

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Wednesday, February 15, 2006 at 7:30 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present

Chairman Emmett Badar
Commissioner David Bratt
Commissioner Stephen Ensberg
Commissioner Yunus Rahi
Commissioner Jim Schoonover
Planning Manager Craig Hensley

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Badar called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:25 p.m. and Commissioner Schoonover led the flag salute.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes for February 1, 2006.

MOTION: Moved by Schoonover, seconded by Bratt to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried, 5-0-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- **No Items Submitted**

PLANNING MATTERS

2. **CONSIDERATION OF D.P.R.B. CASE NO. 05-63** – A request to construct a new 5,500 square foot Retail Building on the northwest corner of Arrow Highway and Rennell Avenue, located at 1301 West Arrow Highway, in Specific Plan No. 2.

Staff report presented by *Planning Manager Craig Hensley*, who stated that this item was first heard by DPRB on December 8, 2005 at which time the building proposed was about 6,800 square feet with five tenant spaces. The Board continued the item to allow the applicant to make revisions addressing areas of concern such as overall mass of the building, setbacks and

architectural details that were not adequate. On December 20, 2005, this item came before the DPRB again with only minor revisions and was denied unanimously. During the appeal period, the project architect met with Staff resulting in significant revisions. On January 12, 2006 the applicant requested that the DPRB reconsider the denial of the application based on significant revisions made to the design. Reconsideration was granted and on January 26, 2006 the DPRB reviewed and approved the revised project and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Exhibits were presented and reviewed.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that this project has really gone through a transformation that has created a project that is greatly improved from what it was before. It will be an asset architecturally to Arrow Highway. He also pointed out that Specific Plan 2 requires a minimum of a 25-foot front and rear setback reserved for landscaping.

In response to Chairman Badar, **Planning Manager Hensley** stated that the building was reduced from 6,400 s.f. to 5,500 s.f. to address setback issues on the east and west sides of the building. The DPRB did not feel that the proposed setbacks were adequate. The setback on the west side did not necessarily need to be 10-15 feet, but needed to provide enough room for access on that side of the property. The DPRB felt that there should be at least 10-12 feet on the Rennell side. The main issues were the east and west setbacks and parking requirement of a higher square footage building. The DPRB felt that any building on this site should be parked for office or retail as this zone allows for both.

Commissioner Schoonoover pointed out that the original plans had 5-6 tenant spaces that were about 15 feet wide which the DPRB did not feel that would be viable spaces.

In response to Chairman Badar, **Planning Manager Hensley** clarified setback requirements, per Specific Plan 2.

In response to **Commissioner Rahi**, **Planning Manager Hensley** stated that in Staff's judgment, a 5,500 s.f. office/retail building creates a less than significant impact in regards to traffic. This intersection on Arrow Highway is signalized and is not at capacity.

Commissioner Rahi expressed concerns with an increase of traffic on Rennell. He stated that he thought the intersection was signalized based on the traffic volume on Rennell which will increase with this project.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that the signal was probably put in at the time the first Kaiser building was constructed.

In response to Commissioner Ensberg, **Planning Manager Hensley** reviewed parking requirements for office use and retail use as per Ordinance 18.156. Parking space requirement was based on large portion of building being used for office space, with the balance being retail or restaurant use.

In response to Commissioner Badar, **Planning Manager Hensley** clarified office use and retail use in regards to parking requirements and typical demand for each.

Commissioner Ensberg stated that he can support this project because of the precautions and changes made to the project.

Chairman Badar opened the meeting for public hearing. Addressing the Commission was:

Tom Layman, 16633 Ventura Blvd. #1320, Encino, Project Architect, who stated he appreciates Staff's assistance. They do not currently have any specific tenants identified for the project. One objective that Staff wanted them to achieve was the ability to lease the entire building for office use, which this project does. He added that there is a need for a small food tenant at this location. Mr. Layman also stated a mix of office/specialty use and small food use to serve needs of the contiguous office space, the medical space across the street and the residential needs north of the project would make this a very viable project. They have no problems with the conditions posed by the DPRB.

In response to Commissioner Rahi, **Mr. Layman** replied that the traffic is representative of the uses there, with the highest demand being for a food tenant. Any food tenant that goes in at this location would probably be a specialty tenant that caters to the offices in the neighborhood. Office tenants are much less in terms of trips per 1,000 s.f. A traffic consultant was not a requirement for this project.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Schoonover to approve Staff's recommendation for a new 5,500 square foot Retail Building on the northwest corner of Arrow Highway and Rennell Avenue, located at 1301 West Arrow Highway, in Specific Plan No. 2 and the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

3. CONSIDERATION OF AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

Planning Manager Hensley asked the Commissioners if they would like to be enrolled as Members of the American Planning Association. He stated that the current budget would cover this expense and that he felt that it would be a good learning tool for the Commission. Commission members would receive: *Planning Magazine* and *The Commissioner*, a quarterly newsletter. Commissioners also receive notices of customized training programs.

ACTION: The Commissioners concurred that membership would be beneficial and directed staff to process the applications.

4. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDING PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING TIME

Chairman Badar suggested that the Commission change its starting time to 7:00 p.m. The City Council and several other Commissions start their meetings at 7:00 p.m. and Staff has informed him that the Commission has the authority to make this change.

ACTION: All Commissioners concurred to change the Regular Meeting Time to being at 7:00 p.m., effective March 1, 2006.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

5. Director of Community Development

No communications were made.

6. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

7. Planning Commission

No communications were made.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Badar adjourned the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for March 1, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Emmett Badar, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Craig Hensley
Planning Manager

Approved: March 15, 2006