

MINUTES: of the Minor Exception Permit Committee Meeting of the City of Redlands held Wednesday, December 10, 2018, at 9:00 a.m. are as follows:

I. ATTENDANCE & CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Conrad Guzkowski, Planning Commission
Bob Botts, Planning Commissioner
Brian Foote, City Planner/Planning Manager

STAFF: Sean Reilly, Associate Planner

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. The minutes of the Minor Exception Permit Committee Meeting of November 28, 2018, were approved 3-0.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments presented.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Meeting Location: 28300 San Timoteo Canyon Rd, Redlands
Meeting Time: 9:15 A.M., December 10, 2018

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Minor Exception Permit No. 579** for 28300 San Timoteo Canyon Road, Redlands, CA 92374, a proposal to construct retaining walls the height of approximately ten to eleven feet (10'-11') tall using Allan Block Precision Wall System. The proposed retaining wall is approximately 120 linear feet located within the side and rear yard setback. The property is located within the Agricultural District (A-1). Pursuant to Section 18.168.020 (B) of the Redlands Municipal Code (RMC) "Fences and walls not to exceed six feet (6') in height shall be permitted along the side and rear property lines, except that no fence or wall exceeding three feet (3') in height shall be located within any required front yard area." RMC Section 18.168.050 provides for the granting of minor exceptions to the fencing development standards.

DISCUSSION: The Minor Exception Committee met with the property owner at the project location at approximately 9:15 AM and opened the hearing. Neighbor Joseph A. Cruz (28350 San Timoteo Canyon Rd.) was present at the time the meeting began at the subject property. The applicant discussed their project description and presented the project plans (grading plan, site plan, and wall plan). The Committee and neighbor walked through the property to view the site conditions and to visualize the proposed plan. A lengthy discussion occurred regarding the proposed retaining wall locations, finish grade and proposed slopes, confirmation of retaining wall heights, and the appropriateness of the wall materials and CMU block color. The

applicant confirmed use of Allan block in an earth-tone color for all retaining walls. The Committee also recommended that landscape (climbing vines from the bottom of walls, or descending vines from the top of walls) be included in the plans. The property owner stated that the revision as discussed to add landscaping was acceptable. Neighbor Joseph Cruz stated that he would not be opposed to the project with the suggested revisions, and departed the hearing prior to the vote. After this discussion, there was a motion by Commissioner Guzkowski to approve the proposal, as amended (with Conditions of Approval), seconded by Commissioner Botts, and approved by a vote of 3-0.

DECISION: The Minor Exception Committee voted 3-0 to approve the applicant's proposal subject to the following Conditions of Approval. Sean Reilly then explained the 10-day appeal period and procedure for filing any appeals.

1. The CMU block shall Allan block in an earth-tone color for all retaining walls.
2. The proposed retaining wall(s) visible from San Timoteo Canyon Road shall incorporate landscaping (such as descending vines planted at the top of wall and cascading down over the visible face).

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Meeting Location: 303 S. Michigan Street
Meeting Time: 10:00 A.M., December 10, 2018

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Minor Exception Permit No. 589** for 303 S. Michigan Street, to install approximately one hundred (100) linear feet of six (6) foot tall white vinyl fencing within the front yard setback of the property to enclose the front yard area. The property is located within the Multiple Family Residential (R-2) District. Pursuant to RMC Section 18.168.020(B), "Fences and walls not to exceed six (6) feet in height shall be permitted along the side and rear property lines, except that no fence or wall exceeding three (3) feet in height shall be located within any required front yard area." RMC Section 18.168.050 provides for the granting of minor exceptions to the development standards applicable to fences and walls.

DISCUSSION: The Minor Exception Committee met at the project location at approximately 9:45 AM and opened the hearing. The applicant's representative, Stacy Boyle, was present. Neighbors Andy Hoder and David Cross were present. Stacy Boyle described the proposal and discussed the property owner's reasons for the request, and the property owner believed the yard was actually their side yard (because they believe the house was originally constructed with the front facing toward Clark Street) and intended to install a hot tub in the yard. Stacy Boyle also stated that the adjacent intersection (Michigan St./Clark St.) was unsafe as several vehicle collisions had occurred in the recent past, probably due to a 2-way Stop (Stop signs on Clark St. only) and limited traffic visibility with parked cars and landscaping along the streets. The committee reviewed the proposal and viewed the

location of the proposed fencing in the front yard, and viewed the site conditions as well as the adjacent intersection at Michigan St./Clark St. to assess traffic visibility. A lengthy discussion occurred regarding the proposed fence height, placement, landscaping, and consistency with the neighboring front yards along Michigan Street. The Commissioners asked staff if the front of the corner lot was actually a "side yard" or "rear yard" according to the code; to which staff explained that the Municipal Code defined the front and street-side of the subject property as the "front yard" on both the Michigan Street side as well as the Clark Street side (because it is a corner lot with two street frontages).

Mr. Foote (attending on behalf of the Development Services Director) expressed staff's concerns about the proposed fence height that exceeds what the Municipal Code otherwise permits (code allows up to three feet high within the front yard area), the configuration of the subject property that has a front yard that protrudes forward beyond adjacent residential lots, the proximity of the intersection with Stop signs only on Clark Street (2-way Stop) and history of vehicle collisions at that intersection, the likelihood that a tall fence or additional landscaping in the front yard would result in additional visual obstructions within the Intersection Corner Cut-off area [per RMC Section 18.168.010], the proposed fence height and placement would not be consistent with the adjacent properties along Michigan Street, and approval of the request as proposed would not be consistent with recent Committee actions that denied or modified similar requests for fencing in the front yard.

Commissioners Botts and Guzkowski expressed their position that the following revisions would be acceptable to them: fence height not exceeding five feet (5'0"), with the fence placed an additional four feet (4'0") back from the front property line and sidewalk, and additional landscape in front of the fence for fence screening purposes; and the proposed fence on the interior side property line (south side) would not exceed five feet (5'0") high within the front yard area. Commissioner Guzkowski also suggested to the applicant that an angled return of the fence (within the front yard nearest the street corner) would be more aesthetically pleasing. The applicant's representative stated that the revisions as described were acceptable. The two neighbors that were present, Andy Hoder and David Cross, did not express any comments or questions.

There was a motion by Commissioner Guzkowski to approve the proposal, as amended (with Conditions of Approval); and seconded by Commissioner Botts. Planning Manager Foote, for clarification purposes for everyone present, then re-stated the motion that had been made along with all of the proposed changes and Conditions of Approval. The applicant then confirmed the applicant's acceptance of the conditions and changes. Planning Manager Foote re-stated staff's opposition to the proposal and amendments, and summarized the reasons for opposition. The vote was then documented with Commissioners Botts and Guzkowski voting to approve, and Planning Manager Foote voting against.

DECISION: The Minor Exception Committee voted 2-1 (Commissioners Botts and Guzkowski to approve, Planning Manager Foote opposed) to approve the applicant's proposal subject to the following Conditions of Approval. Sean Reilly then explained the 10-day appeal period and procedure for filing any appeals.

1. The proposed fence height shall not exceed five feet (5'0") tall within the front yard area.
2. The proposed fence shall be placed not less than four feet (4'0") from the front property line along Michigan Street (i.e., inside edge of the curved sidewalk).
3. The corner of the fence nearest the street intersection shall an angled return, approximately 45-degree, the width of one fence panel (approximately 6-8 feet wide).
4. The proposed fence placement shall be installed not to extend beyond the side plane of the house on the Clark Street side. Side plane of the house (north side) is approximately 8 feet from the north side property line along Clark Street (where the right-of-way line is approximately 9-10 feet from the curb).
5. The applicant shall install low plants within the 4'0" planter area (4'0" setback behind sidewalk) on the Michigan Street side to provide screening of the fence.
6. The proposed fence height on the interior side property line (adjacent to 309 S. Michigan St.) shall not exceed five feet (5'0") high within the front yard area and not beyond the front plane of the house (front yard depth approximately 20 feet on the south side of the lot). The south side fence height behind the front plane of the house may remain at six feet (6'0") high maximum per code.

Brian Foote, AICP
City Planner
City of Redlands

NOTICE: The Minor Exception Permit Committee visited the above referenced properties and made a determination on the request(s). If one wished to appeal a decision, said appeal must have been submitted within ten days (RMC Section 18.168.100) from date of the decision. A formal appeal, with the appropriate submittal fee, must have been submitted to this Development Services Department within this time frame. If no appeals are received within these ten days, the decision of the Minor Exception Committee shall become final.