

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Thursday, May 15, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present

Chairman Jim Schoonover
Commissioner Dave Bratt
Commissioner John Davis (arrived at 7:15 p.m.)
Commissioner Stephen Ensberg
Commissioner M. Yunus Rahi
Senior Planner Marco Espinoza
Associate Planner Luis Torrico
Planning 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.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 14-03** – A request to operate Rockin' Jump, an indoor trampoline park that caters to kids, teens and adults for associated parties and recreational use in the Creative Growth Area 1 Zone – Regional Commercial (CG-1), located at 533 W. Arrow Highway in the San Dimas Station North Shopping Center. (APN: 8386-007-063)

Staff report presented by *Associate Planner Luis Torrico* who stated Rockin' Jump is an indoor trampoline park based in Northern California and this will be the first Southern California location. The proposed location is in the CG-1 zone. The Commission previously reviewed a Classification of Use application for Jumping Jacks in this same zone, a similar type of business with bouncers and party rooms, and determined this type of use is similar to a gym, which is conditionally permitted. Since Rockin' Jump falls into that same category, it requires a Conditional Use Permit as well. The tenant space is just under 20,000 sq. ft. and he went over the floor plan of the tenant space and some of the activities they will be hosting. While Jumping Jacks uses jumpers, Rockin' Jump uses trampolines and will offer several organized activities throughout the week, with birthday parties and group activities by reservation only. They have two different schedules for winter and summer, but Staff is recommending a blanket approval for the hours of operation so they can adjust their hours seasonally. The applicant expects to have 38-45 full-time employees, with 5-7 employees per shift. He stated food will not be prepared on-

site but can be provided by third-party restaurants, and they will also sell pre-packaged snacks and drinks.

Associate Planner Torrico stated the primary concern was in regards to parking. The center is parked at 1 space/222 sq. ft. of floor area, requiring this tenant space to have 90 spaces. A gym use requires 1 space/200 sq. ft. of floor area, or 100 spaces. An applicant can submit a parking study when a use is not listed in the code. The study submitted by the applicant indicates they only need 90 parking spaces, which coincides with how the center is parked. If there are any issues in the future, Condition No. 8 will allow them to revisit the application. He reviewed the discussion from the previous Planning Commission meeting regarding parking requirements in the CG-1 zone, and stated if the Council approves the amendment, the Applicant will not need to comply with the parking study and will only have to comply with the new code requirements.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if Jumping Jacks is in the same area as this new business.

Associate Planner Torrico stated it occupies a portion of the old Levitz building in the Lowe's center across the street. While similar, Jumping Jacks caters to small children while Rockin' Jump caters to kids, teens and adults.

Commissioner Bratt asked if they are proposing to change the front of the building.

Associate Planner Torrico stated the Applicant is proposing to shift the location of the entry doors but otherwise there will be no significant changes.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if there will be any alcohol served.

Associate Planner Torrico stated no.

Commissioner Rahi asked if the consultant that prepared the parking study was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated yes.

Chairman Schoonover opened the meeting for public hearing. Addressing the Commission were:

Chris Johnson, 2257 Rutland Place, Thousand Oaks, stated Rockin' Jump is a franchise business and present tonight is the owner and president of the company from the Bay area. He has worked in the corporate sector for 27 years but has been looking for a change and felt this franchise offered an opportunity for a new second career.

Chairman Schoonover stated he understands this is similar to Jumping Jacks but that business caters to the younger set. He asked at the other locations what is the percentage of teens to adults.

Drew Wilson, President and CFO Rockin' Jump, stated that children stop using Jumping Jacks around six years of age and then move on, which is where they come in. Their core business is in the 6-14 year age range; teens account for 15% of the business, but their mainstay is children's birthday parties. The adults also come in with the kids.

Chairman Schoonover asked if this is mostly a drop-off business then.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, stated it is about 60% drop-off, and about 40% of the adults stay.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, stated they also find that multiple people will come in one car so in that respect it is not like a gym where one person drives to the location.

Commissioner Bratt asked if the trampolines are at ground level and they excavate underneath, and what does the half-pipe jump area consist of. He also asked what insurance requirements do they have.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, stated the trampolines are located three feet above ground so no excavation is required, and they are all ADA accessible. He stated they carry ACM and ITP insurance for trampoline parks and they carry the maximum amount.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, stated the half-pipe area is similar in shape to what you see in skiing and snowboarding and the kids bounce off the sides and go back and forth. He stated the company has a comprehensive safety program with extensive training for the staff and patrons, and built-in safety features in the equipment itself.

Commissioner Bratt asked why San Dimas was chosen for this business.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, stated he looked all over Southern California and felt this was a good area to locate to and that the demographics for the surrounding area would support this type of business.

* * * * *

Commissioner Davis arrived at 7:15 p.m.

* * * * *

Commissioner Rahi asked how many franchises they have in California, and how are they different than Jumping Jacks.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, stated there are four locations open now, one opening soon in Modesto, then San Dimas, Chatsworth and Stockton, and there are approximately 17 throughout the United States. The age group for Jumping Jacks is usually between two to six years old, and then they would graduate to their type of business.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, stated they tend to be complementary businesses, as the blow-up jumpers are designed for small children, and their trampolines are of stronger construction for older ages.

Commissioner Rahi stated he liked the methodology used for the parking study but that it was not stamped by the engineer that prepared the report; however, he is familiar with the company and they are very reputable.

Commissioner Davis stated they discussed parking at this center at the last meeting, and asked if they were going to use the spaces behind the building to accommodate their patrons, and how many spaces are there in that area.

Associate Planner Torrico stated they have spoken to the Applicant about utilizing that parking and we will work with them about providing directional signs to the parking in the rear. He stated there are approximately 70-75 spaces there.

Commissioner Davis stated those spaces are in the count for the center and they don't seem to be utilized at all at this point in time and this would be a good opportunity to use the space.

Chairman Schoonover stated the floor plan seems to make it difficult to access the building from those parking spaces.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, stated the employees will use those spaces but they will let the customers know there are plenty of spaces in the back if they cannot find space in the front.

Commissioner Davis felt it needs to be convenient for people to enter from there or the spaces will not be used.

Associate Planner Torrico stated they could review the floor plan to see if it can be changed to provide customer access.

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

Commissioner Davis stated based on the discussion at the last meeting to remove the requirement for parking at this center, he felt they are losing the only opportunity they have to use those 70 spaces in the back and that there should be a condition to have a secondary entrance to have customers use those spaces. Otherwise he felt it was a great use and would benefit the center and the community.

Commissioner Rahi stated he could also support the proposal.

Chairman Schoonover asked the Applicant if he had any comments relative to the addition of a condition for a secondary access from the back parking lot.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, stated if you look at the parking study they use very few parking spaces during the week; their peak hours are between 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. There will be an entrance in the back and they will encourage the use of those spaces. From a retail perspective they draw people from 20-30 minutes away that will use the other retail tenants. Other than during the peak Saturday hours, they do not require that much parking.

Chairman Schoonover asked about Friday and Saturday nights.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, stated during that time they mostly have teenagers that are dropped off by their parents so they don't use that much parking.

Commissioner Davis stated the parking study shows Friday nights as the highest revenue nights but not the highest parking night. He stated the parking lot is pretty busy on Friday and Saturday nights because of the restaurants in the center.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, stated you would think they are not that busy from the outside but the place is often filled with teens that have been dropped off by their parents. The parents will stay during the birthday parties but not during the evening hours.

Chairman Schoonover stated the Applicant needs to work with Staff on how best to use the rear entrance, but wasn't sure there needed to be a condition since it doesn't seem to conflict with the Friday/Saturday night issues.

Commissioner Davis felt this was the one building that can actually use those spaces.

Commissioner Ensberg stated he did not object with conditioning a secondary access because they want to do things that accomplish the goals of that center, which includes using those back spaces. It didn't seem burdensome to him to have a secondary entrance and it would be a way to encourage proper parking.

Commissioner Bratt felt it becomes a security issue, that by making it a condition you are telling the Applicant they have to have a separate entry point that needs to be monitored by an employee.

Associate Planner Torrico stated Condition No. 8 allows Staff to review the CUP if issues arise with the operations, and that condition could allow them to review the entrance situation if there is a parking problem.

Commissioner Ensberg stated he would rather they be proactive on this issue instead of reactive when there is a problem.

Commissioner Rahi stated he is not familiar with the security concern of Commissioner Bratt and why he felt there would need to be a staff member assigned to that area. He thought they could bring it back if there were any problems.

Commissioner Bratt felt when you have an entry/exit point, he feels that says it needs to be controlled entrance and doesn't think they can just have a door to the outside. The party rooms will be near that area with young people, and feels they are forcing the owner to add a second controlled entrance which affects how they are going to staff the business and maintain it.

Commissioner Davis concurred that the floor plan would need to be redesigned to accommodate a rear customer entrance.

Commissioner Bratt stated if you don't provide a rear entrance you are forcing people who do park back there to walk all the way around the center to get to the front door, and then people will not want to park there.

Commissioner Davis felt this goes back to the discussion at the last meeting that if parking becomes a problem, it will be up to the owner to work it out with the tenants.

RESOLUTION PC-1507

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 14-03, REQUEST TO OPERATE ROCKIN' JUMP, AN INDOOR TRAMPOLINE PARK THAT CATERS TO KIDS, TEENS AND ADULTS FOR ASSOCIATED PARTIES AND RECREATIONAL USE LOCATED AT 533 WEST ARROW HIGHWAY (APN: 8386-007-063)

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adopt Resolution PC-1507 approving Conditional Use Permit 14-03, with the addition of a condition that requires a secondary entrance in the rear of the building during peak hours on Friday and Saturday, and set a review period of six months that allows the applicant to come back and advise if this is unduly burdensome, and that it wouldn't require another hearing to revise.

Commissioner Rahi asked would that mean if the Applicant does not come back in the six months, then they accept the condition.

Commissioner Davis asked the Applicant what impact such a condition will do to them to provide for customer access.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, felt the bigger issue was the design of the center was not optimal with having the parking spaces in the back.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, stated it would require a redesign of the current floor plan, and another concern is that there will be a lot of children walking in the back area and they have a responsibility to be sure they are protected, which would require extra supervision in that area.

Commissioner Rahi asked what if the condition just required them to leave the back door accessible and it is up to the customers to decide if they want to use it or not.

Drew Wilson, Rockin' Jump, stated he would rather wait six months and see if there are any problems before requiring the rear entrance be built.

Commissioner Bratt stated on the floor plan there appears to be an office between the two party rooms and that the area outside the office is not designated for a particular use. He suggested modifying the motion to make that area a reception area for the weekends only during peak hours.

Commissioner Ensberg stated he would modify the motion to include that language.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, asked if they would need to install ADA requirements even if they were just using that entrance on the weekends because right now it would not be accessible. He was concerned that they would have to spend the money improving the entrance and then find out that parking wasn't ever an issue.

Commissioner Rahi stated he believed it would require ADA accessibility.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated another issue is what criteria Staff should use to evaluate if there is a problem with the parking in six months' time. We can encourage customers to park in the back, but even if a back entrance is required, people might still park in the front.

Commissioner Davis asked if they were going to have employees park in the rear, why that does not require ADA improvements.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated he would have to confer with the Building Official on the requirements for a secondary entrance, but overall the requirements are becoming more and more restrictive and costly on what has to be provided for ADA accessibility. He asked if the intent of the motion was if the Applicant felt they did not have any problems with patrons using the front entrance only, then they could come back in six months and request to not have to use the rear entrance.

Commissioner Ensberg stated it allows them to come back for further discussion on that topic if they have reasonable data as to why they do not need the rear entrance and the front parking area is sufficient, and that the requirement for the rear entrance is burdensome on their operations and they would like relief from that condition.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that in order to make that determination it would probably require another parking study be done during peak hours to provide that type of data.

Commissioner Davis asked what happens if they do not require the entrance in the back initially and then determine there is a problem; how do they address it then.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Condition No. 8 states the CUP can come back for review if any problems arise in the future. Staff would always try to work with the Applicant to resolve issues before going so far as requiring another hearing on the CUP.

Commissioner Ensberg felt if there was a problem, it would be harder for them to add an entrance in the future than having it now before they open.

Chris Johnson, Applicant, asked if they were going to require the rear entrance, he would like the Commission to identify it as such so that it could be modified to look like a business entrance with signage and not just like an exit door.

Commissioner Davis felt it should be designed to look like a storefront entrance with proper signage, even if that means modifying the sign program, to encourage people to use the entrance. He hopes that the center begins to fill up with patrons with the new changes. He felt redesigning the entrance now will make the spaces in the back of the center more useable.

Motion as stated and amended carried unanimously, 5-0.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

2. Assistant City Manager for Community Development

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza stated both the Olson and City Venture housing projects were scheduled for environmental/subdivision review next week, and then potentially will be heard at DPRB on June 12, 2014. There is a proposal for three restaurants and a small amount of retail on the Gladstone pads at Costco.

Associate Planner Torrico stated there is a preliminary request to create a new pad at the Lowe's center for a Starbucks and Chipotle.

3. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

4. Planning Commission

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza asked the Commission is they had any scheduling conflicts for the July 3rd meeting.

The Commission concurred it might be better to not have a meeting on that day due to the holiday weekend.

In response to Chairman Schoonover, **Senior Planner Espinoza** stated the City Council approved first reading of the household fowl ordinance with the Planning Commission's recommendations. In regards to HOA regulations, that was discussed and it will be up to them to enforce any restrictions; the City will not.

Commissioner Davis stated only two people spoke against the rehab center item at Council.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the speakers stated that everyone in the area was upset but there weren't any people in the audience to speak about it. The applicant can now submit for plan check.

In response to Commission Rahi, *Senior Planner Espinoza* stated the Tzu Chi have scaled back on their master plan proposal but they have not pursued any action on it. Commissioner Bratt stated he would not be attending the June 5, 2014 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Davis to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 5, 2014, at 7:00 p.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: July 17, 2014