



CITY OF IRWINDALE

5050 N. IRWINDALE AVE., IRWINDALE CA 91706 • PHONE: (626) 430-2200

MARICELA
FRYMARK

CHAIR

RICHARD
CHICO

VICE-CHAIR

ALBERT
ACOSTA

COMMISSIONER

CASEY J.
MIRANDA

COMMISSIONER

JOSEPH V.
RODRIGUEZ II
COMMISSIONER

AGENDA FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE

PLANNING COMMISSION

August 21, 2024

6:30 P.M.

IRWINDALE COUNCIL CHAMBER

Join Webinar at

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86349691359>

Webinar ID

863 4969 1359

In the event that a Zoom broadcast is unavailable, staff will promptly notify the public through its social media platforms. The public meeting will proceed in accordance with The Brown Act.

Submit public comments by email to planning@irwindaleca.gov prior to the start of the meeting. Comments will be read by the Administrative Secretary during public comment. Lengthy public comment may be summarized in the interest of time.

Spontaneous Communications: The public is encouraged to address the Planning Commission on any matter listed on the agenda or on any other matter within its jurisdiction. The Planning Commission will hear public comments on items listed on the agenda during discussion of the matter and prior to a vote. The Planning Commission will hear public comments on matters not listed on the agenda during the Spontaneous Communications period.

Pursuant to provisions of the **Brown Act**, no action may be taken on a matter unless it is listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. The Planning Commission may request staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future Commission or City Council meeting.

Americans with Disabilities Act: In compliance with the ADA and Government Code section 54953(g), the City Council has adopted a reasonable accommodation policy to swiftly resolve accommodation requests. The policy can be found on the City's website: <https://www.irwindaleca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/8075/AB-2449-Reasonable-Accommodation-Policy>. If you need special assistance to participate in a City Council or Commission meeting or other services offered by this City, including an electronic or printed copy of the City's reasonable accommodation policy, please contact City Hall at (626) 430-2200. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist the City staff in assuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service. **Note:** Staff reports are available for inspection at the Planning Division Counter, 16102 Arrow Highway or at City Hall, 5050 N. Irwindale Avenue, during regular business hours (8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday) by appointment only, and by contacting the Planning Division at 626-430-2208.



Code of Ethics

As City of Irwindale Planning Commissioners, our fundamental duty is to serve the public good. We are committed to the principle of an efficient and professional local government. We will be exemplary in obeying the letter and spirit of Local, State and Federal laws and City policies affecting the operation of the government and in our private life. We will be independent and impartial in our judgment and actions.

We will work for the common good of the City of Irwindale community and not for any private or personal interest. We will endeavor to treat all people with respect and civility. We will commit to observe the highest standards of morality and integrity, and to faithfully discharge the duties of our office regardless of personal consideration. We shall refrain from abusive conduct, personal charges or verbal attacks upon the character or motives of others.

We will inform ourselves on public issues, listen attentively to public discussions before the body, and focus on the business at hand. We will base our decisions on the merit and substance of that business. We will be fair and equitable in all actions, claims or transactions. We shall not use our official position to influence government decisions in which we have a financial interest or where we have a personal relationship that could present a conflict of interest, or create a perception of a conflict of interest.

We shall not take advantage of services or opportunities for personal gain by virtue of our public office that are not available to the public in general. We shall refrain from accepting gifts, favors or promises of future benefit that might compromise our independence of judgment or action or give the appearance of being compromised.

We will behave in a manner that does not bring discredit or embarrassment to the City of Irwindale. We will be honest in thought and deed in both our personal and official lives.

Ultimate responsibility for complying with this Code of Ethics rests with the individual elected official. In addition to any other penalty as provided by law, violation of this Code of Ethics may be used as a basis for disciplinary action or censure of a Commissioner.

These things we hereby pledge to do in the interest and purposes for which our government has been established.

IRWINDALE PLANNING COMMISSION



A. CALL TO ORDER**B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE****C. INVOCATION****D. ROLL CALL: Commissioners: Albert Acosta, Casey J. Miranda, Joseph V. Rodriguez II; Vice-Chair Richard Chico; Chair Maricela Frymark****E. AB 2449 DISCLOSURES**

Remote participation by a member of the legislative body for just cause or emergency circumstances.

F. ANNOUNCEMENTS**1. CONSENT CALENDAR**

The Consent Calendar contains matters of routine business and is to be approved with one motion unless a member of the Commission requests separate action on a specific item. At this time, members of the audience may ask to be heard regarding an item on the Consent Calendar.

A. Minutes

Recommendation: No minutes for approval

2. SPONTANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

This is the time set aside for members of the audience to speak on any item not on this agenda that is within the Planning Commission's subject matter jurisdiction. The Planning Commission is an advisory body appointed by the City Council to review and provide recommendations on matters related to land use, planning, and development within the City. Except for very limited circumstances, state law prohibits any Commission discussion or action on items that are not on the agenda.

All members of the public are asked to observe the City's Rules of Procedure and Public Meeting Decorum. The City's Rules of Procedure and Public Meeting Decorum can be found on the City's website, and Chapter 2.40 of the Irwindale Municipal Code. You may also contact the City Clerk's Office for copies.

Each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes unless such time limits are extended. If a member of the public wishes to donate their time to another speaker, both persons must be physically present and in attendance of the meeting. The Presiding Officer may, in his or her discretion, extend the 3-minute time limitation for the particular subject for all speakers. In no event shall the total amount of speaking time exceed 6 minutes per person for the subject under discussion. Organized groups of persons wishing to address the Board on the same subject should select a spokesperson to represent the group, so as to avoid unnecessary repetition.

The Commission may regulate a speaker who is speaking too long or out of order, being unduly repetitious, discussing irrelevancies, or extending to items not within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. Please be reminded that discrimination, abusive use of profanity, unruly disruption, and violent or physically threatening conduct is discouraged. Members of the public shall not disrupt the orderly conduct of the meeting. The Presiding Officer will request that a person cease any disruptive conduct, and if not immediately stopped, will direct the person to be removed from the meeting.

In the hybrid format, both in-person and hybrid audience members will participate in the following order:

Tier 1: In-person attendees

Tier 2: Teleconference attendees

Tier 3: In-person and teleconference attendees who have not previously provide comments on the matter(s) being discussed by the legislative body

3. NEW BUSINESS

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 03-2023 AND ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-2023; CITYWIDE – TITLE 17 ZONING CODE UPDATE

Request for the Planning Commission to recommend to the Irwindale City Council to 1) adopt Zone Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) No. 03-2023 to update Title 17 – Zoning Code of the Irwindale Municipal Code and 2) adopt Zone Change (ZC) No. 04-2023 modifying the Zoning Map.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The proposed project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project, and has determined that the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was assessed in the Environmental Impact Review for the City's General Plan and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15183 and 15162, and is consistent with the previously certified EIR for the City's General Plan, therefore no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update.

Recommendation:

That the Planning Commission consider the proposed Zone Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) No. 03-2023 to update Title 17 – Zoning Code of the Irwindale Municipal Code and 2) adopt Zone Change (ZC) No. 04-2023 modifying the Zoning Map and take one of the following actions:

Recommendation: Affirm Previously adopted Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 819(23) and 820 (23)

RESOLUTION NO. 819(23) A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL (1) ADOPT FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE CITY'S PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND FINDING THE PROJECT EXEMPT FROM FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW, PURSUANT CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15183, AND 15162; AND (2) ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 772, A CITY-INITIATED APPLICATION FOR A ZONE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (ZOA NO. 03-2023) REPEALING AND REPLACING TITLE 17 (ZONING) OF THE IRWINDALE MUNICIPAL CODE IN ITS ENTIRETY WITH A COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE UPDATE.

RESOLUTION NO. 820(23) A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY-INITIATED APPLICATION FOR ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-2023 AND AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE TO REFLECT UPDATES TO TITLE 17 (ZONING) CONSISTENT WITH ORDINANCE NO. 772.

OR

Recommendation: Adopt Resolution Nos. 828(24) and 829 (24)

RESOLUTION NO. 828(24) A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL (1) ADOPT FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE CITY'S PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND FINDING THE PROJECT EXEMPT FROM FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW, PURSUANT CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15183, AND 15162; AND (2) ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 772, A CITY-INITIATED APPLICATION FOR A ZONE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (ZOA NO. 03-2023) REPEALING AND REPLACING TITLE 17 (ZONING) OF THE IRWINDALE MUNICIPAL CODE IN ITS ENTIRETY WITH A COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE UPDATE.

RESOLUTION NO. 829(24) A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY-INITIATED APPLICATION FOR ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-2023 AND AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE TO REFLECT UPDATES TO TITLE 17 (ZONING) CONSISTENT WITH ORDINANCE NO. 772

B. REMOVAL OF THE PRIORIZATION OF FILL SCHEDULE FROM THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND HANSON AGGREGATES WEST, INC. REGARDING HANSON QUARRY, AND THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND CALMAT CO., D.B.A. VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION, REGARDING DURBIN QUARRY AND RELIANCE I QUARRY

Request for the Planning Commission to recommend to the Irwindale City Council to 1) adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement No. 04-05 by and between the City of Irwindale and Martin Marietta Southern California Aggregates, LLC regarding the Hanson Quarry; 2) adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement 01-06 by and between the City of Irwindale and Calmat Co., d.b.a. Vulcan Materials Company regarding the Durbin Quarry; and 3) adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 2 to the Development Agreement No 02-06 for the Reliance I Quarry.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the projects and has determined that the filling of the pits have already been analyzed in the previously Certified EIR's prepared for the projects (SCH# 2003011084), (SCH #2006051107) and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the proposed amendments are consistent with the previously certified EIRs. Therefore no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the amendments.

Recommendation: Adopt Resolution Nos. 830(34), 831(24), and 832(34)

RESOLUTION NO. 830(34) A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 04-05 BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND MARTIN MARIETTA SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AGGREGATES, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, FORMERLY HANSON AGGREGATES WEST, INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, AND A WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARY OF MARTIN MARIETTA MATERIALS, INC.; LOCATED AT 13550 LIVE OAK AVENUE; IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. 831(24) A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 01-06 FOR DURBIN QUARRY BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND CALMAT CO., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION; LOCATED AT 13000 LOS ANGELES STREET, IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. 832(24) A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 02-06 FOR RELIANCE I QUARRY AND RELIANCE II LANDFILL BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND CALMAT CO., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION; LOCATED AT 15990 FOOTHILL BOULEVARD, IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA

5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS**
6. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT**
7. **LEGAL COUNSEL COMMENTS**
8. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
9. **ADJOURN**

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

I, Jesus Hernandez, Administrative Secretary, certify that I caused the agenda for the regular meeting of the Irwindale Planning Commission to be held on August 21, 2024 to be posted at the City Hall, Library, and Post Office on August 15, 2024.

Jesus Hernandez

Jesus Hernandez,
Administrative Secretary



**CITY OF IRWINDALE
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION**



Date: August 21, 2024 **Agenda Item No. 4-A**

To: Honorable Chair and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Community Development Director


Project Planners: Community Development Staff

Project: Comprehensive Title 17 Zoning Code Update

Applicant: City of Irwindale

Project Location: Citywide

CITY OF IRWINDALE - ZONING MAP (PROPOSED)



Staff Recommendation: That the Planning Commission consider the following:

-
- 1) Adopt Resolution Nos. 828(24) and 829(24), with additional, revised, or alternative recommendations to the City Council, and direct staff to report back to the City Council;
- AND
- 2) Recommend that the City Council adopt findings of consistency with the City's previously certified General Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2005071047), and finding the project exempt from further environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183, and 15162;
-

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project consists of a proposed comprehensive update to Title 17, Zoning, of the Irwindale Municipal Code to eliminate constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(c)(3); implement the City's General Plan and Housing Element policies and programs, incorporate changes to State law and reflect recent case law; better define land uses, regulations, exceptions, and improve usability of the Zoning Code; address zoning districts in accordance with the General Plan Land Use Element; facilitate development and redevelopment; and remedy imperfect code amendments and map errors. The update includes text and map updates and is attached as Exhibit A.

BACKGROUND/HISTORY

On February 21, 2024, the draft Title 17 Zoning Code was presented to the Planning Commission and the following recommendations were made:

1. Amend the definition of major arterials in the Zoning Code to be consistent with the definition in the Irwindale General Plan.
2. Add the Billboard Chapter to the Zoning Code as currently written.
3. Keep the SMARA Chapter as is, with direction to bring back the amended Chapter at a later date, for consistency with state law.
4. Minor Variances: add Community Development Director authority to default to 30%, if not listed in the document.
5. For Administrative Approvals by the Community Development Director, document all approvals in the application file.
6. Modify Section 17.09.080a, Planned Development, time extension from 2 years to 1 year.
7. For all commercial and industrial zones, institute a 50-foot setback for new development, measured from the property line for the side facing and abutting any residentially zoned property.

These recommendations will be included with any additional recommendations to the City Council.

At the July 17, 2024 Planning Commission meeting, the comprehensive zoning code update was again presented to the Commission, with a directive from the City Council to

have the Planning Commission review the update in light of public comments made at the April 10, 2024 City Council meeting.

The Planning Commission heard the staff presentation and received public comments and made the following recommendations:

- Maximum building height is 35 feet in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 zones
- C-3 is to remain Commercial/Residential zone. No mixed use.
- Maximum building height is 40 feet in the M-1 zone
- Maximum building height is 50 feet in the M-2 zone if abutting or adjacent to residential zone
- Maximum building height is 60 feet in the M-2 zone
- Maximum building height is 50 feet in the M-2 zone within a 500-foot buffer measured from the Town Center area identified in the General Plan

The Planning Commission directed staff to provide visual graphics of M-2 zones with the proposed setbacks from residential and the 500-foot buffer for further discussion (Exhibit F).

Proposed Changes to Draft Development Standards in Commercial and Industrial Zoning Districts

Tables 17.05.030 and 17.06.030: Revisions to Commercial, Industrial, and Office Development Standards

Table 17.05.030 - Development Standards - Commercial Zones, prescribes the development standards for the Commercial Zones. Additional regulations are denoted in the righthand column. The specific regulations in the referenced section shall apply to the use in addition to other applicable provisions in other sections of this Zoning Code.

Table 17.05.030 Development Standards - Commercial Zones			
Standard	C-1	C-2	C-3
Density and Lot Requirements			
Density (units/acre)			
Maximum Density	-	-	20
Minimum Lot Size (square feet)	5,000	10,000	10,000
Minimum Lot Width (feet)	50	60	80
Building Form and Location			
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)			
Minimum	0.25	0.30	0.30
Maximum	0.5	1.5	2.0

Table 17.05.030 Development Standards - Commercial Zones			
Standard	C-1	C-2	C-3
Maximum Height (feet)	35	35	35
Minimum Setbacks (feet)			
Front	20	20	20
Street Side	10/20 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel	10/20 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel	15/50 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel
Interior Side	10/20 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel	10/20 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel	15/50 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel
Rear	10/20 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel	10/20 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel	15 /50 abutting a street adjacent to R zoned parcel
Alley	10	10	10

Table 17.06.030 Development Standards – Industrial and Office Zones, prescribe the development standards for the Industrial and Office Zones. Individual letters in parenthesis refer to subsections that directly follow the table. Additional regulations are also denoted in the right-hand column. Section numbers in this column refer to other sections of this Title.

Table 17.06.030-1 Development Standards			
City of Irwindale Development Standards - Industrial and Office Zones			
Land Use Classification	M-1 Light Industrial Zone	M-2 Heavy Industrial Zone	BP Business Park
Lot and Density Standards			
Minimum Lot Size (square feet unless otherwise indicated)	-	-	3 acres
Minimum Lot Width (feet)	-	-	-
Building Form and Location Standards			
Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	0.75	1.0	1.0

Table 17.06.030-1 Development Standards				
City of Irwindale Development Standards - Industrial and Office Zones				
Land Use Classification	M-1 Light Industrial Zone	M-2 Heavy Industrial Zone		BP Business Park
Maximum Height (see definitions for details)	40 feet	60 feet	50 feet if adjacent to a residential zoned property or within 500 feet of Town Center	65
Minimum Setbacks (feet)				
Front	20 feet M2 Zone: Minimum of 30 feet for a property adjacent or across the street from a Residential zone.			
Street Side	15 feet M2 Zone: minimum of 25 feet for a property adjacent or across the street from a Residential Zone.			
Interior Side	0 feet on each side, except that a minimum of 15 feet is required along each property line abutting a Commercial Zone. M1 and BP Zone: minimum of 30 feet for a property abutting a Residential Zone. M2 Zone: minimum of 50 feet for a property abutting a Residential Zone.			
Rear	0 feet; 15 feet abutting a Commercial Zone. A minimum of 30 feet for a property abutting a Residential Zone.			
Alley	10 feet	10 feet		10 feet

Transitional Height Standards. When an industrial use is within 50 Feet from the property line of a Residential Zoned lot, the maximum height is 40 feet. After 50 feet, the maximum height of the industrial zoning district applies. See Figure 17.06.030-1 Transitional Height Standards.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project, and has determined that the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was assessed in the Environmental Impact Review for the City's General Plan and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15183 and 15162, and is consistent with the previously certified EIR for the City's General Plan, therefore no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update.

CONCLUSION

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

1. Adopt Resolution Nos. 828(24) and 829(24), with additional, revised, or alternative recommendations , and direct staff to report back to the City Council;
AND
2. Recommend that the City Council adopt findings of consistency with the City's previously certified General Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2005071047), and finding the project exempt from further environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183, and 15162.

ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit A: August Draft Title 17 Zoning Code Update with proposed revisions (link below)
<https://www.irwindaleca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/9298/Zoning-Code-Draft-August-2024?bidId=>

Exhibit B: July 17, 2024 Planning Commission staff report and attachments (link below)
[Planning Commission Meeting • Agendas & Minutes • CivicClerk](#)

Exhibit C: Proposed Resolution No. 828(24) for ZOA No. 03-2023

Exhibit D: Proposed Resolution No. 829(24) for ZC No. 04-2023

Exhibit E: Ordinance No. 772

Exhibit F: Visual graphics of 50-foot setback in M-2 zones abutting residential and 500-foot Town Center buffer

Exhibit G: April 2024 Draft Title 17 Zoning Code Update (link below)
[ZONING-CODE-DRAFT-April-2024 \(irwindaleca.gov\)](#)

Exhibit H: Draft July 17, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes

Exhibit A:

August 2024 Draft Title 17 Zoning Code Update with
proposed revisions (link below)

[https://www.irwindaleca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/
9298/Zoning-Code-Draft-August-2024?bidId=](https://www.irwindaleca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/9298/Zoning-Code-Draft-August-2024?bidId=)

Exhibit B:

July 17, 2024 Planning Commission staff report and
attachments (link below)

<https://irwindaleca.portal.civicclerk.com/event/144/files/agenda/1409>

**EXHIBIT “C”
RESOLUTION NO. 828(24)**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL (1) ADOPT FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE CITY’S PREVIOUSLY CERTIFIED GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND FINDING THE PROJECT EXEMPT FROM FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW, PURSUANT CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15183, AND 15162; AND (2) ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 772, A CITY-INITIATED APPLICATION FOR A ZONE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (ZOA NO. 03-2023) REPEALING AND REPLACING TITLE 17 (ZONING) OF THE IRWINDALE MUNICIPAL CODE IN ITS ENTIRETY WITH A COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE UPDATE

A. RECITALS.

- (i) The City of Irwindale Municipal Code section 17.84.010 provides that, “The provisions of this title [Zoning], including, but not limited to, the classification of property, shall be amended whenever the public interest and necessity so require.”
- (ii) There is currently a need to update the City’s Zoning Code, contained in Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code (“Zoning”), to incorporate current best practices, industry standards, and recent State planning mandates.
- (iii) In accordance with these needs, the City of Irwindale retained Interwest Consulting Group to prepare the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, attached herein as Exhibit A. The Comprehensive Zoning Code Update would implement, but is not limited to, the following improvements and changes:
 - (a) Streamline the development process by providing clear development standards that eliminate ambiguity in the City’s permit requirements and approval process;
 - (b) Reorganize the Zoning Code to a modern, streamlined format, making it easier to read and navigate, and eliminating internal inconsistencies and errors;
 - (c) Comply with recent changes in state law imposing additional requirements on cities and counties statewide, including, for example, amending “objective design standards” for multi-family housing and updating regulations on Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADUs”);
 - (d) Implementing the City’s General Plan by making changes to the Zoning Code that are directed by the General Plan’s vision and policies.

- (iv) The thirty-day public review period for the draft Comprehensive Zoning Code Update began on June 15, 2023. The initial thirty-day public review period was extended until August 15, 2023. During the review period, the Community Development Department and Planning Department solicited and accepted public comments regarding the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update. Additionally, the Community Development Department and Planning Commission conducted a public information session regarding the draft updates to the Zoning Code on July 19, 2023, during which they received questions and comments from the public. The City later published staff responses to comments and questions received during the session.
- (v) The Community Development Department and the Planning Commission have conducted additional public outreach efforts, including the following:
 - (a) Informational tables at Music in the Park, which took place on Thursdays from 7 PM to 9 PM at Irwindale Park, and the Irwindale Public Library Spring Book Festival on March 26, 2023;
 - (b) Stakeholder interviews with property owners, businesses, development professionals, and City residents on August 31, 2020, September 2, 2020, September 14, 2020, September 21, 2020 and September 30, 2020;
 - (c) Flyer distributions made to each residential property in the City, through the Irwindale Chamber of Commerce, and to all Irwindale Business License holders. Informational and meeting flyers publicly posted at City Hall, the Irwindale Public Library, the Irwindale Senior Center, and the Community Development Department.
- (vi) The draft Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was presented to the Planning Commission on September 20, 2023, for comment and review by the Commission.
- (vii) Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project, and has determined that the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was assessed in the Environmental Impact Review for the City's General Plan (SCH# 2005071047) and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15183 and 15162, and is consistent with the previously certified EIR for the City's General Plan, therefore no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update.
- (viii) On October 20, 2023, a notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was published in the San Gabriel Valley

Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation, in accordance with the California Government Code.

- (ix) A notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update and Zoning Map Update was notice was posted at Irwindale City Hall, Irwindale Library, the Community Development Department and the local post office. As a courtesy, a copy of the notice was also mailed to each residential household. The notice was also mailed or delivered at least 10 days prior to the public hearing to all owners of the subject real property proposed to undergo zone changes or amendments, as well as all owners of real property within 500 feet of the real property subject to the Zone Changes or amendments, in accordance with the California Government Code.
- (x) A duly noticed public hearing was originally scheduled for October 30, 2023. The Planning Commission received further public comment and input on the proposed Zoning Code and Zoning Map Update, and continued the item to a date uncertain.
- (xi) On November 3, 2023, a notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was published in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation, in accordance with the California Government Code.
- (xii) On November 13, 2023, the draft Title 17 Zoning Code was to be presented to the Planning Commission during the public hearing portion of the meeting. Before the item was presented by staff, the Planning Commission voted to continue the item to a future date.
- (xiii) On February 9, 2024, a notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was published in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation, in accordance with the California Government Code.
- (xiv) On February 21, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the Planning Commission by City staff.
- (xv) On February 21, 2024, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution Nos. 819(23) and 820(23), recommending that the City Council adopt Ordinance No. 772, repealing Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code ("Zoning") in its entirety, and adopting the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update in its entirety as Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code with the following additional recommendations: 1) Amend the definition of major arterials to be consistent with the General Plan, 2) Add the existing billboard chapter to the Zoning Code

as currently written, 3) Keep the SMARA chapter as is and direct Staff to amend the chapter to be consistent with State law and present the draft to the Planning Commission for review, 4) Authorize the Community Development Director to grant approvals up to a 30% deviation from the measurable standard, if not explicitly listed in the Minor Variances section, 5) All administrative approvals granted by the Community Development Director shall be documented in writing and on file, 6)Planned Development permits, per Subsection 17.09.070.A(1), shall expire in one (1) year instead of two (2) years, 7) All commercial and industrial zones shall institute a 50 foot setback measured from the property line on the side of any new development that abuts or faces any residentially zoned property.

- (xvi) On April 10, 2024, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the City Council by City staff.
- (xvii) On April 10, 2024, the City Council directed staff to bring the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration.
- (xviii) On July 17, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the Planning Commission by City staff and continued the item to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on August 21, 2024, and directed staff to prepare visual graphics of M-2 zones with proposed setbacks from residential and the proposed 500-foot buffer from the Town Center area.
- (xix) On August 21, 2024, the Planning Commission concluded the public hearing. The Planning Commission now wishes to recommend that the City Council of the City of Irwindale approve proposed Ordinance No. 772, adopting the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code.
- (xx) All legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

B. RESOLUTION.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby found, determined and resolved by the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale as follows:

1. **Recitals.** The Planning Commission hereby specifically finds that all of the facts set forth in Recitals, Part A, of this Resolution are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference.

2. **Findings.** Based upon substantial evidence and testimony taken from the record as a whole, and received at the public hearing, both oral and written, including the staff report, and all attachments thereto, all of which shall constitute the entire record of the matter, the Planning Commission hereby finds that the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, attached herein as Exhibit A, is necessary and consistent with and will implement the City's vision, goals, and policies of the Irwindale 2020 General Plan. The Planning Commission further finds that the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update is consistent with state law, and the proposed revisions to the Zoning Code are in the interest of the public and are necessary to comply with state law. In particular:

- a. The General Plan contains six land use categories that do not have zoning districts that implement these land use categories within the current Zoning Code. The Zoning Code Update would modify or create new zoning districts to be consistent with the General Plan, consistent with California Government Code section 65300 *et seq.* and the Infrastructure and Resource Management Elements of the City's General Plan; and
- b. The Zoning Code Update would modify Zoning Code districts/regulations to allow for infill and redevelopment in the City, allowing for land use plans and development patterns that allow succession of use and economic development, consistent with General Plan Community Development Element Policy 7, Community Development Element Policy 9, and Community Development Element Policy 10; and
- c. The Zoning Code Update would create a new landscaping chapter, as to consolidate all landscaping regulations in the Zoning Code and provide adequate buffers, screening, and landscaping, and require and retain trees and plantings, consistent with General Plan Resource Management Element Policy 29; and
- d. The Zoning Code Update would create new performance standards and additional site design regulations to minimize conflicts of industrial uses with residential neighbors, consistent with General Plan Resource Management Element Policy 19, Resource Management Element Policy 20, Resource Management Element Policy 21; and
- e. The Zoning Code Update would update development standards, nonconforming regulations, and sign code regulations to address regulatory impediments of new businesses and business expansions,

consistent with General Plan Community Development Element Policy 16; and

- f. The Zoning Code Update would update residential lot requirements and development standards, allow new housing types and update Accessory Dwelling Unit regulations to encourage varied housing types, sizes, and tenure opportunities, and encourage creative and efficient residential site developments consistent with General Plan Housing Element Policies 16, 17, and 20, Resource Management Element Policy 11, Program No. 9, and Promotion of Energy and Water Conservation to Existing Residents and in City Sponsored Housing Projects; and
- g. The Zoning Code Update would update residential development standards and allow new housing types in order to codify inclusionary housing requirements and associated policies under state and local law, consistent with General Plan Housing element Policy 4; and
- h. The Zoning Code Update would update the Zoning Code to comply with State mandates, including SB 35, SB 330, the Housing Accountability Act, SB 9, and other Accessory Dwelling Unit Requirements, consistent with Housing Element Policy 14 and Housing Element Policy 19.

3. **CEQA Findings.** The Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council find that pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project, and has determined that the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was assessed in the Environmental Impact Review ("EIR") for the City's General Plan (SCH# 2005071047) and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15183 and 15162, is consistent with the previously certified EIR for the City's General Plan, therefore no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update.

4. **Recommendation.** On the basis of these findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt Ordinance No. 772, repealing Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code ("Zoning") in its entirety, and adopting the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update (Exhibit A) in its entirety as Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code with the following recommendations:

- 1) Amend the definition of major arterials to be consistent with the General Plan
- 2) Add the existing billboard chapter to the Zoning Code as currently written
- 3) Keep the SMARA chapter as is and direct Staff to amend the chapter to be consistent with State law and present the draft to the Planning Commission for review

4) Authorize the Community Development Director to grant approvals up to a 30% deviation from the measurable standard, if not explicitly listed in the Minor Variances section

5) All administrative approvals granted by the Community Development Director shall be documented in writing and on file

6) Planned Development permits, per Subsection 17.09.070.A(1), shall expire in one (1) year instead of two (2) years

7) All commercial and industrial zones shall institute a 50-foot setback measured from the property line on the side of any new development that abuts or faces any residentially zoned property

8) [INTENTIONALLY BLANK- recommendations to be added as directed by Planning Commission]

5. **Severability.** If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is, for any reason, held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the application of any other section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Resolution, and to this end the invalid or unconstitutional section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase of this Resolution are declared to be severable. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Resolution and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, part or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, parts or portions thereof be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

6. **Certification.** The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall certify the adoption of this Resolution, and a copy shall be transmitted to the City Council.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 21st day of August 2024.

Maricela Frymark, Chair
City of Irwindale Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

I, Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Community Development Director of the City of Irwindale, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale held on the 21st day of August 2024, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

**EXHIBIT “D”
RESOLUTION NO. 829(24)**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY-INITIATED APPLICATION FOR ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-2023 AND AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE TO REFLECT UPDATES TO TITLE 17 (ZONING) CONSISTENT WITH ORDINANCE NO. 772

A. RECITALS.

- (i) The is currently a need to update the City’s Zoning Code, contained in Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code (“Zoning”), to incorporate current best practices, industry standards, and recent State planning mandates.
- (ii) In accordance with these needs, the City of Irwindale retained Interwest Consulting Group to prepare the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update. The Comprehensive Zoning Code Update would implement, but is not limited to, the following improvements and changes:
 - (a) Streamline the development process by providing clear development standards that eliminate ambiguity in the City’s permit requirements and approval process;
 - (b) Reorganize the Zoning Code to a modern, streamlined format, making it easier to read and navigate, and eliminating internal inconsistencies and errors;
 - (c) Comply with recent changes in state law imposing additional requirements on cities and counties statewide, including, for example, amending “objective design standards” for multi-family housing and updating regulations on Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADUs”);
 - (d) Implementing the City’s General Plan by making changes to the Zoning Code that are directed by the General Plan’s vision and policies.
- (iii) In tandem with the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, the City has also prepared a proposed Zoning Map Update, attached herein as Exhibit A, which would incorporate any and all changes caused by the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to the current Zoning Map. The Zoning Map Update would implement, but is not limited to, the following improvements and changes:
 - (a) Reflect updated zones in the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including:

1. Eliminating Zone A1 – Agricultural Zone;
2. Creating Zone P/SP – Public/Semi-Public;
3. Re-naming Zone R1 from Single Family Residential to Low Density Residential;
4. Re-naming Zone R2 from Light-Multiple Residential to Medium Density Residential;
5. Re-naming Zone R3 from Heavy-Multiple Residential to Multi-Family Residential;
6. Re-Naming Zone C2 Heavy Commercial to General Commercial;
7. Re-Naming Zone C3 Heavy Commercial-Residential to Commercial/Mixed Use;
8. Eliminating Zone CM – Commercial Manufacturing.

(b) Reflect updates to the zoning of particular parcels, consistent with the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update.

- (iv) The thirty-day public review period for the draft Comprehensive Zoning Code Update and Zoning Map Update began on June 15, 2023. The initial thirty-day public review period was extended until August 15, 2023. During the review period, the Community Development Department and Planning Department solicited and accepted public comments regarding the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update. Additionally, the Community Development Department and Planning Commission conducted a public information session regarding the draft updates to the Zoning Code on July 19, 2023, during which they received questions and comments from the public. The City later published staff responses to comments and questions received during the session.
- (v) The Community Development Department and the Planning Commission have conducted additional public outreach efforts, including the following:
 - (a) Informational tables at Music in the Park, which took place on Thursdays from 7 PM to 9 PM at Irwindale Park, and the Irwindale Public Library Spring Book Festival on March 26, 2023;
 - (b) Stakeholder interviews with property owners, businesses, development professionals, and City residents on August 31, 2020, September 2, 2020, September 14, 2020, September 21, 2020 and September 30, 2020;

(c) Flyer distributions made to each residential property in the City, through the Irwindale Chamber of Commerce, and to all Irwindale Business License holders. Informational and meeting flyers publicly posted at City Hall, the Irwindale Public Library, the Irwindale Senior Center, and the Community Development Department.

- (vi) The draft Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was presented to the Planning Commission on September 20, 2023, for comment and review by the Commission.
- (vii) Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project, and has determined that the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was assessed in the Environmental Impact Review for the City's General Plan (SCH# 2005071047) and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15183 and 15162, and is consistent with the previously certified EIR for the City's General Plan, therefore no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Zoning Map Update.
- (viii) On October 20, 2023, a notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update and Zoning Map Update was published in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation, in accordance with the California Government Code.
- (ix) A notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update and Zoning Map Update was notice was posted at Irwindale City Hall, Irwindale Library, the Community Development Department and the local post office. As a courtesy, a copy of the notice was also mailed to each household. The notice was also mailed or delivered at least 10 days prior to the public hearing to all owners of the subject real property proposed to undergo zone changes or amendments, as well as all owners of real property within 500 feet of the real property subject to the Zone Changes or amendments, in accordance with the California Government Code.
- (x) A duly noticed public hearing was originally scheduled for October 30, 2023. The Planning Commission received further public comment and input on the proposed Zoning Code and Zoning Map Update and continued the item to a date uncertain.
- (xi) On November 3, 2023, a notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was published in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation, in accordance with the California Government Code.

- (xii) On November 13, 2023, the draft Title 17 Zoning Code was to be presented to the Planning Commission during the public hearing portion of the meeting. Before the item was presented by staff, the Planning Commission voted to continue the item to a future date.
- (xiii) On February 9, 2024, a notice of public hearing describing the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was published in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation, in accordance with the California Government Code.
- (xiv) On February 21, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the Planning Commission by City staff.
- (xv) On April 10, 2024, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the City Council by City staff; and
- (xvi) On April 10, 2024, the City Council directed staff to bring the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration; and
- (xvii) On July 17, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the Planning Commission by City staff and continued the item to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on August 21, 2024, and directed staff to prepare visual graphics of M-2 zones with proposed setbacks from residential and the proposed 500-foot buffer from the Town Center area; and
- (xviii) Irwindale Municipal Code section 17.12.020 provides, "The official zoning map for the city may be amended by reference thereto, and by reference to this section."
- (xix) On August 21, 2024 the Planning Commission concluded the public hearing. The Planning Commission now wishes to recommend that the City Council of the City of Irwindale adopt Zone Change No. 04-2023, approving the proposed Zoning Map Update and adopting the Zoning Map Update as the Official Zoning Map of the City of Irwindale, to reflect updates and changes to the Zoning Map consistent with the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update.

(xx) All legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

B. RESOLUTION.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby found, determined and resolved by the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale as follows:

1. **Recitals.** The Planning Commission hereby specifically finds that all of the facts set forth in Recitals, Part A, of this Resolution are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference.

2. **Findings.** Based upon substantial evidence and testimony taken from the record as a whole, and received at the public hearing, both oral and written, including the staff report, and all attachments thereto, all of which shall constitute the entire record of the matter, the Planning Commission hereby finds that the proposed Zoning Map Update, attached herein as Exhibit A, is necessary and is consistent with the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, and will implement the City's vision, goals, and policies of the Irwindale 2020 General Plan, is consistent with state law, and the proposed revisions to the Official Zoning Map are in the interest of the public and are necessary to comply with state law.

3. **CEQA Findings.** The Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council find that pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project, and has determined that the proposed Zoning Map Update was assessed in the Environmental Impact Review ("EIR") for the City's General Plan (SCH# 2005071047) and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15183 and 15162, is consistent with the previously certified EIR for the City's General Plan, therefore no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Zoning Map Update.

4. **Recommendation.** On the basis of these findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt and approve Zone Change No. 04-2023, approving the proposed Zoning Map Update and adopting the Zoning Map Update as the Official Zoning Map of the City of Irwindale (Exhibit A), in accordance with Irwindale Municipal Code section 17.12.020.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 21st day of August 2024.

Maricela Frymark, Chair
City of Irwindale Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

I, Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Community Development Director of the City of Irwindale, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale held on the 21st day of August 2024, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

EXHIBIT “E”

ORDINANCE NO. 772

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE REPEALING TITLE 17 OF THE IRWINDALE MUNICIPAL CODE (“ZONING”) IN ITS ENTIRETY AND ADOPTING THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE UPDATE AS TITLE 17 OF THE IRWINDALE MUNICIPAL CODE, MAKING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT THEREOF AND MAKING CEQA FINDINGS

WHEREAS, a city has the power make and enforce regulations designed to promote the public convenience or the general prosperity, as well as regulations designed to promote the public health, the public morals, or the public safety; and

WHEREAS, in executing that power, a city council may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws; and

WHEREAS, Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code (“Zoning”), otherwise known as the Zoning Code, regulates land use and development within the City of Irwindale (“City”) to protect public health, safety, and welfare of its residents; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Irwindale (“Council”) finds that there is a need to update the City’s Zoning Code, contained in Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code, to incorporate current best practices, industry standards, and recent State mandates, and to further protect public health, safety, and welfare of its residents; and

WHEREAS, the Irwindale Community Development Department, Irwindale Planning Department, and other City of Irwindale staff have prepared, since April 2020, the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, attached herein as Exhibit A. The Comprehensive Zoning Code Update would implement, but is not limited to, the following improvements and changes:

- (a) Streamline the development process by providing clear development standards that eliminate ambiguity to the City’s permit requirements and approval process;
- (b) Reorganize the Zoning Code to a modern, streamlined format, making it easier to read and navigate, and eliminating internal inconsistencies and errors;
- (c) Comply with recent changes in state law imposing additional requirements on cities and counties statewide, including, for example, amending “objective design standards” for multi-family housing and updating regulations on Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADUs”);
- (d) Implementing the City’s General Plan by making changes to the Zoning Code that are directed by the General Plan’s vision and policies; and

WHEREAS, the Community Development Department and Planning Commission conducted a public information session regarding the draft updates to the Zoning Code on July 19, 2023, during which they received questions and comments from the public. The City later published staff responses to comments and questions received during the session. The Community Development Department and Planning Department additionally solicited and accepted public comments regarding the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update until August 15, 2023; and

WHEREAS, on November 13, 2023, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the Planning Commission by City staff; and

WHEREAS, on November 13, 2023, the Planning Commission voted to continue the item to a future date; and

WHEREAS, on February 21, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the Planning Commission by City staff; and

WHEREAS, on February 21, 2024, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council of the City of Irwindale approve proposed Ordinance No. 772, adopting the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code, with additional recommendations; and

WHEREAS, on April 10, 2024, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the City Council by City staff; and

WHEREAS, on April 10, 2024, the City Council directed staff to bring the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration; and

WHEREAS, on July 17, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, on the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to receive testimony and other evidence regarding the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update, including without limitation, information provided to the Planning Commission by City staff and continued the item to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on August 21, 2024, and directed staff to prepare visual graphics of M-2 zones with proposed setbacks from residential and the proposed 500-foot buffer from the Town Center area; and

WHEREAS, on August 21, 2024, the Planning Commission concluded the public hearing and recommended that the City Council of the City of Irwindale approve proposed Ordinance No. 772, adopting the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update to Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the City Council now desires to approve the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update in its entirety in order to update the City's Zoning Code to incorporate current best practices, industry standards, and recent State mandates, and to further protect public health, safety, and welfare of its residents; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code Update is consistent with and will implement the City's vision, goals, and policies of the Irwindale 2020 General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared a Notice of Determination ("NOD") using the City's General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"), after determining that the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was assessed during the City's General Plan EIR, and no subsequent EIR, negative declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update; and

WHEREAS, all legal prerequisites for the adoption of this Ordinance have occurred.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The facts set forth in the recitals in this Ordinance are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 2. The City Council hereby repeals Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code ("Zoning") in its entirety.

SECTION 3. The City Council hereby adopts the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update in its entirety, attached herein as Exhibit A, as Title 17 of the Irwindale Municipal Code ("Zoning").

SECTION 4. The City Council hereby finds and determines based upon the independent judgment of the City Council, after consideration of the whole of the administrative record, that the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update was assessed in the Environmental Impact Review for the City's General Plan (SCH# 2005071047), adopted on June 25, 2008 and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164, no subsequent EIR, negative declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update. City staff is directed to file a Notice of Determination incorporating these findings and determination regarding the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update.

SECTION 5. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is, for any reason, held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase hereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional due to the writs of mandate issued by the Court.

SECTION 6. The Mayor shall sign this Ordinance and the City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, and shall cause the same to be published and posted pursuant to the provisions of law in this regard, and this Ordinance shall take effect 30 days after its final passage. City Staff are directed and authorized to inform and educate the public regarding the adoption of this Ordinance prior to its taking effect.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Irwindale this 25th day of September, 2024.

Albert F. Ambriz, Mayor

ATTEST:

Laura M. Nieto, MMC
Chief Deputy City Clerk

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss.
CITY OF IRWINDALE)

I, Laura M. Nieto, Chief Deputy City Clerk of the City of Irwindale do hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance No. 772 was introduced for first reading at a special meeting of the City Council of the City of Irwindale held on September 25, 2024, and adopted on second reading at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Irwindale held on October 9, 2024, and was carried by the following roll-call vote of the Council:

AYES: Councilmembers:

NOES: Councilmembers:

ABSENT: Councilmembers:

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers:

Laura M. Nieto, MMC
Chief Deputy City Clerk

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

I, Laura M. Nieto, MMC, Chief Deputy City Clerk, certify that I caused a copy of Ordinance No. 772 adopted by the City Council of the City of Irwindale at its regular meeting held September 25, 2024 to be posted at the City Hall, Library, and Post Office on September 12, 2024.

Laura M. Nieto, MMC
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Dated: _____

EXHIBIT F





EXHIBIT F





EXHIBIT F City of Irwindale - Civic Center 500-ft Buffer




Exhibit G:

April 2024 Draft Title 17 Zoning Code Update
(link below)

[ZONING-CODE-DRAFT-April-2024](#)
[\(irwindaleca.gov\)](#)

EXHIBIT "H"

**IRWINDALE COUNCIL CHAMBER
5050 N. IRWINDALE AVENUE
IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA 91706**

**July 17, 2024
Wednesday
6:31 P.M.**

The Irwindale **PLANNING COMMISSION** met in a regular session at the above time and place.

CHAIR FRYMARK Good evening everyone, I would like to call the Planning Commission meeting to order, July 17, 2024, at 6:31p.m. For those that are able to and can see, please stand for the pledge of allegiance.

PLEDGE OF
ALLEGIANCE I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

INVOCATION
CHAIR FRYMARK Dear Heavenly Father, Lord, we stand before you, thanking you for our health and for our safety. Lord, we ask that you bless this community, you bless the first responders, you bless the Staff, you bless the residents, and that you are here with us tonight as we go through the agenda and discuss issues that will impact the future generation of our Irwindale community. We ask that you guide us with strength, with clarity to help us make decisions that will not only impact and be beneficial to our residents, but also to our business community. To bless those and take care of those that are ill and those that couldn't be with you. Be here with us today. All this in Jesus' name we pray, Amen.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners; Albert Acosta; Richard Chico; Casey Miranda; Joseph Rodriguez; Maricela Frymark

Also present: Julian Miranda, City Manager; Jamie Traxler, Assistant City Attorney; Eddie Chan, Director of Engineering; Marilyn Simpson, Community Development Director; Brandi Jones, Senior Planner; Martin Romero, Assistant Planner; Baltazar Barrios, Assistant Planner; Jesus Hernandez, Administrative Secretary; Karen Ruiz, Office Specialist; Jarrod Palmer, Community Development Intern

**AB 2449
DISCLOSURES**

CHAIR FRYMARK We know move on to Item E, AB 2449 Disclosures. Seeing that everyone is here today, I'm assuming we are good to go.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ That is correct.

CHAIR FRYMARK Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIR FRYMARK Do we have any announcements?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ No announcements from Staff.

CHAIR FRYMARK Do any members of the Commission have any announcements they would like to share?

CONSENT CALENDAR

CHAIR FRYMARK We are going to move onto to number 1 in the Consent Calendar. So, the Consent Calendar contains a matter of routine business and is to be approved with one motion unless the member of the Commission requests separate action on a specific item. At this time, members of the audience may ask to be heard regarding an item on the Consent Calendar. For today, it looks like we have one item: that is going to be minutes of the regular meeting that was held on June 19th, 2024. At this time, we could entertain a motion if the Commission would so like.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Motion to approve.

CHAIR FRYMARK Okay, do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA Approve.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ Second was from who? I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA Second from Casey.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ Thank you.

CHAIR FRYMARK Roll call?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ Commissioner Acosta.

COMMISSIONER
ACOSTA Yes

ADMINISTRATIVE Commissioner Miranda.

SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

COMMISSIONER
MMIRANDA Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ Commissioner Rodriguez.

COMMISSIONER
RODRIGUEZ Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ Vice chair Chico.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ Chair Frymark.

CHAIR FRYMARK Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ Thank you.

CHAIR FRYMARK Thank you. Next item on our agenda for tonight is Spontaneous Communications.

SPONTANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ This is the time set aside for members of the audience to speak on items not on this agenda that is within the Planning Commission's subject's matter jurisdiction. The Planning Commission is an advisory board appointed by the City Council to review and provide recommendations on matters related to land use, planning, and development within the city. Except for very limited circumstances, state law prohibits any Commission discussion or action on items that are not on the agenda. All members of the public are asked to observe the City's Rules of Procedure and Public Meeting Decorum. The City's Rules of Procedure and Public Meeting Decorum can be found on the City's website, and Chapter 2.40 of the Irwindale Municipal Code. You may also contact the City Clerk's Office for copies. Each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes unless such time limits are extended. If a member of the public wishes to donate their time to another speaker,

both persons must be physically present and in attendance of the meeting. The Presiding Officer may, in his or her discretion, extend the 3-minute time limitation for the particular subject for all speakers. In no event shall the total amount of speaking time exceed 6 minutes per person for the subject under discussion. Organized groups of persons wishing to address the Board on the same subject should select a spokesperson to represent the group, so as to avoid unnecessary repetition. The Commission may regulate a speaker who is speaking too long or out of order, being unduly repetitious, discussing irrelevancies, or extending to items not within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. Please be reminded that discrimination, abusive use of profanity, unruly disruption, and violent or physically threatening conduct is discouraged. Members of the public shall not disrupt the orderly conduct of the meeting the Presiding Officer will request that a person cease any disruptive conduct, and if not immediately stopped, will direct the person to be removed from the meeting. So we are in the hybrid format, we have both in-person and hybrid audience members, and they will participate in the following order: Tier 1: In-person attendees, Tier 2: Teleconference attendees, and Tier 3: In-person and teleconference attendees who have not previously provided comments on the matter(s) being discussed by the legislative body.

CHAIR FRYMARK

We're now going to move into Tier 1. In person attendees, is there anyone here who would like to speak on an item not on the agenda? Please come forward.

SUZANNE GOMEZ

Good evening Commissioners, Staff and Residents. I was just wanting to share what's happening this summer as a component of the City of Irwindale. We have the opportunity to have a youth employment that are working and studying with some of us in the city, the different components of the departments. And what we're reviewing is that of the government set up. How our government in the City of Irwindale is set up. City Manager, Council Manager set up. But also, I was really excited because the newest budget provided an organizational development departmental chart, and it's newly updated. I brought a copy because I wanted to show you what Irwindale stands by and what we... If I may, can we get them a copy? So the youth employment is set up of youth from our families and it's generational. Some of our nieces and nephews and grandchildren. And they get the opportunity to review the City Council, and all of the departments, and also the Commissioners. And one of the things that I want to highlight tonight is the Community Development Department Organizational Chart. And as you go through the whole organizational chart, I only brought one page, but there's several pages as to all the departments, and as to the City Council, and the City Manager and how it runs. But again, the highlight part here is the forefathers were so wise. If you see the first box, it says who's in charge. And who's in charge is citizens of Irwindale. Then next is the City Council and the City Manager. And this

particular example, that I copied, is Community Development. Next is Assistant City Manager, the Community Development Director, and the rest of the wonderful staff that we have in the Planning Department. And so, I bring this to your attention because we stand here as mentors and representatives for our community. And I just wanted to thank you for taking the opportunity to listen and sharing tonight.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you very much for bringing this forward.

ROBERT DIAZ

Robert Diaz, 2408 South Mountain Ave, Irwindale. I just wanted to say that in the General Plan, I mean in the... I feel that the City Planning Commission perhaps should be looking also, not just the zoning, but the General Plan for the City of Irwindale, because some of the decisions such as traffic circulation. Since we have undeveloped land, if developed in the future during the time that the next Zoning Map and code is in effect. If we wish to widen the roadway. Well, what's the size of an arterial highway? *CHUCKLES* Other cities like Monrovia, they have a wider in the county territory by Myrtle Avenue. Their highway is wider than ours and I'm noticing on the west side of the City, west of the 605 you're getting a lot of traffic. Once you develop the west side, which is underdeveloped at this point. On the far west by Longden. You're going to have more traffic. But when the EIR's are done, they're looking at impact from buildings that are around, not future development. And so, they don't count traffic impact that might exist once they developed the other properties. So, we wind up potentially with traffic congestion. And in the General Map, it shows an example of where road goes through Arrow Highway, the old Buena Vista Road, if you remember where that is. Some of you do. The Buena Vista, the old route was rerouted, but looks like in the General Plan Map it shows that it's back in. And I would question why would you wanna have to divide the lot up? If it's currently a mining use, why would you want to have a General Plan to split it up? Unless you already have some plans in mind, I would think you'd want to keep it all one big parcel for development instead of splitting up with that roadway that's not even there yet but planned to be according to the General Plan or the Zoning Map. So that's when feeling that you need to look perhaps at the General Plan. That's a comment that Councilmember Burrola raised when going along with the motion to bring this matter of the zoning issue back to the Council.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Do we have any other members of the public here today that would like to speak on any other matters that are not currently on the agenda? Seeing none, we can move into Tier 2. Do we have any teleconference attendees?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

We do not.

CHAIR FRYMARK Thank you. Tier 3 is in person attendees and teleconference attendees who have not previously provided any comment, are there any in person attendees that would like to make a comment? Seeing none, do we have any in the hybrid?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ No one on Zoom.

NEW BUSINESS

CHAIR FRYMARK Okay. Thank you very much. So we will move on to Item 3, which is New Business. Not seeing anything under New Business, we're going to move on and open up the Public Hearing.

CHAIR FRYMARK Under public hearing, we have one item, Item A. Zoning ordinance amendment #03-2023 and zone change #04-2023. Citywide Title 17 zoning code update. Do we have a presentation from staff?

PUBLIC HEARING

CHAIR FRYMARK Under Public Hearing, we have one item, Item A. Zoning Ordinance Amendment Number 03-2023 and Zone Change Number 04-2023. Citywide Title 17 Zoning Code Update. Do we have a presentation from Staff?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON Yes, thank you, Chair and Commission. So thank you, Chair, Commissioners, and members of the public. So, this project tonight is a comprehensive Zoning Code update. And when we say comprehensive, not every item is changed, but it involves the entire Zoning Code. So, per the Irwindale Municipal Code provisions of Title 17, which is Zoning, it shall be amended from time to time. So, this work on this update, it began in 2020 with hiring Interwest Consulting Group to prepare the document and provide the environmental analysis for it. The purpose of the update is to implement the General Plan and the Housing Element policies and programs, incorporate changes to state law, better defined land uses, regulations and improve the usability of the Zoning Code. The biggest change to this code is the look and the flow of the code, which has changed for ease of use. Our existing code is what is called a tiered code. What that means is that each section of the code may tier off or refer back to another section. In the pass what we found, this creates confusion for the readers and users of the code. Now it's organized by each zoning designation for uses and development standards. The update also includes text changes and a couple of map updates. So, our current Zoning Code, it was built upon the County Code when the City was incorporated and many of those chapters, they were adopted in 1966 with no updates. There have been some efforts to modernize certain

chapters, and comply with state laws, and address some of the outdated uses, the nonconformity, and also to include overlays zones, incorporate new specific plans, and update administrative policies. And those are done, you know, as needed case by case basis. So over the past 50 some years, there have been a few efforts of preparing and adopting a comprehensive Zoning Code Update, but none have gotten to this level of completion. That is it. Just so you know, there will be future Zoning Code updates that will come to the Planning Commission and to the City Council. Some may include for individual projects, you know, and some when we have to comply with state law. Also, you know, there may be updates that comply with any new technology that affects anything with land use. So with this, you know, over the years there was extensive public outreach for the update. It included mailed and posted public notices, social media outreach, virtual meetings, flyers, written surveys, phone interviews with stakeholders, and emails. This has been going on, you know, even when COVID was going on. So we had to kind of pivot and go to virtual meetings, you know, for some of it was pretty old school, you know, just mailing things out with that. We did have, when we could, we had the informational tables that were set up at city events. And then we included the Chamber of Commerce, and they sent out any updates with their e-mail blast to their members. Notices were also sent to all businesses that did have a Business License in the City. So, we did have a 30-day public review of the document and that was back in 2023. And we did extend it for an additional month at that time. So, we had this update scheduled with the Planning Commission in October and then again in November of 2023. And then at the November meeting, the Planning Commission requested a few changes to the document that were included in the latest version, the April version. Then on February 21st, 2024, the Planning Commission heard the item and recommended that the City Council approve the update with a few additional items for the City Council to consider. So, there were seven items. One was to amend the definition of major arterials in the Zoning Code to be consistent with the definition in the Irwindale General Plan. To add the Billboard chapter to the Zoning Code as currently written, there is no changes to that. To keep the SMARA chapter as is and with direction to bring back the amended chapter at later date for consistency with State Law. Just to let you know, we're still working on that. Then the other recommended change to the City Council had to do with minor variances, to add Community Development Director authority to default to 30% if not listed already in the document. And then for administrative approvals by the Community Development Director to document all approvals in the application file. Then it was to modify section, it was 17.09.080 A, Planned Development. To give the time extension from two years to one year. And then finally the recommendation was for all Commercial and Industrial zones to institute a 50-foot setback for new development, measured from the property line for the side facing and abutting any residentially zoned property. So, on April 10th, 2024, the draft Title 17 Zoning Code

Update was presented to the City Council at a Public Hearing, and at that meeting the City Council heard various comments from the public and directed Staff to have the Planning Commission review the update in light of those public comments. The direction that was given was to take all of the information that was discussed and brought up at that Council Meeting and bring it back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration. But there weren't any real specifics identified. We did have the unofficial transcript of that portion of City Council is attached to the Planning Commission report and it is included in the packet here. And then we did have Interwest prepare a matrix. They went through those comments, prepared a matrix of the public questions and comments, and that was attached as well. Because there were some common themes in those comments. Tonight, the Planning Commission has a few options with this, and we'll go into more detail later, but either it keeps the original Planning Commission recommendation, or add, revise, or provide alternative recommendations, or give alternative direction to Staff. And one of the things I do need to mention is that with this update, it was funded primarily through a grant from the State. And the California Housing and Community Development Department or HCD, they have given the City several time extensions to complete and adopt the update. But recently Staff was informed that if the update does not get adopted, HCD is stated that the City must return the grant money. So I do want to make you aware of that. That concludes my report. Right now, what I will do is I am turning it over to Nick Pergakes with Interwest to go over tonight's meeting agenda.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you.

NICK PERGAKES

Evening.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Evening.

NICK PERGAKES

Commissioner Frymark, Planning Commissioners, Planning Staff and residents of Irwindale. I am going to give a presentation now, going over the status of the Zoning Code Update. Where we are today. Marilyn mentioned some of those items, so I'll go through that pretty briefly, just for the public attending tonight and people online that may not be as familiar with the code update. I just give a little bit of an overview of the objectives of the code update, and why it was done, and going to major planning action and updates. Give an overview of the topics discussed at that April City Council Meeting, review some key changes to the Zoning Code, and then go into questions and comments. And then, Marilyn I guess addressed SB-2 grant already and then we'll go into requesting Planning Commission direction. So the public comment period on the draft Zoning Code was in early June to July of last year, and that's when we had the study session with Planning Commission and City Council members to review the draft. And we got feedback from City Council members, Planning

Commissioners, and city residents at that meeting. We also, after that meeting, reviewed the comments and questions from the public and the study session, and that was provided at the Planning Commission meeting on September 20th, 2023, and received some additional direction and comments. And then I guess we're kind of missing this year, but the November meeting, we came back as well. Got some more direction and then we came back to Planning Commission meeting on February 21st. And at that meeting it was recommended the Zoning Code be brought to the City Council for approval with the changes that Marilyn had recommended as well as other changes that we had discussed over the previous like seven or eight months. We had gone to City Council on April 10th, this year, and again it was requested to go back to Planning Commission for some further discussion on some topics in the code that some residents and some Planning Commission members had some comments and some thoughts on that, that they wanted to have reviewed and looked at it in little more detail. So, some of the main objectives of the Zoning Code update is to ensure consistency with the General Plan's vision, goals and policies. The Zoning Code is an implementation tool, so it implements the General Plan. We wanted to modernize the Zoning Code. Again, it was mostly kind of a shell from the 60s, from the Zoning Code from LA County and it's been updated and amended over the years, but really needed a clean comprehensive look and update to it. We wanted to make the code more user friendly for Staff, for residents, and for property owners, and developers to be able to use it and to, you know, create the projects, or do the things that they want to do to their properties or to the buildings. We also updated the codes format and added more illustrations throughout to explain planning concepts and planning, you know, definitions and other items. And also, to comply with several recent state laws that were enacted since 2018, particularly for housing that would affect the City and needed to be codified into the Zoning Code. At the City Council meeting back in April, the Housing Element and the General Plan was brought up a lot. Some specific developments, specific plans, were also discussed. So just wanted to, you know, for people maybe not as familiar with this, I know the Planning Commission members are very in tune with what's happening with the Housing Element Update, but just want to let people know that the City is in the process of updating their Housing Element, which is part of the General Plan that gives policy direction and programs to how the City will address housing issues in the city, new housing units for residents, and other housing programs. That's again in the process of being prepared and is a separate effort from the Zoning Code Update. However, our firm Interwest Consulting Group and I myself, have been kept, you know, up to date on some of those changes that are happening in the Housing Element and to work in concert with some of those changes that will be, you know, adopted later this year. And then the General Plan update is also being updated at the same time. It's a partial update to a few chapters of the Housing Element that's now required by the State when a housing element is

prepared. It depends on the community, but sometimes an Environmental Justice Element does need to be prepared and that is happening for Irwindale. The Safety Element has to be updated as well to address, you know, safety concerns related to, you know, natural events like wildfires and other things that could affect housing and housing development in the city. And then, you know, other things are happening in the city, you know, like the Allen Drive residential project, there's existing specific plans like City of Hope, Reliance II Specific Plan, and the Park at Live Oak, which is separate from the Zoning Code. It has development standards; it has zoning tied specifically to those properties, but those are not part of the Zoning Code Update. Those are separate documents that have been prepared and drive the development in those areas. So, to give a bit of a summary from the last City Council Meeting or the meeting, sorry, in April. Some people came up to, you know, residents had some concerns or had questions or comments about zone changes for specific parcels. For example, changing some industrial properties to commercial zoned properties that is not part of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update. The code update is really to update the zone districts overall. There have been some zones that have been consolidated because either there's just not many of those properties that are zoned, like for example CP, the Commercial Professional, or you know, there's another manufacturing zone that also, you know, has been kind of taken and brought into other zones. However, there has been some specific zone changes. I think the City Staff has taken over the last year for various reasons. So some of those zone changes have happened, but this is not a comprehensive look at where to change a lot of industrial properties to commercial or whatnot. That would be, you know, a separate effort under, you know, it has to start with the General Plan kind of looking at those properties, and then it would happen either, you know, through a City driven exercise or, you know, perhaps a property owner wants to do rezonings of properties from, you know, M1 to say C2 or C3. There was also concern about the C3 Zone. C3 Zone is an existing zoning district today that implements the Town Center General Plan category. That does allow residential and commercial in the zone. However, with this zoning code update, we are recommending that they can be combined onto one property where residential can be on top of retail. We have discussed vertical mixed-use, but there is an option also to do horizontal mixed-use where perhaps residential could be behind a commercial building. So that's something I wanted to bring to your attention tonight. If you would like to update the Zoning Code before it goes to City Council to allow either vertical or horizontal mixed-use. That is something we'd like to bring for your consideration. And then the role of the General Plan policies and programs and how they're implemented. Again, there was some thoughts about... They're concerns about how the Zoning Code addresses certain issues and some of those issues are actually addressed at policy level, at the General Plan level. The Zoning Code is really implementing the policies and programs of the General Plan.

In terms of environmental and community concerns. There were some concerns brought up about new housing along Allen Drive. That that is not being specifically addressed in the Zoning Code Update, however, we are looking at setbacks and heights for various districts. So there are some components that, you know, could affect Allen Drive, but that was brought up a few times during the City Council meeting. There was a request to improve air quality and dust control in the city. There is a new performance standards chapter in the code that's not there today in the existing code which addresses noise, odor, dust, various environmental impacts related to new development. So that is in the code now. Perhaps, you know, some people didn't realize that was in there or maybe they did, but you know, it does address air quality and other environmental impacts in the city, you know, to address those items. There was also, at the mayor request, to include environmental justice topics and quite a bit of those like hazardous waste, noise issues, glare issues, other things are addressed in that performance standards chapter. However, more at the policy level and like programs and how you can address environmental justice as a city, that's more reflected and addressed in that standalone element that's being prepared as part of the General Plan Update, partial update. And then the next kind of round of comments were related to development standards such as Commercial Industrial zones, particularly for building heights in the C3 Zone, M1, and M2 zones. We have provided examples in Irwindale with some building heights in your packet so, you could see what some example building heights are throughout the city. That's been requested by the Planning Commission, so we provided that. Then, you know, there are some issues I think we had talked about in that City Council meeting as well as before in a previous Planning Commission meeting where if perhaps setbacks are a bit more than they are now, let's say, you know, maybe there's a 10 foot setback now, but we want to make it 30-40 feet sometimes that could create an issue with development and could be considered perhaps create a nonconforming situation or taking. We can talk more about that later. In terms of building setbacks, we've talked about separation of industrial and residential uses. I feel that the Zoning Code for Irwindale does address those issues of when a new industrial building or commercial building is abutting a residential use. And we have specific, you know, larger setbacks when a new building is going to be next to residential zoned property. And we also provided some examples as well that we're going to talk about tonight. This slide shows building heights in in the Commercial Zoning districts and in the Manufacturing or Industrial Zoning districts. It shows the existing maximum height today in the Zoning Code and then what we've proposed. If you notice in the C2 and C3 zones we did discuss reducing down the maxima heights from what is in that April draft that you're seeing in front of you. So we did discuss bringing it down and tonight I think we're going to want to talk a little bit more based on the comments we received from residents, perhaps adjusting that down. You know, if you feel like it's, it's important to, but we can talk about

that in a moment. And then the Manufacturing Zones as well. Today there is an existing maximum height of 35 feet in the M1 zone. It is proposed that the max height be for 50 feet. And then there is no M2 existing maximum height level in the code today, but we have proposed a maximum height of 65 feet. And I know we I think we talked about bringing that down perhaps to 60 feet in a previous meeting. So, we'll also kind of get your thoughts on that as well. Well, before I move into any... Some of these pictures and some examples from the industrial zones, did any of the planning commissioners have any questions?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Yes, I do. Excuse me. Going back, I am looking for the wording proposing a higher height limitation. Who's proposing that higher height limitation and why?

NICK PERGAKES Okay, when I am saying propose, it's really... This is a draft Zoning Code Update, so it is proposed for tonight. Proposed in the code update. This might be my opinion, but I think you might be asking, you know, how did it get to that height level perhaps or...

VICE-CHAIR CHICO No, I'm asking why do we want to increase the height level.

NICK PERGAKES Right, so we held stakeholder meetings back at the beginning of the process with some property owners, developers, architects that do development projects in the city, and based not only on projects that have been built in the city or ones that will be built in the future, there is a need to have taller buildings to allow for products being stored in there and to best utilize the space of those buildings. And it's a major investment to build on a property here, and to build a building they would like to be able to maximize, you know, that property and that building space to allow for more space in the buildings to store materials and wholesale goods in there. Perhaps I'll show you a couple of examples where... You know, we have examples like there might be a little bit of a disconnect in height between what some of the existing heights are today and what's being proposed. So that's why I think tonight is a good opportunity for us to look at those heights and say, well, you know, based on comments from residents, perhaps and Planning Commissioners, City Council Members, you know, is there a way forward to look at those sites again and maybe adjust this accordingly?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO You've answered my question.

NICK PERGAKES Okay, good.

CHAIR FRYMARK Nick, I'm not sure if this is a question for you or for Staff, but I'm going to propose it anyway and answer as best needed. You mentioned in your report, thank you by the way it was very thorough appreciate walking us through the process. It was mentioned that there are

portions of the General Plan that are currently being revised. And there are other portions that are currently are not, but in looking at the comments that were provided on April the 10th and listening to the audio of the City Council meeting that was held on April the 10th, there was a couple of Council Members and residents that asked about rezoning specific areas, and it was mentioned that the General Plan would need to be reviewed and updated first in order for that to happen. What is preventing us from doing that?

NICK PERGAKES

I don't know, I don't want to... I have an answer, but I think Marilyn would better eloquently say that answer so.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

Thank you, Chair. The City Council would have to direct Staff, you know, to begin that endeavor to change that.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Their comments were to change it, but they would have to directly indicate to City Staff that they would like that section of the General Plan amended.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

Yes, there is a process for that.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Would you, just for the record, indicate what that process is?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

Well you know, depending on... Well, we wouldn't want to do just spot changes, you know, but we'd want to have them specifically identify those areas. It would involve getting funding for that too. We would have a consultant who would be looking at that and preparing those changes. There may or may not you know be... Well there are definitely be an environmental analysis, but whether it required an EIR or a Mitigated Negative Declaration or that. It would have to be determined, you know, at that time. So that would be the start of that process. And then again, it would involve community outreach, for that as well, to residents and businesses and any other interested parties and agencies. So.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Other questions?

COMMISSIONER
RODRIGUEZ

I have a have a comment regarding the height level of an M2 Zone being 65 feet which is proposed today correct?

NICK PERGAKES

Yeah, it's part of the zoning code effort. Yes, it did... We did look at 65 feet.

COMMISSIONER

In looking at the maps, both the existing and the proposed maps, it

- RODRIGUEZ appears that there's a large portion of the city that is zoned M2. So, the height level at 65 would be concerning.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Would it be appropriate at this time to engage in a conversation about possibly reducing it, or is that something that we would do after we continue with the Public Hearing and get further feedback
- ASSISTANT
CITY ATTORNEY
TRAXLER That would be appropriate after you continue with the Public Hearing.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Thank you. But we can absolutely discuss that about reducing the height at M2, to speak to your comment.
- NICK PERGAKES And I will also mention, with one new Planning Commissioner, I think that we've discussed this before, but there is opportunity for a building to go a little bit higher if they have a parapet wall. So that does allow some flexibility because there's the top of the building, but then there's the extra amount if there's like a wall to like to hide or screen like air conditioning equipment or mechanical equipment. So that that does that does allow some flexibility. So, if perhaps those heights are brought down, there is some flexibility with adjustment, if a developer needs to go up a little bit, they could use that parapet wall to, you know, help screen a little bit too.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Good to know, thank you.
- NICK PERGAKES Okay. Thank you. So, here's a few examples in the M1 Zone, the existing maximum height is 35 feet. We had proposed maximum height of 50-feet. Here's a couple buildings in the city. They are under 40 feet. So, if you know, Staff and Planning Commission wanted to look at bringing that down a little bit, that proposed maximum height, you know... Just we'll have a discussion later, but you can kind of give it some thought if you'd like to bring that down a little bit. And then for the M2 Zone, however, there is no maximum height today. But there are some buildings that are at 60 feet, like the Kaiser Permanente building, you know, kind of off the 605 freeway that is at an M2 Zone. That is a 60-feet. I believe on the left is a Home Depot building. That's an M2 Zone and that's at 50 feet. So, there are some buildings getting up there in the city today that are, you know, above 50 feet. That's why we were looking at trying to accommodate some of those needs and not have any buildings that would be nonconforming if we did change that height or create a maximum height. And remember this is a maximum height doesn't mean that a developer has to build to that. That's the highest they can go, right. In this presentation we're showing some of the other heights of buildings, there was some measured buildings heights throughout the city and the zoning. So we provided that to you, in the Staff Report. I believe you have that table as well in your packet. And you know, we can show some more examples too. We have some

of those at the end of the presentation we can go to. Then for setbacks for the Commercial Zones, this exhibit shows in the red like what it would be to have a 50-foot setback requirement from residential. So as we had talked about in the previous Planning Commission meeting, that can create, you know, somewhat of an issue if it is a narrow or like a lot that, you know, isn't much more over than 100 feet in length. It could be somewhat of an issue. But we just wanted to show this to you because I think we had talked about it before and having some type of graphic indicating that. But in the C1 zone, we have a 20-foot requirement abutting residential. C2 as well, 20 feet abutting residential. Then the C3 zone where we're showing 50 feet. And then for Industrial Zones, here's a an example of M1 next to residential, and what it looks like having that 30 feet kind of separation from an industrial building in an M2 Zone from a Residentially Zoned property. And into that little table is kind of showing you what today the existing front setback is, and then how it kind of works with the abutting Residential Zone. We also show what's proposed front, because today there is no existing front setback in an M1 Zone. So, we're creating a minimum of 20 feet in the M1 Zone, and then 30 feet if it's abutting a Residential Zone. And then we have existing rear setback being proposed, and then existing side and proposed side setbacks. Okay to move on to M2 Zone? And then here's another aerial example. I believe this is right at the corner of Irwindale Avenue and Arrow Highway showing what, you know, with the new requirements of having a special setback when an M2 Zone is adjacent to a Residential Zone and what that would look like. If there aren't any questions, this was the next slide, but just wanted to have a check in right now and see if there are any comments before we go into discussion later.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

Question actually, regarding basically the buffer. The example you had is the what the guess is the Ayutla Market that property, or the Jack in the Box, that buffer would be increased. So what would go there? More property in between that? Currently it's a parking lot right now.

NICK PERGAKES

It just means that no development could happen within that area, so it'd be landscaping or parking, but a building couldn't be within that that distance.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

Got it, thank you.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Any other questions? Okay, we can keep going thank you.

NICK PERGAKES

So Marilyn, I will bring you up here for the next step. Is that okay?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR

We went through those slides fast. So, before I go onto the recommendation, I do want to discuss the environmental review on this. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA,

- SIMPSON the City is the lead agency and has analyzed the project and has determined that the proposed Zoning Code Update we're assessed with the... And the environmental impact Review, for the City's General Plan and pursuant to CEQA guidelines, Section 15183 and 15162 is consistent with the previously certified EIR for the City's General Plan. So, the recommendation with this is that, as I mentioned before, there's some options that the Planning Commission can affirm the previous Resolutions; Number 819(23) and 820(23), which included the Planning Commission's previous recommendations, that I read off, to the Irwindale City Council. And then you can direct Staff to report back that to the City Council or you could adopt there are new resolutions; 828(24) and 829(24) with additional revise or alternative recommendations to the City Council and then direct Staff to report that back to the City Council. And with those recommend that the City Council adopted findings of consistency with the City's previously certified General Plan Environment Impact report or you can provide alternative direction to Staff.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Thank you, Marilyn. So, before we really start to unpack these recommendations, we absolutely want to hear from the residents here. But I do have a question regarding the environmental impact. So, it was mentioned that the Comprehensive Zoning Code was assessed in the EIR in the City's General Fund, but this is a different updated code, so we're just assuming that it meets the CEQA guidelines without having to go through another review?
- COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON Yes.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Why and how did we get to that determination?
- NICK PERGAKES The Zoning Code, based on the changes that are being made, it doesn't require any EIR to be to be prepared. Most of the changes are in concert with recent housing legislation. They're changes that meet the intent and the purpose of the General Plan, so it doesn't need to have a specific EIR done for the Zoning Code based on the changes that are being made.
- CHAIR FRYMARK If it was done in an abundance of caution, what would be the impact to the City and would there be any kind of cost associated with doing such a review?
- NICK PERGAKES Yes. You could do an Initial Study to look at the impacts and do an assessment to see if it's a Neg. Dec. basically, a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts. So yeah, that would be a costly exercise for the City to undertake. I will say that I've done about seven to ten Zoning Code Updates over the last five years, with my company, and

- similar situation to Irwindale have a General Plan in place. It's meeting the intent of the General Plan, meeting the intent of recent housing legislation. The environmental doesn't need an environmental impact report based on the changes that are similar to what we've been doing in other places... Okay.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Just for full transparency, what would the cost be approximately? And I understand it's going to be a give and take figure, but in your experience, what would it be?
- NICK PERGAKES Yeah, to do like an initial study and kind of like preliminary environmental impact analysis would be probably \$75,000. Maybe more it just depends.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Plus or minus.
- NICK PERGAKES Yeah.
- COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON Thank you, Chair and Commission. I'm going to revise that because we have we have sent numerous RFP's out for things, and we've looks at other cities and that. I would double that at this point.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Double?
- COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON Yes, I would.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Okay, thank you. Does any members of the Commission have any further questions before we open it up to the floor? No?
- COMMISSIONER MIRANDA I have a few questions. On the project overview I was looking at, is this also included in the new one, proposed zoning updates? It's says consistent with implementation with the City's visions, goals and policies of Irwindale towards the General plan. It goes down to here; sorry I just missed it. Back on complying with changes in state law, it mentions objective design standards for multifamily housing will allow developers to create projects that can be approved at staff level, if very specific standards for quality design are met. I'm curious about that. Seems a little ambiguous, a little too streamlined for me. I think projects should be able to come to us before... To me, I don't know how you feel about that?
- NICK PERGAKES Yeah, so I don't know if I should say unfortunately, but cities now are needing to, you know, basically abide by SB35, which is a new housing law that helps streamline multifamily housing in the state. Cities that need affordable housing, or if a developer comes in and proposes a

development that has an affordable housing component, they have the ability to go through a streamline review process. And if the city doesn't have design standards in place, to reflect the character and the kind of the design and the aspects of new different that you want to see, and what you think high quality development is. If you don't have those standards in place, then the city will not be able to ask the developer to make those changes. They can go through a process bringing that multifamily development in to City Staff. It bypasses Planning Commission, bypasses City Council. Has to meet several criteria though, so it's not like any new multifamily developer that comes would go under SB35 and could take that route, but it's happening all over the state. Properties are, you know, being purchased. Housing is being built and it's going under that SB35 Law. And if a city doesn't have those... And that's what I wrote, I wrote objective design standards that you would have to be able to, you know, address the character of new housing, you know, how it looks, how it appears. So that is a new section in the code that's not in the existing Zoning Code today to address SB35.

CHAIR FRYMARK

What if a city... Thank you for asking that. Sorry, go ahead, I have a lot of questions. What if a city doesn't go and do mixed-use, what if they just don't?

NICK PERGAKES

Well, it's not necessarily mixed-use, it could be multifamily just alone and if it has an affordable housing component, there's these new state laws like SB330 and SB35 that basically... Like, let's say maybe it doesn't fall in that category of SB35, but it's under SB330, there is a limit on the number of Public Meetings that could be held for that multifamily building to get reviewed. If it does go through Staff and then goes to the Planning Commission, there's now a limit, like I think 5 meetings that it would have to be reviewed and approved in that amount of time or that amount of meetings. So there's been a lot of laws coming down, you know, in the last five years and cities have to abide by those. And you know, again, there are special things that are in there that... It's not like anything can just kind of go through that hoop there are some things in place. But if they do meet those criteria, those eligibility criteria under SB35. you wouldn't be able to review it as a Planning Commission. It would go straight to Staff, get reviewed with those objective design standards. And then that's where you could say, oh, well, you need to make a change on this aspect of your development, your aspect of your building, architecturally or masking your building, or site design or other aspects.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

I know we have it in commercial, our building designs, but do we have a residential? Do you have a new plan coming up, a residential plan? So we have that objective standards already set.

NICK PERGAKES

Do we have residential standards?

COMMISSIONER MIRANDA NICK PERGAKES	Yes, standards set. Yeah, we wrote those for the new Zoning Code Update. Yeah. And then you have Commercial and Industrial Design Guidelines today that addresses Commercial and Industry Design Guidelines. And we prepare draft update to the Commercial Design Guidelines and Industrial Design Guidelines.
CHAIR FRYMARK	It talks about the palm trees.
NICK PERGAKES	Yes. Yup. You're welcome.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Any other questions from the Commission? Okay thank you.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	A quick one actually. Regarding, you mentioned the mixed-use, actually, versus vertical and horizontal. I know many residents have spoken to me about this actually already. About in the area, by our park area, we don't really want horizontal...
ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ	Commissioner Miranda...
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Sorry. They wouldn't want horizontal perhaps... Vertical, sorry. Maybe horizontally will work, you know, office building in front, housing in the back possibly, but I know they're leaning towards more the Gold Line perhaps or outer outskirts, more of something vertical.
NICK PERGAKES	Ohh, up towards the Gold Line and not necessarily down here where the Town Center it?
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Correct. Not closer correct. Yeah that are some of the concerns they have been telling me about that.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Did I read somewhere in their report that talks about there was an analysis down in that Metrolink area, that speaks that there's not being any available space to develop mixed-use?
NICK PERGAKES	I'm not sure, I haven't seen it.
CHAIR FRYMARK	I read that somewhere. I am not making that up.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	I think you are right.
NICK PERGAKES	So the one thing to consider, and I think Brandi and Marilyn can help me out with this, is that I know the Housing Element in the update is looking at opportunities to increase housing in the city, housing opportunities. You know, based off your regional housing needs

assessment, you're given a proportion of housing that needs to be, you know, built over a certain time period. I believe it's by 2029. So, it does in the policies or program section of the Housing Element talk about the opportunity for mixed-use in the C3 district, that would allow Residential over Commercial or horizontally so... Marilyn, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think you would have to allow it in one form or another perhaps, but you might want to be able to speak to that.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO An opinion on that. I would like to know an opinion on that. Do we have to have it?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON Well, now we're getting into the Housing Element Update and the programs with that, which is different from the Zoning Code. What you can put in the Zoning Code is if you don't want the vertical mixed-use, the horizontal is an option with that. In any case, when you're mentioning by the Gold Line, you know, because that was with the sites inventory with the Housing Element in there, and those are overlays they're looking at. The density is a little bit higher in those areas. So, we would still have to meet the numbers in there.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Yes, we know.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON But again, you know, with the sites inventory, I just want to say we have to... when we get our RHNA numbers, the Regional Housing Needs Allocation numbers, doesn't mean we have to build those. We just have to identify those sites where it could be, okay. And that's in process. Is that answering it?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO No, that's not my question. My question is do we have to have mixed-use in our Zoning Code? That's my question.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON That we have to? it is something that in our in our Housing Element, we have been told to allow for that for mixed-use. Yeah, and we already have that with this C3 Zone, in the city.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Housing Element mandates that we must have mixed-use in our Zoning Code.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON I'd have to verify that again with our consultant.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO I don't think so, I'm just guessing myself.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR Yeah, not mixed-use but it would be...

SIMPSON

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

I think it's out of the Housing Elements realm to dictate the Zoning Code.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

Yeah, we'd have to have multifamily in there, that it is required with that but not mixed-used in there.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Can we put some clarity on that, whether or not we need to have mixed-use. I understand we need to have multifamily, but it sounds like mixed-use is...

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

No, I don't think that we need the mixed-use. No, yeah. I missed spoke.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Okay. So potentially if there is no mixed-use, then that portion could be eliminated. Which would be the C3.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

You can always get it later.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

So you know that that's another thing is that if a developer came in and they wanted to propose that, you know, and again, we can't refuse an application, you know, we would bring that forward, you know, and that would be something if it's a Variance or, you know, something else that would need to allow that. But it would be something that would be discretionary, that would be brought not only in front of the Planning Commission, but the City Council as well.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Okay. So we're going to continue with the Public Hearing. Is there anyone from the audience that would like to come forward and speak on this item?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

So you want to go ahead and open up the Public Hearing?

CHAIR FRYMARK

Of course, sorry about that. So at this time, we'll go ahead and open. One day I'll get it right you guys. I will.

OPEN PUBLIC
HEARING

At 7:31 p.m., Chair Frymark opened the Public Hearing.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY

Okay, so before we do go with the audience, let me just read a e-mail we received. Okay. We did receive an e-mail from Erin Thrash from

HERNANDEZ Rexford Industrial and it is placed on your dais there is an exhibit as well, just to let you know. Just a short summary. They attached an exhibit to help clarify why additional building height is valuable to both owners, operators, and members of the community. The additional building height allows for additional volume in the warehouse, which is valuable in attracting height credit tenants. You can see we're able to double the numbers of racks, and there for goods, stored in the same footprint - making this building more desirable to a sophisticated, professional company that will take pride in this building and neighborhood becoming a type of neighborhood that we all want. The other point of this exhibit is to showcase how additional building height would allow for improved architectural and roof screen of any required equipment. Okay, now we can go ahead whenever you're ready to do.

CHAIR FRYMARK Thank you.

NICK PERGAKES This is the exhibit, by the way, that was included with the email.

CHAIR FRYMARK Perfect.

NICK PERGAKES It just shows the building height that would allow more storage.

CHAIR FRYMARK And then it has also the parapet listed, okay. Thank you. You guys ready. Miss Roman.

CARMEN ROMAN Thank you. Do you want to wait for Commissioner Chico or just go?

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ We should note that he did step out.

CHAIR FRYMARK And now he's back.

CARMEN ROMAN Thank you. Carmen Roman, Irwindale resident. I'm just going to go around and say my notes and stuff and hope it'll come out on record. When we speak at this at a later date because I'm all over the place. First of all, with the Housing Element in Irwindale, we usually build about 25 to 30 homes per need of family growth. When we're talking about C3, Multifamily, we don't have hotel, motels. We don't want... Well I don't and I know people who do not want mixed-use multi. I'm not sure what exactly multifamily is. We don't want the ghetto type housing with apartments and stoops, where everyone plays outside. We've said that before. Sorry, the C3, we continue to say we do not want C3 over and over, yet it continues over the months and this year it gets put back on. We do not want family homes above businesses. We don't want eateries or anything or the side by side, vertical or horizontal. When it comes to EIR's in Irwindale, we are high count, cancer prone. And we've lost many family members, everyone here that's a resident has lost someone. So when you talk about an EIR and

the financial impact, life is priceless. We would rather return the grant money, then make rush or rash decisions. We don't want that timeline being held over, unless we can get it done within that time. And we have said numerous times. We want the height to be 35 feet, even if you go a little more. No one ever mentioned 65 feet. Then you're talking about equipment facades. Maybe 75-80 feet. We do not want L.A. high rises, Pasadena, San Diego. No, when you talk about EIR, setbacks, and everything, I see the state regulation and the realm of what those diameters are, but we're a small town. We don't want all that 65-70 feet and no limit is ridiculous. No one wants... Everything should have a limit. May I continue, or no?

CHAIR FRYMARK

Can you make it fast, please.

CARMEN ROMAN

Yes. So, the no Mixed-use... The 50 versus... When we spoke last time, we said the setback residential to the company should be 50. We have the example on Arrow Highway and Allen which is very dangerous at night, you can't tell if those lights are cars coming or if it's from the setback. So, we do want a further setback, not 20 feet to 30, it is 30 to 50. And we don't wanna waive anything... the EIR's we want. We live with dust, noise, pollution, trucks, traffic. You can't put a price on that because we residents are the ones who live around it. So everyone take a drive by Arrow Highway, and also Allen Street, Fraijo. If you're putting them up on this paperwork or on this, then you have to address it all the way. You can't say we are making a rule now and then oh later when you want to build over there, you'll say it's already been done. So, they should have public right to speak as well. Thank you.

LYNN KNOX

Good evening.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Good evening.

LYNN KNOX

I'm Lynn Knox and I'm a real estate broker here for CB Richard Ellis. And I've been working in the City of Irwindale for the industrial buildings, some of them you've shown tonight, for the last 26 years. And one thing I can tell you is when I started in Irwindale, it was a lot smaller. And a lot of the users in my market, in the San Gabriel Valley, were never interested in Irwindale because they were going to the City of Industry, they were going to Pomona, El Monte. They wanted to find good buildings that were a decent ceiling height and a great location. Irwindale has a wonderful location for these types of users. It's access to the 605, the 210, the 10, the 60. This is why they come here. And in the last several years Irwindale has now almost surpassed the City of Industry with industrial development and users coming into the market. Home Depot, I think is a great example. And I think that the reason they came here was because of that beautiful building right along the freeway. When you talk about ceiling heights. The industrial users in the market, Amazon, you could say, Home Depot. These larger users,

what they're looking for is cube space in the warehouse. The more cube space they get, the more product they can store. Sometimes just a few more feet gives them a whole another level of cube space. And they're paying rent, a lot of these on the size of the building, not on the cube space. So, it's really important that we try to attract those guys that really want that high ceiling. A lot of these users are going to the Inland Empire because they're building buildings out there that are 50 feet and more inside the building. I really think it's something you guys should think about in terms of offering more opportunity. We are zoned a lot M2. You pointed that out, and that's true that's this is a city that has a lot of land and opportunity for new development. I would say that you've done a wonderful job in guiding all these developers with the city guidelines and the architecture. It's all very uniform and very attractive and I think to your credit, that has been one of the nice things about watching the City of Irwindale grow. So when you say we're a small city, we're not a small city! Not at all. In fact in the entire San Gabriel Valley, Irwindale is the third largest industrial city. And I think we should want to keep that in mind and attractive more companies here. We have a great new development that's going to be started up at the North End of the 210. We get constant calls on that development. They want to be up here. They love the location. So, I would hope that you will look at that seriously, thank you.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you.

ROBERT DIAZ

Robert Diaz, 2408 South Mountain Avenue, Irwindale. I sure hope you're not ready to approve these items tonight. Because I think you have to consider more than just what's in the print there. The City Council, for example, at the last meeting on this, referred this matter back to the Commission. Certain Members raised some questions for consideration by the Planning Commission. But I have not heard any discussion about that or inclusion into the code, perhaps because as we've been told, we have policy decisions to make that are not part of this code. But I would tend to disagree with some of that because you're asked to approve a Zoning Map. And that zoning map, doesn't include for example more commercial property. You asked to approve the map. You do that tonight or when you do it, if you have any more commercial property, when you're going to have it. Then you're going to have to have a definition of commercial. In the General Plan you have Regional Commercial. But that calls for a balance. It allows mostly industrial. What we need is get some revenue for the future when the mining industry is out. And so for that, I think you have to focus on putting commercial, but I don't see anything in the Zoning Map for that. And because of the regional zoning designation, I think you have to change that definition to say it's no longer Mixed-use, it's all Commercial. Or make a new designation, commercial, whatever you call it. But you got to do it. And that's not addressed. Sure, there would be probably individual codes for them. Let me speak a little more. The setbacks. For commercial along Arrow Highway. 50-foot set

back from Residential, it's too much when the lots only 100 feet deep and then you have the 20-foot front yard. That's living 30 feet for development. Any case the height limit? For M1, definitely 35 feet. I feel the way the existing code is fine. And if they wanna go higher, you go to the Planning Commission for CUP or variance. That's kind of returning power back to the City. Because Specific Plans aren't doing it. They're taking away from the City. I don't think you should be, as a policy, be considering Specific Plans and avoid them. Just zone the land properly. That's why I think the zoning aspect is so important and how you define it. Also, about the maximum height that they proclaim. You have to consider the interpretation of the code. In the past 35 feet meant 35 feet from base to the top of the parapet or... Now it's been interpreted as a ceiling level.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you, Mr. Diaz.

FRED BARBOSA

Good evening, Chairman, Commissioners, residents, audience. My name is Fred Barbosa, 16164 Calle de Paseo. Even though we had a lot of recommendations, we never were able to find which were implemented, and one of the ones that I was talking about was auto dismantling was alternate land use. Now that we come up with a C3, I think that would be the perfect location. That property is not going to be in play for the next 15 years, because a lot of the people there just renewed their leases. So if you make it Residential or C3, that gives you 15 years gives you enough time to reach out to the state and to the federal government and ask for Superfund loans, that will help set up the offset of housing that we're trying to develop with the state getting off of our case. Another thing, on the code it says that... I had a motorhome and I sold it, but I'm going to get another one but according to the code once it's gone, I have to set it behind a fence. Well, my lot, the lots that we live in over there on the coral homes are the smallest lots in all of Irwindale. I would like to be grandfathered in when it comes to that, because it would be impossible to put in a gate the way our homes are situated there. Another thing, on amending the General Plan, I would like to see the City look into the fact that they change Commercial and allow Residential in that part, just like they do in L.A. They're getting warehouses, empty buildings, and they're using them for housing because those buildings are sitting there empty. Let's give the people the option of whether they want to keep it Commercial, Residential or whatever. But let's leave that option over, just like a lot of other cities are doing. Another thing. Since you said the housing thing hasn't been set in stone yet or you're still working on it, well, according to it right now, we're only allowed eight acres per unit right now, and that's going to change, right? And because if not, there's only going to be 64 units on that, what they're telling us is going to be 100 and some homes. So, I would like clarification on that. And then when you're talking about C3, why not include the Raceway? Or Reliance 2. I mean I have no problems out there because they it's not going to impact the residents here. Who cares what's out there as long as it

generates income to the city. Why are we trying to break them? Thank you. Have a good... Oh and another thing what I didn't understand is, why is it if you have low low income? You get less parking stalls. To me that's discrimination. I would like an answer on that please.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you, Mr. Barbosa.

MIRAN TUMANJIAN

Good evening. Madam Chair, fellow planning commissioners, my name is Miran Tumanjian. I work for a nonprofit organization, NAIOP SoCal. And on behalf of our nearly 1300 members of NAIOP SoCal. We serve as the leading nonprofit for developers, owners and investors of industrial, office and retail real estate throughout Southern California, specifically in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. I salute City of Irwindale Staff and its retained consultant for their solid professional work on the comprehensive Zoning Code update and on the modified Zoning Map. Many NAIOP SoCal members are long term institutional investors in the City of Irwindale Industrial and Office zones. Our members are closely engaged in providing substantial community benefits at no cost to taxpayers. Such benefits include upgrading streets, sidewalks and other community infrastructure, funding parks, and significant boosts. These services are significant boost to municipalities and counties property and sales tax revenues. As stewards of sustainable development, our members generously contribute to the socioeconomic advancement of communities throughout Los Angeles County, including to the City of Irwindale. Our members demonstrate their ongoing commitment to decarbonization and renewable energy by installing solar panels on warehouses, investing in zero emission vehicles for onsite operations, deploying cool pavement technologies and using environmentally friendly building materials. NAIOP SoCal believes that Staffs proposed new development standards relative to the City's industrial and office zoning districts are sensible and commensurate with high quality contemporary development and design standards deployed by industrial developers in infill markets across Los Angeles County. For industrial zones, we approve Staffs proposed minimum setbacks of industrial buildings from residential zones, commercial zones and alleyways. We also approve Staff proposed maximum building heights in Industrial and Office Zones and especially the proposed building heights in the M1 and M2 zones that that is the new proposed maximum heights. NAIOP SoCal urges the Irwindale Planning Commission to adopt the draft Comprehensive Zoning Code Update with the proposed maximum building heights for industrial zones included in a final version of the Zoning Code Update. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you for being here tonight.

STEVE MASURA

Evening Commissioners, my name is Steve Masura. I'm with Rexford Industrial Realty. I'm here to agree with Staff's recommendation and

support the proposed Zoning code primarily for industrial property because we do primarily industrial so primarily for the M1-M2 Zones. Rexford is long term holder of properties. We own several properties in Irwindale and have and would like to continue investing in them and be able to rebuild some of them. And as mentioned by Erin Thrash, with who's with our company, and others that the higher height for the M1 Zone would facilitate better, more modern development and allow for higher quality tenants to come in. And it's an incentive to rebuild those properties because at the current 35-foot limit it doesn't meet more than modern standards as mentioned for new tenants to want to do. Typically, they want to do a 36-foot clear height. So, a 36-foot clear height still needs additional height to actually for the roof structure and the parapets to cover the equipment. So, you need that extra 10 feet essentially or more over to the 36 feet. So, you need at least 46 to 50 feet to get on the on the actual building height. So, the roof itself at the clear height is only 36 feet at the ends because the roof has to have a structure that goes up to get thicker in the middle to support the roof and the distance needed, it goes up. So, you need that extra space on the building height, which allows for better architecture as well to build those parapets and cover the medical mechanic equipment as mentioned. So, we believe that would be beneficial to the city to incentivize better development and better businesses coming into the city, better quality business tenants that are going to stay long term and better quality jobs, versus maybe coming in and out on a lower quality building. And in fact, you might overtime have higher vacancy if you have these lower quality buildings with the lower clear heights. The other thing is, is that just that diagram is showing pallet heights, not stories. So, the more efficient palette inventory and racking is better. That's what the modern tenants want. They want they want that more efficient racking and inventory systems and it's harder to get that with the lower clear heights. And also, just a reminder that industrial things are single story. So we want a 50 foot height on a single story building. This is not a multi-story building. Yeah, you might have a mezzanine with a second story office on some of it, but it's a very small part of the building. So, it's not like an office building or residential building that might be multistory. A 50 feet would be five stories on a on an office building, for example. So in conclusion. Uh. We think that that that makes more sense as a single-story building for industrial. Thank you.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Is there a...?

SUZANNE GOMEZ

Suzanne, Suzanne Gomez resident. I too would like to take this time to applaud our Planning Department and our consultant for the work that we've done for the Zoning Code. As you can see, what we've come across is that this complex, the different elements that are still, we still have questions when it comes to the Housing Element. And then we just found out tonight that we do not have to have Mixed-use. What are relief, right? So, there's so many questions that are still coming. And one of the things that I just want to affirm is that the residents have

spoken. We have the residents, businesses have... We're pro-business. We're not, not pro-business because we care about our community and because we care about the legacy and the work that you're doing that this work that you're doing tonight, the zoning, the General Plan, the Health Element is going to take precedent the next 25 to 50 years. So, we can't take it lightly. Even if you decide to continue it or pass some things, it's not done yet. And we, we'll take the money. Council will have to come up and give the money for to continue this study because we've only begun to touch the basis of it. So, my main concern though is along with my counterparts and federal residents is that I still want to speak to Chapter 1708, which is Specific Planning Zone and that is... When we look at that one, that speaks to accountability and A,B, and C If you look at that, you're not going to have time tonight because I'm talking really fast because I only have 3 minutes, which we also have to change with the City Council. But anyway, chapter 1708 speaks to specific planning zones, and one of the things that it says is that if there's any element that needs to be clarified, that it's given to the Director of Planning, which I completely respect. However, I don't think that should be the way that we go. I think that we should change the Zoning Code to reflect that specific plans have to be first come to the Commission and/or the City Council, or both. And that we need to change the directions of how the Specific Plans are moving forward. The second thing that I have major concerns on, along with the other things that my fellows have indicated is... If you look on page one. I'm looking at page 100 and 104 in the and agenda item. And what we consistently see is that over and over again, not just when we're speaking to these findings and this recommendation, but CEQA guidelines. Yes, we can comply with CEQA guidelines, but we have known that Irwindale has congestion and pollution. And I think that we can go, we can do what we want within the ramifications of state law, our municipal code and federal law. So therefore, then we can, you can implement standards that we can meet for our community. And I suggest that in the CEQA guidelines, we don't go for the minimum that we access a higher standard for the benefit of our community and our future. Thank you.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you, Miss Gomez. Do we have any further comments?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

On Tier 2 we do.

CHAIR FRYMARK

We do?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

Yes.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Are we moving to Tier 2? I'm not seeing any more for Tier 1. Okay, move on to here two please tier 2.

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

We will move on to Tier 2. I do have a member iPhone.

DENA ZEPEDA

Thank you, Chair. It's Dena Zepeda. First of all, I'd like to thank and congratulate Casey. And thank you for all those questions and concerns because us residents, we have many. And my Commissioners, you are our umbrella, you are our voice and we want everything to come to you. We want everything to come to you before anything is planned as in our past, we've always been overlooked. We have always been overruled by our planning department and I'm going to say it straight out because it's happening again. Again, they're not listening to what we're asking. Again, no, we're not going higher. And you're going to bring in more people, more people. No, we don't need it. We are a small community, a residential small community, and we're getting choked. And I thank you, Commissioners, for listening to us and letting us continue and continue to get it right. I agree with Mr. Barbosa, if you're going to do anything over there by the racetrack, make it happen over there, right there over there, just one or whatever, you know. But we already saw the plan there and any no 60-70 foot high thing, we don't want that. You're choking us, claustrophobic. It is getting awful. We have so many empty spaces right now, so many empty. You go around, drive around, see how many you need to fill. Let's fill those first and we'll be okay. We don't want to get choked up anymore. Our ER, I mean EIR. Ohh, come on, we're not going to let that go by. And if you notice, they keep bringing the same thing back over and over. Why aren't we being heard? Why aren't the residents being heard? Please stop choking us. Stop putting this over our head. 60 feet, you know, 75 feet more space. You're going to look beautiful. Like, no, we don't want to look like Pasadena. We don't want to look like, you know, all those other places. We don't wanna be competing with City of Industry. We are losing many. For what's already going on. Like Miss Gomez says, let's be a little stricker. Let put our standards up higher. And if you want to be in Irwindale and it's so nice, then you will, you will oblige by what we say or what we want. Come on. Come on down. Come on down, don't, don't sit there and try to make our city pollute us more. But we, we brought a lot of, you know, things to the attention of our Council, of our Commissioners and it just, you know, keeps getting taken away from us or being looked over. And that's not what we're here for. That's not where we want, we want to come to some kind of decision, especially for the housing. And I want to thank you guys. First of all, my Commissioners, I want to thank you. I haven't been to a couple of meetings, but I thank all of you because you have been on it, you have been on it and your concerns are the residents. But I felt I had to speak tonight because there were outsiders coming in

not knowing what we're going through. And I just want to remind you, thank you.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Thank you, Mr. Zapeda. Is there anyone else on Tier 2?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

It does not look like we have anybody else.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Is there anybody in Tier 3 that didn't speak before under Tier 1 that would like to speak about this item in the Public Hearing. Seeing none. Anybody again in Tier 3?

ADMINISTRATIVE
SECRETARY
HERNANDEZ

No one in our Zoom audience.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Perfect, okay. Well, thank you. So at this time, we'll go ahead and close the public hearing of this item. And we will have a discussion.

CLOSE PUBLIC
HEARING

There being no speakers, Chair Frymark closed the Public Hearing at 8:02 p.m.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Before we start engaging in this very important conversation, I want to just put a couple things out there for us to consider. First, the decisions that we are making here today or are considering making here today, do have a significant impact on not only our residents but also our business community. And so the task at hand is not an easy task. It's one that is complicated and is one that is multi layered. So, there's a lot to think through. It's important for us to address all of the concerns from not only our residents, but also the business community, we have, you know, families here. So I want us to engage in this conversation with having like actionable items to be able to bring forward, whether that be in the form of recommendations that will go back to the City Council or whether that would be recommendations to Staff, so that we don't continue to go into this loop of just back and forth. It would be nice to be able to move forward, whether that be with additional recommendations for consideration or some significant changes. And so with that that is all I have to say before we start this conversation. Is there any members of the Commission that would like to speak?

COMMISSIONER
ACOSTA

I would like some clarification. For Staff, on the height. The maximum heights proposed for the M1, M2 for example. The heights that are listed there and that are proposed, obviously we are still going to determine what we propose, but does that height include the parapet or can the maximum height be exceeded with the parapet?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

The heights that are proposed are for the building heights. Parapets are architectural features and will be above that.

DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

COMMISSIONER
ACOSTA

Okay.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER
RODRIGUEZ

As I have spoken about earlier, there is a large portion of the map that is proposed that has M2 Zoning. A lot of that M2 zoning is close to our Town Center. So, there are concerns regarding the maximum height level being at 65 feet. Is this something that we can decrease to 40 feet and when a business comes forward and request additional, then it comes back to the Commission at a later date? This would be for Staff.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

Again, those are the maximum heights that were proposed and it's in the Planning Commissions discretion to make a recommendation to go lower than that. If somebody should come in and ask, you know, for something higher, they would be requesting a variance. And there's particular findings that we would have to make as Staff, you know, for that. We couldn't make it if it was just self-imposed in there. There would have to be some unusual reason, you know, or something, you know, a geographic reason or something that we could make that finding for that. But part of this is not what is coming to the Planning Commission, and then to the City Council. It's not changing all the M2 Zoning. That's something that the City Council, you know, should direct Staff to do at a future date. We heard it to remove it near the Town Center area, you know, that's something that if they direct Staff to do that. Then M2 that is more on the west side, where it's not close to residential, that would make sense. And then again, depending on what's recommend tonight and moves forward. Again, the Zoning Code will be amended from time to time, and that may be something that gets amended in the future.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

To expand on that, at this time for us to select a maximum height, we don't have to have findings, do we? I just want to make sure.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

Not at this time.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

No, it's our discretion.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR

Yes.

SIMPSON

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

It's only if there's an appeal or public whatever.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

Yes.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

Or a request for a CUP whatever. Okay, that is all I wanted to make sure. Oh Marilyn, I have another question. Is it possible to separate the adoption of this Zoning Code and the adoption of the Zoning Map, so that we only do one of the two?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

I am looking to legal for that.

ASSISTANT
CITY ATTORNEY
TRAXLER

I would say that if you are going to adopt the Zoning Code, you should, and I would recommend adopting the Zoning Map because the Zoning Map, if you leave as is, will be inconsistent with the Zoning Code. And you want to number 1, ensure consistency, but also, number 2, I believe the proposed Zoning Code is eliminating certain zones. And so we would want to reflect that within the updated Zoning Map.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

Okay. But this is a new code with new specifications, if you will. And these specifications have been imposed on this Zoning Map that we're supposed to adopt. Who or how was it done to superimpose this new Zoning Code on this new Zoning Map? Who selected the areas? The old Zoning Map was obviously very different. Obviously. How was that done?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

I hope I am going to answer your question.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

I hope I asked it correctly.

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

I know, but I want to make sure I understand it. The text is changing in the Zoning Code. And some of that text change would affect the Zoning Map, like A1 to R1 or combining the zone. So, we don't have CM which is basically M1, so eliminating that. So, the text will dictate the development standards in that zone. So, whatever the map, you know, if the map has M1, it would be whatever decisions you make about the development standards for M1.

- VICE-CHAIR CHICO If we in fact are forced to do that and adopt the Zoning Map, would it not be a good idea to step back and give us time to review a change to the Zoning Map, that would adhere to our preferences rather than just superimpose the new Zoning Code. In other words, If we're going to adopt a new Zoning Map, I would like to step back and study because I would like to make some changes. They would adhere to the new Zoning Code, yes.
- COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON Okay, are you talking about changing different zoning designations on that map?
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO Rezoning different areas.
- COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON Oh, okay. That would be a different project, to rezone. If you want to bring... For example, are you talking about rezoning M2 to something else?
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO Correct.
- COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON Okay, that that's something that hasn't been studied with this and that would be a different project. That would be something, again, that taking that on... It can be a recommendation that you give to the City Council, but it would be the City Council, who would have to tell us and designate what do they want to rezone it to. Whether it's rezoning, let's say M2 to Commercial of some sort.
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO We seem to end up, nobody's fault, doing different things at different times. The General Plan was adopted in 2020 I believe, and here we are having to adopt a brand new Zoning Code to adhere to the General Plan. It would seem to me it should have been done at the same time. Nobody's fault, just the way things happen. But here we go with the with the Zoning Map. Now we're going to do this and then later on, go review this or change the Zoning Map. Why can't we do it all at once? I know we have a deadline, but I agree with whoever said, it's not important. The money is not that important. This is a permanent... This is a permanent situation that we're adopting here, so that the thing about the deadline is not important to me. Should we not be doing it all at one time?
- COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON That's a policy decision that would be for the City Council to make.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Could you remind me just for the sake of clarity, what is the grant amount?

COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR
SIMPSON

It was \$160,000.

CHAIR FRYMARK

So maybe because it sounds like, and please correct me if I'm wrong fellow commissioners, that there are things that are currently in the Zoning Code update that we're not necessarily comfortable with moving forward. And so I think that, in order for us to move forward, it may be a good idea for us to unpack what those things are and make recommendations so that those updates can potentially be made and then we can go come back out of future meeting, review the changes that were made to the Zoning Code, and then at that point make a recommendation to move to the City Council for approval. Okay. So then let's start off with C1. C1 is neighborhood commercial. It is currently. Oops that is setbacks give me a second. Okay. So C1, we start off, if we're looking at the packet of information that we received, page 7 in our packet. Thank you, City Staff for putting it together. I really appreciated the minutes those were fun to read and listen to. C1, maximum height is currently set in the Zoning Code as presented at 40 feet. Are we comfortable with a 40-foot height maximum for C1? If we are comfortable then that would mean no changes for C1, the maximum height would stay at 40 feet. And looking at the corresponding Zoning Map for C1, we do have... Let me see here. A small section of C1... Can we pull up C1, thank you. C1 is like that very light salmon color. Where did it go? So, we do have some areas under C1. Currently it is proposed at 40 feet. Did we have a different recommendation?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

Regarding the height?

CHAIR FRYMARK

Regarding the height, yes.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

And there's no residential in that area at all? Right?

CHAIR FRYMARK

In looking at the map, and Staff please let me know is it close to residential? Is see C2 being close to some residential, but I don't see it very close to residential, no.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

No. Generally, in those areas that it is not, it can go higher in those areas.

CHAIR FRYMARK

I think what we're hearing tonight is the residents don't want heights that are, 1. really, really high and close to their area, 2. developments that are going to bring in additional pollutants.

COMMISSIONER

Correct.

MIRANDA

CHAIR FRYMARK

At least that's what I'm hearing. So, if we're looking at C1 and it's not close to any residential, the proposed height maximum is 40 feet. Are we comfortable with that number?

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

I've heard 35 from residents, but 40 in that area I think would be okay.

CHAIR FRYMARK

I mean it's not... Between 35 to 40 is not a big difference. I'm trying to also keep in mind our business sector, and the need to continue to look at revenue sources so that we can continue to fund the programs the residents are so... And I don't mean that in a negative way, but that makes the City who we are. So, 40 feet, we're going to leave it as is, is what I'm hearing.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

Yes.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Okay. So let's move on to C2. So, no recommendations for C1. We're moving on. C2 is the pinkish color. It is somewhat close to residential. It abuts M1 or currently what is categorized as M1. It's on Arrow Highway. If we can bring up that map just for a visual. Thank you, Nick. No, we're looking for more the Zoning Map, that proposed Zoning Map with the different colors, yes. Thank you. So we're looking at C2, we're looking at the salmon color. It is close to M1 and it's also close to M2. It's on the Arrow Highway Street. Right now, the maximum height is also 40 feet. Mind you, it is somewhat close to the Civic Area. And we do have some businesses that are already there. Is that where the bank is at you guys, Staff?

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

It's where the bank and also the clinic is in that area, the Wendy's and all that stuff.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Okay, so currently in the Zoning Code it is proposed at 40 feet.

COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA

I would think it'd be too high for the residents where they're at for their viewpoint on that area.

NICK PERGAKES

If I may, I think it was proposed at 50, but we discussed bringing it down to 40 at that February meeting, so. But actually, today the C2 Zone allows for maximum height of 45.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Currently it allows for 45 feet. I'm just looking at page seven of the Staff Report. It shows in blue text that it's 40. So that's a proposed figure? Okay. So currently it's at 45. We're proposing it at 40 and that's where it's currently proposed at. Okay. So, are we comfortable with keeping it

as proposed, which is 40 feet in the C2? That's on Arrow Highway... Staff, can you tell us which businesses are there currently?

SENIOR PLANNER JONES Some of the businesses that are on Arrow Highway, so the bank building is at the southwest corner. There is vacated the Diaz Liquor, the clinic, Wendy's, the former Carl's Junior, the Trammell Crow Development, the gas station, the mini storage, the Fire Department.

CHAIR FRYMARK What is the height of the clinic? I'm assuming it's under 45 feet because it is currently 40.

SENIOR PLANNER JONES It's a single-story building.

CHAIR FRYMARK Okay. So C2 then. Thank you, Brandi. C2, it's being proposed at 40. Are we comfortable with leaving it as is? That would bring it down from what's existing at 45, it'll bring it down to 40.

COMMISSIONER MIRANDA We're lowering it, but the only current project could be the Daiz property. It's vacant.

CHAIR FRYMARK Right.

COMMISSIONER MIRANDA So the residents who live behind there, how they feel about going 45, we haven't has that height yet.

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY HERNANDEZ Commissioner Miranda.

COMMISSIONER MIRANDA Sorry, sorry about that. The residents who live there now, have we asked them to speak about that because it blocks their view. If you look down at the other places like on Ayon, before my grandma was still around, that building went up without any... She lost her view over here on Allen Drive and those buildings went up, that project... I'm sure people were not happy about it. So, I think we should ask them about that before we even say yes to a 40. Even though it's 45 already and we're lowering it, and we want to say yes to next project but I'm not sure if we're ready to go forward with that.

CHAIR FRYMARK It is unclear whether or not they provided any feedback. I know that the Planning Department has asked on multiple occasions by way of survey to provide feedback, but...

COMMISSIONER MIRANDA It was a poor, poor return, I saw it.

CHAIR FRYMARK There was some return, but yeah...

COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Nine people.
CHAIR FRYMARK	But yeah, we welcome more feedback for sure.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Brandi, what's the definition of ceiling height? The floor?
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	Of the ceiling height? It is typically like to the finish floor to top height.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Heights floor. Then there's the parapet wall, whatever, above that.
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	Parapet.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	So 40 would yield 45, 46, 47.
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	It could.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yes.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So C2, I believe, Commissioner Miranda, you were asking for Staff to survey residents in that area.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Please, yes. I think they would be happy with that.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Great example of the Zoning Map problem.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Yes.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Yeah, yeah. Absolutely. Fellow Commissioners, do you guys have any additional feedback?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I would like to see that at 35, myself.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Guys, 35?
COMMISSIONER ACOSTA	I am concern that is a little low. I'm comfortable with the 40. We still have to get businesses to be interested in that size.
CHAIR FRYMARK	And it could be a marketable property, piece of real estate. I miss Diaz Liquor and the Clearly Canadians right there. Fond memories. But I see your point.
COMMISSIONER	In general, he's correct. I agree with Commissioner Acosta it is too low,

MIRANDA	but not in that area because it is residential, too close. I think that the designation could work other places. I would like to go even higher, but not to where it's at.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Then I go back to the Zoning Map issue.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Correct. Vice-Chair, I totally agree with you.
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	My concerns would also be regarding C1. If we are looking at heights of 40 at C1, is that something where we could lower that height for C2 to 35?
CHAIR FRYMARK	What would be the staff impact? Would it be possible for the Staff to ask some of those residents if they would have any concerns with the height being at 40 feet?
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	We've had multiple community meetings and we've noticed the public. So they've had the opportunity to come in over the last... Well, we've been working on this for four years, but over the last at least 18 months we've had a lot of public outreach.
CHAIR FRYMARK	We recognize the outreach, and we appreciate the survey, and the resurveying of the residents. But specifically to this location, we're just... Maybe we can do it one more time, but specifically asking them not like a full a full whole city query...
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Door knocking.
CHAIR FRYMARK	But maybe a good old fashioned door knock, hey it's your friendly Planning Department.
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	I am not door knocking. I am Sorry.
CHAIR FRYMARK	I don't know if it is a reach. It is just an ask. How many residents are we talking about that live there? I think it's like four houses.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Probably four or five, yeah. But, you know, if it is one, it is worth it.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Yes, please. Quickly, please.
CARMEN ROMAN	Okay. Thank you. There are residents there, and already the view... It's a great location for businesses, but you're taking away the view of the dam, the mountains around us to look at a building and that's the tragedy here.

CHAIR FRYMARK	Luckily, even if it's between 35 to 40 feet, it's still not so high that it would obstruct too, too much. You would still see our beautiful San Gabriel Mountains...
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	And that would be, sorry 20 feet? No. Proposed away from the...
CHAIR FRYMARK	Setback?
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Yes, setback.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So the setback we haven't talked about. I believe in the C2 area, which is the current zone we're looking at, existing front setback is 10 feet, we're proposing 20 feet. Existing rear is 20 feet, but it's being proposed at 10 feet or 20 feet if it's next to a residential area, which in this case it would be for that particular parcel that we're talking about. The sides are currently it's 5 feet. And then 20 feet if an abutting a residential zone. We are proposing 10 feet. Or it was proposed 10 feet, but we went back and proposed 20 feet if it's abutting a residential zone. So, I mean there's a buffer.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	A buffer.
CHAIR FRYMARK	We are talking about a difference of five feet really. I'm comfortable with 40 feet, but I hear our fellow Commissioners that there's a difference in thought there. I'm also not opposed to going down to 35 for the sake of the residents in that particular area, and it seems like it would be consistent with the existing buildings that are already there. Do we want to make a formal recommendation to bring it down to 35 or are we going to continue...
COMMISSIONER ACOSTA	Which one are we talking about? C2?
CHAIR FRYMARK	The same one, C2?
COMMISSIONER ACOSTA	C2, okay.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Do we do it in a motion form?
CHAIR FRYMARK	Well, right now we're just making recommendations. I don't know if we're actually proposing a motion at this point.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Yeah, recommendations.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER	At this point, you would just need consensus of the Planning Commission.
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	I would be comfortable with recommending the 35 feet.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON	For both C1 and C2?
CHAIR FRYMARK	So for C1 we said 40.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON	Okay.
CHAIR FRYMARK	For C2, is where we are having this conversation.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON	Okay.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So we're hearing mostly.... I mean, if we're good, I'll vote...
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	I've heard from residents 35 is the most...
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I recommend 35, because it is going to end 40 plus.
COMMISSIONER ACOSTA	We're looking to set the guidelines, right? This is the Zoning Codes. So, any individual project that comes to us, we're still going to be able to approve and set the rules for.
CHAIR FRYMARK	If they want to build something in C2 that is currently zoned with the maximum height of, let's say it's approved at 35, then yeah they would need to come back, and correct me Staff if I'm wrong, if they would like a height that's higher than that.
COMMISSIONER ACOSTA	But even if we were to set it at 40 and when they brought in the project, we could tell them we want to limit a little bit less or we didn't want that specific one in that area to be as high.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Or are we stuck there?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	It doesn't work in reverse.

CHAIR FRYMARK	It doesn't work in reverse?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	No, It doesn't work. If you say it's 35 and their building complies, they don't have to come to us. They don't have to come to us.
COMMISSIONER ACOSTA	So if it's if our guidelines are lower, then they have to have apply for the variance?
CHAIR FRYMARK	If they want something higher.
COMMISSIONER ACOSTA	If they want something higher.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Is that correct Marilyn?
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON	So 35 feet in C1 is also reasonable and that's pretty typical.. So if you're looking at keeping C1 and C2 the same?
CHAIR FRYMARK	We weren't necessarily, I mean we were looking at C1 from a different lens because it wasn't close to residential. C2, it is closer to residential, which is why we are looking to consider bringing it down. But thank you for making that clarification. So C2. 35 feet, are we comfortable with that? Okay. So, I think we're all in alignment that's C2 we're recommending 35 feet. Do we need to have a conversation about setbacks? For C2 General Commercial.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	What do you think? That's going to be just so the viewpoints like the back of their house or they can see the mountains still the damn, will that be enough, sufficient 20 feet.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Existing, it's 10 feet right now.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	We're improving it.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So we're actually creating more of a distance. What I am concerned about is are we setting setbacks that are going to make it unreasonable for somebody to come in and want to build on that lot.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	That's what I mean it's like it's in a bad situation. It go back to the Zoning, the Vice Chair and said the Zoning situation, it's maybe shouldn't be zoned for that.
CHAIR FRYMARK	We already have businesses that are there.

COMMISSIONER MIRANDA CHAIR FRYMARK	They're all lower, they're all existing. And spaced out appropriately. True. So, you're suggesting a recommendation to rezone that to something different?
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Possibly? What do you suggest?
CHAIR FRYMARK	What zone would you like to see there? What is this regarding?
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Alright, C1 is the lowest, right? That's lowest but.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I am not seeing much difference for setbacks.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Conundrum we have, I mean if someone comes with business, we want business in, we had some business there already that Wendy's and we have the clinic and it worked out. So, we could have said the way it is and then and then this comes in, we can address it then.
CHAIR FRYMARK	It seems though, that if we were to want to make a recommendation to shift a zone from C2, as proposed to C1 that would be recommendation that goes back to Council.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Yeah, looks like it.
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	It would be a totally separate process from this, it would be a Zone Change.
CHAIR FRYMARK	And what does that process look like?
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	For example, if this is the city-initiated Zone Change, there's an application. We prepare the report do the Public Notice everything. It comes to the Planning Commission first for recommendation to the City Council to adopt the zone, change for a specific location.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Could there then be multiple zone changes included in that application. And the reason I'm asking is because the 10 acres on Allen is currently in the proposed map zone as M2, we know that there's going to be residential there. So why not clean that up now, if we're going to go through that process and request the Council to rezone it as R1.
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	Yeah, you can do multiple parcels, which is preferred versus just spot zoning of one parcel. Also, for the 10 acres, we are waiting for the City Council to tell us which acres they want to be zoned for residential. So, we're waiting for them.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Thank you. Okay, so we're still kind of stuck on C2.

COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	That's something to consider as well. So, we're talking about possibly rezoning that parcel to C1, but we just recommended a height level 40. So maybe we should reconsider that and have the height levels for C1 and C2 be at 35.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Then if they need more... A variance, we can approve that. Could you hear me?
CHAIR FRYMARK	I mean, yeah, we can, we can talk about that. So we're saying...
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	On the map...
CHAIR FRYMARK	C1 maximum height be 35 and C2 maximum height be 35. So that there's consistency.
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	That is correct.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Question, as we go through these and we're going through it as we are now, and once we get to a resolution, are we able to approve this and still go back to that general and go to council, have them suggest these changes we want to see? In the zoning...
CHAIR FRYMARK	I believe that would be a Jamie question.
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER	So if I understand your question correctly, it's approve the Zoning Code as proposed with further recommendations to the City Council, right?
COMM MIRANDA	Yes.
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TRAXLER	That is what is currently being proposed under the new resolutions. Let me pull up the numbers for you. Resolution numbers 828 and 829. 828 is the recommendation for the Zoning Code itself, 829 is the recommendation for the Zoning Map. So, if you look at the resolution itself which is Exhibit C1 in the Agenda Packet. And in that resolution, it's Section 4 recommendations. It includes the seven previous Planning Commission's recommendations. And then there is an eighth intentionally blank space for additional recommendations as directed by the Planning Commission. But I will say that the Planning Commission can also amend, revoke, or modify any of the previous recommendations as well.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Thank you.

- CHAIR FRYMARK Would it also, Jamie, be an option to not move forward on adopting or making a recommendation to the Council. To approve even with the amendments and just continue to ask Staff to make the changes that we're proposing today and then at a later meeting, see those changes in the packet and then take action at that time.
- ASSISTANT
CITY ATTORNEY
TRAXLER Yes, that is an option as well.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Thank you. So, I believe we're on C... So staff I believe we talked about and fellow Commissioners, please correct me if I'm wrong. The last I heard was making a change so that for the sake of consistency, both C1 and C2 have maximum height of 35 feet. So that is that will be our recommendation for change for C1 and C2. Let's move on to C3. Currently C3 Zone has an existing Max height of 45 feet. It's proposed at 60 feet. We discussed at a previous Planning Commission reducing that down to 50 feet. If we're looking at the Zoning Map, we will see that there are some areas that are currently C3 that are close to residential. This is also the zone that there was a lot of conversation about because of the Commercial Mixed-use Zone. We did learn today that there is not necessarily a need from a legal perspective to have C3 in our Zoning Code. So we it sounds like we have a couple of options.
- ASSISTANT
CITY ATTORNEY
TRAXLER Chair, if I may... I don't think that that's exactly accurate and Nick probably knows at this point better than I, but I do believe that Mixed-use, which is C3 in the City's Zoning Code is designated in the City's General Plan, which would make a C3 Zone or some kind of Mixed-use Zone necessary.
- NICK PERGAKES I can't recall if the General Plan. It does say Mixed-use for C3. I mean... Well, let me say this. C3 is an existing zone. It implements the Town Center designation of your General Plan. It's already in place. We're not proposing a new C3 district. It's already there in your existing code and it has a purpose. Now what's negotiable I think is whether you want to allow vertical or horizontal mixed-use to occur. A commercial building can go in C3 now. A residential building can go in C3 now. We're just proposing that you can do them together on the same property. So it's, I think it's up to you, Jamie if that sounds correct, that they can decide on that.
- ASSISTANT
CITY ATTORNEY
TRAXLER That is correct, yeah.
- COMMISSIONER
MIRANDA I was hearing from residents they don't want that at all, Mixed-use.

CHAIR FRYMARK	But it sounds like it's in the General Plan and we need to have it.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	You're using the terminology mixed and that's what we're trying to eliminate. If we or someone decides that they want residential on this particular C3 property, fine, or a business on this one but not together.
NICK PERGAKES	Okay, a standalone. Okay. So, I mean that is your decision if you want to do it we're just kind of keep it the same as is we're, you know, it's not vertical mixed-use or horizontal. It can't be done on the same property. You want to just have it commercial on a C3 or residential on a C3, it's up to you.
CHAIR FRYMARK	If that is the recommendation of the Commission, Nick, would we have to then redefine what Mixed-use is in the Zoning Code?
NICK PERGAKES	We would just take out... I believe your Housing Element is going in that direction of... So there are programs and policies and it does talk about Zoning Code changes in the Housing Element to direct changes, future changes, but we're just anticipating those changes now and making that. But if today you say you don't want the Mixed-use then we would just take out any reference to that, yes.
CHAIR FRYMARK	On one hand, I mean Mixed-use could be an opportunity to address two needs. One, have a commercial need, which we know that we need for revenue streams and two, create additional residential opportunities for the families that we have currently living in our community. So in full transparency, this C3 Zone gives me pause because of the reasons I just outlined.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Currently this whole area is where Ayutla is at, that market area, correct? The whole...
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	As well as what we spoke about earlier Diaz Liquor. That is also C3 so if we were allow this to continue and there was horizontal or vertical in that area, that would also cause problem with height.
CHAIR FRYMARK	C3 is the salmon. I mean, C3 is the red color.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	That's the red. So actually, that where the Jack...
CHAIR FRYMARK	I don't know if that is where Ayutla is at. It is the Jack in the Box and it's those houses right there. And then it's... Oh is that the car wash, that little red dot.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Ohh, yeah, you're correct.
CHAIR FRYMARK	That's the car wash, right?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	Correct. And there's a vacant lot next door,
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Correct.
CHAIR FRYMARK	And then we have a couple more on the other side of Arrow.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Interesting it's designated next to each other and difference. This goes back to the General Plan.
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	Then it would be the tire shop as well.
CHAIR FRYMARK	That's what that is right there, the tire shop? Okay, and then we also have on our westside, a small area of C3.
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	I believe, and this would be for Staff. On the westside where it's C3, that was something that we discussed at another meeting, and it was rezoned to our R1. Is that correct?
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	Which parcels?
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	The C3 designated C3 on the West side.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	It's Mountain and Meridian.
SENIOR PLANNER JONES	Yes, that's already been adopted by the City Council, so that'll be changed to R1 along with the Ruelas and Citrus View.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	It seems to me that based on where the red dots are, the location of the C3 that we would limit the height on that one also. There is no need. I don't see any need to have a 50-foot height. In fact I don't see any need to have any more than 35 feet there.
COMMISSIONER MIRANDA	Not near our Civic Center. No, you're right. Not right there.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Not right there. I mean there were specific areas where it is located.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So if it stays, because it's required as part of our General Plan, then we would consider bringing it down from... It's currently... So the last time we talked about it, we had made a recommendation to reduce it to 50. So is the recommendation to bring it down more.

COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	35 feet.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yeah, bring it down to 35, given were it is located.
CHAIR FRYMARK	To make it consistent because of the location.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yes.
COMMISSIONER RODRIGUEZ	As well as the recommendation to be either residential or commercial.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Not both.
COMM MIRANDA	Right.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Commissioner Acosta, are you comfortable with that?
COMM ACOSTA	I am comfortable with that yes, I agree with it.
CHAIR FRYMARK	OK. So I believe Staff that the recommendation for C3 is to reduce the height from the proposed 60, and then 50, but not to 35. And to not allow for mixed-use, but rather single standalone, either residential or commercial occupancies in those areas. What was that?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Or is the big word.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Or in capital letters. OK. So we have C1-C2-C3. This is exciting. We're making progress, guys. Yes, very good. Okay, let's move on to M1 and M2. Does that sound good? OK, so if we're looking at, let's start off with, if it's OK with everyone to start off with M1. Currently it's proposed at a. So the existing height maximum is 35 feet. We proposed 50 feet. And if we're looking at the zoning code map, we'll see that M1 is not ..there's one small area that yes is close to residential so that is you know that area next to kind of the civic area um. And then we have the other M1 that is on more of the West side of the city. Um. It's currently a max height that's proposed at 50 feet. Are we comfortable with leaving it as is?
COMM MIRANDA	We currently have buildings already down that strip right there.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Do we know the height of the spectrum building by any chance?
COMM MIRANDA	Chair Frymark, the unique thing about this chitlins area is that it's sunken in. Those buildings are very high, but it's deliberately done that way it's sunken in.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Be careful.

CHAIR FRYMARK Ohh, so in... This was a a sheet that was provided by staff and it has pictures of some of the existing businesses. So there's one business that's currently on 5027 Irwindale Ave. which is that business center area across from or on Irwindale Ave. is zoned M1 and the height there is 22 feet. Just for like visuals? It's a single story Business, it's not very high. Do you guys have this? 20-22 feet. You wanna pass it to Commissioner...? Business Center.

COMM MIRANDA Ohh yeah.

AD SEC HERNANDEZ Just to know on the record Commissioner... Vice Chair Chico has stepped out.

CHAIR FRYMARK Should we actually take a 5 minute recess? You like? To go with that.

AD SEC HERNANDEZ OK.

CHAIR FRYMARK Yeah. So let's just take a quick five minute recess and we'll come back and continue discussing M1. Thank you.

5-MINUTE RECESS

CHAIR FRYMARK The residential area, M1... I think we are talking about the heights. We have not got to setbacks yet. Can we pull that slide back up, that talks about the existing heights? Thank you.

So existing is 35 feet in the M1 area. I mean, we have some pretty beautiful buildings. That are currently zoned in M1 at 35 feet. This one to the right is 37, but we're proposing it. Or it's currently not we it's currently being proposed at 50 feet. Um, from a personal perspective, I am not comfortable with that height next to the residential area, but if it's on the West side of town where there's not a lot of residents, not opposed to it, thoughts?

COMM ACOSTA I would be comfortable with the Max height of 40 feet.

CHAIR FRYMARK OK 40 feet M1. Any other recommendations?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO You have 40 feet that would end up in 46-47. Don't forget that. I would rather see again 35 and then end up 40. Or you can make it 30 shakes feet as a chart showed us. It ends up in 42-43. And when we're looking at here is 37 feet, nice looking. Ohh I would say like make it 36 AND let's use their number.

CHAIR FRYMARK Are these two-story dwellings or two-story businesses.?

COMM MIRANDA Single story, single warehouses look like. So currently we have we talked about single. 36 feet. Currently we have the spectrum on the street. Everything else is down below correct.

CHAIR FRYMARK	Um. We have the spectrum. We have, I think, Edison. There. We have the...businesses that shall not be named publicly.
COMM MIRANDA	Those are ground level and they sunk down a little bit for the parking lot, just a little bit, and that helps the height for the height. And they ARE set back pretty good. So I think we're good there, I mean far as height wise.
CHAIR FRYMARK	But as in...
COMM MIRANDA	In 40 or 35. I think 40 is reasonable.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yeah, I think.
COMM ACOSTA	Comfortable with 40 feet.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Comfortable with 40. OK. So M1, I believe it sounds like we are comfortable with recommending that that be changed from proposed Max height of 50 to 40 feet. Can we talk about setbacks in that area because it is adjacent to residential, I want to make sure we touch on that. So the setback for M1 current? Ohh. Actually before I move on to setbacks, what about the West side M1? Do we want to make it any different? How can it differ? Or does it have to all be the same?
SP JONES	Affect all the M1 in the whole city.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	They can come for a CUP.
COMM MIRANDA	Yeah.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Gonna keep us busy.
SP JONES	A CUP or a zoning variance?
COMM MIRANDA	Variance!
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	They have it available.
CHAIR FRYMARK	OK, so the setbacks are currently proposed... Existing is on the front, side is none. And we're proposing 20 feet. OK.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Looking at M1 correct? OK. And it says existing front none 25 feet if abutting residential area; that 25 feet is from where to where? Is it from the street curb to the building or is it from the residential property line to the building?

SP JONES	All roads, all setbacks are measured from the property line to the building. So we don't measure from the curve, we don't measure from the center line of the street, it's from the property line.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Um. If there's a street in between.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Starts with the property line, right?
NICK	It doesn't matter.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Residential property line to the building.
NICK	Ohh no. The property line of the commercial of the property. Yeah it's always confusing property.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Thank you very much for clarification.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So we proposed or it is proposed at 20 feet. And then 30 feet if abutting residential. For M1 light industrial do we wanna keep it as?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	They're proposing 20 to 30 feet residential, that's good, I think.
COMM ACOSTA	On the slide that you just put up is what's the distance of that?
CHAIR FRYMARK	Red.
COMM ACOSTA	Red. It the slide that's up right now, what's the distance as far as feet in the red? This.
CDD SIMPSON	It said thirty feet.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So, but I'm seeing that... So currently if it's approved in that way, there's going to be some areas or some businesses that are in that area that are going to be not conforming at that point.
CDD SIMPSON	That's correct.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	A lot of that. We eventually are going to have a lot of that.
CDD SIMPSON	They'd be considered legal nonconforming.
CHAIR FRYMARK	No ramifications. Nothing.
CDD SIMPSON	They can continue to operate as is, just like think new routine repair and maintenance. But they could not intensify the use or not intensify or expand the building. And then if they demoed it and came in, they'd have to meet these new development standards.

- CHAIR FRYMARK Um. So do we want to make any changes to the surface? Or leave it as proposed.
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO Proposed.
- COMM MIRANDA The rears is none but it says it can't be 15 in the abutting commercial. You're.
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO It's in the back.
- COMM MIRANDA OK, Yeah.
- CHAIR FRYMARK OK. So for M1, we'll leave the our recommendation will be to leave the setbacks as proposed in the M1 zone. Two zone. This is our heavy industrial and this is what a lot of our proposed zoning map is made of. There's a lot of M2 in the city. Currently. M 2, what is the height? Thank you. This is a the setbacks could we put. Thank you. OK. So the existing Max height, there's no limit on the existing, but we're from it's being proposed at 65 feet, the Kaiser that the big beautiful Kaiser building is 60 feet. And this is this is the Home Depot. The Home Depot is 50. Just for context. We do have some M2 near some residential. Yeah. Both the civic area and then also on the West side, but what we zone 1 applies to all. So that's something we should consider. Especially because our city does have room for development, room for growth, room to bring in new businesses. And you wanna keep that in perspective.
- COMM MIRANDA The interesting thing for our general plan actually because in zoning because there's areas we want to bring businesses as they spoke about today having these big areas and you know we are big business, even our residential small where we are, we want those big business to come in. But when they're next to residential, we don't want them large and they spoke loud and clear they don't want that. Um, so. I think we need to designate these areas, some areas different. You know, where it's away from residential, then yes, it's still high. You know, let's get them some room, invite businesses in and it's delicate situation for you know, taking care of our priorities, our residents, but also being inviting to our businesses.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Jamie, is there a way to to do that?
- ACA TRAXLER Today, no um. But you could make a recommendation to the City Council to consider potential zone changes.
- CHAIR FRYMARK So we would potentially need to rezone... Some of the areas that. Are currently at M2 to maybe a different designation. So that and two can be zoned higher.

- ACA TRAXLER Ohh it is possible. Um, but it would just be for the Planning Commission, a recommendation to the City Council for the City Council to consider, and then ultimately the City Council would determine whether or not that was something that they wanted to go forward with.
- COMM MIRANDA Have fun because of me looking at the forefathers right there on our wall and what this totally goes against what they want for the residents right here. But outside they want to be business. They wanted the mind. We wanted to take care of the residents right here. We're at a conundrum. Because we want to go big. We can't go big here. What would be our options?
- CHAIR FRYMARK It sounded like based on... Comments that we just received that we would just make a recommendation for a rezoning of those particular areas. And then it would be up to the city council's discretion to vote whether or not to allow for such a rezoning to happen.
- COMM MIRANDA OK. So in that case, let's just make a decision, the ones based, the ones that are away from residential from the height and then we'll make a recommendation and we'll go from there. Is that idea?
- CHAIR FRYMARK I I love the idea. I love the concept. Ultimately, it would be up to the council to approve such change. It does feel like it's still the spirit of our of our founding fathers. And speaks to the need that, the residents so clearly articulated. Um. While also taking into consideration the desire to continue to grow and to be good partners with our business community.
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO However, for the meantime notwithstanding zone change process. I am looking at a picture here the Home Home Depot. At 50 feet. I would suggest that we change the 65 to 50 feet. In the meantime, keep the. Specification on the conservative side. With the Council, if they want change, to change it. It's my thought.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Vice Chair, if I may, just for clarity purposes, are you saying for M2 change the proposed 60 feet, sorry, 65 feet to 50 feet? For now. And then kind of tackle all the rezoning later.
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO Yes, exactly. Us or whoever, the council table, whomever us or them tackle the rezoning. But you see the Home Depot building, very attractive, very spacious. It looks like it serves a purpose.
- CHAIR FRYMARK Are there thoughts on M2 in terms of the height? We have a option on the table which is to raise. Recommend 50.
- COMM ACOSTA I agree with God, Commissioner Chico regarding the 50 feet and then recommend to the City Council of possible change in rezoning to the M2 that is near the Town Center to M1.

- COMM MIRANDA We had some Realtors speak earlier about development bringing businesses and and they were speaking directly to having those higher for them to be more attractive and to be it's a beautiful building. Can we perhaps... you still here? Comment from her. Um. Is that sufficient? I think Mr. Redford, still here, is gone to. Hello, question for you is is 50 feet sufficient?
- REXFORD My comment is this on my comment would be that if you're concerned about the height next to residential you don't have to change the zone you can just have the development standards say that the height be lower if it's closer to reside adjacent to financial in some zones. So you could do that for height as well. Uh. Loaded question for you is is 50 feet sufficient? My comment is this on my comment would be that if you're concerned about the height next to residential, you don't have to change the zone. You could just have the development standards say that the height be lower if it's closer to adjacent to residential. Or and or increase the setback if it's in adjacent to residential which you're already doing that you have a different standard percent backs adjacent to residential in some zones. So you could do that for height as well. I would say that M2 is is appropriate to be higher than 50 feet as you can see because if they're not in adjacent to residential. Thank you.
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO Appreciate it. I understand that. You know 60 or 65 feet is more attractive. My concern is that I would rather have it. Stated in our code at 50 feet and if you have a customer, builder, developer wants to come in, they can come in for a variance that that's the way I prefer to do business so that we get to review the plans.
- REXFORD And the problem, it's very difficult to approve variances because of the findings. So if there was a different method like a conditional use permit to allow additional height. You still have the discretion to say yes or no. A conditional use permit would be better than a variance.
- VICE-CHAIR CHICO And we know that if we put additional height, no it not doesn't necessarily come before us.
- REXFORD I'm saying if you want to propose that you could, but the variance would be very, It's very difficult. People wouldn't take that uncertainty. Developers wouldn't come to you for a variance because it's too uncertain. Pardon. It's an additional step, right on additional step and it's very uncertain because no guarantee of approval. On that we don't. We're not asking for guarantee because the CUP is still discretionary, but at least you could look at all the factors involved on a case by case basis where the property is, that's what the CUP would be.
- CHAIR FRYMARK First, city staff, what is the why? Why is it a variant? Versus the CUP in making a change. Thank you. Thank you for being here and staying here. Your feedback.

CDD SIMPSON

The CUP is for the use itself, so a variance would be. Well, if they were trying to do a variance in the use, let's call it, that is unchanged. Two, you would change the. The zoning designation to include a particular use, OK, so but variances have specific findings that we have to make that there is something that is unique about that property that if the decision makers did not grant it, that means that they wouldn't have parity. Where they wouldn't be equal to someone else who is in their similar situation. So variances are usually, if you get, I don't know, like setbacks and things, you know, for if you had a triangular parcel, you know, irregularly shaped, you know, that would be something that OK, you know, they have a legal parcel. They wanna build, but you know, because of something you have a pinch point or something that they wouldn't make your typical setback, you know, that would be something that we would look at, you know, and see, you know. OK, well, if they want to maximize the use of their property, but they couldn't. Without a variance. So. That if I can go back to the first thing and this gentleman actually, you know, had stated it that it is within, you know, the planning commissions discretion to make a recommendation to put it into the development standard, you know, if you want to reduce the height in an M2 zone, if it's abutting the residential zone property, you can do that the same way that you're having different standards, you know, for setbacks as well. So. So the ones you know, the properties, you know over Home Depot, you know Kaiser now there is a residential next to it. So that height could be different than let's say property because we have quite a bit of property that's M2 that on the north side of Arrow. Or on Vincent, you know over there. So that's within your discretion to make that recommendation.

CHAIR FRYMARK

Sounds like that could be a possible solution to what we're discussing.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO

Let me say this. The City Council referred this matter to us because of many issues. I interpreted... interpreted their message to be that they wanted things to be on the conservative side regarding setbacks, regarding height and so forth. That's the position I'm taking. Toward this item and other items, and you're welcome to bring it to the City Council and say, well, they did this, but we are trying to talk them out of it. Let the City Council change. But I interpreted their feeling that they wanted things on the conservative side. That's why it's back here again. They didn't like the first.

CHAIR FRYMARK

They also didn't give any specific recommendations as to what they would like to see changed, right. M2. It sounds like we're kind of at an interesting point. We either make a recommendation to bring it down to I believe, Christ Church you said you were comfortable with your option, so that's what I'm hearing on the table as an option. Or another option is to add in the design standard, Development Standard. That if it's abutting residential that is not to exceed X height. Is that correct? Any thoughts on either of those two options?

COMM MIRANDA	I like the second one below the standard abutting, it's a good way to eliminate going too high, 50 but 50 where it needs to be and then we're able to attract businesses when it's far away from residential.
COMM RODRIGUEZ	Leaning more towards Commissioner Chico with a 50 feet. Capping that high level at that.
COMM ACOSTA	Split it. I'm actually thinking going with the proposed size of 65 unless it's abutting residential area then capping it.
CHAIR FRYMARK	That's the third option. So you're suggesting if I'm? Just iterate 65 feet maximum height. The question of if it is a abutting a residential area then in the development standard it be. Reduced to 50. What would you like to see after 50?
COMM RODRIGUEZ	For the M2.
CHAIR FRYMARK	My thought on this is. To make a recommendation to reduce the height. To 60 or actually to... Keep it at 60 feet. No, the maximum height is currently 65, so keep it at 60 feet. And in the Development standard. Indicate that if it's at residential, bring it down to 50 feet for up to. So I'm kind of in the middle.
COMM MIRANDA	Um, you know with that 16?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I'm going to accept it.
COMM RODRIGUEZ	Now we do that so, but in the residential area. What's the distance? It isn't even decided yet.
CHAIR FRYMARK	That abiding is the way I'm interpreting about it? Please stop. For clarity purposes that were on the main same page, it's any parcel property line that is next to or adjacent to a residential area.
CDD SIMPSON	That's correct.
COMM RODRIGUEZ	How could we put in terms of 500 feet from residential area?
CHAIR FRYMARK	Parking or what are you?
COMM RODRIGUEZ	Well, I'm more I'm more thinking about the M2 that's across the street from Arrow Highway.
CHAIR FRYMARK	OK.
COMM MIRANDA	So that's not a budding residential.
COMM RODRIGUEZ	Ohh, I see what you mean.

COMM MIRANDA Ohh.

COMM RODRIGUEZ But it's still near that civic area.

COMM MIRANDA Civic area as well include?

CHAIR FRYMARK Well, I believe what Commissioner Rodriguez is looking at in particular is this M2 zone, although it's not right next to residential, it is in that civic area. And so if we were to make the recommendation to make M2... We said 60 feet with the exception of if it's a budding or residential, it wouldn't apply there, but it's still close to that civic area. Which is where you're putting in that caveat to add a 500 foot buffer.

COMM MIRANDA That's a good caveat.

CHAIR FRYMARK Staff, any thoughts on that?

CDD SIMPSON Can you repeat?

CHAIR FRYMARK Yeah. So the part, the area in question is the M2 zone that is on Arrow Highway on the north side of Arrow Highway. That is near the civic area, so if we were to zone that earth not zone, it's already zoned to M2. But if we were to make a recommendation that. The height in those in that area not exceed 60 feet. The design... the developmental standard for residential wouldn't necessarily apply there because it's not right next to a residential area.

CDD SIMPSON That's correct.

CHAIR FRYMARK So what Commissioner Rodriguez is proposing is that for that particular area that we include a 500 foot condition so that we are making sure that if that M2 area is within 500 feet of a residential area that then it would not exceed 50 feet around M2. So. Yeah.

CDD SIMPSON So a 500 foot buffer from residential?

CHAIR FRYMARK If it's not abutting because it's either abutting or because in this area, can we pull up the zone map again? So I believe what Commissioner Rodriguez what you're referring to is this M2 area right next to M1 on Arrow Highway. OK, so it's this is the existing map, but if we look at the proposed map. Thank you. Um, this M2 area on Arrow Highway. Right. Yeah, right there. Right. Right, right there. Yeah, right there. So it's right next. It's right next to the civic area. It's not next to residential, so that area essentially would be... would go all the way up to potentially 60.

CDD SIMPSON So the town center area it's that's a designation and the general plan so the 500 foot buffer for...

CHAIR FRYMARK Area next to the civic.

CDD SIMPSON OK well yeah i think we can do that

CHAIR FRYMARK Yeah because it's close to residential but it's not next to and the property to make the condition that. In the development standard that it is, if it's next to a residential area, then if you reduce to 50 feet, it wouldn't apply there.

CDD SIMPSON OK, that's correct. Yeah.

CHAIR FRYMARK So try to catch that proactively. If I replace or, that makes sense.

CDD SIMPSON You're going to put our map maker to work on that, so to provide that buffer, yeah.

CHAIR FRYMARK So what?

COMM MIRANDA It would alleviate the whole viewpoint, you know. No, that's great... good catch Commissioner Rodriguez.

CHAIR FRYMARK Let me try to summarize all that. They're making me work today. Already had a full workday. So, for the area in M2, it sounds like we are recommending as a Commission to reduce the height from currently 65 to 60. However, in the design standard of the developmental standard, we would like to add that if it is abutting residential the maximum height may not exceed 50 feet in M2. We would also like to add. That we would also like to add a 500 foot buffer in the M2 zone. That is near the civic area. And in that area maximum height should not exceed 50 feet. Get that? So we covered all of the Cs, M1 and M2. Do we have any other recommendations? That we would like to propose.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Did you want to look at setbacks for M2? Setbacks for M2?

CHAIR FRYMARK Sure, let's do that. So setbacks for M2?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Regarding the building heights. Business Park. So they have 65 feet. Are we leaving that? Any problem? That we make sure.

CHAIR FRYMARK In the Business Park area. What?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Recommended 65, right? Or the code has 65?

CHAIR FRYMARK Yeah, tell me what page you're looking at.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO I'm looking at a code page 43.

CHAIR FRYMARK	Ohh in the...
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yes.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Ohh. So long as we're not seeing any issues with it, I don't see any reason to bring it down, right.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I mean, I just want to make sure the Commissioners are aware of it. Fine.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Yeah, OK. Then let's go to the M2. Setbacks. I don't believe we had any conversation or finalization on that.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Question? Arterials... We discussed that briefly. What is the setback on Arrow Highway? Corner of Arrow Highway and Irwindale Ave. The frontage on Irwindale Ave. What does that set back? The existing buildings are all the way across Buildings across.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Would that be the area like where the jack-in-the-box, the white buildings with the pictures? Oh, oh, oh, wait, I didn't we look at that one time.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yeah, we did. Briefly. Because I would like to say, I would like to see whatever that is being these specification for major arterial. I know. First thing I'm going to hear is going to make a lot of businesses nonconforming. So be it.
COMM MIRANDA	So. It's at 5200 Irwindale Ave. Right?
AD SEC HERNANDEZ	It's the one right there you see on the picture across the street.
COMM MIRANDA	Yeah, you can see the corner of it.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Ohh yeah.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I don't... we came up with an answer occupancy right because they were fifty around 50. I'm around 50 and we at least like it around 50.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So for the M2 zone, the set back and that's for you're talking about in all major arterial.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yeah, major. There's only what, four or five of them? I think we were told of Arrow Hwy. Irwindale Ave. I forget what the others are... Live Oak.
CHAIR FRYMARK	First, setbacks are adjacent to the major arterial.
NICK	OK, well I will double check the zoning code, I think today you have none, although that's not probably a good idea. So we proposed 20

feet. I mean, to have more than that, that would, that's quite a lot to ask for more of a front setback.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO That's what we have now. We don't want to make those businesses nonconformity, right?

NICK Well, but, but some might want to be up to 20 feet, they might want to be a little closer to the to the street, I'm not sure.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Why can't we have what we have now is it's consistent all the way across Irwindale Ave.

NICK I would have to look at that corner. I I don't, I'm sorry, I don't... that does... that really look 50 feet from the from the property line? It might be that building up at the corner.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Easy. Yeah, I think so. That one time is 70, but yeah, 50 sounds reasonable.

CHAIR FRYMARK Are you thinking keeping that only in the area of Civic Center that way?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Well, it says major arteries. Yeah. It's only the four or five streets.

COMM MIRANDA Yeah, yeah.

CHAIR FRYMARK M2 for sure. Alright, thanks.

ENGINEER PIMENTEL Good evening, Chair. Commissioners, right now will we know the major arterials that we have are Arrow Highway, Irwindale, Foothill, Live Oak. Sorry, try to think of hand. Yeah, Irwindale, Arrow, Live Oak and Foothill. If I'm not mistaken. Yeah.

COMM MIRANDA On Foothill, do we have any interest of having the business going there now do we know if they are developing there on Foothill the big parcel?

ENGINEER PIMENTEL Um. I'm not too sure they're

CHAIR FRYMARK It's the Reliance II Specific Plan is, isn't it?

COMM MIRANDA Oh that's right yeah.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Anyway I would like to see 50 feet. If that is in fact what it is know.

CHAIR FRYMARK What is it currently in the plan?

VICE-CHAIR CHICO They are requesting here 35 feet.

CHAIR FRYMARK Do our fellow Commissioners have any thoughts on making that recommendation for that change.

COMM MIRANDA	I am curious, for Nick. Is there a reason for opposition to that to have some business who want 20 feet or?
CHAIR FRYMARK	I think it just reduces the amount of development space, right?
NICK	We don't have a front setback for that part. If you did want to do it along an arterial street I understand, because cars are going faster, there's more traffic, you want more of a setback, but it's an M2 zone. I don't know. I mean Marilyn, you would know better the traffic moving in the City.
CDD SIMPSON	I am happy to defer back to engineering on this.
ENGINEER PIMENTEL	Good evening again. So on a lot of our main arterials, I know we do have a 45 mile speed limit except for in the Civic Center area, I believe that's 35 for Irwindale, but the rest of it is either 40 or 45 miles an hour. So speed is kind of higher on those areas and it is heavy traffic because it is our main arterials through the through the city.
COMM RODRIGUEZ	Can confirm that that is a 50 foot setback?
ENGINEER PIMENTEL	On Google Maps right now. I was seeing that down that... You're talking about that northeast corner, correct?
COMM RODRIGUEZ	Correct.
ENGINEER PIMENTEL	From Arrow Highway, roughly the property line to the building, it is about 50 feet from when I measured it on Google Maps. Give or take. That's what I'm saying. It's approximate. You would literally have to go out and measure it.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	And I believe it's the same thing on the other side of the street across from Diaz Liquor, orwhatever you want to call it.
ENGINEER PIMENTEL	I would have to look into that...
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	That is close, close enough. They have a lot of space.
CHAIR FRYMARK	I don't see that being... luckily most of those areas are already built out right?
COMM MIRANDA	Yeah, correct.
CHAIR FRYMARK	That's something to consider. It is pretty congested in those major arterial highways. And it sounds like we already have a precedent with that building being at 50. Having a 50 foot set back. We will have a. New development. So if arrow is one of the major arterial we have, was it Athens coming in right there? I don't know what.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO There are doing the recycling.

CHAIR FRYMARK That's already done. So, are we comfortable with making that recommendation? So, it sounds like we have a proposed recommendation for discussion. It is a 50 foot setback along all of the City's major arterial. Brandi.

SP JONES For example, if we're looking at this intersection, we would have the 50 foot along the major arterial, we would have the 500 foot buffer from the Town Center, and then we would have the regular base zone setbacks for M2. So which one would take precedent?

COMM MIRANDA Hmm, that is interesting.

CHAIR FRYMARK If we already have...

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Good question, you guys wrote it.

SP JONES We did not write that.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO Who wrote it?

SP JONES We just wrote the simple setback. One number.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO I understand that. But all this... Somebody submitted this to us and you say it is conflicting, it is.

SP JONES I am basing it on what you just proposed.

CHAIR FRYMARK We are proposing some of these changes, so it is creating some conflicts in somethings. Okay, so if on Arrow Highway we're proposing a 50-foot setback that will conflict with the 500 foot Development Standard that we added in that Civic Area for M2. So, it is like we can't have it both ways. At least not on Arrow. But Irwindale Avenue, Foothill and Live Oak, we could.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO And Foothill, don't forget Foothill.

CHAIR FRYMARK Yeah, we can do it on Irwindale Ave, Foothill, and Live Oak. But we would be conflicting. Maybe we don't apply that arterial to Arrow because of that 500 for buffer.

VICE-CHAIR CHICO (Inaudible)

CHAIR FRYMARK I mean the both kind of speak to two different things. One is speaking to the height and then the other one is speaking to...

VICE-CHAIR CHICO We can we just take the greater of the two and that location?

COMM MIRANDA	Yeah, is that possible.
CHAIR FRYMARK	The greater of the two?
COMM MIRANDA	Whatever is the need. Is it height because of the view point for the resident or is it just we want it back.
CHAIR FRYMARK	I mean it seems like the most feedback that we've been getting is about the height from our residents. So maybe that takes president if we have to choose.
COMM RODRIGUEZ	I agree.
CHAIR FRYMARK	So it sounds like we're talking about the maybe the arterial... Set back applying to Irwindale Ave, Foothill, and Live Oak only. So that we can continue to limit the height next to that Civic Area on Arrow. Is that what we're saying?
COMM MIRANDA	I think so. Will that work Brandi? Will that work?
SP JONES	Well, this intersection would still be impacted because Arrow is running through. And also take into consideration when that buffer is done. Like the buffer could only touch maybe one portion of the parcel. The remaining portion of the parcel could just be the regular based zone set back or it could be the arterial setback. Each layer that's added creates more complications for interpretation.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	So then the question is, if we leave it at 35 feet, does that solve the problem?
SP JONES	Leave it at 35?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Yeah, the setback at 35. Does that solved the problem or is it still conflicting?
SP JONES	Well if we have one setback for all M2. That's what we're concerned about, setbacks, yeah. Then I don't know if that would be an issue, but where's the 35? Is that just somewhere in the middle?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I don't know because it says the front setback major arterial 35 and it covers all the Industrial Zones.
SP JONES	What page is that.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	43.
SP JONES	Back to 35 from the 20 from last time.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	I'm sorry, say that again.

SP JONES	So it appears that we went from 35 to 20. So, you want to go back to 35?
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	It's 35 on here. No, just no. It just says 35.
SP JONES	So we will leave it 35. 35 is what you are saying.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	Will that work?
SP JONES	It will work, I guess, but if you're going to also have that buffer, you still have to...
CHAIR FRYMARK	The issue is still there.
SP JONES	It is the overlap. So you would just let it need to let us know which one?
CHAIR FRYMARK	So that we can maintain the integrity of that buffer because it's close to the residence in that Civic Area. Then maybe the 35 feet that's being proposed as a setback wouldn't apply to Arrow Highway, would only apply to Irwindale Ave, Foothill, and Live Oak.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	If that is the case leave it at 50, if it is not going to apply to Arrow Highway.
CHAIR FRYMARK	It would still kind of leave us at same situation. Unless we take away...
COMM MIRANDA	Will we propose the height closer to residence 500 feet, right? It was close enough.
CHAIR FRYMARK	That was the buffer, the 500 feet was the buffer in that M2 Zone, near the Civic Area by the Residential Area. So essentially if we were to remove that buffer condition, then that M2 area could be zoned up to I believe we said 50 feet.
COMM RODRIGUEZ	I believe that buffer needs to be in place because a 60 foot building could potentially be like you were speaking about earlier, 70 feet, 75 feet on Arrow Highway, across the street from, you know, the car wash, the residents, the park. And I feel that's too large of a building in this area.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Maybe that has to take priority over the major arterial desire to move the set back to 50. So leave the buffer at 500 feet and not make any changes?
COMM RODRIGUEZ	Is there any proposed development in this area?
SP JONES	Yes.

COMM MIRANDA	There is no solution at all like possibly keeping that buffer at the 500 somehow and keeping our 50 feet on the Arterial on Arrow Highway. Can we think of a solution.
VICE-CHAIR CHICO	The overlap, that makes a difference.
SP JONES	I mean, if there's the properties that have both. So, which one do we use? Do we use the one that's more strict?
CHAIR FRYMARK	I would say lean on the one that's most conservative.
COMM MIRANDA	Can we identify that area in particular?
CHAIR FRYMARK	There's properties already there right now. It's actually... We just can't see them on the map, but it's these parcels, these structures that are right here on arrow next to the building that we determined is at 50 feet.
COMM MIRANDA	Correct. Can we be specific in the parcels in that sense, so we know what we're dealing with. Is that possible? Staff. Brandi is it possible to be specific by parcels on having that 500 feet.
SP JONES	It may be possible. But for example, if we do it by parcel and if there's a subdivision done or a parcel number changes then technically, that parcel is no longer the same one that was called out.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Maybe we don't make a recommendation for M2. Sorry, make a recommendation for the arterial now, until we kind of continue to think about it. Because I don't know if you guys are wanting to... I guess the question is for the Commissioners, are we wanting to make the recommendations for all the different recommendations that we made for C1 through C3, plus M1 and M2 with the height and the setbacks that we proposed, and ask Staff to make those recommended changes to the Zoning Code and then bring it back to the Commission to review and then take action at our next Commissioners meeting.
COMM MIRANDA	I think we have some questions and I think we can maybe take some time to meet with Staff actually and go find some solutions in the meantime as well.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Brandi?
SP JONES	So what we can do for the next meeting or actually maybe even before that, we can provide a visual of the Town Center area that might be more helpful.
CHAIR FRYMARK	Yeah.

COMM MIRANDA
CHAIR FRYMARK

Yeah, that would be great. Thank you.
So maybe for now, because it is getting late and as great as this discussion is, maybe we move forward with the recommendations that we propose tonight, ask staff to prepare the document with the recommendations that the Commission presented tonight and then come back, either reach out to us, let us know when you have some visuals for us to review, and then we can think through possible solutions so that at our next Planning Commissioner meeting, we could hopefully be at a place where we can take action to make a formal recommendation to the City Council.

ACA TRAXLER

That sounds like a motion to me.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS/
PRESENTATIONS**

**COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR REPORT**

**LEGAL COUNSEL
COMMENTS**

**COMMISSIONER
COMMENTS**

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Maricela Frymark, Planning Commission Chair

Attest:

Jesus Hernandez, Administrative Secretary



**CITY OF IRWINDALE
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION



Date: August 21, 2024 **Agenda Item No. 4-B**

To: Honorable Chair and Members of the Planning Commission

From: Eddie Chan, City Engineer
Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Community Development Director

Project Planners: Community Development and Engineering Staff

Project: Prioritization Clause Amendments

Applicant: City of Irwindale, Vulcan Materials Co., and Martin Marietta

Project Location(s): Hanson Quarry, 13550 Live Oak Avenue, Irwindale, CA; Durbin Quarry 13000 Los Angeles Street, Irwindale, CA; and Reliance I Quarry 15990 Foothill Boulevard, Irwindale, CA

Staff Recommendation: That the Planning Commission consider the following:

-
- 1) Adopt Resolution No. 830(24), a resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement by and between the City of Irwindale and Martin Marietta Southern California Aggregates, LLC for the Hanson Quarry;

AND

- 2) Adopt Resolution No. 831(24), a resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement by and between the City of Irwindale and Calmat Co., D.B.A. Vulcan Materials Company, Western Division for the Durbin Quarry;

AND

- 3) Adopt Resolution No. 832(24), a resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement by and between the City of

Irwindale and Calmat Co., D.B.A. Vulcan Materials Company, Western Division for the
Reliance I Quarry

SUMMARY

Each of the Amendments is proposed to remove the “Prioritization of Fill” schedule which was established to facilitate an organized and systematic approach to filling the various pits throughout the City of Irwindale to ensure that sufficient fill material could be dedicated to each site for timely completion of the pits, rather than a piecemeal approach without a cohesive strategy such that the pits would not consistently receive sufficient fill material and therefore, would take much longer to complete. Since the implementation of the prioritization schedule, various pits in the City of Irwindale have successfully been filled and are now in the process of development. As a result, the need for the prioritization schedule is no longer required as there is now sufficient fill material to fill the remaining pits without the necessity of the structured prioritization approach. Accordingly, the proposed amendments would terminate the requirement for prioritization of commercial filling activities.

BACKGROUND/HISTORY

The Irwindale Reclamation Authority (“Authority”), a joint powers authority, was established under a joint power agreement between the City of Irwindale and the Irwindale Redevelopment Agency. The primary functions of the Authority are:

1. To govern the reclamation of mining quarries to ensure compliance with State Mining and Geology Board Reclamation Regulations.
2. To provide a financial assurances mechanism under the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (“SMARA”) that allows the Authority to offset reclamation costs by a pledge of revenues in calculating financial assurances.
3. To receive and reassign, for the purposes of complying with SMARA, the operating rights from each of the mining company participants to the Authority.

Due to the constraints imposed by the Redevelopment Dissolution Bill (AB 1X 26 and AB 1484) on the future activities of joint power authorities, the Successor Agency of the Irwindale Redevelopment Agency transferred its membership interests in the Irwindale Reclamation Authority to the City’s Industrial Development Authority. This move was made to ensure continued compliance with state law.

As part of the Irwindale Reclamation Authority's oversight, the City and Reclamation Authority entered into various agreements with the mining operators throughout Irwindale in order to create a prioritization fill schedule. Each agreement included specific language concerning the prioritization of filling activities related to operating a Commercial Inert Landfill in the following order: United Quarry 1 (also known as Nu-Way Arrow Pit), followed by United Quarry 2. However, the City retained the authority to suspend the commencement of reclamation activities at United Quarry 2 and may authorize Hanson Quarry to operate a Commercial Inert Landfill after the completion of reclamation activities at United Quarry 1.

The City of Irwindale entered into Development Agreements with United Rock Products, Vulcan Materials, and Martin Marietta (Hanson) which contained language establishing the prioritization fill schedule, identifying the Priority Quarry, with the ability to operate a Commercial Inert Landfill for a certain period of time, to the exclusion of other operators.

Since the establishment of the prioritization fill schedule in 2004, the reclamation of the following pits/quarries has been completed, and they are now in the process of development:

1. United Quarry 1 (AKA Nu-Way Arrow Pit/The Park @ Live Oak)
2. Vulcan Reliance II Quarry
3. Nu-Way Live Oak Pit (AKA Gateway Pit)

The successful completion of filling these pits/quarries has resulted in an ample supply of fill materials in Irwindale, sufficient to support more than one Priority Quarry simultaneously. Consequently, it has been determined that the prioritization schedule is no longer necessary.

On March 11, 2020, the City Council/Board of the Reclamation Authority authorized and directed staff to initiate discussions with the mining operators to terminate the Prioritization Schedule of filling activities for a Commercial Inert Landfill.

Staff negotiated, and the City Attorney's Office prepared, the proposed Amendments to the Development Agreements. Each mining operator has executed the proposed amendments, in agreement with their terms. The agreements shall be recorded with the Los Angeles County Registrar/Recorder.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

Section 65868 of the California Government Code authorizes a development agreement to be amended, in whole or in part, by mutual consent of the parties to the agreement or their successors in interest pursuant to sections 65867-65867.5 of the California Government Code. Prior to approval of an amendment to a development agreement, the Planning Commission must hold a noticed public hearing and provide a recommendation to the City Council. (Gov. Code § 65867.) The provisions of the amendment to a

development agreement must be found to be consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plan.

Hanson Quarry

Hanson Quarry is identified in the City's General Plan as an active quarry. There is no applicable specific plan for the site. Upon completion of mining activities, the City's General Plan contemplates that because many of the pits are located in close proximity to freeways, these areas are subject to intense development pressure due to the scarcity of developable land. As a result, the General Plan has designated a number of these pits, including Hanson, as Commercial, Recreational, and Light Industrial, to capitalize on these factors as a means to generate revenue for the City and serve the regional population.

The removal of the priority schedule will facilitate the ultimate development of Hanson. Thus, the proposed Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the City's General Plan and is intended to encourage the highest and best use for Hanson into an eventual Recreational, Commercial, and Light Industrial development.

Durbin Quarry

The Durbin Quarry is identified in the City's General Plan as an active quarry. There is no applicable specific plan for the site. Upon completion of mining activities, the City's General Plan contemplates that because many of the pits are located in close proximity to freeways, these areas are subject to intense development pressure due to the scarcity of developable land. As a result, the General Plan has designated a number of these pits, including the Durbin Quarry, as "Regional Commercial" to capitalize on these factors as a means to generate revenue for the City and serve the regional population.

The purpose of the proposed Amendment No. 1 is to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities. The removal of the priority schedule will facilitate the ultimate development of the Durbin Quarry. Thus, the proposed Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the City's General Plan and is intended to encourage the highest and best use for the Durbin Quarry into an eventual Regional Commercial development.

Reliance I

Reliance I is identified in the City's General Plan as an active mining operation. There is no applicable specific plan for the site. Upon completion of mining activities, the City's General Plan contemplates that because many of the pits are located in close proximity to freeways, these areas are subject to intense development pressure due to the scarcity of developable land. As a result, the General Plan has designated a number of these pits, including Reliance I, as Industrial and Commercial to capitalize on these factors as a means to generate revenue for the City and serve the regional population.

The purpose of the proposed Amendment No. 2 is to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities. The removal of the priority schedule will facilitate the ultimate development of Reliance I. Thus, the proposed Amendment No. 2 is consistent with the City's General Plan and is intended to encourage the highest and best use for Reliance I into an eventual Industrial Commercial development.

PUBLIC NOTICE

A notice of public hearing on the proposed amendments was given in accordance with section 65867 of the Government Code and published in a newspaper of general circulation, the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, on August 9, 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the projects and has determined that the filling of the pits have already been analyzed in the previously Certified EIR's prepared for the projects (SCH# 2003011084), (SCH #2006051107) and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the proposed amendments are consistent with the previously certified EIRs. Therefore, no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the amendments.

CONCLUSION

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

1. Adopt Resolution No. 830(34), entitled "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 04-05 BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND MARTIN MARIETTA SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AGGREGATES, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, FORMERLY HANSON AGGREGATES WEST, INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, AND A WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARY OF MARTIN MARIETTA MATERIALS, INC.; LOCATED AT 13550 LIVE OAK AVENUE; IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA"
2. Adopt Resolution No. 831(24), entitled "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 01-06 FOR DURBIN QUARRY BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND CALMAT CO., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION; LOCATED AT 13000 LOS ANGELES STREET, IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA"
3. Adopt Resolution No. 832(24), entitled "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY

COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 02-06 FOR RELIANCE I QUARRY AND RELIANCE II LANDFILL BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND CALMAT CO., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION; LOCATED AT 15990 FOOTHILL BOULEVARD, IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA”

ATTACHMENTS

- Exhibit A: Resolution No. 830(24) with attendant Exhibit
- Exhibit B: Resolution No. 831(24) with attendant Exhibit
- Exhibit C: Resolution No. 832(24) with attendant Exhibit

EXHIBIT "A"**RESOLUTION NO. 830(24)**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 04-05 BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND MARTIN MARIETTA SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AGGREGATES, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, FORMERLY HANSON AGGREGATES WEST, INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, AND A WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARY OF MARTIN MARIETTA MATERIALS, INC.; LOCATED AT 13550 LIVE OAK AVENUE; IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA.

A. RECITALS.

- (i) On January 3, 2006, the City of Irwindale ("City") and Hanson Aggregates West, Inc., now Martin Marietta Southern California Aggregates, LLC ("Martin Marietta"), entered into an agreement entitled "Development Agreement" ("Agreement") to govern the development of parcels identified in Exhibit A of the Agreement described as: (1) Plant Parcel; (2) Reclamation Parcel; (3) Green Parcel; (4) Peck Parcel; (5) Southwest Corner Parcel; and (6) Lake Parcel (collectively referred to as "Hanson"); and
- (ii) In Sections 2.7 and 11.4 of the Agreement, entitled "Commercial Filling Operations" and "Reclamation Incentives/Penalties," respectively, the City and Martin Marietta agreed to a prioritization system to fill pits that have been mined and are ready for reclamation. Those various pits in the City have successfully been filled and are now in the process of development; and
- (iii) As a result of the successful completion of filling various pits, the need for the prioritization schedule and the City's fill program is no longer required as there is now sufficient fill material to complete the filling of the remaining pits without the necessity of the structured prioritization approach; and
- (iv) Martin Marietta has made a request to amend the Agreement to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities, triggering the application of post-priority provisions in the Agreement, and update the Agreement to reflect the change in corporate status ("Amendment No. 1"); and
- (v) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the development agreement has been considered in the Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2003011084) prepared for the development project in the Agreement, and the proposed approval of the Amendment No. 2 is consistent with the analysis contained therein; and

- (vi) Sections 65868 of the California Government Code authorizes a development agreement to be amended, in whole or in part, by mutual consent of the parties to the agreement or their successors in interest pursuant to sections 65867-65867.5 of the California Government Code; and
- (vii) On August 21, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, closed said hearing, and adopted this resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement.
- (viii) All legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

B. RESOLUTION.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby found, determined and resolved by the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale as follows:

1. **Recitals.** The Planning Commission hereby specifically finds that all of the facts set forth in Recitals, Part A, of this Resolution are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference.

2. **Findings.** Based upon substantial evidence and testimony taken from the record as a whole, and received at the public hearing, both oral and written, including the staff report, and all attachments thereto, all of which shall constitute the entire record of the matter, the Planning Commission hereby finds this Planning Commission hereby specifically finds as follows:

a. The proposed Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, its purposes and applicable Specific Plan(s).

Hanson is identified in the City's General Plan as an active quarry. There is no applicable specific plan for the site. Upon completion of mining activities, the City's General Plan contemplates that because many of the pits are located in close proximity to freeways, these areas are subject to intense development pressure due to the scarcity of developable land. As a result, the General Plan has designated a number of these pits, including Hanson, as Commercial, Recreational, and Light Industrial, to capitalize on these factors as a means to generate revenue for the City and serve the regional population.

In order to facilitate the orderly filling and ultimate development of the mining pits within the City, the City and the mining operators agreed to a priority schedule within which certain operators would have the sole right to fill their respective pit or

quarry with commercial filling activities in order to ensure timely completion of the filling of each site, rather than a piecemealed approach. Since that time, several pits and quarries have been successfully filled and the City and operators have determined that there is an ample supply of fill materials in Irwindale, sufficient to support more than one commercial fill operation simultaneously. Consequently, it has been determined that the prioritization schedule is no longer necessary. The purpose of the proposed Amendment No. 1 is to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities. The removal of the priority schedule will facilitate the ultimate development of Hanson. Thus, the proposed Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the City's General Plan and is intended to encourage the highest and best use for Hanson into an eventual Recreational, Commercial, and Light Industrial development.

3. **CEQA Findings.** Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project and has determined that the filling of the pits has already been analyzed in the previously Certified EIR prepared for the project (SCH# 2003011084) and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the proposed Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the previously certified EIR. Therefore, no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Amendment.

4. **Recommendation.** On the basis of these findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt an Ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement as set forth in Exhibit "A."

5. **Certification.** The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall certify the adoption of this Resolution, and a copy shall be transmitted to the City Council.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 21st day of August 2024.

Maricela Frymark, Chair
City of Irwindale Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

I, Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Community Development Director of the City of Irwindale, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular

meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale held on the 21st day of August 2024, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

EXHIBIT "A" TO PC RESOLUTION NO. 830(24)

AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

This **AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT** ("Amendment No. 1") is entered into as of _____ 202_, by and between Martin Marietta Southern California Aggregates, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, formerly Hanson Aggregates West, Inc., a Delaware corporation ("Hanson"), and as of October 1, 2021 a wholly owned subsidiary of Martin Marietta Materials, Inc. ("Martin Marietta"), and the City of Irwindale (the "City"), a California municipal corporation (collectively, the "Parties"), with reference to the following facts:

RECITALS

A. On January 3, 2006, the City and Hanson entered into the agreement entitled "Development Agreement" ("Agreement") to govern the development of parcels identified in Exhibit A in the Agreement described as: (1) Plant Parcel; (2) Reclamation Parcel; (3) Green Parcel; (4) Peck Parcel; (5) Southwest Corner Parcel; and (6) Lake Parcel (collectively the "Site").

B. In Sections 2.7 and 11.4 of the Agreement, which sections are entitled "Commercial Filling Operations" and "Reclamation Incentives/Penalties", respectively, the Parties agreed to a prioritization system to fill pits that have been mined and are ready for reclamation.

C. The intent behind the "Commercial Filling Operations" section was to establish an organized and systematic approach to filling the various pits throughout the City of Irwindale to ensure that sufficient fill material could be dedicated to each site to timely ensure completion thereof rather than have a piecemeal approach without any deadlines or a cohesive strategy such that pits may not consistently receive sufficient fill material and, therefore, could take much longer to complete.

D. Since the Effective Date of the Agreement, various pits in the City of Irwindale have successfully been filled and are now in the process of development.

E. As a result of the successful completion of filling various pits, the need for the prioritization schedule and the City's fill program is no longer required as there is now sufficient fill material to complete the filling of the remaining pits without the necessity of the structured prioritization approach.

F. Section 11.4 of the Agreement, among others, establishes requirements and obligations should the prioritization system be terminated.

G. Accordingly, the Parties now desire to amend the Agreement to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities and trigger the application of post-priority provisions in the Agreement. The Parties also desire to update the Agreement to reflect a change in corporate status.

TERMS

1. Amendments to Agreement. The Agreement is amended as provided herein:

a. Section 2.7 of the Agreement, entitled “Commercial Filling Operations” is hereby amended by adding the following sentence to the end of the current provision:

“As of the date of Amendment No. 1, the priority system described in this Section is hereby dissolved and terminated and, as a result, commercial filling operations are permitted on the Site. The Parties shall thereafter comply with the post-priority requirements and obligations set forth in of the Agreement including, but not limited to, Section 11.4.”

b. Section 1.3 of the Agreement, entitled “Interest and Representation of Hanson”, is hereby amended to include the following new subdivision (k):

(k) Subsequent to the Agreement, Hanson Aggregates West, Inc. was converted to a limited liability company and later changed its name to Hanson Aggregates, LLC, which (i) on October 1, 2021 became a wholly owned subsidiary of Martin Marietta Materials, Inc. and (ii) later changed its name to Martin Marietta Southern California Aggregates, LLC.

c. Section 17.3 of the Agreement, entitled “Notices Demands and Communications Between the Parties”, is hereby amended as follows:

Notices, demands, submission of documents, and communications between City and Hanson shall be given either by personal service, delivery by courier, or by mailing in the United States mail, certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested, addressed to the addresses provided below.

CITY: CITY OF IRWINDALE
5050 North Irwindale Avenue
Irwindale, CA 91706
Telecopier No. (626) 962-4209
Attn: City Manager

A copy to: ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP
1 Park Plaza Suite 1000
Irvine, California, 92614
Phone: (949) 223-1170
E-mail: aguerra@awattorneys.com
Attn: Adrian Guerra, Esq.

DEVELOPER: MARTIN MARIETTA SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AGGREGATES,
LLC
4123 Parklake Avenue
Raleigh, North Carolina, 27612
Attn: General Counsel

A copy to: Martin Marietta Materials, Inc.
 4123 Parklake Avenue
 Raleigh, North Carolina, 27612
 Attn: General Counsel

Martin Marietta Materials, Inc.
Irwindale Plant
13350 Live Oak Avenue
Irwindale, California 91706
Attn: Plant Manager

2. Continuing Effect of Agreement. Except as amended by this Amendment No. 1, all provisions of the Agreement, as amended by Amendment No. 1, shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect. From and after the date of this Amendment, whenever the term "Agreement" appears in the Agreement, it shall mean the Agreement, as amended by Amendment No. 1.

3. Affirmation of Agreement; Warranty Re Absence of Defaults. City and Hanson each ratify and reaffirm each and every one of the respective rights and obligations arising under the Agreement. Each party represents and warrants to the other that there have been no written or oral modifications to the Agreement other than as provided herein. Each party represents and warrants to the other that the Agreement is currently an effective, valid, and binding obligation.

4. Adequate Consideration. The Parties hereto irrevocably stipulate and agree that they have each received adequate and independent consideration for the performance of the obligations they have undertaken pursuant to this Amendment No. 1.

5. Authority. The persons executing this Amendment No. 1 on behalf of the Parties hereto warrant that (i) such party is duly organized and existing, (ii) they are duly authorized to execute and deliver this Amendment No. 1 on behalf of said party, (iii) by so executing this Amendment No. 1, such party is formally bound to the provisions of the Agreement, as amended and (iv) the entering into this Amendment No. 1 does not violate any provision of any other agreement to which said party is bound and should be read and construed in a manner which would not conflict with other agreements or contract amendments entered into or intended to be entered into by the Parties for the purposes referenced in the Recitals above.

[SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Amendment No. 1 on the date and year first-above written.

CITY:

CITY OF IRWINDALE,
a California municipal corporation

_____, Mayor

ATTEST:

Laura M. Nieto, Chief Deputy City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP

Adrian R. Guerra, City Attorney

MARTIN MARIETTA:

MARTIN MARIETTA SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA AGGREGATES, LLC., a
Delaware corporation

By: Albert Lawrence

Name: Abbott Lawrence

Title: West Division President

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

John A. Billan, Assoc. General Counsel

EXHIBIT "B"

RESOLUTION NO. 831(24)

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 01-06 FOR DURBIN QUARRY BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND CALMAT CO., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION; LOCATED AT 13000 LOS ANGELES STREET, IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA.

A. RECITALS.

- (i) On September 24, 2008, the City of Irwindale ("City") and CalMat Co. dba Vulcan Materials Company, Western Division ("Vulcan"), entered into an agreement entitled "Development Agreement for Durbin Quarry" ("Agreement") to govern the development of an active mining quarry known as Durbin Quarry; and
- (ii) In Section 7.2 of the Agreement, entitled "Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill" the City and Vulcan agreed to a prioritization system to fill pits that have been mined and are ready for reclamation. Those various pits in the City have successfully been filled and are now in the process of development; and
- (iii) As a result of the successful completion of filling various pits, the need for the prioritization schedule established in Section 7.2 of the Agreement is no longer required as there is now sufficient fill material to complete the filling of the remaining pits without the necessity of a structured prioritization approach; and
- (iv) Vulcan has made a request to amend the Agreement again to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities ("Amendment No. 1"); and
- (v) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the filling of the pits has been considered in the Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2006051107) prepared for the development project in the Agreement, and the proposed approval of the Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the analysis contained therein; and
- (vi) Sections 65868 of the California Government Code authorizes a development agreement to be amended, in whole or in part, by mutual consent of the parties to the agreement or their successors in interest pursuant to sections 65867-65867.5 of the California Government Code; and

- (vii) On August 21, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, closed said hearing, and adopted this resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement.
- (viii) All legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

B. RESOLUTION.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby found, determined and resolved by the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale as follows:

1. **Recitals.** The Planning Commission hereby specifically finds that all of the facts set forth in Recitals, Part A, of this Resolution are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference.

2. **Findings.** Based upon substantial evidence and testimony taken from the record as a whole, and received at the public hearing, both oral and written, including the staff report, and all attachments thereto, all of which shall constitute the entire record of the matter, the Planning Commission hereby finds this Planning Commission hereby specifically finds as follows:

a. The proposed Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, its purposes and applicable Specific Plan(s).

The Durbin Quarry is identified in the City's General Plan as an active quarry. There is no applicable specific plan for the site. Upon completion of mining activities, the City's General Plan contemplates that because many of the pits are located in close proximity to freeways, these areas are subject to intense development pressure due to the scarcity of developable land. As a result, the General Plan has designated a number of these pits, including the Durbin Quarry, as "Regional Commercial" to capitalize on these factors as a means to generate revenue for the City and serve the regional population.

In order to facilitate the orderly filling and ultimate development of the mining pits within the City, the City and the mining operators agreed to a priority schedule within which certain operators would have the sole right to fill their respective pit or quarry with commercial filling activities in order to ensure timely completion of the filling of each site, rather than a piecemealed approach. Since that time, several pits and quarries have been successfully filled and the City and operators have determined that there is an ample supply of fill materials in Irwindale, sufficient to support more than one commercial fill operation simultaneously. Consequently, it has been determined that the prioritization schedule is no longer necessary. The

purpose of the proposed Amendment No. 1 is to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities. The removal of the priority schedule will facilitate the ultimate development of the Durbin Quarry. Thus, the proposed Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the City's General Plan and is intended to encourage the highest and best use for the Durbin Quarry into an eventual Regional Commercial development.

3. **CEQA Findings.** Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project and has determined that the filling of the pit has already been analyzed in the previously Certified EIR prepared for the project (SCH# 2006051107) and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the proposed Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the previously certified EIRs. Therefore, no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Amendment.

4. **Recommendation.** On the basis of these findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt an ordinance, approving Amendment No. 1 to the Development Agreement as set forth in Exhibit "A."

5. **Certification.** The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall certify the adoption of this Resolution, and a copy shall be transmitted to the City Council.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 21st day of August 2024.

Maricela Frymark, Chair
City of Irwindale Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

I, Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Community Development Director of the City of Irwindale, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale held on the 21st day of August 2024, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

EXHIBIT "A" TO PC RESOLUTION NO. 831(24)

**AMENDMENT NO. 1
TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR DURBIN QUARRY**

This **AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR DURBIN QUARRY ("Amendment No. 1")** is entered into as of July __ 2023, by and between CALMAT CO., a Delaware corporation, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION ("Vulcan") and the City of Irwindale (the "City"), a California municipal corporation (collectively, the "Parties"), with reference to the following facts:

RECITALS

A. On September 24, 2008, the City and Vulcan entered into that agreement entitled "Development Agreement for Durbin Quarry" ("Agreement") to govern the development of an active mining quarry known as Durbin Quarry.

B. In Section 7.2 of the Agreement, which section is entitled "Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill", the Parties agreed to a prioritization system to fill pits that have been mined and are ready for reclamation.

C. The intent behind the "Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill" section was to establish an organized and systematic approach to filling the various pits throughout the City of Irwindale to ensure that sufficient fill material could be dedicated to each site to timely ensure completion thereof rather than have a piecemeal approach without any deadlines or a cohesive strategy such that pits may not consistently receive sufficient fill material and, therefore, could take much longer to complete.

D. Since the Effective Date of the Agreement, various pits in the City of Irwindale have successfully been filled and are now in the process of development.

E. As a result of the successful completion of filling various pits, the need for the prioritization schedule established in Section 7.2 of the Agreement is no longer required as there is now sufficient fill material to complete the filling of the remaining pits without the necessity of the structured prioritization approach.

F. Accordingly, the Parties now desire to terminate Section 7.2 of the Agreement and thereby terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities.

TERMS

1. Amendments to Agreement. The Agreement is amended as provided herein:

a. **Section 7.2 of the Agreement, entitled "Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill", is hereby deleted in its entirety and shall have no further force and effect as of the date of this Amendment No. 1. The Parties have reviewed all agreements and operating entitlements and agree that the deletion of Section 7.2 will have no other impact on entitled operations or approvals and no amendments to the underlying entitlements are required.**

2. Continuing Effect of Agreement. Except as amended by this Amendment No. 1, all provisions of the Agreement, as amended by Amendment Nos. 1, shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect. From and after the date of this Amendment, whenever the term “Agreement” appears in the Agreement, it shall mean the Agreement, as amended by Amendment No. 1.

3. Affirmation of Agreement; Warranty Re Absence of Defaults. City and Vulcan each ratify and reaffirm each and every one of the respective rights and obligations arising under the Agreement. Each party represents and warrants to the other that there have been no written or oral modifications to the Agreement other than as provided herein. Each party represents and warrants to the other that the Agreement is currently an effective, valid, and binding obligation.

4. Adequate Consideration. The Parties hereto irrevocably stipulate and agree that they have each received adequate and independent consideration for the performance of the obligations they have undertaken pursuant to this Amendment No. 1.

5. Authority. The persons executing this Amendment No. 1 on behalf of the Parties hereto warrant that (i) such party is duly organized and existing, (ii) they are duly authorized to execute and deliver this Amendment No. 1 on behalf of said party, (iii) by so executing this Amendment No. 1, such party is formally bound to the provisions of the Agreement, as amended and (iv) the entering into this Amendment No. 1 does not violate any provision of any other agreement to which said party is bound should be read and construed in a manner which would not conflict with other agreements or contract amendments entered into or intended to be entered into by the Parties for the purpose of terminating the fill prioritization system referenced in Recitals B and C above.

[SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Amendment No. 1 on the date and year first-above written.

CITY:

CITY OF IRWINDALE,
a California municipal corporation

_____, Mayor

ATTEST:

Laura M. Nieto, Chief Deputy City Clerk


APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP

Adrian R. Guerra, City Attorney

VULCAN:

CALMAT CO., dba VULCAN
MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN
DIVISION, a Delaware corporation

By: 

Name: *James T. Robinsky*
Title: *President - Western Division*

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Signature

Name, Title

EXHIBIT “C”**RESOLUTION NO. 832(24)**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF IRWINDALE RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 02-06 FOR RELIANCE I QUARRY AND RELIANCE II LANDFILL BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF IRWINDALE AND CALMAT CO., A DELAWARE CORPORATION, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION; LOCATED AT 15990 FOOTHILL BOULEVARD, IRWINDALE, CALIFORNIA.

A. RECITALS.

- (i) On September 24, 2008, the City of Irwindale (“City”) and CalMat Co. dba Vulcan Materials Company, Western Division (“Vulcan”), entered into an agreement entitled “Development Agreement for Reliance I Quarry and Reliance II Landfill” (“Agreement”) to govern the development of an active mining quarry known as Reliance I and a landfill site called Reliance II; and
- (ii) On March 10, 2021, the City and Vulcan entered into a contract amendment (“Amendment No. 1) to Agreement which terminated any terms or conditions relating to Reliance II Landfill; and
- (iii) In Section 7.2 of the Agreement, entitled “Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill” the City and Vulcan agreed to a prioritization system to fill pits that have been mined and are ready for reclamation. Those various pits in the City have successfully been filled and are now in the process of development; and
- (iv) As a result of the successful completion of filling various pits, the need for the prioritization schedule established in Section 7.2 of the Agreement is no longer required as there is now sufficient fill material to complete the filling of the remaining pits without the necessity of a structured prioritization approach; and
- (v) Vulcan has made a request to amend the Agreement again to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities (“Amendment No. 2”); and
- (vi) Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the filling of the pits has been considered in the Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2006051107) prepared for the development project in the Agreement, and the proposed approval of the Amendment No. 2 is consistent with the analysis contained therein; and
- (vii) Sections 65868 of the California Government Code authorizes a development agreement to be amended, in whole or in part, by mutual consent of the parties

to the agreement or their successors in interest pursuant to sections 65867-65867.5 of the California Government Code; and

- (viii) On August 21, 2024, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing, as required by law, closed said hearing, and adopted this resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance approving Amendment No. 2 to the Agreement.
- (ix) All legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

B. RESOLUTION.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby found, determined and resolved by the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale as follows:

1. **Recitals.** The Planning Commission hereby specifically finds that all of the facts set forth in Recitals, Part A, of this Resolution are true and correct and are incorporated herein by this reference.

2. **Findings.** Based upon substantial evidence and testimony taken from the record as a whole, and received at the public hearing, both oral and written, including the staff report, and all attachments thereto, all of which shall constitute the entire record of the matter, the Planning Commission hereby finds this Planning Commission hereby specifically finds as follows:

a. The proposed Amendment No. 2 to the Development Agreement is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, its purposes and applicable Specific Plan(s):

Reliance I is identified in the City's General Plan as an active mining operation. There is no applicable specific plan for the site. Upon completion of mining activities, the City's General Plan contemplates that because many of the pits are located in close proximity to freeways, these areas are subject to intense development pressure due to the scarcity of developable land. As a result, the General Plan has designated a number of these pits, including Reliance I, as Industrial and Commercial to capitalize on these factors as a means to generate revenue for the City and serve the regional population.

In order to facilitate the orderly filling and ultimate development of the mining pits within the City, the City and the mining operators agreed to a priority schedule within which certain operators would have the sole right to fill their respective pit or quarry with commercial filling activities in order to ensure timely completion of the filling of each site, rather than a piecemealed approach. Since that time, several pits and quarries have been successfully filled and the City and operators have determined that there is an ample supply of fill materials in Irwindale, sufficient to

support more than one commercial fill operation simultaneously. Consequently, it has been determined that the prioritization schedule is no longer necessary. The purpose of the proposed Amendment No. 2 is to terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities. The removal of the priority schedule will facilitate the ultimate development of Reliance I. Thus, the proposed Amendment No. 2 is consistent with the City's General Plan and is intended to encourage the highest and best use for Reliance I into an eventual Industrial Commercial development.

3. **CEQA Findings.** Pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the City of Irwindale environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, has analyzed the project and has determined that the filling of the pits have already been analyzed in the previously Certified EIR's prepared for the project (SCH# 2006051107) and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the proposed Amendment No. 2 is consistent with the previously certified EIRs. Therefore, no subsequent EIR, Negative Declaration, or addendum is required for approval of the Amendment.

4. **Recommendation.** On the basis of these findings, the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt an ordinance, approving Amendment No. 2 to the Development Agreement as set forth in Exhibit "A."

5. **Certification.** The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall certify the adoption of this Resolution, and a copy shall be transmitted to the City Council.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 21st day of August 2024.

Maricela Frymark, Chair
City of Irwindale Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

I, Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Community Development Director of the City of Irwindale, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Irwindale held on the 21st day of August 2024, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

Marilyn Simpson, AICP, Secretary

EXHIBIT "A" TO PC RESOLUTION NO. 832(24)**AMENDMENT NO. 2
TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR RELIANCE I QUARRY AND RELIANCE II
LANDFILL**

This **AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR RELIANCE I QUARRY AND RELIANCE II LANDFILL** ("Amendment No. 2") is entered into as of July __ 2023, by and between CALMAT CO., a Delaware corporation, DBA VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN DIVISION ("Vulcan") and the City of Irwindale (the "City"), a California municipal corporation (collectively, the "Parties"), with reference to the following facts:

RECITALS

A. On September 24, 2008, the City and Vulcan entered into that agreement entitled "Development Agreement for Reliance I Quarry and Reliance II Landfill" ("Agreement") to govern the development of an active mining quarry known as Reliance I and a landfill site called Reliance II.

B. On March 10, 2021, the City and Vulcan entered into a contract amendment entitled "Amendment No. 1 to Development Agreement for Reliance I Quarry and Reliance II Landfill" ("Amendment No. 1.") which terminated any terms or conditions relating to Reliance II Landfill. Accordingly, this Amendment No. 2 incorporates by reference any amendments as described in Amendment No. 1.

C. In Section 7.2 of the Agreement, which section is entitled "Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill", the Parties agreed to a prioritization system to fill pits that have been mined and are ready for reclamation.

D. The intent behind the "Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill" section was to establish an organized and systematic approach to filling the various pits throughout the City of Irwindale to ensure that sufficient fill material could be dedicated to each site to timely ensure completion thereof rather than have a piecemeal approach without any deadlines or a cohesive strategy such that pits may not consistently receive sufficient fill material and, therefore, could take much longer to complete.

E. Since the Effective Date of the Agreement, various pits in the City of Irwindale have successfully been filled and are now in the process of development.

F. As a result of the successful completion of filling various pits, the need for the prioritization schedule established in Section 7.2 of the Agreement is no longer required as there is now sufficient fill material to complete the filling of the remaining pits without the necessity of the structured prioritization approach.

G. Accordingly, the Parties now desire to terminate Section 7.2 of the Agreement and thereby terminate the requirement for prioritization of filling activities.

TERMS

1. **Amendments to Agreement.** The Agreement is amended as provided herein:

a. **Section 7.2 of the Agreement, entitled “Commencement Date/Prioritization of Fill”, is hereby deleted in its entirety and shall have no further force and effect as of the date of this Amendment No. 2. The Parties have reviewed all agreements and operating entitlements and agree that the deletion of Section 7.2 will have no other impact on entitled operations or approvals and no amendments to the underlying entitlements are required.**

2. **Continuing Effect of Agreement.** Except as amended by this Amendment No. 2 and Amendment No. 1 terminating all terms and conditions pertaining to Reliance II Landfill, all provisions of the Agreement, as amended by Amendment Nos. 1 and 2, shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect. From and after the date of this Amendment, whenever the term “Agreement” appears in the Agreement, it shall mean the Agreement, as amended by Amendment Nos. 1 and 2.

3. **Affirmation of Agreement; Warranty Re Absence of Defaults.** City and Vulcan each ratify and reaffirm each and every one of the respective rights and obligations arising under the Agreement. Each party represents and warrants to the other that there have been no written or oral modifications to the Agreement other than as provided herein. Each party represents and warrants to the other that the Agreement is currently an effective, valid, and binding obligation.

4. **Adequate Consideration.** The Parties hereto irrevocably stipulate and agree that they have each received adequate and independent consideration for the performance of the obligations they have undertaken pursuant to this Amendment No. 2.

5. **Authority.** The persons executing this Amendment No. 2 on behalf of the Parties hereto warrant that (i) such party is duly organized and existing, (ii) they are duly authorized to execute and deliver this Amendment No. 2 on behalf of said party, (iii) by so executing this Amendment No. 2, such party is formally bound to the provisions of the Agreement, as amended and (iv) the entering into this Amendment No. 2 does not violate any provision of any other agreement to which said party is bound and should be read and construed in a manner which would not conflict with other agreements or contract amendments entered into or intended to be entered into by the Parties for the purpose of terminating the fill prioritization system referenced in Recitals C and D above.

[SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Amendment No. 2 on the date and year first-above written.

CITY:

CITY OF IRWINDALE,
a California municipal corporation

_____, Mayor

ATTEST:

Laura M. Nieto, Chief Deputy City Clerk


APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP

Adrian R. Guerra, City Attorney

VULCAN:

CALMAT CO., dba VULCAN
MATERIALS COMPANY, WESTERN
DIVISION, a Delaware corporation

By: 
Name: James T. Plimley
Title: President - Western Division

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Signature

Name, Title