seconds to see and identify the sign and make a decision whether or not to exit before passing the off-ramp. The priority southbound viewpoint was selected just south of the Lemon Street Undercrossing approximately 6/10’s of a mile north of Bundy Canyon Road. A northbound viewpoint was also selected to provide a sense of scale of the proposed sign heights from the rest of the community.

To start the test, the sign panel simulating the actual sign area was raised by the boom to a maximum height of 73 feet. The top of the signage area at 73 feet corresponds to a total sign structure height of approximately 81 feet. The simulated sign area was then lowered in ten foot increments until the sign was partially obscured by the ground surface. The bottom of the sign panel became partially obscured when the top of the simulated sign area was 53 feet above the ground. The test at 53 feet indicated that only about the top one-third of the project signage area. The 65-foot tall option was also
requested by a member of the Planning Commission during the Flag Test. The digital images taken at each height setting are contained in Attachment E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top of Simulated Sign Area</th>
<th>Top of Proposed Sign Structure*</th>
<th>Is the Simulated Sign Fully Visible?</th>
<th>Images are in Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73 feet</td>
<td>81 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 feet</td>
<td>71 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 feet</td>
<td>61 feet</td>
<td>Partially (about 1/3 of sign)</td>
<td>E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 feet</td>
<td>73 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>E-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The top of the proposed sign structure is approximately 8 feet above the signage area.

Section 65906 of the State Planning and Zoning Law establishes the purpose and limitations for variances and are the foundation for the findings which must be made to approve a variance. The City’s required findings for variances mirror these provisions of State Law. The provisions of State Law are as follows:

“Variances from the terms of the zoning ordinances shall be granted only when, because of special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of the zoning ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification.

Any variance granted shall be subject to such conditions as will assure that the adjustment thereby authorized shall not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated.

A variance shall not be granted for a parcel of property which authorizes a use or activity which is not otherwise expressly authorized by the zone regulation governing the parcel of property.”

While the third criteria/limitation to approving a variance is not applicable to this request, the first two provisions do apply to this request.

The first criteria states that a variance can be approved only if there are special circumstances applicable to the property which make developing the site different from similarly zoned properties in the vicinity of the project. The site is affected by topographic constraints that are not common to other similarly zoned parcels in the project vicinity. This site is substantially lower than the elevation of the adjacent freeway combined with split freeway elevation north of the site further blocks visibility of the site (the northbound travel lanes are ten to fifteen feet higher than the southbound travel lanes). The site and associated freeway condition is substantially different from other interchange-commercial sites. The topographic constraints include the elevation difference between the site and freeway travel lanes over Bundy Canyon Road and the fact that southbound travel lanes for Interstate 15 are 10 to 15 feet lower than the
northbound travel lanes. In effect the northbound travel lanes create a hill condition which effectively blocks the property from freeway traffic. These unique topographic and site constraints (as confirmed by the flag test) justify the approval of a modified variance request.

The second criteria to granting of this variance shall not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated. Based upon staff's analysis, the approval of this proposed variance does not constitute the approval of a special privilege by allowing taller freeway signage than the Zoning Ordinance allows because no other freeway oriented commercial centers have the same site constraints (e.g. a lower elevation combined with split freeway elevation). The existing City policy is to allow some higher freeway signage to equalize commercial sites that are substantially lower than the freeway travel lanes or whose sites are blocked by off-site features. The implementation of this policy does not create a special privilege situation since only topographically effected commercial sites receive the approval for additional sign height variations.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider approving a height variance for a 71-foot high freestanding sign for Canyon Plaza as contained in Attachment D. The 71-foot tall sign should allow for reasonable visibility of most of the sign, especially the top portion where the service station logo is expected to be located. The resolution approving the variance and associated conditions of approval for Variance 1757 are contained in Attachment A.

FINDINGS:

1. There are special circumstances applicable to the parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, that the strict application of this ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification.

   The site is affected by topographic constraints not common with similarly zoned parcels in the area. The topographic constraints include the elevation difference between the site and freeway overcrossing for Bundy Canyon Road and the fact that southbound travel lanes for Interstate 15 are 10 to 15 feet lower than the northbound travel lanes. Following an evaluation of the initial request for an approved variation a reduced signage was determined to meet the intent of the variance provisions contained in Section 65906 of the State Planning and Zoning Law. To address the specific site constraints and provide an equivalent signage opportunity for this commercial site, the maximum allowable sign height of 45 feet needs to be equalized by providing an additional 20 feet in height to offset the height of the freeway plus an additional 10 feet to offset the lower elevation for the southbound travel lanes. In effect, the elevation of the northbound travel lanes creates a hill condition which obscures the site from southbound traffic.
along Interstate 15. These unique topographic and site constraints, as described in the staff report, justify the approval of a modified variance request.

2. Granting of this variance shall not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated.

The approval of this proposed variance does not constitute the approval of a special privilege by allowing taller freeway signage than the Zoning Ordinance allows because no other freeway oriented commercial centers have the same site constraints. This site is substantially lower than the elevation of the adjacent freeway combined with split freeway elevation north of the site which further blocks the site visibility (the northbound travel lanes are ten to fifteen feet higher than the southbound travel lanes). The site and associated freeway condition is substantially different from other interchange-commercial sites. Consequently, the approval of this variance does not create a special privilege situation since only topographically effected commercial sites receive the approval for additional sign height variations.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:

The Planning Department prepared and circulated an Initial Study for the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planning Application 08-0179. Notice was published in the Riverside Press-Enterprise, and was mailed to all property owners within a 300 foot radius of the project site. A copy of the project environmental review document was circulated to potentially interested agencies and was available for public review at City Hall. The document was available for review from June 25, 2009 to July 15, 2009. Potentially significant impacts were identified for aesthetics, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, and noise. However, these impacts were determined to be “Less than Significant” with mitigating factors and mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study. During the public review period, comments were received from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Riverside County Waste Management Department. Based upon the information contained in the letters, no major changes to the documents were required.
ATTACHMENTS:

A. Resolution of Approval for Variance 1757
   Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval
B. Location Map
C. Site Plan
D. Proposed Freestanding Sign
E. Flag Text Results

Approved by:

____________________
David Hogan
Planning Director
RESOLUTION NO. PC____

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WILDOMAR APPROVING VARIANCE 1757 TO CONSTRUCT A 71-FOOT TALL FREESTANDING SIGN AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF BUNDY CANYON ROAD AND INTERSTATE 15 (PROJECT NO. 08-0179)

WHEREAS, an application for to allow the establishment and operation of a gasoline service station, three drive-thru restaurants, and two retail buildings on vacant land located at the southeast corner of Bundy Canyon Road and Interstate 15 has been filed by

Applicant/Owner: Bundy I-15 LP
Authorized Agent: Ino Cruz, Absolute Design Methods, Inc
Project Location: Southeast corner of Bundy Canyon Road and Interstate 15
APN Number: 367-100-019 and 367-100-020
Lot Area: 6.64 gross acres

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has the authority per Chapter 17.196 of the Wildomar Municipal Code to take action on Variance No. 1757 to construct a freestanding sign 75-foot tall freestanding sign; and

WHEREAS, on May 9, 2009, the City gave public notice by mailing to adjacent property owners and by placing an advertisement in a newspaper local circulation of the holding of a public hearing at which the project would be considered; and

WHEREAS, on June 3, 2009 the Planning Commission held the noticed public hearing at which interested persons had an opportunity to testify in support of, or opposition to, the Variance and continued the project to the July 15, 2009 Planning Commission meeting; and

WHEREAS, on July 15, 2009 the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at which it received public testimony concerning the project and the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, following the public hearing the Planning Commission approved the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for Conditional Use Permit 3403, Tentative Parcel Map 32257, and Variance 1757; approved Conditional Use Permit 3403, approved Tentative Parcel Map 32257, and continued the public hearing for Variance 1757 to August 19, 2009 for further study; and
WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a continued public hearing on August 19, 2009, for Variance 1757 (a component of Project 08-0179) at which it received public testimony concerning the project;

NOW THEREFORE, the Planning Commission of the City of Wildomar does hereby resolve, determine and order as follows:

SECTION 1. ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS.

The Planning Commission, in light of the whole record before it, including but not limited to, the City’s Local CEQA Guidelines and Thresholds of Significance, the recommendation of the Planning Director as provided in the Staff Report dated July 15, 2009, and documents incorporated therein by reference, and any other evidence (within the meaning of Public Resources Code § 21080(e) and § 21082.2) within the record or provided at the public hearing of this matter, hereby finds and determines as follows:

A. CEQA: The approval of this Conditional Use Permit is in compliance with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), in that on July 15, 2009, at a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission approved and adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program reflecting its independent judgment and analysis and documenting that there was not substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, from which it could be fairly argued that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. The documents comprising the City’s environmental review for the project are on file and available for public review at Wildomar City Hall, 23873 Clinton Keith Rd., Suite 201, Wildomar, CA 92595.

B. Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The project is found to be consistent with the MSHCP. The project is located outside of any MSHCP criteria cell area and mitigation is provided through payment of the MSHCP Mitigation Fee.

SECTION 2. REQUIRED FINDINGS.

Pursuant to Wildomar Municipal Code, and in light of the record before it including the staff report dated July 15, 2009 and August 19, 2009, and all evidence and testimony heard at the public hearing Variance 1757, the Planning Commission hereby finds as follows.

A. There are special circumstances applicable to the parcel of property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, that the strict application of this ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity that is under the same zoning classification.

The site is affected by topographic constraints not common with similarly zoned parcels in the area. The topographic constraints include the elevation difference between the site and freeway overcrossing for Bundy Canyon Road and the fact that southbound travel lanes for Interstate 15 are 10 to 15 feet lower that the northbound travel lanes.
Following an evaluation of the initial request for an approved variation a reduced signage was determined to meet the intent of the variance provisions contained in Section 65906 of the State Planning and Zoning Law. To address the specific site constraints and provide an equivalent signage opportunity for this commercial site, the maximum allowable sign height of 45 feet needs to be equalized by providing an additional 20 feet in height to offset the height of the freeway plus an additional 10 feet to offset the lower elevation for the south bound travel lanes. In effect, the elevation of the northbound travel lanes creates a hill condition which obscures the site from southbound traffic along Interstate 15. These unique topographic and site constraints, as described in the staff report, justify the approval of a modified variance request.

B. Granting of this variance shall not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated.

The approval of this proposed variance does not constitute the approval of a special privilege by allowing taller freeway signage than the Zoning Ordinance allows because no other freeway oriented commercial centers have the same site constraints. This site is substantially lower than the elevation of the adjacent freeway combined with split freeway elevation north of the site which further blocks the site visibility (the northbound travel lanes are ten to fifteen feet higher than the southbound travel lanes). The site and associated freeway condition is substantially different from other interchange-commercial sites. Consequently, the approval of this variance does not create a special privilege situation since only topographically effected commercial sites receive the approval for additional sign height variations.

SECTION 3. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS.

Based on the foregoing findings, and on substantial evidence in the whole of the record, the Planning Commission hereby takes the following actions:

A. Consistency Determination. The Planning Commission hereby determines that the Initial Study prepared for Project 08-0179 accurately reflects the potential impacts associated with the approval of Variance 1757 (a component of Project 08-0179).

B. Conditional Approval. The Planning Commission hereby approves Variance 1757 (Project 08-0179) for a 71-foot tall freestanding sign subject to the Conditions of Approval attached hereto and incorporated by this reference as Exhibit A.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of August 2009.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________________
Thomas Jex
Assistant City Attorney

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
David Hogan
Planning Commission Secretary

Robert Devine
Chairman
EXHIBIT A
CITY OF WILDOMAR
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Planning Application Number: Variance 1757 (08-0179)

Project Description: Canyon Plaza 71-foot tall Freestanding Sign (with the top of signage area located at 63 feet)

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 367-100-019 & 367-100-020

Approval Date: August 19, 2009  Expiration Date: August 19, 2012

Within 48 Hours of the Approval of This Project

1. The applicant/developer shall deliver to the Planning Department a cashier's check or money order made payable to the County Clerk in the amount of Two Thousand Fifty Seven Dollars ($2,057.00) which includes the One Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Three Dollars ($1,993.00) fee, required by Fish and Game Code Section 711.4(d)(3) plus the Sixty-Four Dollar ($64.00) County administrative fee, to enable the City to file the Notice of Determination for the Mitigated or Negative Declaration required under Public Resources Code Section 21152 and California Code of Regulations Section 15075. If within said 48-hour period the applicant/developer has not delivered to the Planning Department the check as required above, the approval for the project granted shall be void due to failure of condition [Fish and Game Code Section 711.4(c)].

2. The applicant shall review and sign the Acceptance of Conditions of Approval document that will be provided by the Planning Department staff and return the document with an original signature to the Planning Department.

General Requirements

3. The applicant shall indemnify, protect, defend, and hold harmless, the City, and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof, from any and all claims, demands, law suits, writs of mandamus, and other actions and proceedings (whether legal, equitable, declaratory, administrative or adjudicatory in nature), and alternative dispute resolutions procedures (including, but not limited to arbitrations, mediations, and other such procedures), (collectively "Actions"), brought against the City, and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof, that challenge, attack, or seek to modify, set aside, void, or annul, the any action of, or any permit or approval issued by, the City and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof (including actions approved by the voters of the City), for or concerning the project, whether such Actions are brought under the California Environmental Quality Act, the Planning and Zoning Law, the Subdivisions Map Act, Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085 or 1094.5, or any other state, federal, or local statute, law, ordinance, rule, regulation, or any decision of a court of competent jurisdiction. It is expressly agreed that the City shall have the right to approve, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld, the legal counsel providing the City's
defense, and that applicant shall reimburse City for any costs and expenses directly and necessarily incurred by the City in the course of the defense. City shall promptly notify the applicant of any Action brought and City shall cooperate with applicant in the defense of the Action.

4. The approval of the variance shall comply with the provisions of Title 17 – Zoning (Ordinance 348), unless modified by the conditions listed herein. This approval shall expire in three (3) years unless an application for an extension is filed at least 30 days prior to the expiration date. The City, for good cause, may grant up to two (2) one-year extensions of time, one year at a time.

5. The project and all subsequent projects within this site shall comply with all mitigation measures identified in Environmental Assessment 39508.

6. The development of the premises shall substantially conform to the approved site plan and elevations contained on file with the Planning Department.

7. The developer shall obtain City approval for any modifications or revisions to the approval of this project. Deviations not identified on the plans may not be approved by the City, potentially resulting in the need for the project to be redesigned. Amended entitlement approvals may be necessary as a result.

8. The Applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for the permanent files 8” X 10” glossy photographic color prints of the approved color and materials board and the colored architectural elevations. All labels on the color and materials board and Elevations shall be readable on the photographic prints.

9. No grading shall be performed without the prior issuance of a grading permit by the City.

10. No sign structure or signage identified in this approval shall be constructed or operated without the prior issuance of grading and building permits by the City.

11. All building construction and design components shall comply with the provisions of the most recent City-adopted edition of the California Building, Plumbing and Mechanical Codes, California Electrical Code, California Administrative Code, and all appropriate City of Wildomar Standards and Codes.

12. The development of the freestanding sign structure shall comply with the provisions and conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permit 3403.

13. No extensions of time shall be approved for Variance 1757 unless either of the following occurs: (1) an extension of time has been approved for Conditional Use Permit 3403 or (2) the site development approved by Conditional Use Permit 3403 has been substantially constructed. For the purpose of this condition, substantial development is defined as the construction of the buildings and related parking and landscaping on at least three building pads.

14. This approval shall not be valid until all outstanding permit and application processing fee balances are paid in full. No extensions of time shall be granted unless all balances have been paid in full.

(End of the Conditions of Approval)
ATTACHMENT B
ATTACHMENT C
The location of the proposed freestanding sign is marked with a star.
The gray box represents the approximate size of the Flag Test sign panel.
E-1 73-FOOT FLAG TEST RESULT
(81-foot high sign structure)

SOUTHBOUND ON I-15

NORTHBOUND ON I-15
E-2 63-FOOT FLAG TEST RESULT
(71-foot high sign structure)

SOUTHBOUND ON I-15

NORTHBOUND ON I-15
E-3  53-FOOT FLAG TEST RESULT
(61-foot high sign structure)

SOUTHBOUND ON I-15

NORTHBOUND ON I-15
E-4 65 FOOT FLAG TEST RESULT
(73-foot high sign structure)

SOUTHBOUND ON I-15