

DRAFT MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
APRIL 25, 2018

CALL TO ORDER: The Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Chairperson Juarez in the City Council Chambers at 7:02 p.m.

FLAG SALUTE: Commissioner Arias led the flag salute.

ROLL CALL: Roll was taken by Development Services Manager Stadnicki.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Juarez; Commissioners Grajeda, Arias, Brown, Ursua, Hemming and Ramos (arrived at 7:12 p.m.)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Development Services Director Suarez, Development Services Manager Stadnicki, Assistant City Attorney Jared, Senior Planner Khan, City Engineer Guerrero.

---

ITEM D:  
PUBLIC COMMENT:

---

ITEM E:  
CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – February 28, 2018.

**Motion by Commissioner Hemming, seconded by Commissioner Arias, carried by a unanimous vote of the members present (6-0-0-1), to approve the consent calendar.**

---

ITEM F:  
HEARING ITEMS:

F-1                                      CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 6844-2017) TO PERMIT THE MODIFICATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 14-058 TO ALLOW FOR THE REMOVAL OF CERTAIN CONDITIONS RELATED TO GRADING, PAVING, AND PARKING FOR A SITE IN THE C-4 (HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL) ZONE.

Emily Stadnicki, Development Services Manager, stated staff is recommending this item be continued to May 9, 2018.

**Chair Juarez opened the public hearing.**

**Motion by Commissioner Hemming, seconded by Commissioner Arias, carried by a unanimous vote of the members present (6-0-0-1), to approve to continue to a date certain, May 9, 2018.**

---

F-2 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA 5394-2016), CHANGE OF ZONE (ZONE 5395-2016), CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 12-012) AND TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (PARCELMAP 7550-2017) FOR THE ANNEXATION OF MULTIPLE PARCELS AND PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY ALONG VALLEY BOULEVARD, TOTALING APPROXIMATELY NINE ACRES IN SIZE, CURRENTLY LOCATED IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, TO THE CITY OF POMONA, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF FIVE TILT-UP WAREHOUSES ON A PORTION OF THE ANNEXED SITE. ALL PARCELS WOULD BE DESIGNATED AS “WORKPLACE DISTRICT EDGE” IN THE POMONA GENERAL PLAN AND “M-2 GENERAL INDUSTRIAL” UNDER THE POMONA ZONING ORDINANCE.

Associate Planner Khan, Associate Planner, provided a presentation on the item.

He spoke about the Letter of Opposition by the property owner of Parcel A, Mr. Matt Rzonca and his wish to be excluded from the Annexation. He provided a document with the Local Agency Formation Commission’s (LAFCO) response to Mr. Rzonca’s comments to be added to the record.

Commissioner Hemming asked City Engineer Guerrero if the six (6) new street lights and existing utility poles will be underground.

City Engineer Guerrero responded that there is a condition in the Conditional Use Permit requesting that the existing overhead lines be moved underground; however, some are some higher voltage lines, so it may not be feasible. He noted the code also allows for an applicant to request an exemption.

Commissioner Hemming clarified that if Edison says it can be done, it will be done.

City Engineer Guerrero responded that if Edison says that it can be done, then it can be done and reiterated that the applicant has the right, as allowed by City code, to request an exemption.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Guerrero if the comment about “water and sewer service would not be provided by the City” was accurate in the letter expressing concerns about annexation.

City Engineer Guerrero referred Commissioner Brown to Raul Garibay, Supervising Water Resources Engineer.

Raul Garibay, responded that currently that property resides in the Walnut Valley Water District, so Pomona would not be serving them water; however, they would be able to provide sewer.

Commissioner Brown questioned the process and clarified that if the Council approves, it would essentially be a request to LAFCO and the County for this annexation to take place.

Associate Planner Khan responded yes, he stated in order for LAFCO to consider the annexation their commission would need to see that an initiation of proceedings happened (which took place already), and that the City Council has taken an action for pre-zoning to approve all these parcels within a certain zoning

and within a certain General Plan designation. Once that happens, they also need to see that there was some environmental review conducted on the all the parcels and then they can go forward.

Commissioner Brown asked for clarification on the on the terms of action on the request; they can either approve that, deny that or can they make amendments or modifications.

Associate Planner Khan responded per his conversation with LAFCO, yes, it's a discretionary action and that LAFCO could approve, deny, or modify. He reported based on discussion with staff at LAFCO they would recommend full annexation.

Commissioner Grajeda asked Senior Planning Khan asked about a wedge on the design near Parcel A and asked where the auto body shop is located.

Associate Planner Khan, responded that the wedge is a graphic design error; it's the full parcel and the dark part is reflecting the M-2 zoning.

Commissioner Grajeda asked if it was possible for them to just remain out if they want to stay out.

Associate Planner Khan, responded that it is staff's recommendation based on conversations that the LAFCO staff would not support this project in its entirety if one of the parcels was exempt. He reported in LAFCO's opinion in order to fulfill their responsibilities they want to ensure all the entire County parcels are annexed.

Commissioner Grajeda asked if The City has any kind of liability if the owner of Parcel A is forced into the annexation.

Assistant City Attorney Jared responded that certainly there is ability after the LAFCO decision for an aggrieved party to file a lawsuit; however, the grounds for that lawsuit is very narrow, and they essentially have to show fraud or extreme error. In his review of this case, he stated he has not seen anything that would be grounds to support a legal challenge and in his opinion is that there would not be liability in approving tonight's action.

Commissioner Arias asked for clarification about Parcel A and the City of Industry's role.

Associate Planner Khan responded if the parcel were exempt the City of Industry would not necessarily have to deal with it, it would just create a smaller island and there could be an invitation for proceedings for an annexation of those islands but from LAFCO and the County's opinion is they won't support the creation of an island, period.

Commissioner Ramos asked if there would be any economic hardship by him (Mr. Mathew Rzonca) being a part of this.

Assistant City Attorney Jared replied that economic hardship isn't grounds here, and the LAFCO process was created to ensure a logical and fully built out City, so that islands like this don't exist. He responded to Commissioner Arias' question about Pomona or another city having to annex and stated it doesn't work that way. He stated the applicant on the application is asking to annex a portion to Pomona and LAFCO is basically saying, ok, and while you're at it, group in the rest of that island, so that the gaps are filled in and they don't have unincorporated pockets throughout the County.

Commissioner Ursua asked about entitlements given to the owner of Parcel A.

Associate Planner Khan recommended asking the owner of Parcel A about entitlements concerning his property with the County of Los Angeles. He reported the building on Parcel A is mid-construction.

Commissioner Ursua asked if a Conditional Use Permit will be required for whoever decides to occupy the building and if the owner will have to come before the Planning Commission with a proposal for occupancy.

Assistant City Attorney Jared responded not necessarily; Parcel A currently has a building that is in mid-construction, so in the strictest terms, the owner has an entitlement for a building permit from the County and there is nothing in this action tonight that would take that away. He stated in regards to the use of that building, if there is a use happening at the time of annexation, that use will be grandfathered; however, just like any other parcel in the City of Pomona, the City can change the zoning and certain uses can be prohibited, so if one buys a piece of property and develops it, there is no reasonable expectation that's it's going to stay zoned the same forever.

Commissioner Ursua asked for clarification that the Parcel A owner's argument is that L.A. County has broader use provisions and Pomona would urge him to get his building finished and use established.

Assistant City Attorney Jared responded yes, if built and being used a certain way, theoretically they would have that has a grandfathered right; however, there are aspects to that where amortization comes into play and it depends on what the use actually is. He noted staff has not done anything to ascertain the truthfulness of the statements in the letter and if the uses Mr. Rzonca says are allowed per County zoning, is truly a full or accurate list.

Commissioner Ursua asked if the spec buildings are going to be leased or sold.

Associate Planner Khan, responded they will be leased out.

Commissioner Ursua asked if those users would have to come before the Planning Commission.

Associate Planner Khan responded they wouldn't have to come before the Planning Commission, they would go to the Planning Division counter and staff would issues clearances.

Commissioner Ursua expressed concerns with the design of the buildings on the west end and middle and the possibility of a high intensity trucking operation. He asked how the City can make sure that doesn't happen.

Assistant City Attorney Jared clarified the prior question and answers; He stated it would not come before the Planning Commission if it's a use specifically allowed in M2 and allowed under other zoning conditions, those go to the Planning Counter; however, there would be other types of uses where a Conditional Use Permit is required, and under 580 of our code there is a chart that says even in the M2 there are certain uses that always require a Conditional Use Permit and those typically intense abuses that require mitigation which Commissioner Ursua is has expressing concerns about (i.e. trucking facilities).

Commissioner Ursua responded that's what he wanted to hear; that the Commission is not setting themselves up for something that is not going to be manageable in the traffic sphere.

Associate Planner Khan stated there are two mitigation measures specifically within the MND (Mitigated Negative Declaration) about traffic impacts, one about not having on street parking and the other that all truck maneuvering and cueing must be completed onsite; no trailer drop offs or cuing within the public right of ways are permitted. In addition, there are a series of traffic conditions from Public Works about truck turning movements being limited to the application travel lane and not impacting adjacent travel lanes, truck turning templates must be submitted, and the project driveway is being designed and constructed in conformance with standards that would allow trucks to come in. He stated based on these Conditions of Approval, staff feel Mr. Ursua's concerns are being addressed.

Commissioner Ursua spoke about the role of the planning desk and staff being aware of the Commission's concerns.

Development Services Director Suarez spoke about the proposal providing a specific design which includes two bays for trucks and auto parking required for warehousing. He noted it is a whole different design for the concerns being mentioned. He stated it would be appropriate to include a Condition of Approval recommendation to City Council that specifically indicates a desire to provide clarity to the applicant and future users that come in for a business licenses and for future staff that deal with this proposal.

Chair Juarez stated he echoes the concerns of Commissioner Ursua. He spoke about there being a 36,000 square foot building and being asked to approve a Conditional Use Permit. He commented he doesn't have a problem with the zone change, the annexation, or the General Plan Amendment. He noted the Conditional Use Permit is important because the other building is 10,000 square feet less and has similar trucking facilities and he would rather see more turn around space than the auto parking spaces. He noted he understand that the parking spaces are important when one has a labor intensive type of use, but these are large enough spaces (36,000 square feet) to promote a larger type of manufacturing business that would require additional truck and dock space and more parking spaces. He commented the footprints are a little askew from the reality and he doesn't want to come back here six months when the buildings are up and have their hands are tied.

Assistant City Attorney Jared asked Chair Juarez if he was asking for clarification as to the acreage or the site coverage.

Chair Juarez responded yes, the issue is site coverage.

Development Services Director Suarez responded that a 36,000 square foot building is actually quite small, if you are talking about manufacturing and warehousing. He stated this design only caters to limited types of uses and most of the uses Mr. Juarez and Mr. Ursua are expressing concerns about range from 200,000 to a million plus square feet, and those uses is not what is proposed here. He reiterated it has been designed, as proposed, for warehousing. He noted manufacturing has one parking requirement and warehousing has another. He reported, the Attorney and he spoke about Condition #1 of the resolution, and suggest adding language specifically at the end of the second page, before two at the top, after plans, for it to be consistent with the M2 allowed uses of the City of Pomona. They feel that this would address all of the concerns the Commission has at this time.

Commissioner Hemming stated one of the pictures mentioned that Mr. Rzonca has been working on this for years; however, according to LAFCO's letter that is not true and states that "although this annex proposal was filed on September, 22, 2017, he (Mr. Rzonca) has failed to pursue a pre-annexation agreement with the City of Pomona to protect his interests".

Commissioner Grajeda clarified there will be 196 stalls across the 5.76 acres and asked if parking will be allowed on the street.

Associate Planner Khan responded no parking is permitted on the street.

Commissioner Grajeda reported he visited the site and didn't remember seeing any "no parking" signs.

City Engineer Guerrero responded that for this project there is a specific condition that will ask the developer to prohibit parking by either painting a red curb or adding signage along the project frontage.

Chair Juarez asked staff to clarify if the annexation goes through what the responsibility is for the City of Pomona for the maintenance and upkeep of Valley Blvd.

Assistant City Attorney Jared replied it falls into the City's responsibilities within the corporate boundaries.

**Chair Juarez opened the public hearing.**

**Ignacio Crespo**, the architect for Chalmer's Equity Group, spoke about challenges due to the annexation and not having options, because half of the property was in Pomona and half was in L.A. County. He commented they are happy to become part of the tax base for the City of Pomona and stated he is available to answer questions. He noted Chalmer's owns industrial buildings all over the area, mostly in L.A. County, and this project is to build 5 spec buildings that will be kept under the Chalmer's portfolio and leased, therefore, whoever leases the building will have to come to the City and make sure it's a permitted use.

Chair Juarez asked Mr. Crespo if he had any concerns about the truck parking and docking.

Mr. Crespo responded they have designed plenty of space in front for truck maneuvering. He noted these are small buildings, so the capacity of trucking with two doors is enough for most of the occupants that would come there. If somebody that has a more intensive use looks at the building, it would not be a good fit for them. He reported it is good for food guys or warehousing businesses that have in and out with small trips and just use 1-2 trucks.

Chair Juarez asked if that's the target.

Mr. Crespo responded yes.

Commissioner Ursua expressed concerns that they will be trucks in the bay and then more trucks coming in. He spoke about the company's intent and asked what kind of manufacturing institutions they are looking at and about staff needing to look at facility hours in correlation with of truck traffic.

Mr. Crespo responded this all depends on whoever leases and they would need to look at this on a case by case basis. He stated if they have a use that is given by right, by the City, within the Conditional Use Permit they will not have to come back, however, if there is something else that might bring a point of concern, it definitely would be presented for a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Ursua commented collaboration between the Company and the staff is important.

Associate Planner Khan reported when a tenant comes in for a business license they have to get a zoning clearance from the Planning Division and it is the City's standard to ask for a Statement of Operations and for a full detailed explanation of hours to make a determination if that use is allowed in the M2 zone.

Development Services Director Suarez reported that this project has an accompanying environmental document which includes a review of the traffic. He stated City Engineer Guerrero could provide the details if the Commissioner desires.

Chair Juarez, invited the two speakers to the dais and provided Mr. Rzonca with 3 additional minutes.

**Matthew Rzonca**, stated that Parcel A is about 12,000 square feet and he has owned the property for many years. He reported it used to be a gas station which was closed because of the cost of ongoing environmental regulations, so they eventually closed, cleared it out and removed most of the contamination. He stated they have been working with the L.A. County Planning Department in Los Angeles ever since to design a building that met the County's building requirements and zoning. He spoke about the response from LAFCO not containing the truth about the timeline and that he could provide the building permit as evidence. He shared he brought a tax bill tonight, which does show improvements, and indicates Pomona gets revenue from the property. He spoke about LAFCO's preference to keep the consolidation as tight as possible; however, down valley there are properties that are part of the County and it is not necessary for his lot to be included for the

project to move forward, it is something that LAFCO prefers. He spoke about LAFCO seeing lines and not people and there being an oversight agency that gives the Planning Commission the ability to make a decision. He shared The City of Industry attempted to annex these properties previously and after a couple years they found it didn't make sense. He reported the building is probably 50-60% complete and they are going as fast as they can but there are limitations in being a small family, not a big developer. He spoke about the property being on septic and the fact that there must be no other sewer source for the State of California to let them go on septic.

He commented he would welcome sewer but it would be very difficult logistically to get a sewer up to this spot and the City would never recover the cost from his little tax base. He asked that the Planning Commission consider letting him continue with the design of this building, the criteria, the zoning, use and setbacks.

**Shelley Rzonca**, stated they received the LAFCO letter 10 minutes before this meeting, so there was no time to prepare. She spoke about affecting "one little guy" to help the project of another "much larger guy" who has locations all over California. She shared her husband is a mechanic and she is a teacher, and they have been working on this project for years and years to help with their future. She expressed concerns with the truthfulness of LAFCO letter. She shared that unincorporated L.A. County has an interactive site to look up uses by property address and could be used to confirm uses referenced. She spoke about LAFCO only requiring their property to be included if completely surrounded by the City of Pomona. She requested the Commission get all the information before you making a big decision that will impact their lives. She commented she wants to project to proceed, as it will beautify the City, however, she requests the Commission leave their Parcel out.

Mr. Crespo was brought back up for rebuttal.

Mr. Crespo spoke about it just being a City boundary and the Rzonca's ability to keep their building, as designed, and then working with the City on uses. He noted he \doesn't see an impediment to use the Parcel if it changes from L.A. County to the City of Pomona, if the City is going to allow the setbacks and conditions that are existing to be grandfathered.

**Chair Juarez closed the public hearing.**

Commissioner Ramos asked when staff received the LAFCO letter.

Associate Planner Khan responded the email was sent a few hours before the hearing. He clarified that everything contained in that letter is not new to staff, but just a response to what the applicant provided in their letter.

Commissioner Ramos spoke about the rebuttal and commented that The Rzonca's don't need a reason, just a desire to be excluded. He stated they are not landlocked, but rather at the tail end of a piece of land and he doesn't see the purpose of insisting this Parcel be part of the deal. He spoke about it being their land and their right and about property rights being one of the biggest things that makes this country powerful. He commented that The Rzonca's made a valid point about a big corporation insisting on having their way against a small individual they know can't really fight back.

Commissioner Brown asked The Rzonca's what information they have about what the zoning designation under L.A. County.

Mr. Rzonca stated its M1 ½

Commissioner Brown stated he was able to go online and yes it is M1 ½ but there is a couple of combined zones, the BE (Board Exemption) and IP (Industrial Preservation) zone. He commented he doesn't think

they have the development rights they think you have, because the IP zone has seven pages of prohibited uses including a lot of retail, and its purpose is to preserve manufacturing and industrial activity. He stated there are differences in our M2 zone and their IP zone, but not as substantial as they believe and he would encourage them to take a look at it again, because there may be some advantages of being a part of the City of Pomona.

Mr. Rzonca he stated he did review the City of Pomona and there are some specific issues because of his lot size that precludes him from having many items; banquets halls and public settings because of the smaller size.

Commissioner Brown responded that banquet halls are not allowed in the IP zone either.

Mrs. Rzonca interjected that if you go onto the interactive map there are also overlays in that area. She stated if the Commission needs more information, she can provide a map.

Commissioner Brown encouraged the Rzonca's to look at the City of Pomona zoning because he thinks L.A. County is more restrictive than specific in the letter they provided.

Mr. Rzonca commented that he spent years with the L.A. County.

Mrs. Rzonca stated she is not opposed to Pomona and shared they emailed every single month for years and never had an opportunity to discuss zoning or being grandfathered in.

Commissioner Brown had questions for Public Works regarding sewer; the comment was made that this site is currently onsite septic and there was a claim that sewer would not be in the area. Would we be providing sewer if they City were to annex that property?

Raul Garibay responded on the south side of the property, according to our records that there is a sewer line that does exist and the City staff has identified and informed them where to connect.

Commissioner Brown confirmed he was referring to what about Parcel A.

Raul Garibay stated he wasn't prepared to answer and he would have to look into this.

Assistant City Attorney Jared clarified Commissioner Brown's question, and asked if the sewer line could be extended down the block.

Raul Garibay replied the answer would be yes, however, there would be a cost associated.

Commissioner Brown offered a couple of comments in response to Commissioner's Ramos comments. He stated he understands the County's position and looking at this as a landlocked situation. He stated he is concerned about the Commission taking action that would prompt LAFCO to deny this request, as this is definitely in the interest of the City of Pomona, he believes it's in the interest of all property owners in this area. He stated he doesn't share the concerns raised by his colleague about site design and site layout.

Commissioner Hemming stated we are not stopping Parcel A from having a building; we are limiting the use of that building. She spoke about the letter from The Rzonca's citing examples of what Pomona wouldn't allow that L.A. County would; that being a recycling business, cannabis cultivation commercial indoor, cannabis manufacturing, cannabis manufacturing processor, distribution general, distribution transporter, cannabis retail store, cannabis micro business, cannabis micro business with store, fast food, dine in restaurant, alcohol, a hotel, adult oriented businesses and on sale alcohol and others. She stated this is why the Commission should want this annexed because we may not want one of those uses next door to a Pomona businesses. She noted the City has been spending a lot of time making those rules and she wants to



see that quality upheld. She made a motion to go with LAFCO and staff recommendations to approve the annex to City Council.

Commissioner Brown, seconded

Assistant City Attorney Jared asked if the motion included the additional sentence that Mr. Suarez mentioned.

Commissioner Hemming stated she would agree to include that.

Commissioner Grajeda he can entertain that motion, but requested to allow everyone on the Commission to speak.

Assistant City Attorney Jared clarified parliamentary procedure. He stated there has been some discussion, someone make a motion and a second, so now that's on the table and everyone else can now comment and have discussion on the motion. He noted a vote doesn't have to be taken right now.

Commissioner Grajeda requested staff include more documentation if an email or a letter like this comes in with no dates.

Development Services Manager Stadnicki clarified the first page has the date and time, it's a two page document.

Commissioner Grajeda reported he only had one page.

Commissioner Ramos clarified with Assistant City Attorney Jared, that if Parcel A stayed part of L.A. County, the City wouldn't have any control of what goes on as mentioned by Commissioner Hemming.

Assistant City Attorney Jared responded no, the City of Pomona would not. He stated L.A. County has its own development code that addresses the regulation of cannabis.

Commissioner Ramos stated he didn't interpret this that way initially and he had a change of heart on this issue.

Chair Juarez commented that although cannabis uses are not allowed now, there is a good possibility that they will be allowed in the future, as the City of Pomona is working on an ordinance for medical marijuana and recreational use.

Assistant City Attorney Jared confirmed there is currently there is a complete ban, a moratorium, in all zones throughout Pomona on commercial cannabis uses; however a petition has been submitted, and that has not yet qualified for the November ballot to allow commercial cannabis manufacturing, testing, all of the known retail aspects of commercial cannabis in the M2 zone. He stated if that qualified for the ballot and got a sufficient number of votes and these parcels are annexed into the City that use would be allowed in those areas. He noted the retail component under that petition is limited to the Downtown area. He reported that City Council has also asked for ordinance to be brought back and staffs are in the process of assisting Council with a draft of that ordinance that is due back in May. .

Chair Juarez called for the vote.

**Motion by Commissioner Hemming, seconded by Commissioner Brown, carried by a majority vote of the members present (5-0-2-0), to approve the General Plan Amendment (GPA 5394-2016), Change of Zone (ZONE 5395-2016), Conditional Use Permit (CUP 12-012) and Tentative Parcel Map (PARCELMAP 7550-2017) for the annexation of multiple parcels and public right of way along Valley Boulevard, totaling approximately nine acres in size, currently located in the County of Los**

**Angeles, to the City of Pomona, and the development of five tilt-up warehouses on a portion of the annexed site. All parcels would be designated as “Workplace District Edge” in the Pomona General Plan and “M-2 General Industrial” under the Pomona Zoning Ordinance, with additional language added to Condition #1 of the resolution to be consistent with the M2 allowed uses of the City of Pomona.**

Development Services Director Suarez stated this project will be moved forward to City Council, date to be determined.

---

ITEM G:  
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATION:

Commissioner Grajeda reported he will be running for District 5 in 2019 and has filled out his initial documentation and will continue until August.

Commissioner Brown thanked Mr. Guerrero for work related to the CicLAvia event. He commented it was a terrific, open streets event and nice to see so many people out there, including many who don't ride bicycles on a regular basis.

Commissioner Ramos echoed Commissioner Brown's comments about CicLAvia. He commented that one doesn't realize how close you are to LaVerne or Claremont until you ride through with no traffic on bicycles. It was an amazing site, with a lot of people and fun all around.

Chair Juarez requested Mr. Guerrero make note of the need to improve/replace the dividing reflective dots on Towne Ave. He stated at night he cannot delineate lines in cars with good lighting until he gets by the Cemetery going South on Towne and shared and it looks like he is driving drunk. He requested to use discretionary funds for street improvement, just replace those dots and getting them in good order before the rainy season, when it gets even worse.

---

ITEM J:  
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER COMMUNICATION:

Development Services Manager Stadnicki reported that City Council approved four more positions for Planning this Monday. She commented they are looking forward to staffing up and bringing the Commission full agendas, with multiple items.

Development Services Director Suarez commented he too went to CicLAvia and had a great time with his family. He reported staff is preparing six items for the May 9<sup>th</sup> agenda; two of these items relate to the Fairgrounds and are currently being noticed and will include a study session during the public meeting. He stated the Fairgrounds project is anticipated to have up to 3 meetings related to discussion of the amendment of the F-zone district. He reported they have noticed a 1000 foot radius and sent about 800 mailers to inform folks about the meeting.

---

ITEM I:  
ADJOURNMENT:

The Planning Commission meeting was motion to adjourn by Chairperson Juarez at 8:24 p.m., to the regular scheduled meeting of May 9, 2018 in the City Council Chambers.

---

Emily Stadnicki  
Development Services Manager  
Mario Suarez, AICP  
Development Services Director

Jessica Thorndike, Transcriber  
The minutes of this meeting are filed in the Planning Division of City Hall, located 505 South Garey Avenue, Pomona, CA, 91766.