

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BRADBURY,  
HELD ON JUNE 23, 2010 AT 7:00 PM  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT CITY HALL**

- Meeting Called to Order:** The meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Bradbury was called to order by Chairman Hernandez at 7:00 p.m.
- Pledge of Allegiance:** Chairman Hernandez led the pledge of Allegiance.
- Roll Call:** PRESENT: Chairman Hernandez, Commissioners Kuba, Gifford and Novodor  
ABSENT: Vice-Chair Dunst  
STAFF: City Planner Meyer and City Clerk Saldana
- Vice-Chair Dunst Excused:** Commissioner Gifford made a motion to excuse Vice-Chair Dunst from the meeting. Commissioner Kuba seconded the motion which carried.
- Approval of Agenda:** Commissioner Gifford moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner Kuba seconded the motion which carried.
- Approval of May Minutes:** Commissioner Kuba requested on Vice-Chair Dunst's behalf to take out Karen's entire comment on page 7 as she did not mean to come across that way. Commissioner Gifford moved to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2010 Planning Commission meeting as amended. Commissioner Kuba seconded the motion which carried.
- Compliance with California Political Reform Act:** In compliance with the California Political Reform Act, each Commissioner has the responsibility to disclose direct or indirect potential for a personal financial impact as a result of participation in the decision making process concerning development applications. The Commissioners disclosed the following information relative to the items contained on the agenda:
- Agenda Items:** 1389 Sharon Hill Lane (AR 10-252 & NC 10-92):  
Commissioners residing within 500 feet of 1389 Sharon Hill:  
*None*
- Zone Code Amendment No. ZCA 10-17:  
*Citywide*

<b>Motion to Receive and File Staff Memo:</b>	Commissioner Kuba made a motion to receive and file the staff memorandum dated June 23, 2010. Commissioner Gifford seconded the motion, which carried.
<b><u>Public Hearing:</u> AR 10-252 &amp; NC 10-92 for 1389 Sharon Hill</b>	City Planner Meyer stated that the applicant, Mr. John Sheng, is requesting approval of plans to construct a new two-story 8,030 square foot single-family estate dwelling unit with an attached 4-car garage containing 971 square feet of enclosed floor area. City Planner Meyer reviewed the conditions of approval for the Architectural Review and Neighborhood Compatibility applications.
<b>General Plan:</b>	The City's adopted General Plan designates the subject property as Residential/Agriculture 2-acre minimum. The proposed development project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the City's adopted General Plan in terms of density and land use.
<b>Zone and Surrounding Land Uses:</b>	The subject property is zoned A-2-SP (Agriculture/Residential 2-acre minimum, Specific Plan). The subject property contains 1.1 gross acres of land area. The site complies with the provisions of Specific Plan No. SP 05-01 in terms of lot area. The subject property is surrounded by property zoned A -2-SP. The adjacent parcel to the north and west is a permanent open space area. The parcels to the east and south are vacant.
<b>Environmental Assessment:</b>	The subject property was environmentally assessed as part of the Specific Plan review and adoption process. An environmental Negative Declaration was adopted as part of Specific Plan No. SP 05-01. The construction of the subject dwelling unit is Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15303 (New Construction) and Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects).
<b>Recommendation:</b>	The Planning Department recommends that the Planning Commission take the following action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) approve and environmental Categorical Exemption from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and</li> <li>b) adopt the findings of fact relative to the submitted applications.</li> </ul>
<b>Public Hearing Opened:</b>	Chairman Hernandez opened the public hearing and asked those speaking in favor or opposition to come forward and be heard.
<b>Speaking in Favor:</b>	Mr. John Sheng, Architect and probable builder Mr. Robert Henderson, property owner
<b>Public Hearing Closed:</b>	There being no opposition, Chairman Hernandez declared the public hearing closed.

**Discussion:** The only real concern shared by the City Planner and Planning Commission was the amount of impervious material in the front yard. A condition was added to plant a tree in the middle of the turnaround to reduce the amount of impervious material.

City Planner Meyer stated that this will be the first project under the new fee schedule, which means inspection fees have to be paid at the time the building permit is issued.

**Motion:** Commissioner Kuba made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 10-203 PC, approving Architectural Review Application No. AR 10-252 and Neighborhood Compatibility Application No. NC 10-92 for 1389 Sharon Hill Lane (property owners: M/M Robert Henderson) subject to the conditions in the staff report dated June 23, 2010 as amended. Commissioner Gifford seconded the motion, which was carried by the following roll call vote:

**Approved:** AYES: Chairman Hernandez, Commissioners Kuba, Gifford and Novodor  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Vice-Chair Dunst

**Zone Code Amendment No. 10-17:** City Planner Meyer stated that the City Council has determined that off-street parking and the storage of vehicles and equipment in the required setbacks has become a significant property maintenance issue and that existing regulations are inadequate and should be enhanced in order to protect the public health and welfare and preserve the character of the City.

Therefore, the Planning Commission has been directed by the City Council to examine existing provisions of the Bradbury Zoning Code regarding the prohibition of vehicle and equipment parking and storing in the required residential setbacks. After reviewing the City's regulations and the regulations adopted by other municipalities the City Council would like to receive recommendations from the Planning Commission how to best protect the public's health and welfare regarding this issue.

**General Plan:** The City's adopted General Plan establishes a goal to preserve the community character. The regulation of on-site storage of vehicles and equipment is consistent with the City's goal to protect the public's health and welfare to preserve the community's character.

**Zone:** The proposed regulation of the on-site parking and storage of vehicles and equipment would be applicable to all zones.

**Environmental Assessment:**

The proposed project is Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Class 8, Section 15308 (Actions by Regulatory Agencies for Protection of the Environment) of the CEQA Guidelines.

**Background:**

At its May 26, 2010 meeting, the Planning Commission identified issues relative to the regulation of off-street parking and storage of various vehicles. Below is a summary of the identified issues:

1. Because much of the City is zoned for agricultural purposes, off-street parking regulations must recognize that the needs of the parcels used for farming and ranching are different than the needs of smaller urban type parcels.
2. The screening of vehicle and equipment storage areas is important.
3. Parking on paved surfaces may be appropriate for parcels zoned R-7,500, R-20,000 and A-1.
4. Parking on paved surfaces may be inappropriate for parcels zoned A-2 and A-5 because a variety of farm equipment is used for agricultural purposes. Often farm equipment is left in the fields and pastures.
5. Long term parking and storage of vehicles and equipment in the required front and side yards should be prohibited.
6. Long term parking and storage of vehicles and equipment in the required rear yard may be permitted if the vehicles and equipment properly screened.
7. Screening of vehicles and equipment should be in the form of landscaping and/or solid fencing. The maximum allowable height of fencing is six (6) feet. Six foot high fences will not totally screen 10-foot high recreational vehicles.
8. There is an example of the City allowing a recreational vehicle to be parked in the front yard setback of a parcel zoned R-7,500 for over 40 years. Would this parcel be exempted from compliance with new more restrictive regulations?
9. Because the City is composed of a variety of different and distinct neighborhoods, perhaps new regulations should be sensitive to the needs and desires of the residents located in the different neighborhoods.
10. Perhaps a list of "Performance Standards" should be created to address the issue of unacceptable vehicle and equipment storage as defined by the residents of the various neighborhoods.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the Planning Commission take the following action:

1. Discuss the direction given by the City Council so as to clearly define the issues; and
2. Clearly identify information and materials that the Planning Commission will need in order to assist in its decision making capacity; and
3. Set the matter for a public hearing at the regular Planning Commission meeting of October 27, 2010.

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Novodor stated that with the budget restrictions the City should impose a fee for long-term parking (more than seven consecutive days).

The Planning Commissioners discussed Mr. Wood's RV issue again. City Planner Meyer stated that in order to have the parking permission "grandfathered in" it had to be legal before the new regulations, but it isn't.

Commissioner Kuba wanted to continue the discussion in order for Vice-Chair Dunst to be present. Commissioner Kuba also suggested that staff forward the list of the identified issues to the City Council.

Chairman Hernandez stated that the Planning Commission has time to keep this item on the agenda until October, when a joint workshop with the City Council and Planning Commission is planned.

**Photographs/  
Examples:**

In addition to the photographs of examples of vehicles and equipments stored on privately owned residential property that may be offensive to the surrounding neighborhood City Planner Meyer had added some examples of his own neighborhood in the City of Fontana.

**Public Comments  
regarding  
ZCA 10-17:**

Alan De Vault, 244 Barranca Road, asked the City Planner what "front yard" means and if he could identify the front yard of his property at 244 Barranca. City Planner Meyer stated that the front yard is measured 50 feet back from any public or private street. Mr. Meyer showed Mr. DeVault on a map what would be considered his front yard.

Mr. Phil Wood, 2337 Elda Street, stated that he has parked his RV in the same spot since the early 70's but has nothing in writing. Mr. Wood stated that he serves on the City's Emergency Response Committee and that his RV is stocked with supplies and has a generator and is ready to go at any time. Because of this reason Mr. Wood would like to keep the RV where it is.

**Motion:** The Planning Commission continued discussion re: Zone Code Amendment No. ZCA 10-17 to the next Planning Commission meeting.

**Reports and Items for Future Agendas:** Planning Commissioners: Commissioner Kuba stated that the County just passed an Ordinance approving a solar panel initiative that allows property owners to receive tax credits. City Planner Meyer stated that he will check into it. Commissioner Novodor stated that he left solar dish information with the City Manager for the new City Hall Construction.

City Manager: City Planner Meyer reported that the City Manager went home with a fever.

City Planner: City Planner Meyer distributed the Planning Department Project Status Report dated June 17, 2010.

**Adjournment:** At 8:05 p.m., Chairman Hernandez adjourned the meeting.

---

Frank Hernandez - Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Claudia Saldana - City Clerk