

MINUTES

Regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Redlands held in the Council Chambers, Civic Center, 35 Cajon Street, on Tuesday, April 14, 2026 at 5:00 P.M.

Present: Karah Shaw, Chair
 Emily Elliott, Vice Chair
 Rich Smith, Commissioner
 Mark Stanson, Commissioner
 Alicia Gyllenhammer, Commissioner
 Kawa Shwaish, Commissioner
 Rosa Dominguez, Commissioner

 Sean Reilly, Director
Staff: Brian Foot, Planning Manager
 Jazmin Serrato, Associate Planner
 Rosemary Montoya, Associate Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting came to order at 4:00 p.m. with a quorum of committee members.

2. ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE

City Clerk Jeanne Donaldson administered the Oath of Office to all Planning Commission Members.

3. ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR

Chair Shaw opened the nomination period and invited Planning Commission members to submit nominations for the office of Chair.

Commissioner Alicia Gyllenhammer nominated Vice Chair Emily Elliott for the position of Chair. Vice Chair Elliott declined the nomination and subsequently nominated Chair Shaw to continue serving as Chair.

Following the vote, Chair Shaw received 0 No, 5 Yes, and 2 Abstain.

Chair Shaw was elected to continue serving as Chair.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - 3 MINUTES

(At this time, the public has the opportunity to address the Commission on any item of interest within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission that does not appear on this agenda. The Commission may not discuss or take any action on any public comment made, except that the Commissioners or staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by members of the public)

Chair Karah Shaw opened the Public Comment Period. There were no comments forthcoming, and the Public Comment Period was closed.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

On motion by Commissioner Stanson, seconded by Commissioner Smith move to approve the Consent Calendar.

Vote: 6 Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstention. The motion passed to approve the Consent Calendar.

A. Approval of March 10, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

B. Commission Sign Review No. 498

C. Extension of Time No. 1 for Commission Review and Approval No. 960

Item No. 5 - C, was pulled from the agenda and will be rescheduled.

D. Extension of Time No. 2 for Commission Review and Approval No. 950

Commissioner Stanson abstained from Item No. 5 - D, and it is a project he previously submitted as the applicant for the project.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Minor Commission Approval No. 56

Chair Shaw inquired if the Commissioners had any ex-parte communication with the applicant. There were no comments forthcoming.

Jazmin Serrato, Associate Planner , gave an overview and presentation on the item.

Chair Shaw asked if the Commissioners had any questions for staff.

Vice Chair Elliott asked whether the 25-foot setback was measured from the street or the property line. Ms. Serrato stated it is measured from the property line the back of the sidewalk. Vice Chair Elliott also asked about the review process for HOA properties. Ms. Serrato explained that an HOA approval letter is required during the building permit process and the item would not return to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Kawa Shwaish asked about pedestrian visibility around the corner, noting that the greenery in the photo appeared to limit visibility. He stated that, based on the higher setback, no visibility impacts to pedestrians or vehicles were expected. Ms. Serrato responded that the addition would not affect visibility because it is located farther back, behind the existing structure and away from the landscaping.

Chair Shaw opened the Public Comment period for in-person attendees, Zoom participants, and written comments. There were no other comments forthcoming, Chair Shaw closed the Public Comment period.

On Motion of Commissioner Stanson, seconded by Commissioner Smith, move to adopt Resolution No. 1743 for Minor Commission Review No. 56, subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.

Vote: 7 Yes, 0 No , motion passed

B. Ordinance Text Amendment No. 372

Chair Shaw inquired if the Commissioners had any ex-parte communication. There were no comments forthcoming.

Brian Foote, Planning Manager , gave an overview and presentation on the item.

Chair Shaw asked if the Commissioners had any questions for staff.

Commissioner Shwaish asked whether a complete rebuild would allow the structure to be torn down and reconstructed to the same square footage and height without meeting new regulations. Mr. Foote clarified that the ordinance allows a 100% rebuild to the square footage and height existing on the effective date of the ordinance, which serves as the reference point.

Commissioner Shwaish asked whether abandoned or unused warehouses that change ownership and require rebuilding would fall under the same provision. Mr. Foote stated that it depends on what exists as of the ordinance's effective date. If the use was legally established, such as through a business license or required permits before the effective date, then it would be covered and allowed to continue under the ordinance.

Commissioner Shwaish asked whether the height limit was intended to prevent increases in warehouse capacity. Mr. Foote clarified that the focus is on the building envelope, its physical size, construction, and resulting intensity of use rather than capacity. Commissioner Shwaish then asked whether the rebuild provisions limit increases in the number of loading docks, which could affect traffic. Mr. Foote stated that the number of docks is not specifically addressed and has not been considered in the provisions.

Commissioner Stanson expressed concern about including a strict height limit in the ordinance, noting that operational needs can change over time. He stated that restricting height could make surrounding buildings obsolete, unusable, or less functional compared to those in the adjacent "doughnut hole" area outside City control. He felt the ordinance should allow some flexibility for minor future changes rather than limiting buildings to their exact existing height.

Commissioner Shwaish asked how "intensity of use" is defined, noting that increased height could result in greater operational volume and environmental impacts, even without added square footage. He expressed concern that height flexibility might allow intensified operations through other means. Mr. Foote stated that the draft ordinance does not currently include a definition for intensity of use.

Chair Shaw asked whether staff could further define "increased operations," possibly using truck trip activity, and include that for Commission review when height changes are requested. Mr. Foote stated that staff can explore this, noting that percentage-based height increases may also be an option but would require careful analysis. Chair Shaw asked how the Commission would feel about staff returning with a proposal, either establishing this in the ordinance or requiring Commission approval for any height increase.

Commissioner Shwaish stated he had concerns about height increases as they relate to capacity, noting that increased capacity would also increase intensity. He said that height adjustments could be acceptable for logistical

purposes as long as it is clearly defined that height increases do not result in increased capacity. Otherwise, the provision could be vulnerable to workarounds.

Commissioner Stanson suggested allowing height changes to return to the Commission for approval rather than restricting them entirely. He noted that technological advances may require future height adjustments and expressed concern that an overly strict ordinance could make the City less competitive compared to surrounding areas. He supported keeping flexibility in the ordinance to avoid limiting the City's long-term market position.

Chair Shaw requested that staff further evaluate and define project intensity, review applicable percentage thresholds, and return to the Commission with recommendations and a proposed height change for approval. Mr. Foote responded that this approach is acceptable and noted that, as currently written, the provisions require Commission review for any additional square footage added to a project, but they do not appear to address increases in building height.

Vice Chair Elliott asked what circumstances would trigger a rebuild, questioning whether it must result from a loss event or if a property owner could voluntarily demolish and reconstruct a building. Mr. Foote explained that the draft ordinance allows a property owner to voluntarily rebuild an entire structure. Vice Chair Elliott noted that this could potentially allow an application for a taller building and asked what review process would apply, given that the use is no longer permitted and the rebuild would not fall under a standard CRA. She requested clarification on how such an application would be processed functionally.

Mr. Reilly explained that in past cases where a building was lost, such as through fire, property owners returned with a building permit to reconstruct the structure at the same height and square footage. If an increase in height were proposed, it would be processed as a revised CRA. He added that the purpose of allowing voluntary rebuilds in the draft ordinance is to support updates that improve energy efficiency, which may encourage property owners to pursue such upgrades.

Chair Shaw opened the Public Comment period for the in-person audience, Zoom or written.

Bill Blankenship, a Redlands resident representing the NAIOP Inland Empire Chapter, stated that the City has done a good job with planning. He emphasized, as Commissioner Stanson noted, that building height is an important factor. He explained that many currently vacant logistics facilities are under performing because they no longer meet modern industry standards, leading businesses to relocate. He urged the Commission to consider building height carefully to prevent facilities from becoming obsolete and sitting vacant in the long term.

Brenda, a Redlands resident, stated her opposition to additional warehouse construction in the city. She expressed concern that, due to Redlands' population density and smaller size, the community cannot compete with larger cities in accommodating more warehouse development.

Julia Lenhaerd, Ph.D. a climate scientist from the University of Redlands participating via Zoom, asked the Commission to consider that different types of warehouses, such as a shift from manufacturing to refrigerated logistics can have significantly different environmental impacts. She also noted that if future increases in building height are being discussed in relation to technological changes, she hopes that future regulations will also evolve to become more environmentally protective, emphasizing public health. She asked whether the proposed ordinance will require that any new rebuilds meet updated environmental and health standards.

Mr. Foote provided a brief overview of two written comments submitted for the item: one from Nicole Torstvet, representing ProLogis, a warehouse owner and operator in Redlands, who expressed opposition to the ordinance; and one from Michael Paisner, who submitted comments in support of the ordinance.

There were no other comments forthcoming, and the Public Comment period was closed.

On motion of Commissioner Stanson, seconded by Commissioner Gyllenhammer to continue the Ordinance Text Amendment No. 372 discussion indefinitely.

Vote: 7 Yes, 0 No, motion passed

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Vice Chair Elliott asked Mr. Reilly for an update on the former Vons shopping center. Mr. Reilly responded that staff remains in contact with the property owner, who has indicated they are in discussions with multiple potential tenants but have not provided any specific details at this time.

Commissioner Gyllenhammer then inquired about the vacant Look Cinema building. Mr. Reilly stated that the situation is similar; staff is in contact with the property owner, but there are no new updates to report.

Chair Shaw asked for an update on the status of the Redlands Mall. Mr. Reilly stated that an update is expected likely toward the end of the year, possibly in the fall of 2026.

8. DIRECTOR'S UPDATES

Mr. Reilly reported no major updates. He noted that on March 28, 2026, the Regency Center project was approved by the City Council. The project, located on the northeast corner of Tennessee and Lagonia, is currently in plan check and moving forward.

9. ADJOURN TO THE

Chair Shaw adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm to the April 28, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting.