

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Thursday, June 21, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present

Chairman Jim Schoonover
Commissioner David Bratt
Commissioner John Davis
Commissioner Stephen Ensberg
Commissioner M. Yunus Rahi
Assistant City Manager Community Development Larry Stevens
Director of Development Services Dan Coleman
Planning Commission Secretary Jan Sutton

CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Chairman Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and Commissioner Bratt led the flag salute.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes: June 7, 2012

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **CONSIDERATION OF MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 11-03** – A request to amend San Dimas Zoning Code Chapter 18.152 Signs. **(Continued from June 7, 2012)**

Staff report presented by *Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens* who stated this is the Continued Public Hearing from June 7, 2012. Based on previous input, he has submitted six standards to address portable Open House signs, consisting of being permitted for single-family open houses, can be used only on weekends and legal holidays, maximum six square feet per sign and height of four feet maximum (similar to A-Frame signs), attachments prohibited and a maximum of four signs for any one open house. They would also be prohibited from placement in the public right-of-way, and if they are on private property, they need the property owner's permission. It would also be required that the address of the property, and the name and address of the realtor be on the sign so if the City receives complaints, they have a way to

contact the realtor about it. The signs should be constructed of durable material and securely installed.

Commissioner Davis thought there should be a condition that limits the number of signs that can be placed in any one spot, as he has seen one realtor putting multiple signs on the same property.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated he could add a condition that there should be no more than one sign on any piece of property per realtor. They can be double-faced to allow better visibility, and that way it should allow for multiple realtors to use the same location without overcrowding it.

Commissioner Bratt stated he has noticed more open houses being held on Fridays now. He was all right with the standards as currently written, which do not include Friday as part of the weekend, but thought he would mention it.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated he put the yard sale signs in the exempt section, so while you would need the free permit to hold the yard sale, and this will provide an opportunity to help people understand the sign criteria, you do not need a separate permit for the signs. The standards are basically the same as for Open House signs, and would require the name and address for the sale to be on the sign for contacting the responsible person if any issues arise, and can be in smaller print. The signs would need to be durable and fastened, which would allow for wire-frame signs, with the intent to discourage hand-made signs that are posted on public property. He is also including a restriction on placing them on parked vehicles.

Commissioner Davis stated he would also like the same condition added as they did for Open House signs limiting the number at any one location.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated in regards to electronic message boards, he put the standards in Section 18.152.060 which is the general design specification section that all other sections can refer back to. He went over the standards in the report starting with number E1, covering length of time for any one message, moving images, luminance, auto-dimming requirement after dark, defaulting to a freeze-image if the sign malfunctions, adjusting brightness based on the ambient light and reducing glare. Section 6 requires the commercial messages be related to the business or services on the site where the sign is located, which can include for sale or leasing information as long as it is for something on the site.

He stated Section 7 was a discussion item on whether to require mandatory public service announcements. Sometimes applicants will use this approach as a means to getting their sign permitted, such as the offer from the Hospital to include messages from the City.

Commissioner Ensberg didn't see why we would be imposing that requirement for a sign that is on private property. He stated since the Hospital initially brought up the request for an electronic sign, possibly we should give them the standards to review and provide input on.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated he was looking for input from the Commission on this and the section could be re-written to encourage including public service announcements instead of requiring them. He stated it would be difficult to circulate the standards to everyone ahead of time for comments. The standards are written to support the City's position; everyone does not need to agree with them for the standards to be appropriate.

Commissioner Bratt did not think it was the function of Staff to contact everyone with every proposed change. They have been notified that there is a public hearing occurring, and they

can attend to provide input if they were interested. He felt it would be best to encourage public service announcements but not set a certain amount they would have to comply with.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated he would probably add language to explain what qualifies as a public service announcement, which would not include advertising or political messages, though non-commercial free speech on a permitted sign cannot be regulated. Based on comments he will delete the section requiring time and temperature.

Commissioner Davis expressed concerns about having a sign that might shine into residential windows, like at the Hospital, and thought there should be a standard about the intensity of the sign at the closest residential structure.

Assistant City Manager Stevens then discussed location standards for electronic message boards, and if used as a part of a monument sign, only 60% of the area can be for the electronic screen, the rest would be a permanent message. These can be part of multi-tenant monument signs and freeway signs as outlined in the report. He will be doing additional research of State law regarding gas station price panels. Based on prior discussion these signs will be prohibited from AP and Industrial zones. He felt a retail business that locates in an industrial zone wouldn't necessarily need the same advertising as one that locates in a retail center, so would not need this type of sign. He will also be adding criteria in the section covering signs in other zones so that they did not have to write a section for other zones such as the Public/Semi-Public.

Commissioner Bratt asked what the standard for a development to have a monument sign is.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated a freestanding commercial, industrial or office building with a single-tenant generally is allowed to have a monument sign. The Code is being amended to allow single-tenant identification in shopping centers. The Downtown area has different criteria as they would be located in the public right-of-way. He did not allow electronic message boards in the Downtown area, which would include Albertson's, and the only place freeway signs are allowed are in the larger integrated centers such as San Dimas Station, Lowe's/Levitz, Target, Ralph's, and Costco.

He stated the last item tonight was in response to comments to have a stronger message about the importance of signs to businesses in the Purpose Section.

The Commission felt Section A could begin at the sentence starting "Therefore, the intent..." and in Section E, they suggested the words "In addition" could be deleted from the second sentence.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the only thing they have not addressed from the previous list is unique areas, such as having something similar to a window sign at places like Starberry Farms which has no windows. It may be possible with the change in language in the Purpose and Intent section to reasonably interpret it to allow similar standards on buildings without windows. In response to Commissioner Davis he stated it may be possible to add something about "open-air facilities" that could address it.

Commissioner Davis advised he would be out of town for the July 19th meeting.

Commissioner Bratt felt it was important to have all five Commissioners present to vote on the final version of the amendment.

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Davis to continue the public hearing to the July 5, 2012 meeting. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

1. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND CONSIDERATION OF MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 12-01** – A request to amend the Carport Setbacks of Specific Plan No. 26 to match the surrounding multi-family residential zone consistent with General Plan Housing Element Policy 4.2 and 4.3, for the property located at the northwest corner of East Bonita Avenue and San Dimas Canyon Road. (APN: 8390-013-021, 024, 025, and 026) A Negative Declaration is Proposed. **(REQUEST TO PULL ITEM FROM AGENDA)**

Staff report presented by *Director of Development Services Dan Coleman*, who stated the City recently received notice that Summerhill Homes has pulled out of this project. As there may be other amendments needed for this project, Staff felt it was best to wait and incorporate all the changes simultaneously. A notice of cancellation was mailed to the public hearing mailing list.

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Davis to pull this item from the agenda. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

3. Director of Development Services

Director Coleman stated the City received a letter from the United States Postal Service that they will not be relocating the post office and it will continue all operations from its current location.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the RMC has received the final report from the consultant regarding the Walnut Creek Habitat area. The joint meeting of the Commissions is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, July 17 at 6:00 p.m. in one of the community rooms, but Staff will confirm the details in the next week or so. He stated they would most likely be presented with options to consider, and they would be voting on their recommendation that will be forwarded to the City Council. This is just a Conceptual Master Plan, and it can change over the course of the project based on the needs at that time.

4. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

5. Planning Commission

Commissioner Rahi inquired if there was any update on the proposed Tzu Chi Master Plan that included the Butterfly Property in the City limits.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated there has been no meeting with the Tzu Chi in regards to a final plan. The Tzu Chi have requested to meet with the City and RMC to discuss easement issues and possible lot line adjustments partially related to their plan. They originally asked to meet to discuss doing a joint environmental process with the County, but they have not followed up on that request either.

Commissioner Rahi asked if the City would cover the cost for Commissioners to attend SCAG meetings regarding their Master Plan.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated yes, but it would be best to check with Staff first to ensure there are funds available in the travel budget, as there is a shortfall in the City's budget and certain areas are being reduced to help balance it.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Davis to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for July 5, 2012, at 7:00 p.m.

David Bratt, Vice-Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: August 2, 2012