
**CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING**

May 17, 2006

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: 1:17 p.m.

FLAG SALUTE: Vice-Chairman Brigham

PRESENT: Chairman Tom Beede
Vice-Chairman Tim Brigham
Commissioner Craig Smith
Commissioner Rick Hackney
Commissioner David Caretto, seated at 1:32 p.m.
Commissioner Anne Zimmerman, seated at 1:32 p.m.

STAFF: Sandra Molina, City Planner
David Martinez, Development Services Director
Janice Etter, Associate Planner
Patrick McLaughlin, Assistant Planner
Jeff Ballinger, City Attorney
Joe Cylwik, Acting City Engineer
Phil Mosley, Chief Building Official
Lynne Rayner, Administrative Secretary

The Planning Commission of the City of Big Bear Lake took the following actions at the May 17, 2006 meeting held in Hofert Hall, Civic and Performing Arts Center, 39707 Big Bear Boulevard, Big Bear Lake, California.

Cheri Haggerty, Public Information Officer, introduced four high school students participating in Student Government Day.

AGENDA APPROVAL

City Planner recommended that presentations, announcements and informational items be moved to after the Consent Calendar.

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Hackney, to approve the agenda as amended. The agenda was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC FORUM

No one wished to speak.

1. CONSENT CALENDAR

1.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of May 3, 2006.

Commissioner Smith asked that the following correction be made to the minutes of May 3, 2006.

Commissioner Smith commented that he believed the Commission should discuss at length a general overall theme for Big Bear mural issue in the near future. City Planner Molina stated that staff will bring a discussion item back to the Commission and that it could possibly be added to the joint workshop on June 26th.

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Hackney, to approve the minutes of May 3, 2006 as amended.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: SMITH, HACKNEY, BRIGHAM, BEEDE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

1.2 Variance 2006-004

Applicants: Marianne and Christopher Kellstrom
Representative: Curry Engineering
Location: 39258 North Bay Drive
APN: 0306-121-01

Moved by Commissioner Hackney, seconded by Commissioner Smith, to approve Resolution No. PC2006-012 approving Variance 2006-004.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: SMITH, HACKNEY, BEEDE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: BRIGHAM

Chairman Beede announced that he has turned in his resignation as Chairman of the Planning Commission, which has been accepted by the City Council. He expressed his pleasure at serving the City, and at the hour of 1:27 p.m. turned the gavel over to Vice-Chairman Brigham and stepped down from the dais.

PRESENTATIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS / INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Mayor Jahn presented Chairman Beede with a Plaque of Appreciation from the City Council, thanking Chairman Beede for his service to the City.

Vice-Chairman Brigham presented a Proclamation of Appreciation to Chairman Beede on behalf of staff and the Planning Commission for Chairman Beede's efforts and time served on the Planning Commission, and offered him best wishes in his future endeavors.

2. REORGANIZATION

a. Swearing in of new Planning Commissioners

At the hour of 1:30 p.m., Mayor Bill Jahn conducted the swearing-in of Anne Zimmerman and David Caretto.

At the hour of 1:32 p.m., Commissioners Zimmerman and Caretto took their seats at the dais.

b. Selection of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

Commissioner Hackney nominated Vice-Chairman Brigham as Chairman of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Smith seconded the nomination.

Commissioner Smith nominated Commissioner Hackney as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission. Vice-Chairman Brigham seconded the nomination.

The nomination of Vice-Chairman Brigham as Chairman and Commissioner Hackney as Vice-Chairman was approved by the following vote:

AYES:	CARETTO, ZIMMERMAN, SMITH, HACKNEY, BRIGHAM
NOES:	NONE
ABSENT:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	NONE

3. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

3.1 Major Special Event 2006-049

Co-Applicants: City of Big Bear Lake and the Discovery Center

Representative: Cheri Haggerty, Public Information Officer

Location: 40870 Big Bear Boulevard

APN: 0308-151-55 and 309-011-29

Assistant Planner Patrick McLaughlin presented the staff report, stating that the applicants are requesting approval to hold a concert series on six Saturdays during the summer of 2006 in the gazebo in Veterans Park on various dates from June 24 through September 2nd from 2:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m. and that the events would be free to the public. He stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission

adopt a resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approving Major Special Event 2006-049.

Commissioner Smith asked staff how many parking spaces would be available between the Church and First Mountain Bank. Assistant Planner McLaughlin replied that he did not know the specific number but indicated that event goers would be directed first to Veterans Park and Bartlett Parking Lot, and that participants would not specifically be directed to First Mountain Bank for parking but could use it.

Commissioner Zimmerman questioned the size of the banners, where they would be placed and the duration of time they would be up. Assistant Planner McLaughlin stated that two will be placed near Big Bear Boulevard, two will be placed on the gazebo, and one will be located at the Civic Center. He said that although the banners were originally proposed to be 10 x 15 ft., the applicant is now proposing much smaller signs, and per the Development Code the signs are allowed to be displayed 15 days prior to an event and for 5 days afterward.

City Planner Molina clarified the signs would be limited to 24 sq. ft., and informed the Commission that they may discuss the schedule with applicant Cheri Haggerty during the public hearing.

Commissioner Smith asked staff why the snow fencing was necessary.

Assistant Planner McLaughlin stated that the temporary fencing is to deter people from walking across the landscaping to access the restrooms and would be up only during the event and taken down every evening.

Commissioner Hackney asked how the no alcohol policy would be enforced.

Assistant Planner McLaughlin replied that staff has met with the Sheriff's Department and Public Works, and that alcohol will be handled by advanced advertising and by the posting of signs that alcohol is not permitted, and that if it is determined to be present the attendee will be asked to remove it. He further stated that there is an ordinance in the Municipal Code stating that no alcohol is allowed in City Parks unless part of a City event, and that it will not be part of this event.

Chairman Brigham asked if any provision had been made for Lake Patrol for people attending the event in boats.

Assistant Planner McLaughlin stated that staff did not address lake access in the staff report.

City Planner Molina clarified that this event is not being touted as a lake event, such as the Island in the Sky event was.

Chairman Brigham asked who would be directing traffic. Assistant Planner McLaughlin replied that the volunteer Citizens on Patrol would be directing traffic during the event.

Commissioner Caretto asked Assistant Planner McLaughlin to explain the insurance requirement to the Commission. Assistant Planner McLaughlin stated that because this is a City event, the City is the insuring agent.

Chairman Brigham asked at what level does the City need to be involved and is there a problem if we are asking the City to indemnify itself.

City Planner Molina stated that the City has its own insurance policy and according to the City's Risk Management Office, the City will acquire a giant umbrella to cover events at the park. The umbrella will also insure the private property owners that are allowing the city to use their parking lots.

At the hour of 1:46 p.m., Chairman Brigham opened the public hearing.

Cheri Haggerty, Public Information Officer, stated that she has already held several meetings to discuss the alcohol and insurance questions, and stated that the June 24th concert will be a run through to see what problems occur so they can be taken care of before future dates.

Commissioner Smith asked Ms. Haggerty about the snow fencing. Ms. Haggerty stated that people tend to side skirt over the landscaping rather than go around through the entrance to the portable restrooms. She stated it was her intention to put the fencing up and take it back down for each concert, but that if the Commission desired it can be held in reserve until it can be determined if it is really needed.

Commissioner Zimmerman asked Ms. Haggerty what the signs will look like and if they could be taken down between each scheduled concert date.

Ms. Haggerty stated that one solid sign will be placed on the Civic Center property near the Boulevard to catch the attention of motorists coming into the City from the west and that two banners will be placed in a triangle side by side in the park near the highway, visible to Big Bear Boulevard traffic. She stated that these signs would encourage and attract visitors into the Village. She continued, stating that originally 10 x 15 ft. banners were proposed but that the Village Specific Plan and Development Code limited signage to 24 sq. ft. total for each banner. She stated it was the intention to try to list the entire concert series schedule on the banners along with the names of bands playing, as advertising for the major sponsorships the City was trying to obtain. She also stated that additional banners would be placed on the gazebo, both on the lake and street sides, which would be taken down immediately after each event.

Hearing no further comment, at the hour of 1:51 p.m. Chairman Brigham closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Smith stated he thought the event was a good one, that he would like to see the snow fencing be optional, and understood that the banner signage would be necessary to obtain the sponsorships needed to pay for the events.

Commissioner Zimmerman stated that she understood that the size of the signage would meet the needs of the applicant and would not deter from the other uses of the park, as originally proposed.

Commissioners Hackney and Brigham agreed that it was a good program and their concerns had been addressed.

Moved by Commissioner Caretto, seconded by Commissioner Smith, to adopt Resolution No. PC2006-13 approving Major Special Event 2006-049, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. PC2006-13

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING MAJOR SPECIAL EVENT 2006-049 TO HOLD THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE CONCERT SERIES EVENT ON JUNE 24, JULY 1, JULY 15, AUGUST 5, AUGUST 26, AND SEPTEMBER 2, 2006 AT VETERANS PARK LOCATED AT 40870 BIG BEAR BLVD (APN 0308-151-55 AND 0309-011-29)

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: CARETTO, ZIMMERMAN, SMITH, HACKNEY, BRIGHAM
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

3.2 Major Special Event 2006-058

Co-Applicants: Big Bear Chamber of Commerce and City of Big Bear Lake
Representative: Kathy Sawyer
Location: 40870 Big Bear Boulevard
APN: 0308-151-55 and 309-011-29

Assistant Planner Patrick McLaughlin presented the staff report, stating that the applicants are requesting approval to hold the Spruce Up For Spring event, which is free to the public, on Saturday, May 27, 2006 in Veterans Park from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., with booths set up by various agencies to hand out information about sprucing up for spring. He stated that although this event has been held in the past, Planning Commission approval is required because this year live music will be performed, and that pre-packaged food and alcohol will be sold at the event. He stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approving Major Special Event 2006-058.

Chairman Brigham asked if timing was an issue, as the different department approvals for electrical permits, fire inspections, etc., need seven working days for approval.

Assistant Planner McLaughlin stated that due to the fact that the application was received late, he felt that staff would be willing to work with the applicants to ensure everything is taken care of before the event.

At the hour of 1:57 p.m., Chairman Brigham opened the public hearing and hearing no comment, closed it.

City Planner Molina stated that staff recommends the following condition of approval be added pertaining to the sale of alcohol.

20. The applicant shall coordinate a meeting with the San Bernardino Sheriff's Department and other private security companies (if applicable) to discuss and create a security plan. (SO, PLN)

Moved by Vice-Chairman Hackney, seconded by Commissioner Caretto, to adopt Resolution No. PC2006-14 approving Major Special Event 2006-058, based on the findings and subject to the amended conditions of approval as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. PC2006-14

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING MAJOR SPECIAL EVENT 2006-058 TO HOLD THE SPRUCE UP FOR SPRING EVENT ON MAY 27, 2006 AT 40870 BIG BEAR BLVD (APN 0308-151-55 AND 0309-011-29)

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: CARETTO, ZIMMERMAN, SMITH, HACKNEY, BRIGHAM
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

- 3.3 Conditional Use Permit 2001-043, Variance 2001-044, Tentative Parcel Map 2001-062
Applicant: Hilton Garden Inn
Representative: Tony Tamberchi
Location: 39708 – 39756 Big Bear Boulevard
APN: 0307-122-15, 16, 22, 25 and 26

Associate Planner Etter re-introduced Architect Gene Fong of Gene Fong Associates, Civil Engineer Jon Ziegler of P.A. Breen Engineering, Inc., and the City's Environmental Consultants Madonna Marcello from Terry A. Hayes Associates and Mr. Ted Lee from Mooney Jones and Stokes. She reminded the Commission that the project was originally heard at the meeting of April 19, 2006 and continued to today. She stated that a detailed staff report for the project was distributed for the April meeting, and that another staff report has been prepared for today's meeting, including staff reports from 2001 and 2002, and that today's staff report addresses issues brought up at the last meeting.

Associate Planner Etter provided background information, stating that the applicant is proposing to construct a 91 guest room hotel, known as the Hilton Garden Inn, that the hotel is proposed to have additional uses consisting of banquet and meeting rooms, a restaurant and cocktail lounge with an outdoor patio, amenities including an indoor swimming pool, spa, sauna and exercise room and that a maintenance and storage building is also proposed to be built on the property. She continued, stating that there will be 171 parking spaces on the site, that a Variance is also requested to exceed the building height limit of 40 feet for the three story portion of the building, and that a Tentative Parcel Map application has also been submitted to combine the five existing parcels into one 3.87 acre parcel. She informed the Commission that the properties are all located in the Commercial Visitor (C-3) zone, and that the property currently contains several buildings, all of which are proposed to be demolished to make way for construction of the hotel.

Continuing, Associate Planner Etter stated that at the April 19th meeting, the Commission requested a large scale tree plan and requested that the applicant revise the project grading to save more trees, widen a driveway and revise the striping pattern of Big Bear Boulevard. The large-scale site plan has been distributed to the Commission, showing all the trees on the property, and the grading of the project has been revised and has been lowered by a foot and a half. As a result, an additional 13 trees can be saved in the front of the proposed hotel building, and another tree can be saved at the northeast side of the parking lot by enlarging a planter area, totaling 14 additional saved trees. Also requested by the Commission was additional information on how the project complies with the open space requirements. She stated that 20 percent of the site must be reserved in open space, either in landscape or natural state condition, and that on a project this size, this would be over 33,000 square feet. As shown on the landscape plan, over 28,000 square feet will be xeriscape landscaping, 11,000 square feet will remain in natural state, and over 19,000 square feet will be set aside as a conservation area for the rare plants.

Associate Planner Etter continued, stating that as shown on the revised plan, the main driveway has been widened to provide two outbound lanes as requested by the Commission at the last meeting. The lane striping along Big Bear Boulevard has also been revised, however City staff recommends against offsetting the center line and does not support the 16-foot wide center median shown on the plan. Instead, the City recommends a one lane wide continuous center median and continuous left turn lane, providing for the maximum amount of vehicle stacking for turning movements into the hotel, along with left turn movements into both driveways into City Hall. Vehicles exiting the hotel would also be provided with a stacking lane for easier merging into eastbound traffic. A condition of approval has been included to revise this striping plan.

Associate Planner Etter informed the Commission that additional information has been provided in the staff report for issues raised by the public at the last meeting. An evaluation of the eagle habitat has been performed by Kurt Campbell of Jones and Stokes and has been included in your staff report. As stated in the EIR, the property is not identified as eagle habitat in the City's General Plan because no trees on the site have suitable characteristics to be routine perches for eagles and therefore there is no

reasonable basis to expect that bald eagles will regularly use this site. Also, Mr. Ted Lee of Mooney Jones and Stokes provided additional information regarding wetlands, pebble plain and impacts to Metcalf Creek. Although a portion of the site at the north end does support Bird-footed Checkerbloom, which is classified as an obligate wetlands plant, the site is not dominated by hydrophilic plants, but in fact is dominated by upland plant species and dry mountain meadow habitat, therefore the site would not be characterized as wetlands under the Clean Water Act. Pebble Plain habitat is habitat that supports rare and special status plants, including the Southern Mountain Buckwheat. As stated in the EIR, Mooney Jones and Stokes surveyed the site for Southern Mountain Buckwheat, a federally threatened species, and while it was determined to exist on the property to the north, it was not detected on the site.

Associate Planner Etter stated that a question was raised at the last meeting regarding direct and indirect impacts to the pebble plain habitat offsite. Topographic contours of the subject property and the property immediately to the north and west indicate a low point located south of the area on the adjacent property containing pebble plain habitat. This low point is located at a “knotch” in the adjacent property at the mouth of Metcalf Creek. Drainage from the subject site enters Metcalf Creek and the Big Bear Lake at this point, and does not enter the portion of the adjacent property, which contains pebble plain habitat. Additionally, the limits of the construction on the subject property are approximately 200 feet to the south and separated by the natural state conservation area, so staff believes that no direct or indirect impacts will occur because the hydrological conditions will not be changing. Likewise direct and indirect impacts to Metcalf Creek are not expected to occur for many of the same reasons as with the Pebble Plain habitat. Metcalf Creek does not cross the subject property but is approximately one hundred forty feet to the west.

Associate Planner Etter continued, stating a concern was also raised at the last meeting regarding emergency preparedness and the additional impact visitors to the hotel might have in time of disaster. The City has adopted an Emergency Operations Plan for all types of disasters and the plan is designed to care for both full time residents and visitors. Staff believes the incremental impact of the guests at this hotel will be negligible, and depending on the disaster, the hotel may be called upon to shelter stranded visitors.

Associate Planner Etter stated that regarding water conservation, low flow plumbing fixtures including sinks, showers and toilets are required for all new development by the Uniform Building Code and Water Conservation Resolutions adopted by the Department of Water. Low flow fixtures will be installed on the project, even though a specific condition does not require them. Staff is recommending an additional condition of approval with respect to water conserving service policies, operations within the hotel such as less frequent linen washing per guest and reminders in the guest rooms.

Associate Planner Etter informed the Commission that since the April 19th meeting, four additional comment letters have been received, and responses to these letters were included in the staff report. Additionally one letter received after distribution of the staff report has been provided to the Commission on green paper.

In conclusion, she stated that the project has been evaluated for consistency with the General Plan and Development Code and staff believes that the findings can be made to support approval of the Parcel Map, the Variance and the Conditional Use Permit. Staff further believes that the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act have been met. Two resolutions have been prepared for the Commission's consideration, one certifying the Environmental Impact Report and adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program, the second resolution approves the Parcel Map, the Variance and the Conditional Use Permit for the project, subject to the conditions of approval and the mitigation measures. The applicant has received all staff reports and resolutions and has indicated that he concurs with all of the conditions of approval and the Mitigation Monitoring Program. Staff recommends conducting a public hearing and adopt the resolutions approving the project.

Commissioner Caretto stated that both he and Commissioner Zimmerman have been provided with all staff reports, the draft and final EIRs, all site plans, minutes, and audio recordings of all meetings relating to this project and he feels prepared to participate in the hearing and decision today. Commissioner Zimmerman agreed, also stating that she had walked the site and checked out the views that may be impacted by any decision made today.

Commissioner Caretto asked if a portion of Delmar Drive, reflected on the plans as part of the driveway entrance, would pose any additional risk to the City having a dedicated public street be used as a portion of the driveway. Associate Planner Etter replied that the small portion of Delmar Drive just north of Big Bear Boulevard is a dedicated public right of way, and that the developer has been in conversations with the City to get feedback on possibly vacating that portion of the street, but the street serves as access to another piece of property to the west and at this time the City will not vacate that section of Delmar Drive. City Attorney Ballinger added that in terms of liability, this would not impose any additional liability on the City.

Commissioner Caretto asked for clarification regarding if the flags had been lowered to reflect the lowered building grade requested by the Commission on April 19th. Associate Planner Etter replied that they had not changed the flags to reflect the lower grade.

Commissioner Hackney stated he had some questions about traffic flow and the new design. He asked if it would be possible to access Delmar Drive in front of the project or do the plans show a curb in that location. Ms. Etter replied that it is intended that Delmar Drive be open and function as a driveway into the project.

Commissioner Hackney replied that a deceleration lane has been provided on the north side and the south side and wondered if there was a real need on the south side for this deceleration lane, how often would there be a heavy traffic impact going east there. He stated that he was still concerned with possible bottlenecks of traffic going in and out of the project because if there is any traffic backed up in the center lane turning into the project from the west, the vehicle in the left turn lane exiting the project will not be able to exit. He stated he would like to see a better solution in this area.

At the hour of 2:31 p.m., Chairman Brigham reopened the public hearing.

Lyman Ellis, resident of Big Bear Lake, presented a short video of eastbound traffic recorded in 2000 from the northeast corner of Cienega and Big Bear Boulevard.

Ed Wallace, resident of Big Bear Lake representing the Sierra Club of Big Bear Valley, stated his opposition to the project and expressed his disagreement with the assessment that there will be no impact on the Pebble Plains or endangered species or wildlife in the area.

Sandy Steers, resident of Fawnskin representing Friends of Fawnskin, stated her opposition to the project for reasons of the height variance, that wildlife will be endangered by cutting 29 trees, and that the hydrology will change and will affect the endangered plants. She further stated she did not feel the project had been properly evaluated and that CEQA requirements have not been met.

Norman Greene, resident of Big Bear Lake, stated his opposition to the project and stated he felt the City Planning Division has done a slip shod job on this project trying to get it through. He said he believed if a vote were taken, the residents would vote two to one that they would not want the project approved.

Greg Schick, resident of Big Bear Lake, stated he approved of the Hilton project but wanted to clarify that he does object to the Variance application and the number of units proposed. He stated the applicant had made no effort to reduce the number of allowable units, that the applicant is maximizing the development at the expense of the adjacent properties and the environment, and that he believes the mitigation measures should have some relationship to mitigation proposals on adjacent parcels.

Michael Karp, resident of Big Bear Lake representing Friends of Big Bear Valley, stated his opposition to the project for reasons of aesthetics, traffic and environmental concerns, stating that the Government should listen to the voices of the citizens, and that a threatened lawsuit would divert monies needed for such things as road repairs to City attorney fees.

John Milbauer, part time resident of Big Bear Lake representing Iris Drive residents, stated his opposition to the project because the height of the building would be materially detrimental to the interests of the properties or improvements in such vicinity in the land use district in which the property is located.

Chairman Brigham brought the discussion back to the Commission level, leaving the public hearing open.

Commissioner Caretto expressed his concern that the resolution does not spell out in a more positive way that the City is not required to protect private property views.

City Planner Molina explained that the General Plan policies are broader in the sense that it talks about public views from public roadways or scenic lake access points, but not specifically about each and every piece of property, that there is no ordinance that protects views for all properties in the City.

Commissioner Zimmerman stated that in the communities that have view preservation ordinances, the properties that are protected by those ordinances are identified by certain criteria, not as a general rule to all properties. She continued, stating that in the case of this project, the properties which would experience the loss of views are so far removed from the lake shore that one would need to examine the reasonableness of their expectation that the view would always be there. She asked the square footage of the third floor portion of the building that would exceed the height limitation.

Gene Fong, the project Architect, stated that the portion of the third floor that requires the Variance is about 50%, which includes the pitched roofline.

Commissioner Smith stated that he believed the developer has done a good job of trying to protect view corridors with the use of open space parking lots because there is a significant space that will open up from what is there presently, and that views might improve in some cases.

Chairman Brigham stated his belief that the public view corridor would improve by the development of this project.

Commissioner Hackney stated he also thought views might be improved, stating that he had walked Snowball Lane and Iris Lane and it appeared to him that the present cluster of trees to the northwest on the south side of the Boulevard are what obstruct the view so he believed the additional 9 feet requested for the hotel would only impact a small slice of view.

Mr. Milbauer returned to the podium and stated that homeowners do not have any expectation that their view may not be obstructed at some point in the future, but do have an expectation that the City Planning Commission and City Council will build things within the height requirements and not approve variances to what has already been determined was the maximum height.

Commissioner Caretto asked for clarification regarding how it is that we are assured that all of the things listed as Mitigation Measures will be monitored and completed.

City Planner Molina stated that the resolution certifying the EIR also includes a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is a table listing the measures, when they need to be complied with, and a place for staff to sign off when each is completed. She continued, stating that for ongoing measures, staff has the responsibility for ensuring that those activities are taking place, basically staff needs to ensure that as the project is being constructed that all Mitigation Measures are being complied with at the time set forth under the program and ensure that annual monitoring is being done.. She explained that Mitigation Measures are not brought back to the Planning Commission for review, that once the Mitigation Monitoring Program is completed, it is not a document that staff provides back to the Planning Commission but typically stays in the case file.

Commissioner Zimmerman asked if there was a requirement that the applicant convey the area with the Checkerbloom to a conservation agency and if so, has one been

assigned. She also asked if this is a conveyance of an easement and would this be the same agency that would monitor a management plan.

Associate Planner Etter explained that the California Department of Fish and Game will approve whatever agency is selected and an agency has not as of yet been named. She stated that the City has various conservation easements throughout town, one such has been given to the Nature Conservancy, but noted that they are no longer accepting easements. She offered that Ted Lee from Mooney Jones and Stokes might have a list of agencies that they are considering. She stated that the monitoring plan is prepared by Mr. Lee's office, and the program is approved by the Department of Fish and Game. It has annual water quality and quantity monitoring built into the plan, including that a non-wasting endowment fund be established to maintain the habitat.

Commissioner Zimmerman asked if the applicant could appeal the endowment requirement, and also asked if the percentage of the Checkerbloom plants was significant among the population of the plants area wide. Ms. Etter replied that the applicant is only able to negotiate the amount of the endowment and the levels of monitoring with the Fish and Game. She deferred the Checkerbloom question to Mr. Lee.

Ted Lee, the biological consultant from Mooney Jones and Stokes, stated that the total number of Checkerbloom on site has been mapped, he did not know the exact number but that it is hundreds of plants, and this number in question represents less than 10% of the population on site. He stated that the Department of Fish and Game is the authorizing agent, that the City only reviews for CEQA compliance. He said that the details of the mitigation plan will be completed in conformance with and to satisfy the California Endangered Species Act and Federal Endangered Species Act and the mechanism for requiring that plan is the trigger that satisfies CEQA.

Commissioner Smith asked about the scenario if everything is done according to plan and Fish and Game buys off on the plan, then what happens if it doesn't work. Mr. Lee replied that the plan will list contingency measures determined by consultation with Fish and Game and may include offsite acquisition, payment of additional funds for management of other populations, and so on, which have not specifically been identified at this time. He stated that the Department of Fish and Game would not issue a permit without a plan that has contingency measures, ongoing monitoring management, and a non-wasting endowment in place to ensure that the plan will be successful and will adequately mitigate any potential loss to these plants.

Commissioner Smith asked Mr. Lee to address the issues of the wetlands and Metcalf Creek one more time.

Mr. Lee responded that a typical analysis of a project like this is to include consideration of potential indirect impact. A typical buffer requirement imposed by the California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is often a hundred foot buffer, and in this case there is a one hundred and twenty foot buffer, which is 20% in excess of what is typically required. He stated that this, in concert with having lighting directed away from the

Creek, which is often an indirect effect, and additional measures to prevent sedimentation of the Creek, that this buffer is consistent with the typical requirements. He continued, stating that regarding the wetlands issue, this is a Clean Water Act issue, which is very explicit, that in order to be considered a wetland the site has to exhibit positive indicators for three parameters, including hydric soils (soils that develop under saturated conditions); hydrophilic plants (plants that typically occur in wetlands and that the criteria for that parameter is that over 50% of the dominant plants must typically occur in wetlands); and indicators of wetland hydrology. Most of the concerns that have been raised have been related to Bird-footed Chequerbloom, which is characterized as a plant that characteristically occurs in wetlands. He stated that although there is some debate in the scientific community of how accurate they are, the requirement is that the predominance of the vegetation on site must be dependent or typically occur in wetlands, which is clearly not the case on this site.

Commissioner Hackney asked if Mr. Lee could address the issue of indirect impacts on Pebble Plain or wetlands offsite. Mr. Lee stated that part of the difficulty in analyzing a project like this is that no matter what the studies say, no matter how the project is designed, you are always going to hear concern that this is not how the project is designed. He stated that they have evaluated the project on the premise that the project has been designed to not change the hydrology on the site. To have the argument be made that this is not to be believed is a valid argument, but not a CEQA issue. He stated that they base the analysis on the information that they have today. The potential offsite impacts with respect to biological resources is another measure that is required to be included in the management plan and monitoring of that situation is required as part of the implementation of the plan. Contingency measures are required to be built in by the mitigation measures in the EIR to ensure that, if in fact the monitoring phase identifies that there is some hydrological change as a result of the project that is resulting in negative effects to the biological resources, then there is a mechanism to compensate for those impacts.

Commissioner Smith commended the developer for maintaining as many trees as possible when redesigning the project, but asked if it would be possible to make islands in the parking lot to save trees number 14, 15, 17, 19, 22 and 31, which are on the periphery of the parking lot and if so, could parking spaces be given up to save these trees.

City Planner Molina replied that the Tree Conservation Ordinance does state that the Planning Commission may allow for the reduction of parking spaces for the conservation of additional trees.

Commissioner Zimmerman asked if the driveway design could be changed to a one-way entrance and exit.

Tony Tamberchi, the applicant, addressed Commissioner Zimmerman's question by stating that Fire Chief Morley had dictated the circulation of the driveways, and as far as the parking spaces are concerned, the loss of ten parking spaces would create a parking problem during busy times. He also stated that according to the arborist, some

of the larger trees require a twelve-foot radius around them, which would eliminate many more parking spaces.

Commissioner Smith noted that trees 18 and 19 are already being saved, so he was now asking about trees number 14, 15, 21, and 22.

City Planner Molina advised that the Tree Conservation Ordinance does allow the Commission to give parking space credits for trees conservation. The Commission can allow for a 15% reduction in parking spaces for tree conservation, but at a rate of one to one, so for four trees only up to four parking spaces could be reduced. However, a tree expert must evaluate those trees to determine if it can be done. And, the number of parking spaces shown on the site plan are the exact number of parking spaces needed, so there would have to be a comfort level if spaces were reduced that there would be sufficient parking spaces at peak demand times.

Commissioner Smith asked if the spaces were calculated at 100% occupancy of the rooms, plus 100% occupancy of the restaurant, plus 100% of the banquet facilities.

Associate Planner Etter stated we are not considering shared use for this project. She informed the Commission that the parking requirement for the uses other than the guest rooms is based on square footage.

Commissioner Caretto pointed out that in Mr. Scullin's report it indicated a desire to have tree wells constructed, but in the follow up letter from Mr. Tamberchi, he indicated that if necessary he would follow that recommendation. He asked if something needed to be added to the resolution to clarify this.

Associate Planner Etter replied that the resolution states to follow the recommendation of the arborist with respect to saving the new trees, due to concern regarding changing the grade to maximize the likelihood that the trees would be saved, specifically Condition 16 (a) reads "that the site grading around the trees to be retained shall be performed as recommended by arborist Aaron Scullin in his May 1, 2006 recommendation letter."

Chairman Brigham asked to what extent the CUP gives Planning control over the environmental management plan.

City Planner Molina replied that the environmental review and the determination that is ultimately made has to be made in order to be able to approve the CUP, the map and all the other applications. She clarified that because those environmental determinations are being made to support the Conditional Use Permit, the Planning Commission has the ability to bring back before them any of the conditions of approval or mitigation measures. Also, if the mitigation measures are being implemented and if it is determined that a better way exists to implement the measure to mitigate that potential impact, under CEQA there is also the ability to substitute mitigation measures, which would also come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hackney again expressed his concern about the eastbound traffic jamming up the cars that are exiting the hotel going east. He wondered if a possible

way to avoid the bottleneck would be if the traffic coming east would be required to turn into Delmar Drive and there was no left turn from the center lane into the main entrance of the project.

Associate Planner Etter expressed understanding of his concern with traffic exiting the site and the left turn movements in, however, creating an entrance only at Delmar Drive would create another problem. She informed the Commission that the applicant previously submitted to staff a proposal that had one entrance into the site at the very western part of the property at Delmar Drive, as opposed to having the main entrance farther down the Boulevard roughly lining up with the eastern entrance to City Hall. Staff's main concern with that design was that people approaching eastbound would pass that entrance by the time they see the hotel. Normal traffic patterns would say that the left hand movements have to be completed before the people exit and also after people do that one time, they would see that there is another exit at the west end of the property and they might use that one the next time. Staff felt that having the entrance only at the west end was not a good thing because they would not see the hotel in time to make the turning movement.

Commissioner Hackney said he understood the explanation but still thought there would be a bottleneck and asked if there would be another way to avoid that.

Acting City Engineer Joe Cylwik stated that if eastbound traffic only could access from the westerly driveway there would be very limited stacking on the highway for those vehicles coming eastbound. By allowing the driveway toward the middle of the property where there is a wider Boulevard allows stacking in the middle of the street thereby allowing eastbound traffic to continue traveling.

Commissioner Hackney reiterated his concern that someone wanting to leave the project and go east could possibly be stuck there for a long time, and asked if perhaps another option would be if the left turn only coming out of the property were somehow to the west side where there is no stacking available for traffic wanting to enter into the project, and people coming east will see the hotel and want to turn in, so they will already be past the Delmar Drive access point, so if that were relocated to the west side, maybe that would resolve the problem.

Ms. Etter asked for clarification, did he mean that the main entrance would be right turn only out. Commissioner Hackney replied yes, and two lanes wide, one coming in and one going out. He then offered that perhaps in order to accomplish this, the Delmar Drive entry would have to be restriped and widened.

Mr. Tamberchi stated that engineers advised him that Delmar Drive should be right turn only to alleviate additional traffic buildups, but thought that if there were two left turn exit capabilities there would be more flexibility.

Commissioner Hackney replied this would be a simple solution that would be an improvement.

Commissioner Smith offered that the downside of this would be if someone were turning left out of Delmar Drive and there are cars stacked up trying to turn left into the

hotel, there will not be a chance to accelerate into traffic, but at least they would be able to exit.

Chairman Brigham asked how much leeway the City has with Caltrans, as far as left and right turn lanes on the highway and also on private property.

Associate Planner Etter replied that Caltrans would support the City if staff recommended a right turn only out movement, but as far as them imposing an additional restriction, she did not think it was likely.

Commissioner Hackney asked if one parking space was eliminated at the Delmar Drive entrance, there might be enough room to create a similar three-lane entry/exit like the other driveway, and giving up one parking space to accomplish that might be worth considering.

City Planner Molina stated that this would necessitate a revision to the project description to include a Variance for the parking space.

Associate Planner Etter asked for clarification, would this scenario be reducing the main entrance down to only two lanes.

Commissioner Hackney replied that he was hoping to have a left turn only coming out both places, and that if one parking space was eliminated immediately to the east of Delmar Drive a substitute parking space could be created over by the flag area, for a net loss of zero.

Mr. Tamberchi pointed out that Delmar Drive is only two lanes the rest of the way, so it would be awkward to have three lanes entering the project then funneling down to two lanes.

A discussion ensued regarding the Delmar Drive entry and exit lanes, and the possibility of eliminating the landscape area proposed there to create an additional lane, and then restrict the new third lane to a right turn only lane. The following language was added to Attachment 2, Page 64:

16. (t) Show the alignment of all adjacent streets, turn lanes, medians, bus turnouts, and location of project entrance(s), drive-aisles, traffic control devices, sidewalks, landscape setbacks, and location of other proposed infrastructure on the site plan. The plans shall depict that the two driveways into the project each contain one entrance and two exit lanes. These plans shall depict a cross section, which includes acceleration/deceleration lanes, eastbound/westbound travel lanes, and a center continuous left turn lane. The two-way center turn median shall be extended eastward as far as possible, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Caltrans. All restriping improvements shall be installed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Caltrans. (ENG)

Commissioner Caretto asked for clarification regarding where the loading zone and trash collection areas were.

Associate Planner Etter stated that a service area including a loading zone and trash collection area are at the northwest corner of the building, however with the circulation change the Commission is requesting, trash trucks and service vehicles would then be required to turn right and go all the way around the building to the service area.

Commissioner Hackney asked if an exception could be made for those service vehicles, and all other vehicles must turn right.

Associate Planner Etter replied that directional signage could indicate deliveries straight, hotel guests to the right.

Commissioner Smith asked with respect to views and property values, are there any court cases that might be an issue for the City down the road.

City Attorney Jeff Ballinger replied no, the general rule legally speaking is diminution in value of property does not state a cause of action.

Chairman Brigham asked Mr. Schick to return to the podium.

Mr. Schick stated that he had an additional comment on the Checkerbloom plants. He stated that he has a PRC report that shows that there were less than two dozen Checkerblooms on the subject property when he was the owner of the property, so perhaps the Checkerbloom plant had been prolific in the last few years and quite possibly might not be as endangered as once thought if there are a hundred plants on the property now. He also inquired if Delmar Drive would bisect the two separate Checkerbloom areas or if it would be combined it into one area.

Mr. Tamberchi stated that this decision would be made by the Department of Fish and Game. There is a sewer easement going down that street so the City would need access to that area.

Commissioner Caretto asked to return to the subject of trees, stating that when trees are saved there would be a subsequent reduction in the number of trees replaced, or are we still holding the developer to 92 new trees.

Associate Planner Etter stated that the Commission may want to alter the wording, as the 92 number is stated in the recital portion, but on this project just to be more specific a number could be specified, such as up to 92 trees. We do have a preliminary landscape plan submitted reflecting 43 trees being removed, with replacement numbers in the high nineties. We are asking for a final landscaping plan as a condition of approval so the number of replacement trees could be reduced if the Commission wishes to do so.

City Planner Molina added that the Tree Ordinance doesn't require that for one tree removed one tree needs to be replaced; that it is not a Development Code requirement that 92 trees have to be replaced and that the applicant has not indicated that replanting 92 trees would be an issue.

Commissioner Smith added that he would also like to require a certain number of the replacement trees to be a large size trees and he also stated he would like to spell out the requirement that the trees be protected by fencing the dripline.

Associate Planner Etter stated that in the conditions of approval we do indicate that the replacement trees shall be no smaller than 15 gallon, with 60% of the replacement trees to be larger, 24-inch box.

Chairman Brigham asked Mr. Tamberchi if he was in agreement with replacing 92 trees.

Mr. Tamberchi replied that the ordinance requires a one to one ratio and since he is removing 29 trees, he will replace 29 trees, but stated it was not his intention to barren the area. He did not know the number, but stated that he will plant a lot of trees and will maximize the size whenever possible for the areas to be replanted.

City Planner Molina clarified that the previous Tree Conservation Ordinance did require tree replacement of one to one, however, the new Tree Ordinance, updated in 2003, does not require a one to one ratio, as it recognizes that a vacant piece of property with trees on it supports a certain number of trees, but once developed, the site cannot support the same number of trees so no longer requires the one to one ratio. The new Ordinance allows the tree expert to determine how many trees can be supported on the site, but does state that for every six parking spaces one tree has to be installed, so 30 trees would be the minimum requirement on this project.

After a discussion regarding trees being removed, tree replacement numbers, and tree care, the following language was amended to Pages 13 and 14 of Attachment 1 in as follows:

3. The Planning Commission finds that the revised project description, revision to mitigation measure BR1 contained in the Final EIR, the attachments accompanying the Final EIR, including Supplemental Information Sheet, and information provided in the staff report do not represent significant new information so as to require recirculation of the Final EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The revised project description of a building height of 13 feet 9 inches as stated in the DEIR to a height of 8 feet 9 inches (approximately 9 feet) as described in the Final EIR and staff report, and the revision in the number of trees to be removed ~~and replanted~~ from 42 ~~and 96~~ respectively, in the DEIR, to 43 ~~and 92, respectively~~ 29, as described in the Final EIR and staff report does not constitute significant new information, cause a new significant environmental impact, or require a new mitigation measure...
5. (b) Biological Resources. The development of the project will impact approximately eight Bird-foot checkerbloom (*Sidalcea pedata*), a federal- and state-listed endangered plant species. Indirect impact via human-induced disturbance or habitat modification may threaten other individuals of Bird-foot checkerbloom and Cottony clay-flower (*Pyrorocoma uniflora* var. *gossypina*), a California Native Plan Species-listed plant. An impact would occur to a local resource, pine trees, by the removal of approximately 43 29 native trees from the site...

The following changes were requested to Pages 71 and 75 of Attachment 2:

- 42. (c) Except as recommended by a qualified tree expert, replacement trees shall be no smaller than fifteen (15) gallon size, with 60% of the replacement trees to be twenty-four (24) inch box size, with a diameter of no less than two (2) inches measured at a point one (1) foot above natural grade. In addition, no less than six (6) replacement trees shall be forty-eight (48) inch box size or larger. These larger trees shall be planted along the Big Bear Boulevard frontage. Tree types shall comply with the Tree Conservation Ordinance.
- 62. Construction activities shall comply with the tree conservation requirements contained in the Tree Conservation Ordinance. Temporary tree protection devices shall be used and installed around the dripline of trees and stands of trees to delineate the protected areas. (PLN)

At the hour of 4:23 p.m., Chairman Brigham closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hackney requested the following typographical errors be corrected to Page 37 of Attachment 1:

37. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, final inspection, and release of utilities	Traffic and Parking TP1 – A deceleration/acceleration land <u>lane</u> shall be provided along westbound Big Bear Boulevard adjacent to the project site to allow westbound right turns into the project site to exit the main stream of traffic along Big Bear Boulevard, without impeding traffic flow. Vehicles existing <u>exiting</u> the project would be able to attain a speed compatible with traffic flow along Big Bear Boulevard before entering the main traffic stream.	City Engineer and California Department of Transportation	
---	---	---	--

Chairman Brigham asked that the following text be corrected to Pages 36 and 38 of Attachment 1:

34. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, final inspection, and release of utilities	BR2—A habitat management plan shall be completed prior to site grading and prepared to the satisfaction of the City Planner. The habitat management plan shall address management of the open space areas in perpetuity. Specifically, this plan shall monitor the success of the transplanted Bird-footed Checkerbloom. In addition, this plan shall also incorporate annual monitoring of the Bird-footed Checkerbloom population within the fenced preserve areas. Monitoring shall be conducted in accordance with the USFWS Recovery Plan for the Bird-footed Checkerbloom (USFWS 1998). The habitat	City of Big Bear Lake Planning Division	
---	--	---	--

	<p>management plan shall also address the need for adaptive management of the Bird-footed Checkerbloom populations, fencing, signs, hydrology, and annual water quality sampling. An annual report shall be submitted to the USFWS, CDFG, and the City of Big Bear Lake.</p> <p><u>Biological Resources BR2 - The eight <i>Sidalcea pedata</i> (Bird-footed checkerbloom) individuals located outside of the preserved fenced areas shall be flagged and transplanted to a suitable habitat, possibly on-site within the preserved fenced areas. Transplantation shall be conducted during the fall months when Bird-footed checkerbloom is dormant. In addition, seed shall be collected from the Bird-footed checkerbloom plants. A revegetation plan shall be completed prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The revegetation plan shall be completed to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game and shall specify the location, monitoring methods, success criteria, and project alternative in case transplantation is unsuccessful. In the event that transplantation is unsuccessful, acquisition of a suitable site capable of supporting Bird-footed Checkerbloom shall be required. In addition to acquiring a suitable site, the restoration areas shall be conserved in perpetuity in a conservation easement. Seed collection and transplantation of the Bird-footed checkerbloom plans will require authorization from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game Section 2081 Permit.</u></p>		
<p>39. The following mitigation measures shall be on-going</p>	<p>BR2 A habitat management plan shall be completed prior to site grading and prepared to the satisfaction of the City Planner. The habitat management plan shall address management of the open space areas in perpetuity. Specifically, this plan shall monitor the success of the transplanted Bird-footed Checkerbloom. In addition, this plan shall also incorporate annual monitoring of the Bird-footed Checkerbloom population within the fenced preserve areas. Monitoring shall be conducted in accordance with the USFWS Recovery Plan for the Bird-footed Checkerbloom (USFWS 1998). The habitat management plan shall also address the need for adaptive management of the Bird-footed Checkerbloom populations, fencing,</p>	<p>City of Big Bear Lake Planning Division</p>	

	<p>signs, hydrology, and annual water quality sampling. An annual report shall be submitted to the USFWS, CDFG, and the City of Big Bear Lake.</p> <p><u>Biological Resources BR2 - The eight <i>Sidalcea pedata</i> (Bird-footed Checkerbloom) individuals located outside of the preserved fenced areas shall be flagged and transplanted to a suitable habitat, possibly on-site within the preserved fenced areas. Transplantation shall be conducted during the fall months when Bird-footed Checkerbloom is dormant. In addition, seed shall be collected from the Bird-footed Checkerbloom plants. A revegetation plan shall be completed prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The revegetation plan shall be completed to the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game and shall specify the location, monitoring methods, success criteria, and project alternative in case transplantation is unsuccessful. In the event that transplantation is unsuccessful, acquisition of a suitable site capable of supporting Bird-footed Checkerbloom shall be required. In addition to acquiring a suitable site, the restoration areas shall be conserved in perpetuity in a conservation easement. Seed collection and transplantation of the Bird-footed Checkerbloom plans will require authorization from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game Section 2081 Permit.</u></p>		
--	--	--	--

City Planner Molina clarified that the mitigation measures are reflected correctly in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

Commissioner Caretto pointed out an additional correction to Page 30 of Attachment 1:

<p>4. Prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Biological Resources BR7 - Prior to demolition and construction, temporary tree protection devices shall be installed to protect the approximately eight <u>twenty-one</u> trees to be saved from removal.</p>	<p>City of Big Bear Lake Building and Safety Division</p>	
---	--	---	--

Additionally, Chairman Brigham requested the language on Page 16 of Attachment 1 be amended as follows:

- (g) Utilities and Service Systems. Domestic water is provided by the City of Big Bear Lake Department of Water, which receives all of its supply from groundwater wells. The City of Big Bear Lake ~~and surrounding region are~~ is experiencing drought conditions and ~~are~~ is under water connection limitations. Projected annual water demand of the hotel is approximately 11 acre-feet. The design of the hotel and landscaping incorporate water-conserving fixtures and appliances, and xeriscape landscaping materials and techniques. No significant impacts to natural gas, electricity, or solid waste would result from the project...

Commissioner Smith concluded that Associate Planner Etter had done a wonderful job on this project for many years and expended a significant amount of time and energy on the project.

Chairman Brigham agreed and stated that he liked the project and it is a good vision for Big Bear.

Moved by Commissioner Caretto, seconded by Commissioner Smith, to adopt Resolution No. PC2006-15 certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for Minor Subdivision 2001-062 (Tentative Parcel Map No. 15705), Variance 2001-044, and Conditional Use Permit 2001-043, based on the findings and subject to the amended conditions of approval as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. PC 2006-15

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PREPARED FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION 2001-062 (TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 15705), VARIANCE 2001-044, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 2001-043, FOR A 91-GUEST ROOM HILTON GARDEN INN HOTEL ON 3.87-ACRES, ZONED COMMERCIAL VISITOR (C-3) LOCATED AT 39708, 39720, 39730, 39738 AND 39756 BIG BEAR BOULEVARD, ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS 307-122-15, 16, 22, 25 AND 26.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: CARETTO, ZIMMERMAN, SMITH, HACKNEY, BRIGHAM
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Vice-Chairman Hackney, to adopt Resolution No. PC2006-16 approving Minor Subdivision 2001-062 (Tentative

Parcel Map No. 15705), Variance 2001-044, and Conditional Use Permit 2001-043, based on the findings and subject to the amended conditions of approval as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. PC 2006-16

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE APPROVING MINOR SUBDIVISION 2001-062 (TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 15705), VARIANCE 2001-044, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 2001-043, TO COMBINE FIVE UNDERLYING PARCELS INTO ONE 3.87-ACRE PARCEL, TO ALLOW A BUILDING HEIGHT OF APPROXIMATELY 49 FEET, AND TO CONSTRUCT A 91-GUEST ROOM HILTON GARDEN INN HOTEL ON THE PROPERTY ZONED COMMERCIAL VISITOR (C-3) LOCATED AT 39708, 39720, 39730, 39738 AND 39756 BIG BEAR BOULEVARD, ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS 307-122-15, 16, 22, 25 AND 26.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: CARETTO, ZIMMERMAN, SMITH, HACKNEY, BRIGHAM

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

4. PLANNING OFFICIAL'S REPORT

City Planner Molina informed the Commission that included in their packets was copy of the DWP presentation on the demand offset program.

5. SUMMARY COMMENTS

Chairman Brigham welcomed the two new Commissioners and stated that Tom Beede will be missed.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments, Chairman Brigham adjourned the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE MEETING OF JUNE 21, 2006.

Lynne Rayner, Administrative Secretary