



## City of Fontana

### Draft Planning Commission

### Minutes

Idilio Sanchez, Chair  
Ricardo Quintana, Vice Chair  
Joe Armendarez, Secretary  
Torrie Lozano, Commissioner  
Dylan Keetle, Commissioner

---

<b>Tuesday, July 1, 2025</b>	<b>6:00 P.M.</b>	<b>Grover W. Taylor Council Chambers</b>
------------------------------	------------------	--

---

...

**PH-A Master Case No. 24-0065: Specific Plan Amendment No. 24-0001, Tentative Tract Map No. 20729 (TTM No. 24-0010) and Design Review No. 24-0035 - A request to amend the Rancho Fontana Specific Plan and to subdivide approximately 3.3 acres for condominium purposes and for the site and architectural approval of a new residential development consisting of 54 attached condominium dwellings and associated improvements, pursuant to an Addendum to the Rancho Fontana Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report.**

Chair Sanchez opened the public hearing.

The City Clerk's Department received one (1) written correspondences in opposition of this item.

Associate Planner, Cecily Session-Goins, presented the staff report.

Vice Chair Quintana inquired about the results of the traffic study and potential concerns related to traffic flow and left turns into the development. Associate Planner Session-Goins provided detailed traffic study results and clarified that the project will not be gated, which will support smoother traffic movement. Associate Planner Session-Goins also noted that two driveways will provide ingress and egress and that the queuing analysis indicated that even during peak times, projected queues will remain well within the

available spacing from the signalized intersection on Orlando Drive. Additionally, inbound peak hour traffic is expected to result in roughly one left turn every 12 minutes, leading staff to conclude that no significant traffic or queuing issues are anticipated.

Another discussion ensued between the commission and staff regarding the location and extent of anticipated queuing, specifically whether queues would form along Orlando Drive or within the site's internal drive aisles. Staff explained that the queuing analysis primarily focused on Orlando Drive and nearby intersections, and no significant backup is anticipated either from Baseline Road or Lime Street.

Additional questions were raised regarding the relatively low number of peak hour trips projected for a 54-home development. Staff noted that trip estimates reflect the assumption that not all residents travel during peak periods and that the projections align with standard modeling methods.

Commissioner Keetle inquired about the fencing along Baseline Road, and staff clarified that while the development is not gated, there is an existing concrete block wall on the southern property line. The applicant plans to install a tubular steel fence and small retaining wall approximately three feet from the block wall to create a drainage channel for managing runoff and that the existing wall will be cleaned and maintained as part of the project. Regarding park and barbecue facilities, commissioners raised concerns about their location near parking areas and the lack of monitoring, questioning whether these amenities would be open to the public and how access would be managed.

Vice Chair Sanchez questioned why the project was not designed as a gated community, noting the property's potential for controlled access and the possible benefits of reducing street traffic during peak hours. Staff deferred the question to the applicant.

The applicant, Bryan Avilla, on behalf of NewBridge Homes, stated that he read and agreed to the Conditions of Approval and clarified that the property will be a single-parcel condo project with an HOA (Homeowners Association) managing common areas, including the park and parking, with covenants, conditions and restrictions to prevent unauthorized public use.

Commissioner Keetle raised concerns about the accessibility and enforcement of private amenities within the proposed development, specifically the park and barbecue areas. The applicant confirmed that these areas are private and will be managed by the HOA. Enforcement would fall to the HOA and property management, with potential support from law enforcement if necessary. However, commissioners expressed concerns about the practicality of keeping the public out, given the proximity to surrounding single-family homes and the likelihood of non-residents accessing the space.

The conversation also revisited the idea of gating the community to address unauthorized use, though concerns were raised about the burden that might place on the Fontana Police Department and the risk of overly restricting residents. The applicant

acknowledged these issues and emphasized that similar models exist elsewhere in the city.

Regarding parking, the applicant explained that it will not be assigned but will be regulated by time limits, with towing and property management oversight to ensure proper use. Assigned parking may be considered in the future.

Chair Sanchez asked whether the applicant was open to gating the community. The applicant responded that from a traffic standpoint, gating the entire community would introduce challenges, including the need for turnarounds and increased loading on nearby streets—issues the current project design does not accommodate. While the applicant expressed a preference not to gate the development, they acknowledged that gating the park area could be a reasonable compromise and is an option they are open to considering.

Chair Sanchez suggested key cards for park access and parking passes for residents to manage parking and prevent issues. The applicant was open to both ideas.

Vice Chair Quintana inquired about vehicle queuing locations. The applicant clarified queuing occurs on Orlando and Baseline streets, not inside the project. Vice Chair Quintana praised the modern Spanish design and landscaping, confirming the plants shown in the renderings will be used on-site.

Secretary Armendarez confirmed that city staff had completed all technical reviews, including traffic and CEQA, prior to the commission's review. He emphasized that commissioners should assess the project as presented, not direct the applicant without consulting city staff.

Chair Sanchez clarified that the commission's role includes questioning city staff and the applicant and proposing conditions if desired. He stressed that differing opinions among commissioners are expected and part of the process.

Secretary Armendarez asked for respect in acknowledging that not all commissioners share the same views or assumptions about the project.

No individuals spoke in support or opposition of this item.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Chair Sanchez made a motion to approve the project with a request for staff and the applicant to explore possible gated access or key cards for the park as a non-binding suggestion.

Attorney Stephen Deitsch explained that if a motion is made and not seconded, another commissioner can offer a substitute motion which takes precedence. The motion to have

the applicant work with staff on park gating and key cards was clarified as a suggestion, not a condition of approval, ensuring it would not delay or scale the project if infeasible.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Based on the information contained in this staff report and subject to the attached Findings and Conditions of Approval; staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. PC 2025-022; and recommend that the City;**

- 1. Adopt the Addendum and Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP) to the Rancho Fontana Specific Plan EIR (SCH No. 1981100211) and direct staff to file a Notice of Determination; and,**
- 2. Adopt an ordinance approving Specific Plan Amendment No. 24-0001; and,**
- 3. Adopt a resolution approving Tentative Tract Map No. 20729 (TTM No. 24-0010); and,**
- 4. Adopt a resolution approving Design Review No. 24-0035**