

MINUTES: of the Minor Exception Permit Committee Meeting of the City of Redlands held Monday, July 12, 2021, at 9:00 a.m. are as follows:

I. ATTENDANCE & CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Joe Richardson, Planning Commissioner
Mario Saucedo, Planning Commissioner
Brian Foote, City Planner/Planning Manager
STAFF: Sean Reilly, Senior Planner
Jocelyn Torres, Assistant Planner

The meeting came to order at 9:10 a.m. with a quorum of Committee members, located at 1600 Orange Avenue, Redlands, CA.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of April 12, 2021

Commissioner Richardson made a motion to approve the minutes of April 12, 2021, seconded by Mr. Foote, and approved 2-0 (Commissioner Saucedo abstained).

III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments provided on any matters not on the agenda.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Meeting Location: 1600 Orange Avenue, Redlands
Meeting Time: 9:15 A.M.

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Minor Exception Permit No. 620** – A request to construct 6-foot tall open steel perimeter fencing within the front yard setback and combination retaining walls with guard rails and security fencing in excess of 6 feet tall within the interior of the project for a proposed 328-unit apartment project. The subject property is located at 1600 Orange Avenue within the EV/2500RM, Multi-Family Residential District. Pursuant to RMC Section 18.212.220, the maximum height for retaining walls within the front yard area is thirty inches (30") in height. Retaining walls exceeding thirty inches (30") in height will require a protective fence or guardrail of at least thirty six inches (36") in height either of solid material or with intermediate members so spaced that a nine inch (9") sphere will not pass through. The combination of a retaining wall may not exceed nine feet (9'), except if such retaining wall and guardrail is within fifteen feet (15'0") of an existing dwelling, the combination of retaining walls and guardrails shall not exceed six feet (6'0") in height. However, RMC Section 18.168.050 provides for the granting of minor exceptions to the fence standards.

Discussion: The Minor Exception Permit Committee met at the project location and opened the public hearing. No neighbors or other members of the public appeared at the meeting or submitted written public comments prior to the meeting. The applicant's architect was present and provided a detailed description of the proposal. The applicant explained how the retaining walls and fences proposed will provide additional security and how they are necessary for the site design of the project. The Minor Exception Permit Committee asked questions regarding the height of the proposed fencing and fence placement. Mr. Reilly provided information regarding the code requirements applicable to fences and walls around the perimeter of the project site. The Minor Exception Permit Committee added a condition of approval that the applicant shall add a decorative cap to the perimeter portions of the CMU block wall.

Commissioner Richardson made the motion to approve the proposal, and seconded by Commissioner Saucedo, with the added Condition of Approval that the applicant shall add a decorative cap to the perimeter portions of the CMU block wall.

Decision: The Minor Exception Committee voted 3 to 0 to approve the application as proposed.

- B. Meeting Location:** 1647 Henrietta Street, Redlands
Meeting Time: 9:45 A.M.

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Minor Exception Permit No. 619** – A request to construct a 5 foot tubular steel cross-fence within the front yard setback area, and a 4 foot tall tubular steel fence on top of a 3'2" concrete retaining wall within the front yard setback area (for a maximum height of 7'2"). The subject property is located at 1647 Henrietta Street, within the R-A, Residential Estate District. RMC Section 18.212.220 allows the maximum height for retaining walls within the front yard area to be thirty inches (30") in height. Retaining walls exceeding thirty inches (30") in height will require a protective fence or guardrail of at least thirty six inches (36") in height either of solid material or with intermediate members so spaced that a nine inch (9") sphere will not pass through. The combination of a retaining wall may not exceed nine feet (9'), except if such retaining wall and guardrail is within fifteen feet (15'0") of an existing dwelling, the combination of retaining walls and guardrails shall not exceed six feet (6'0") in height. However, RMC Section 18.168.050 provides for the granting of minor exceptions to the fencing development standards.

Discussion: The Minor Exception Permit Committee met at the project location and opened the public hearing. The applicant and the applicant's landscape architect were present and provided a description of the proposed fence and project. The applicant cited the need to install a fence around the new pool recently constructed on the north side of his house within the front yard area adjacent to Pepper Way, and the negligible rear yard area on his corner lot. Committee members asked questions regarding the proposed fence height, material, and placement around the front yard and new pool. Staff provided explanation regarding code requirements and height limits for fences within required front yard areas (in this case, on the Henrietta Street side and also the Pepper Way side). Two neighbors attended the meeting a few

minutes after it began, and did not provide any comments. There were no written public comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Staff asked the applicant to consider revising the placement of the fence on the Henrietta Street side to stay behind the minimum 25-foot front setback, revise the fence placement along the Pepper Way side to move the fence posts approximately 3 to 4 feet back from the top of the retaining wall (to reduce the combined wall/fence height) and provide low shrubs and planting within the suggested 3 to 4 foot wide planter area, as well as lower the proposed fence height near the retaining wall along Pepper Street. The applicant declined all suggested design alternatives. Staff also explained the purpose of a Minor Fence Exception Permit (contained in RMC Section 18.168.050 including public health and safety), and the proposed height of the wall/fence combined with new landscaping and tree at the applicant's corner of the street intersection may obscure motorists' visibility around the corner.

Commissioners Richardson and Saucedo stated they felt the applicant's original proposal was reasonable. Commissioner Richardson made the motion to approve the proposal, and seconded by Commissioner Saucedo. City Planner Foote explained why staff and the Development Services Director would not be in support of the application as proposed (without modifications to lower the fence height and revise the fence placement), as staff's opinion was that there was no precedent for such a fence within front yards in the immediate surrounding neighborhood, alternative designs with the fence pulled back could still accomplish the applicant's privacy objectives, and to approve such a fence height near the front property line would set a bad precedent if any other neighbors in the area were to apply for a Minor Fence Exception Permit in the future.

Decision: Commissioners Richardson and Saucedo voted for approval, and City Planner Foote voted against, the motion to approve the application as proposed.

- C. Meeting Location:** 610 Creekside Drive, Redlands
Meeting Time: 10:40 A.M.

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Minor Exception Permit No. 621** – A request to construct a six foot (6'0") tall wrought iron fence and a six foot (6'0") tall wrought iron gate within the front yard setback area located at 610 Creekside Drive, within Sunset Hills Specific Plan No. 43. RMC Section 18.168.020(B) states, "Fences and walls not to exceed six feet (6'0") in height shall be permitted along the side and rear property lines, except that no fence or wall exceeding three feet (3'0") in height shall be located within any required front yard area." RMC Section 18.168.050 provides for the granting of minor exceptions to the fencing development standards.

Discussion: The Minor Exception Permit Committee met at the project location and opened the public hearing. No neighbors or other members of the public appeared at the meeting or submitted written public comments prior to the meeting. The applicant and the applicant's fence contractor were present and provided a description of the proposal. The applicant explained the need for increased security and safety around their property in a remote area of the city. Committee members asked questions

regarding the height of the proposed fencing, fence placement around the front yard and along the side property line, and the fence material and design. Ms. Torres provided information regarding the code requirements applicable to fences in the front yard area. City Planner Foote asked the applicant to consider revising the placement of the fence in the front yard to move it further back from the front property line along Creekside Drive, allow for more landscaping in front of the proposed fence, and the applicant declined any changes.

Commissioner Saucedo made the motion to approve the proposal, and seconded by Commissioner Richardson.

Decision: Commissioners Richardson and Saucedo voted for approval, and City Planner Foote voted against, the motion to approve the application as proposed.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.



Jocelyn Torres
Assistant Planner
City of Redlands

NOTICE: The Minor Exception Permit Committee visited the above referenced properties and made a decision on the application(s). If one wishes to appeal a decision, said Appeal must be submitted within ten days from the date of the decision (RMC Section 18.168.100). A formal Appeal, with the appropriate submittal fee, must be submitted to the Development Services Department within the 10-day appeal period. If no Appeal is received within ten days of the decision, then the Minor Exception Committee's action shall be final.