

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**  
***REGULAR MEETING***  
**MARCH 19, 2002**

---

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** 12:30 p.m.

**FLAG SALUTE:** Chairman "Shed" Conklin

**PRESENT:** Chairman "Shed" Conklin  
Vice Chairman Thomas Beede  
Commissioner Charles Brewster  
Commissioner Bill Jahn  
Commissioner Robert Day

**STAFF:** Molly Bogh, Community Development Director  
Marco Martinez, City Attorney  
Sandra Molina, Principal Planner  
Janice Etter, Associate Planner  
Neil Braunstein, Associate Planner  
Ray Snyder, Assistant Planner  
Phil Mosley, Chief Building Official  
Anne Schneider, City Engineer  
Jennifer Worth, Administrative Secretary

The Planning Commission of the City of Big Bear Lake took the following actions at the March 19, 2002 meeting held in the Training Room of City Hall, 39707 Big Bear Boulevard, Big Bear Lake, California.

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

Moved by Commissioner Jahn, seconded by Commissioner Day, to approve the agenda as presented. The agenda was approved unanimously.

**PRESENTATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

There was nothing to report.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No one wished to speak.

**1. CONSENT CALENDAR**

1.1 Minutes from the regular Planning Commission Meeting of February 20, 2002.

Item 1.2 was removed from the Consent Calendar in order to discuss it separately.

1.3 Temporary Use Permit 2002-012  
Location: 43285 Goldmine Drive  
APN: 310-951-01  
Applicant: Mr. Bernie Knudseon and Mr. Don Richardson

An application of the Friends of the Moonridge Zoo, proposing to hold a 5K and 10K Fun Run, fundraising run, on City streets on Sunday, May 19, 2002. The start and finish of the Fun Run will be at the Moonridge Animal Park. This project has been determined to be categorically exempt from the Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15304, Class 4 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Associate Planner Janice Etter presented the staff report recommending that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approving Temporary Use Permit 2002-012, based on the findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Moved by Vice-Chairman Beede, seconded by Commissioner Brewster, to approve Consent Calendar items 1.1 and 1.3. The motion was carried by a vote of 5 in favor to 0 opposed on item 1.1 and 4 in favor to 0 opposed on item 1.3. Commissioner Bill Jahn abstained from voting on item 1.3.

At this time, item 1.2 was discussed further.

1.2 Temporary Use Permit 2002-021  
Location: 41800 Garstin Drive  
APN: 2328-021-06  
Applicant: Arizona Pipeline Company

A proposal to establish a temporary construction yard approximately 200 feet wide by 400 feet deep in size to be located at the east end of the 5.22 acre Snow Summit overflow parking lot. The property is zoned Commercial Resort (CR). This project has been determined to be exempt pursuant to Section 15304 Class 4(e), of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The exemption pertains to temporary uses of land having negligible or permanent effects on land.

Assistant Planner Ray Snyder presented the staff report recommending that the Planning Commission find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopt the attached findings subject to the conditions of approval.

After discussion, item 22 of the conditions of approval was amended as follows:

22. During the duration that the site is occupied as a construction yard, the applicant shall ensure that ~~each morning~~ a water truck will be used to control dust on the site each morning and each afternoon prior to the return of the crews and as needed, as determined by the City.

A new condition was also added to the conditions of approval, as follows:

28. There shall be no activity on the site from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. to mitigate potential impacts to adjacent areas.

Moved by Vice-Chair Beede, seconded by Commissioner Jahn, to approve resolution 2002-07, adopting Temporary Use Permit application 2002-021, based upon the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained within the resolution including the above noted changes, as follows:

#### **RESOLUTION NO. PC2002-07**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING TEMPORARY USE PERMIT 2002-021 TO ESTABLISH A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION YARD AT THE EAST END OF THE 5.22 ACRE SNOW SUMMIT OVERFLOW PARKING LOT AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF FOX FARM ROAD AND GARSTIN DRIVE, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 2328-021-06.**

The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: BREWSTER, DAY, JAHN, BEEDE, CONKLIN  
NOES: NONE  
ABSENT: NONE  
ABSTAIN: NONE

## 2. ACTION ITEM

### 2.1 Plot Plan and Design Review 201-171

Location: 41939 Fox Farm Road

APN: 2328-102-15

Applicant: Mountain Area Transit Authority (MARTA)

Representative: Mr. Martin Gombert

A proposal to construct a 3,432 square foot maintenance office and operations facility and associated parking on property measuring approximately 1.14 acres, zoned Manufacturing (M). An environmental Initial Study was prepared, in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that determined that potential environmental impacts related to Hazards and Cultural Resources can be mitigated to levels of insignificance and a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigated Measure Monitoring Program has been prepared.

Assistant Planner Ray Snyder presented the staff report recommending that the Planning Commission consider the project and adopt the resolution adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approving Plot Plan and Design Review application 2001-171, based upon the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained within the resolution. Additionally, Mr. Snyder wished to note that the initial study shows the proximity of the project to the airport as 2 miles, however the actual distance is 1.75 miles, and staff will make this correction.

Staff addressed Planning Commission concerns regarding this project including: architectural treatments to the sides of the building, fuel tank location and design, drainage, parking lot lighting, landscaping, and the number of required parking and bus storage spaces.

Mr. John Meyer, representing MARTA, spoke in favor of the project and agreed to the discussed changes to the conditions to approval. He encouraged the Planning Commission to allow the proposed number of parking spaces due to the possibility of expansion within the next two years.

Resident Ms. Kanita Reese expressed her concerns over the potential pollution that this type of project would bring to the area and requested that the current industrial zoning of this site be reconsidered in order to allow more attractive utilization of this space.

After discussion the following items within the conditions of approval were amended:

9. Prior to the granting of a final inspection and release of utilities for the project, the applicant shall ~~have demonstrated the responsibility to~~ pay for a third party consultant acceptable to both the Fire

Department and Marta ~~for the purpose of reviewing~~ to review the LPG installation plans for compliance with NFPA 58 and ~~for~~ conducting a fire/safety analysis to recommend appropriate mitigation/prevention measures. The plan which has been submitted is subject to revision upon approval of the plans for the LPG station.

39. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping and irrigation plan showing plant size, species, and irrigation materials for City review and approval. The landscape plan shall demonstrate the use of drought tolerant plant materials complemented with a drip irrigation system to conserve water use. In addition the planting plan shall include 23 trees as shown on the conceptual landscaping plan, of which no less than eight trees shall be within the front setback area and shall include evergreen trees to screen the building.
42. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a photometric plan for city review and approval indicating the location of light standards to illuminate the parking area and the proposed illumination levels of these lights. A lighting fixture detail shall be provided with the final plans and shall be approved by the Planning Division prior to issuance of a building permit. The design of any lighting fixtures shall be decorative and compatible with the building design and with light standards used on other developments in the vicinity, along Fox Farm Road. Illumination shall not create off-site light and glare.

Moved by Commissioner Jahn, seconded by Commissioner Brewster, to adopt the resolution adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approving Plot Plan and Design Review application 2001-171, based upon the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained within the resolution including the above noted changes, as follows:

#### **RESOLUTION NO. PC2002-09**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING PLOT PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION 2001-171 TO CONSTRUCT A 3,432 SQUARE FOOT MOUNTAIN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (MARTA) FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED PARKING LOT ON PROPERTY MEASURING APPROXIMATELY 1.14 ACRES, ZONED MANUFACTURING (M) LOCATED AT 41939 FOX FARM ROAD, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 2328-102-15**

The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: BREWSTER, DAY, JAHN, BEEDE, CONKLIN  
NOES: NONE  
ABSENT: NONE  
ABSTAIN: NONE

2.2 Plot Plan and Design Review 2001-206

Location: 742 Summit Blvd.

APN: 2328-073-05

Applicant: Mr. Donald Bassett

Representative: Mr. Allen Brown

A proposal to construct a 1,960 square foot duplex on property measuring 7,700 square feet, zoned Multiple Family Residential (R3). This project has been determined to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15303 (b), Class 3 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This exemption pertains to the construction of a duplex in an urbanized area.

Planner Ray Snyder reviewed the staff report and recommended that the Planning Commission consider the project and adopt the resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approving the Plot Plan and Design Review 2001-206, based upon the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained within the resolution.

The Planning Commission requested that the conditions of approval include the condition that has to do with protecting the health of the remaining trees on the site. After some discussion among the commissioners and staff the following condition was added to the conditions of approval:

19. The remaining trees shall be maintained in healthy condition. If any trees on the site die within two (2) years of the construction of this project, which has been disturbed due to construction, such trees shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio with a twenty-four (24) inch box tree of the same species. The determination as to the cause of tree death shall be based on whether more than 40% of the tree's root zone, as defined by the drip line, has been disturbed during construction, as determined by the Chief Building Official.

Tom Owen, representing the applicant, commented that he would agree to the new condition of approval number 19.

Moved by Commissioner Jahn, seconded by Vice-Chairman Beede, to adopt the resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approving the Plot Plan and Design Review application 2001-206, based

upon the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained within the resolution including the above noted addition, as follows:

**RESOLUTION NO. PC2002-10**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING PLOT PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW 2001-206 TO CONSTRUCT A 1,960 SQUARE FOOT DUPLEX ON PROPERTY MEASURING 7,700 SQUARE FEET LOCATED AT 742 SUMMIT BOULEVARD, APN 2328-073-05**

The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: BREWSTER, DAY, JAHN, BEEDE, CONKLIN  
NOES: NONE  
ABSENT: NONE  
ABSTAIN: NONE

**3. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM**

3.1 Site Approval (Conditional Use Permit) and Design Review 2001-167  
Location: 41856 Fox Farm Road  
APN: 2328-021-04  
Applicant: Mr. Jay Kuhne  
Representative: Mr. Robert Ricciardi

An application to construct five single-story self storage buildings totaling 68,200 square feet, covered recreational vehicle storage totaling 18,840 square feet, and a two-story 5,916 square foot building containing office and retail space on the ground floor and two residential units, to be occupied by full-time on-site caretakers, on the second floor. Seven uncovered parking spaces will be provided for the office and two 2-car garages will be provided for the two residential units. The property consists of one 5.81 acre lot zoned Commercial (C). An initial study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that potential could be mitigated to a Level 4 insignificance. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This Public Hearing was continued from the March 6, 2002 Regular Meeting.

Associate Planner Neil Braunstein stated that staff had recommended this item be continued to allow the applicant additional time in which to submit revised plans to reflect the Planning Commission's directions at the March 6, 2002 meeting.

At this time, Chairman Conklin invited any comments from the public. Resident Kanita Reese wished to reiterate her same concerns as she had expressed for Item 2.2 over the potential pollution that this type of project would bring to the area and requested that the current zoning of this site be reconsidered in order to allow more attractive utilization of this space.

There being no further comments from the public, Chairman Conklin, upon the advise of the City Attorney, postponed action on this item until the end of the meeting in order to continue the public hearing to a date certain.

### 3.2 Specific Plan Amendment 2001-185

Location: 25 non-contiguous properties

APN(s): 308-131-02, 308-166-07, 308-166-08, 308-166-09,  
308-166-10, 308-166-38, 308-166-39, 308-166-40, 308-166-42,  
308-166-43, 308-166-44, 308-166-45, 308-166-46, 308-166-47,  
308-166-57, and 308-181-11 AND 308-162-41, 308-162-42,  
308-162-43, 308-162-44, 308-171-28, 308-171-35  
AND 309-011-30 AND 308-182-43 and 308-182-44

Applicant: City of Big Bear Lake and Ms. Nancy Borden

Representative: Mr. Eddie Etter

An application to amend the Village Specific Plan. The amendment consists of the re-designation of 25 non-contiguous properties totaling 2.25 acres in the Village Specific Plan to various land use designations, as follows:

Sixteen properties are proposed to be re-designated from various designations to Public-Quasi Public (PQP) to reflect the public uses of the properties: Assessor Parcel Numbers: 308-131-02, 308-166-07, 308-166-08, 308-166-09, 308-166-10, 308-166-38, 308-166-39, 308-166-40, 308-166-42, 308-166-43, 308-166-44, 308-166-45, 308-166-46, 308-166-47, 308-166-57, and 308-181-11.

Six properties are proposed to be re-designated from Parking to Village Retail (VR) in order to clarify the intent of the original Plan: Assessor Parcel Numbers 308-162-41, 308-162-42, 308-162-43, 308-162-44, 308-171-28, 308-171-35.

One property is proposed to be re-designated from Public-Quasi Public (PQP) to Lake Front Commercial (LC) in order to reflect the private ownership of the property and to bring it into consistency with adjacent properties: Assessor Parcel Number 309-011-30.

Two properties are proposed to be re-designated from Residential-Multi Family (R) to Commercial Lodging (CL) in order to allow the use of the properties as a parking lot in support of an existing business in the Village: Assessor Parcel Numbers 308-182-43 and 308-182-44.

An Initial Study and Negative Declaration have been prepared for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Initial Study determined that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

At the request of Chairman Conklin, City Attorney Martinez advised that the Planning Commission may waive the presentation of the staff report but the Commission must proceed with the public hearing and provide a written recommendation to the City Council as required by State law.

Chairman Conklin wished to note that the City had received two letters recommending approval of changing the designations on the zoning of the properties mentioned in this item.

It was decided that a brief overview of the staff report should be presented.

Associate Planner Neil Braunstein reviewed the staff report and also explained that it was staff's opinion that the re-designation of parcel numbers 308-182-43 and 308-182-44 from Residential-Multi Family (R) to Commercial Lodging (CL) did not create any negative impacts with respect to land-use designations. Mr. Braunstein added that this would create a non-conforming use for the properties because the single-family residential house that exists the southern property is not an allowed use under the Commercial Lodging designation, which means that the owner would be restricted from expanding or re-building the house in the event of damage to the house. Mr. Braunstein explained further that if the owner wished to re-build, it would have to be re-built to a conforming use.

Chairman Conklin asked if the owner was aware of this restriction. Mr. Braunstein replied that she was and still supported the amendment. He added that it was staff's opinion that this restriction did not create a sufficient enough problem to not approve the amendment.

Mr. Braunstein then recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the attached resolution recommending the adoption of the Negative Declaration and adoption of Specific Plan Amendment 2001-185.

At this time, Commissioners Jahn and Brewster recused themselves from further discussion of this item due to conflicts of interest in owning properties adjacent to parcels included in the amendment.

Commissioner Day wished to express his concern that the property owned by the Big Bear Lake Community Church would be re-designated to Commercial (C) so that the potential for any future public use of this lake front property would be eliminated.

Ms. Bogh responded that it has been the policy of the City not to designate any property as public that is not a publicly owned piece of land as it could be misleading to the public who may think they can go on the church property even though it would be trespassing. Additionally, the church could challenge the City if the City did not allow the church other uses for its land.

At this time, Chairman Conklin opened the public hearing at 2:22 p.m. There being no comments from the public, Chairman Conklin closed the public hearing at 2:23 p.m.

In response to a question from Commissioner Day, Ms. Bogh explained that she and Mr. Braunstein met with the head pastor of the Community Church and after an explanation of their purpose for changing the land-use designation for the property, they gave him the choice and he chose to re-designate the property to Lakefront Commercial.

After staff clarified further issues raised by Commissioner Day, the motion was moved by Vice Chairman Beede and seconded by Chairman Conklin to adopt the resolution recommending adoption of the Negative Declaration and adoption of Specific Plan Amendment 2001-185, as follows:

**RESOLUTION NO. PC2002-11**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT 2001-185 TO AMEND THE VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN BY REDESIGNATING 25 NON-CONTIGUOUS PROPERTIES TOTALING 2.25 ACRES IN THE VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN TO VARIOUS LAND USE DESIGNATIONS.**

The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: DAY, BEEDE, CONKLIN

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ABSTAIN: BREWSTER, JAHN

3.3 Site Approval (Conditional Use Permit) and Design Review 2001-201

Location: 40797 Lakeview Drive & 520 Bartlett Road

APN: 308-171-38, 28 & 308-163-55

Applicant: Mr. Charles Brewster and Mr. Craig Brewster

An application to add an approximate 3,000 square foot second story to an existing restaurant and reconfigure the parking lot at 40797 Lakeview Dr., to construct a 16-unit

lodge at 520 Bartlett Road, and establish a parking management plan. The second story addition at 40797 Lakeview Drive will consist of dining and meeting area, dance area, bar area, outdoor patio area, storage space, office space, and restrooms. In conjunction with the second story addition, the applicant proposes to reface the façade improvements using wood siding, wood beam treatments, copper awnings, rock treatment at the base and shaker roofing. The new 16-unit lodge at 520 Bartlett Road will be constructed of wood siding, log trim, veneer base siding and shaker roofing. The applicant is proposing to establish a parking management plan to utilize off-site parking at 40905 Big Bear Boulevard (APN 309-101-42), to incorporate tandem employee parking, dual use of a loading/parking space, and valet parking. The property at 40797 Lakeview Drive is zoned Village Retail within the Village Specific Plan and consists of .70 acres (30,800 square feet) and the property at 520 Bartlett is zoned Village Retail within the Village Specific Plan and consists of .54 acres (23,712 square feet). An environmental Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, which determined that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment because the project has been modified to incorporate mitigation measures relating to Traffic/Transportation and Noise, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared.

Chairman Conklin explained to the public that due to Commissioner Brewster's conflict of interest regarding this item he must recuse himself from the table for this item but may act as a proponent for the project on his own behalf.

City Attorney Martinez affirmed that the conflict of interest rules provide an exception so that Commissioner Brewster has the ability to act on his own behalf regarding a property of which he is the sole owner, or an owner along with members of his family.

Principal Planner Sandra Molina reviewed the staff report and recommended that the Planning Commission consider the project and adopt the resolution adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approving Plot Plan and Design Review application 2001-171, based upon the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained within the resolution.

Additionally, Ms. Molina reviewed the proposed revisions to the conditions of approval, which were reflected in the "green sheet" memo distributed prior to the meeting. The revisions were as follows:

18. Prior to installation of water lines and/or connection to the public water system ~~the approval of a grading plan or building permit issuance~~, the applicant shall contact the Department of Water to determine whether the existing five-eighths (5/8) inch water main needs to be upgraded to a one (1) inch meter.
25. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a completed ~~final~~ soils report shall be submitted and approved by the City.

28. Prior to issuance of a building permit or new sewer connection, whichever comes first, the application shall pay the appropriate sewer fees for each building through the Engineering Division.
29. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide documentation to the City that the ~~an additional~~ ten (10) feet of right of way along Lakeview Drive shown on the site plan has been dedicated to Caltrans or Big Bear Boulevard shall be dedicated to the City.
38. Exterior ladders providing roof access shall be prohibited. ~~Access to the roof shall be provided within the building.~~

Ms. Molina explained that these revisions were made in order to provide more clarity based upon a previous discussion with the applicant. Ms. Molina also added that the applicant was requesting the initial approval period of 12 months be extended to a total of 18 months up front rather than having to come back in a year to request an extension, as an 18 month extension is allowed per the Development Code. Ms. Molina advised the Planning Commission that this has been done before with other complex projects. The Planning Commission agreed that this would be acceptable.

Chairman Conklin opened the public hearing at 3:05 p.m.

Proponent Charles Brewster spoke in favor of his project and addressed Planning Commission concerns.

Bob Carlisle, architect for the project, spoke in favor of the project and answered questions of the Planning Commission.

Staff and the proponents addressed additional Planning Commission concerns including parking, camouflaging the kitchen exhaust hood, landscaping, and the applicant's intent not to use the new banquet facility as a stand-alone night club.

Big Bear Lake resident Greg Schick expressed his concerns over potential traffic flow problems on Lakeview Drive from the addition of this project.

Chairman Conklin closed the public hearing at 4:00 p.m.

Based upon the discussions between the Commission, staff, and the proponent, the following changes to the conditions of approval were made.

23. Street improvements plans shall be submitted and approved by the City prior to issuance of any construction permit for on site or off site work. Plans shall include all work as identified on the grading plan including curb and

gutter, sidewalks, driveways and street improvements along Bartlett Road, and shall indicate a swale to carry storm water on the east side of Bartlett Road, adjacent to the parallel parking spaces.

42. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a photometric plan indicating the location of light standards to illuminate the parking area and the proposed illumination levels of these lights, to the Planning Division for review and approval. Illumination shall not create off-site light and glare. The minimum illumination at parking spaces shall be maintained at a one-foot candle intensity. The plan shall require the approval of the City Planner. All building and parking lot light fixtures proposed shall be decorative as approved by the City Planner, and shall be constructed with fixtures as used on Village streets and public parking lots. A detail shall be provided with the final plans and shall be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit.
57. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit final elevations that demonstrate that the kitchen exhaust hood is screened from view by camouflaging it as a chimney spark arrester, in a manner which is an architectural component of the building as approved by the Planning Commission.
60. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall record a deed restriction approvable by the City, on Assessor's Parcel No. 0309-101-42 (40905 Big Bear Boulevard), and a lease restriction for businesses located on said parcel, stating that the use of the thirteen (13) on-site parking spaces shall be restricted for the use of the Robinhood Inn, located at 40797 Big Bear Boulevard between the hours of ~~6:00~~ 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. a daily basis on Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays and on major holidays, including the period between Christmas and New Year's Day. Said restriction shall not be removed without the written permission of the City of Big Bear Lake, and shall only be removed when the applicant demonstrates that sufficient parking can be provided to support the uses on 40797 Lakeview Drive.
64. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall post a "No Parking" sign on the east elevation of the Robinhood Inn, adjacent to Pine Knot Avenue, and a sign at the joint loading/parking space identifying it for use as a loading zone only from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
65. The banquet facility and bar areas are approved for use as an accessory use for the hotel only, and shall not be used for the primary use of a nightclub, lounge, bar, or similar facility.

Moved by Commissioner Jahn, seconded by Commissioner Day, to adopt the resolution finding adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program and approving Site Approval and Design Review 2001-201, based upon the findings and subject to the conditions of approval, with an extension to the project expiration date to April 3, 2004, and including the aforementioned revisions as follows:

**RESOLUTION NO. PC2002-12**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, AND APPROVING SITE APPROVAL (CONDITIONAL UE PERMIT) AND DESIGN REVIEW 2001-201 TO EXPAND AN EXISTING HOTEL BY ADDING BANQUET/MEETING FACILITIES TO AN EXISTING RESTAURANT, 16 NEW UNITS, AND RELATED PARKING FACILITIES INCLUDING THE USE OF AN OFFSITE PARKING LOT ON PROPERTIES, AND PARKING MANAGEMENT PLAN LOCATED AT 40797 LAKEVIEW DRIVE (APNS 308-171-38 AND 308-171-28), 520 BARTLETT ROAD (APN 308-163-55), AND 40905 BIG BEAR BOULEVARD 9APN 309-101-42).**

The motion was passed by the following vote:

AYES: DAY, JAHN, BEEDE, CONKLIN  
NOES: NONE  
ABSENT: NONE  
ABSTAIN: BREWSTER

Chairman Conklin convened the meeting at 4:20 p.m. to allow for a short recess. The meeting reconvened at 4:25 p.m.

3.4 Site Approval (Conditional Use Permit) and Design Review 2001-043, Major Deviation 2001-044, and Minor Subdivision 2001-062 (Tentative Parcel Map No. 15705)

Location: 39708 through 39756 Big Bear Boulevard  
APN(s): 307-122-15, 16, 22, 25, and 26  
Applicant: Mr. Tony Tamberchi

An application requesting approval for a 91-unit hotel on the 3.9-acre site. The property is located within the Multi-family/Commercial (C-2) zone district. The Major Deviation component of the project is to increase the building height from 35 feet to 39 feet, and to reduce the parking requirement for shared uses within the building. The Minor Subdivision component of the project is to combine 5 existing parcels into 1 parcel

containing 3.9 acres. The 91-unit hotel will contain the ancillary uses of a 4,000 square foot banquet facility, a 1,068 square foot restaurant, 1,700 square foot lounge, a 500 square foot lobby service bar, a 624 square foot maintenance building and 178 parking spaces. An environmental Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which determined that although the project has the potential to cause significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project that will reduce all potential impacts to insignificant levels.

This Public Hearing was continued from the March 6, 2002 Regular Meeting.

Associate Planner Janice Etter updated the Planning Commission on the revisions to the project that had just been submitted, including an increase in the size of the endangered plant habitat area; revisions to the height of the building; a reduction in the parking space requirements; the relocation and modification to a storage building; and revisions to the landscaping plan. Ms. Etter recommended that the Planning Commission not take any action on this project but conduct a public workshop on the proposed project, review the project, receive public input and provide direction as deemed appropriate regarding the design and environmental issues to staff and the applicant.

Chairman Conklin opened the public hearing at 4:35 p.m.

Tom Brown, a neighbor adjacent to the project, expressed his concerns in regards to a lack of a snow storage area for the project and his desire to have an Environmental Impact Report prepared for the project.

Lakeview Pines resident Sandy Steers expressed her frustration regarding the public hearing process with this particular project. She also expressed concerns regarding the height of the project, not having enough employee parking, the lack of drainage and the endangerment of native plants, and felt that an Environmental Impact Report should be done.

Sierra Club President Glenda Aikens spoke in favor of conducting an Environmental Impact Report for the project and expressed concerns over the removal of trees and habitat; any streambed flow alterations and drainage; and how snow would be removed from the property.

City resident Dennis Large spoke in favor of conducting an Environmental Impact Report and was also concerned about the height of the hotel building.

Resident Bill McConnell asked if the City had received any input from the Presbyterian Conference Center. Staff responded that they had not.

Adjacent property owner Greg Schick expressed his concern over the proposed parking plan for the project. He also explained that he would like restricted access to Daisy Lane

due to the endangered plants and wildlife in that area. Mr. Schick spoke in favor of an increased building height in order to preserve additional trees on the property.

Owner and applicant Tony Tamberchi spoke in favor of his project and explained to the Commission and to the public that an Environmental Impact Report had not been requested and that the CEQA process was being postponed. Mr. Tamberchi expressed his frustration over not being able to receive more direction from the Planning Commission about what they would like to see with his project.

Ronald Aarons, architect for the project attempted to address some concerns brought up by the public by explaining the thoughts behind the design of the hotel.

Eric Jacobs, representing Hilton Hotels, spoke in favor of the project and addressed the concerns over the number of parking spaces. Mr. Jacobs stated his opinion is that the City's code requirements for parking are in excess of what is really needed and that the City should use Hilton developments in other municipalities as examples. Mr. Jacobs also discussed the possibility of utilizing valet parking.

Chairman Conklin closed the public hearing at 5:30 p.m.

No further action was taken in regards to this item.

Item 3.1 was re-addressed at this time. Commissioner Brewster moved to continue the public hearing for this item to the April 3, 2002 regular meeting. Commissioner Day seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

**4. PLANNING OFFICIAL'S REPORT**

There was nothing to report.

**5. SUMMARY COMMENTS**

There were no comments

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

At the hour of 5:30 p.m., Chairman Conklin adjourned to the Regular Planning Commission Meeting of April 3, 2002 at 1:15 p.m. in Hofert Hall.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE MEETING OF July 3, 2002

---

Jennifer Worth, Planning Commission Secretary