

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Thursday, July 17, 2014 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 of Comm. Dev. Larry Stevens
Senior Planner Marco Espinoza
Assistant City Attorney Mark Steres
Planning Secretary Jan Sutton

CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Chairman Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m. and Commissioner Bratt led the flag salute.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes: May 15, 2014
June 5, 2014 (Bratt absent)

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Ensberg to approve the May 15, 2014 minutes. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

MOTION: Moved by Davis, seconded by Ensberg to approve the June 5, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-0-1 (Bratt abstained).

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 155 N. EUCLA AVENUE, APNS 8386-006-010, 025, 026, 027, 028 AND 029:**

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 14-01: A request to amend the General Plan Land Use Designation to Residential High to allow for a density level of 12.1 to 16 units per acre; and
MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 13-06: A request to amend Specific Plan No. 23 by creating a new "Planning Area III" that will allow residential development; and
ZONE CHANGE 14-01: A request to change the zone of the appendage portion of the project (APN: 8386-006-029) from Multiple Family (MF-15) to Specific Plan 23, Area III;

TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 72590 (TTM 13-02): A request to process a Tentative Tract Map for Condominium Purposes for 47 attached residential units; and
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD CASE NO. 13-31: A request to develop 47 two- and three-story townhomes on approximately 3.65 acres in a gated community. The residential units will range in size from 1,315 sq. ft. to 1,838 sq. ft. Each unit will have a two-car garage (totaling 94 parking spaces) and an additional 48 on-site parking stalls for residents and visitors; and
TREE REMOVAL NO. 14-05: A request to remove 58 trees from the site. A tree replacement plan will be required and be incorporated into the landscape plan.

Staff report presented by *Senior Planner Marco Espinoza*, who stated the hearing tonight is for a proposal to construct 47 townhomes and explained the various applications needed in support of the project. The property is located at 155 N. Eucla Avenue, which is currently being used as a contractor's storage yard and an appendage portion that is being used for storage. To the south are the railroad tracks, Comfort Suites, Extended Stay America, and Lowe's. To the north are single-family properties, many of which are very deep lots. To the west is an apartment complex and to the east is another contractor's yard and single-family homes. Currently the site is accessed by one entrance from Eucla Avenue, with an office building, corrugated metal buildings and additional sheds for material storage on-site.

The Applicant is proposing to construct multiple buildings containing four to seven units per building. The main entrance will be aligned with 2nd Street and have a community gate. He showed the circulation plan and where there will be additional guest parking. The appendage portion will be used for various leisure activities and a walking path, and there will be additional green space on the southern portion of the project. The buildings are designed in a Craftsman style in compliance with the Town Core Design Guidelines.

The General Plan is the master plan for the City and the Zoning Map should be in alignment with the Land Use Map. The current designation for the main portion of the lot is industrial and the appendage portion is commercial. The Applicant is asking to change the designation to residential for both portions. The additional application is to make the zoning map and zoning consistent with the General Plan. The majority of the site is already zoned Specific Plan No. 23, (SP-23) so the Zone Change would only impact the appendage portion.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the Municipal Code Text Amendment is to create a new area within SP-23 to allow for the development of housing. This also addresses compatibility with the General Plan, and sets standards for utilities and infrastructure development. The Tentative Tract Map is proposed to create one parcel for the development of the condominiums, and the proposal is to sell the air space, with the HOA maintaining the common areas. The Map was reviewed by the Environmental/Subdivision Committee at two meetings, and their concerns and comments were implemented into the reports. A Notice of Intent was circulated to various outside agencies and posted with the County Clerk, on City posting boards and website. The Committee recommended the application move forward in the process. All environmental concerns were deemed less than significant and could be addressed through the proposed Mitigation Measures.

He went over the design of the units and stated each will have a two-car garage with additional guest parking provided on-site. Some of the units would include tandem garages, which have been approved in other recent projects, and would not exceed 50%; however the maximum allowed in the other projects has been approximately 20%. The DPRB expressed concern over this amount but the Applicant stated this is what works for many of their clients. The architectural style is Craftsman and will include wood siding materials and various details such as false knee braces, brick accents, hung windows, etc.

The Applicant is providing on-site amenities such as bocce ball, horseshoe pits, open space for BBQs with full landscaping around the site. The Board did not consider the entrance gate an issue, but one resident attending the meeting expressed concern about it, and this would be the first gated community within the Town Core. There are four multi-family developments in the Town Core; two are located on Way Hill and are not gated, Village Walk, and one that is entitled but has not been constructed yet.

Senior Planner Espinoza went over the Tree Removal report and added that if trees located near the property line but not on the site itself need to be removed due to the construction of the wall, the Applicant will need to receive authorization from the other property owners. He stated the noticing radius was increased to approximately 900 feet from the site and the Applicant held several community meetings prior to formal submittal of the applications. Originally they wanted more units but reduced the number after meeting with the surrounding residents. They also reduced the height of units along the north property line and Eucla Avenue. The units closest to the property line will be two-story in height and then transition to three-story units, and all north facing windows have been removed on the three-story units. The units also have a 20 foot setback which is typical in single-family zones. The units on Eucla Avenue will have patios that will provide access to the street, and several will have long driveways to provide for four-car parking. Staff and the DPRB are recommending the Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the project and the various applications and environmental mitigations.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if there are other three-story projects in the City, and if they were located next to single-family neighborhoods.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the apartments under construction at Loma Bonita are three-story, and the condos at Grove Station and Village Walk are also three-story. The apartments are surrounded predominately by other multi-family, and Grove Station is not that near to the single-family to the west.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if they would be breaking new ground then by allowing a project like this next to single-family.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated when you look at the site and what is located to the east, south and west, this is a transitional block that buffers the single-family from more intense uses. It is also at the edge of the single-family portion of the Town Core. It is not unusual to see condo or apartment projects clustered towards less desirable uses, so when they reviewed this site it seemed appropriate for the increase in density.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if street parking would be allowed.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated parking is allowed on the public street but at night you would need to have an overnight parking permit.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if there has been a study on the impact on City services with the increased density, and if so, was Staff satisfied with the information. He also asked if the CC&Rs would be reviewed by the City and how do we ensure the reserves are funded. He also wanted to know why the Applicant desired a gated community.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated impacts of the project were evaluated during review of the Specific Plan and by the Environmental Committee and any concerns were addressed through the Mitigation Measures to improve the utilities to support the project. The CC&Rs are supplied by the Applicant but are reviewed by the City Attorney, City Engineer and Staff. He stated the

Applicant could best answer why they wanted a gate, but it is a selling feature which can give potential buyers a sense of security and some people want that.

Assistant City Attorney Steres stated it is the purview of the State Department of Real Estate to ensure there are adequate reserves.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if the Fire Department had any issues with this being a gated community.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated all gated communities have Knox boxes allowing Fire Department access; they have reviewed the project and do not have any issues at this point but will provide final approval during the plan check process.

Commissioner Bratt asked in regards to the gate and the homes fronting Eucla, is there direct access to Eucla.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated there will be a vehicular and separate pedestrian gate and showed where they will be located.

Commissioner Davis stated then there will be no gate in front of the front doors of those units.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated each of the units will have their own low wall around the patio area that will not exceed 42 inches in height and they will have their own direct access to the street.

Commissioner Bratt stated it was brought up at DPRB that the developer wants the vehicle gate to be made of wood. He also asked if the fence along Eucla prevents access by the general public to the development.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated there is a proposal to use wood, but they have also submitted a version that is metal and are agreeable to using either design. He confirmed that unless you are a resident you cannot access the development.

Commissioner Davis asked if he could clarify the location of the homes to the north because there seemed to be a variety of buildings on the lots.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the residences were oriented towards 3rd Street and there were several accessory buildings such as detached garages or sheds located behind the main houses, and then there are a few homes that are oriented towards Eucla.

Commissioner Rahi asked if there would be any line-of-sight issues from the fences that would be in front of the units facing Eucla Avenue for residents exiting the driveway and turning northbound.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated 42 inches was the standard height for front yard fencing and showed on the site plan how they would not create any visibility issues. This will also be reviewed by the City Engineer during plan check. There was also a review conducted to see if there should be a stop sign installed at the intersection with 2nd Street, but the traffic count was insufficient to warrant one. The neighbors have expressed concerns about speeding more than the number of cars, and that would be enforced by the Sheriff's Department. They will also be improving the railroad approach on the west side and working with the City on the east side improvement to the south of the railroad tracks so there will be full connection with the sidewalks.

Commissioner Rahi asked about the lack of a secondary emergency access.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the Fire Department did not require there to be one, and stated they have access throughout the project and can reach all the buildings with their hoses.

Chairman Schoonover stated the report indicates that 42% of the parking is tandem, and that Staff contacted several cities in regards to their experience with tandem parking and asked what the results were of that contact.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated he contacted Glendora, Covina, Arcadia Pasadena and Pomona. The majority allowed tandem in some form, but only one had a maximum requirement of 25% and all the others did not limit the amount. Some had a process for approval such as a minor deviation. Staff felt since we are reviewing the project as a whole it could be addressed at this time. When it has been allowed in the past it was based on what was being developed. Grove Station originally had some tandem parking but it was never developed. When Olson took over the project they went through a process to allow additional tandem parking.

Chairman Schoonover stated the resolution originally said 28% tandem parking but now it is increasing to 50% and asked where did the 28% come from and why is it now increasing.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the 28% was based on the total parking required for the site but the number increased to 50% when you only looked at the covered garage spaces.

Chairman Schoonover wanted to clarify that they are just allowing tandem parking in the Town Core and nowhere outside of it.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated tonight they are just approving an amendment to the Specific Plan for this particular site.

Chairman Schoonover felt they were still setting a precedent for any future development whether it was in Via Verde or on Foothill Boulevard or elsewhere.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated where it has been allowed has been in multi-family developments and did not think it would be allowed on single-family detached lots.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if there was any requirement in the Housing Element to provide any low-income units with this project.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated there are no low-income units or an assisted housing program with this development. These will all be for sale market rate units.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the City may at its own discretion decide if it is appropriate to have an inclusionary requirement, and the best approach would be to adopt an ordinance to apply to all developments rather than evaluating on an individual basis, but they are not required to by the latest Housing Element. All the matters before the Commission tonight are only for this project. If you approve the project without it, you cannot come back and apply it. Another question asked was if the Housing Element required this density at this site, and it does not. The obligation to establish increased densities driven by the Housing Element are associated with a process with the RHNA and they have met that obligation through previous re-zonings without having to increase density on this site or similar sites. The only exception is in the Low-Very/Low category but that requirement has been met by creating zoning opportunities at 30 du/a on designated properties. There was a suggestion in the 2014 Housing Element that some parcels be identified for medium-density housing, and this parcel is

one that was included in that suggestion but there is no obligation to rezone or increase density on this particular parcel based on the Housing Element.

Commissioner Bratt wanted to clarify that based on previous meetings the amendment to the Specific Plan only applied to this parcel and would not change anything for the parcel to the east.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that is correct.

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

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, 1900 Quail Street, Newport Beach, Applicant, who stated they are a Southern California based developer specializing in infill with single-family, townhomes and condominiums from San Diego to San Francisco. He stated the City's General Plan Housing Element identified this site as a potential site for medium-density residential, and that there was a need for housing for young adults. Their initial site plan contained 54 units, but when they presented it at a community meeting a year ago there were concerns expressed about the density, the proximity of three-story buildings to the existing houses, and general traffic concerns and impacts on Eucla Avenue. Since that time they held another community meeting and presented several iterations to Staff to arrive at the project that is being presented tonight. There is now a mix of two- and three-story units, with over 45% open space. They feel they have addressed the concerns of the neighbors as best as they can in regards to privacy, and with less units there will be less traffic generated. What the report doesn't state is that the heavy vehicles being used by L.A. Signal will now be off the road. He feels they have met the Town Core Design Guidelines with the Craftsman architecture. In conclusion he stated they are in compliance with the City's Housing Element; they listened and responded to Staff and community concerns; they received approval from the DPRB; and they have come up with a design that engages the street and the neighborhood. He felt this will be a great addition to the community and will elevate property values in the area.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if there will be a swimming pool in the project, and what is the cost range for these units, and if they had given any thought for inclusionary housing.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated there are no plans for a pool, and the average cost will be around \$450,000. In regards to inclusionary housing he stated they were told at the onset that would not be part of the project so it wasn't considered.

Commissioner Davis asked what he meant by saying the project is "engaging the street."

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated they have designed the units along Eucla to have the front doors and yards facing the street as opposed to other projects where a six-foot block wall will be installed and the units are internally oriented.

Commissioner Davis stated having a wall around the community with a gate doesn't seem very inclusionary to the surrounding neighborhood.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated they have included a gate in the design because they find that is what residents desire and provides security for them, it is not meant to exclude the neighborhood.

Chairman Schoonover stated the site plan indicates there are four or five ADA compliant units, but they appear to be two-story units and asked how they can be considered accessible.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated part of the requirement is that there is a bedroom on the first floor.

Chairman Schoonover clarified the developer was saying the gate is more of a security issue than anything else. He asked about the four phases and if the community area was in the first phase.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated they will be phasing the units starting along Eucla Avenue and then heading west, and confirmed the community area would be part of Phase One.

Commissioner Bratt asked if they have used tandem parking in any of their other developments and how successful was it.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated they have used it before and it seems to work well for singles and families with small children, and it always sells.

Rick Hartman, Chamber of Commerce, stated he reviewed this project on behalf of the Economic Development Committee. They feel it provides a good buffer to the Bonita Corridor and based on the odd shape of the lot it has been designed well. He is a land use professional and felt that many of the questions that have been asked are appropriate, and that it can be difficult to judge a transitional piece. He liked that the two-story units have been placed near the existing residential. He stated tandem parking does work and it helps to utilize the land better. The architectural treatment is classic and goes well with the City. He stated the streets are private streets and having a gate helps to minimize the traffic on the streets that the HOA will have to pay to maintain. He has been a resident of San Dimas for 25 years and thinks adding residential on some of these smaller pieces allows people to live here in the City. He added that he has lived in a house with tandem parking in the past and did not have any problems with it.

Robert Burkett, 512 W. 3rd Street, stated he lives within 300 feet of the project. He agrees with some aspects of the project, that it is transitional and there are some issues the homeowners will reap benefits from. He felt there were still privacy issues and that the third story windows would still look down into people's back yards. He asked if the walls were intended to keep people in or out, and will they be high enough to keep 15-year-olds from jumping over them into their yards. He stated there are two lots north of the project site that have been owned by the same family for 80 years and that they were not giving any opportunity for them to have ingress/egress from those lots and hoped the Commission would consider that.

Nicole Gonzales, 441 W. 2nd Street, stated the gate was an issue. She likes that her neighborhood is walkable and having a gated entrance makes her feel that the new residents don't want to be part of the neighborhood. This area is safe and they do not need a gate. She felt a block wall was inconsistent with the City's desire for wood fences in the past and that it would be an attraction for graffiti. She felt the developer should give something back to the existing community and include a bike path for the neighborhood along the railroad tracks. She did not like the entrance being aligned with 2nd Street and that it will create traffic issues because people speed in that area, and if cars are parked at the curb, it will impact their visibility.

Ampano Beruman, 444 W. 3rd Street, stated she felt this was a good plan but not appropriate for their neighborhood. She has been to several meetings and has yet to hear that anyone is for this development. The developer stated he was listening to the neighborhood when they reduced the number of units but she felt the neighborhood stated they did not want the development at all. She has lived here for 47 years and this is a small town; if you bring in 47 units there will be another 100 people and 100 cars and pets. That is a big increase. She

wanted her community to stay the same. The current use does not disturb the neighborhood and felt her neighbors were rejecting the project because they didn't want all these people moving in. She likes her small town and hopes this area won't be developed.

Della Lee, 524 W. 3rd Street, stated he has lived here for 78 years and felt this does not fit her neighborhood. If this is approved, there will be more cars and people and crime. They would rather have their small town atmosphere and keep the light industrial. Bringing in 47 units will box them in, and the next thing will be the property across the street will also want to develop. She has seen good changes in town but felt they should keep the town core small.

Lisa, 219 N. Eucla Avenue, stated she has to block her driveway with a car so that her five-year-old son can play in the front yard because of people speeding up the street, and he can't even go to the corner of 3rd Street because there is no place to play. She was concerned that when these units turn into rentals there won't be enough parking on-site. She felt they should not be able to get parking permits to park on Eucla. She did not like that a gate was proposed for security purposes because it made it seem like the residents were afraid to live in her neighborhood, which is very safe, and don't want to be part of the community.

Chris Lee stated during the conversation about the houses to the north someone referred to them as being shacks and he did not think that was right. Most of the people in the area are related and have lived here a long time, and when they talk about wanting the area to remain the same it is because they all know each other. Currently there is no crime but with more people moving in it will become more dangerous because of the increase in traffic. The trucks from L.A. Signal do not come up Eucla and do not impact them. He did not like that the windows would still be facing some of their backyards.

Angel Torres, 530 W. 3rd Street, stated he is against the project, and even though he has only lived here seven years he agrees with the previous comments. He stated City Ventures held community meetings, but they did not mention that no one in attendance wanted the project at this location. He wanted to know what needed to be done to have this project denied.

Brad Johnson, 425 W. 2nd Street, stated he lives about three lots away from the site and will be able to see it from his property, and that 2nd Street will be the most impacted. He thinks the City did a good job demanding high quality architecture so was not concerned about that. While he personally would like to live in a gated community, he concurred with earlier statements and did not think a gated community was appropriate for this location. He visited the developer's project in Glendora and people can just walk into it and felt that was better. In regards to the appendage portion, it goes almost all the way to Costco and he would like to see that developed as a bike trail for the community to use, and that as a trade-off for the higher density it should be a publicly accessed trail. He felt eliminating the fencing on the front porches facing the street would relate better to the single-family area. He felt it should be more open to the neighborhood and they should allow people to walk through the project.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated originally they had discussed having a taller wall along the north property line with the City, but typically walls are six feet in height. He understands there is a concern in the neighborhood about teenagers that are hopping the fence from the apartments to head down 3rd Street, but did not think they would have the same issue here since there is no direct access to a street.

Commissioner Ensberg asked what the purpose of having the wall was. He also asked about their project in Glendora that is not gated.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated a portion of the wall will be retaining but mostly it is to show the separation between the properties. He added that in regards to the comments about including a bike trail they do not own the land towards Costco. He stated in Glendora the parking area is gated but because the City is proposing a train station in the area they wanted to maintain community accessibility.

Commissioner Davis asked if there will be a wall along the appendage portion.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated there will be a solid wall long the south side and on the north will be a block wall combined with wrought iron for an open feel. While this might make a good access point for a bike path their property only goes from Eucla to Amelia; you would have to gain access from Metro and Caltrans to make a bike path feasible.

Chairman Schoonover asked where the Glendora project is located.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures, stated it was at Glendora and Ada Avenues, across from the post office.

Chairman Schoonover stated they were in receipt of an email from Jim Johnson, 540 W. 3rd Street, who stated he was in opposition to the project.

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

Commissioner Davis asked what will happen to the properties that are landlocked.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated they have not evaluated at this time whether a particular parcel is landlocked or not, and the City does not have an obligation to facilitate access to a parcel that is landlocked. The bulk of the parcels are narrow, deep parcels with access to 3rd Street, with a few fronting Eucla. It would be the obligation of the landlocked property owner to find a way to get access, possibly by working with a neighbor, if they ever chose to develop it.

Assistant City Attorney Mark Steres stated this proposal does not change an existing situation. The L.A. Signal industrial use is already there and this proposal doesn't change or create different legal rights any of those parcels may have.

Commissioner Davis asked about the driveway being located at 2nd Street and a comment from the public that they did not think that was a good idea.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated originally the driveway was closer to the railroad tracks and both the City Engineer and Traffic Engineer felt if cars started backing up entering the project it could have an impact on the railroad and the alley. They felt the safest and most appropriate location was to align the driveway with 2nd Street and try to create a four-way transition as best as they can.

Commissioner Davis asked about Staff's support of the community gate, and in allowing block walls in the Town Core area.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated since this is a transition area the gate was something they considered. The apartments to the west on Amelia have a gated entrance, and it was proposed as part of the project. Staff is not opposed to it, but does not see it as being necessary and would not object if it were removed. He stated block for perimeter walls is allowed in the Town Core as long as decorative block is used, but they have not typically been approved for the front

yard. Retaining walls with river rock have been approved in the past. The Applicant is proposing low walls for the patio areas facing Eucla with a wood gate, and some wrought iron, but they could look further at using a different material. The six-foot tall wall is set back quite a ways, and the other perimeter wall is a combination of block and wrought iron along the appendage portion to minimize the impact.

Chairman Schoonover stated there are many positive aspects to this proposal but he has a problem with it being a gated community and does not think it is necessary. He also felt that having 50% of the parking as tandem was too much and that they were setting a precedent, especially with this being in the Town Core. He felt the City should try to put a bike path on the appendage property. He understands this is a transitional area, but questioned if this was the right type of product and the right number of units for it. He stated the Craftsman design was a positive aspect and appreciates the developer reducing the building height along the north property line.

Commissioner Davis asked if did not have any issues with the three-story buildings.

Chairman Schoonover stated he is uncomfortable with having units that are three-stories but he can understand why they were designed that way, especially if the ground floor is for parking, you would want to give people two-stories of living space. Reducing the height of the units adjacent to the north boundary to two-story does help.

Commissioner Davis asked for an explanation of the City's desire for more density in this area.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the Housing Element encourages higher densities and one of the tasks associated with its adoption was to evaluate sites, including this one, that may be appropriate for higher density development, but it does not obligate the City to rezone the property

Commissioner Ensberg felt if there is currently a speeding issue on Eucla Avenue that should be addressed separately as that was not related to this project. He stated change is inevitable but it was up to them to make it positive and productive. He was excited that this is for young families and allows people that cannot afford to purchase a detached single-family home to still live in San Dimas. He felt the project is well designed and visually appealing compared to what is currently there. He stated entry gates have been approved in other parts of the City and this has been identified as a transitional area. If it is not unlawful and the owner prefers it, he thinks they can approve the gates. In his reading about land use planning he has learned there needs to be a more intense, efficient use of land. He was in support of the project.

Commissioner Bratt stated he is not a fan of gates but it was not a deal breaker for him. There are gates at the apartments and at The Gables, but he felt it would be a friendly gesture to the neighborhood to remove them from the design. He had some issues with this being a three-story project based on the massiveness of the apartments behind the Fresh 'n Easy but felt these were designed much better where the massiveness was reduced. He did not think the tandem parking was a problem, it is something you get used to, and if the first floor is the garage, you need to have two-stories above it for the living space. He is in support of the project but would like the gate to be removed.

Commissioner Rahi liked the project and thinks the developer has made an effort to address the community's concerns. He doesn't mind that it is a gated community, and felt the project provided enough parking on-site for everything. He would encourage the developer to keep

working with the surrounding community but feels this project will add value to the area and was in support.

Commissioner Davis stated if you covered up the appendage portion it looks like three-story buildings and a parking lot. He did not support having the gate and didn't think it fit with the neighborhood. He stated the exterior design was fine, but the project was too dense and he was not in support of it.

Chairman Schoonover asked was he referring to it being three-stories high or that there were nine buildings when he stated it was too dense.

Commissioner Davis stated both. He reiterated if you covered up the appendage portion, you see nothing but concrete and parking lot. He did not know why this was considered a transitional project, and doesn't see why that just because this property backs up to the railroad you have to build something that is three-stories high. He likes the idea that it adds homes in the community for young people to buy but felt a lot of condo stock ends up being used as rental properties. His fear is that it won't accomplish what everyone hopes in providing entry-level homes and because of the other issues he could not support the project the way it is designed.

RESOLUTION PC-1510

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 14-01, AMENDING THE LAND USE DESIGNATION MAP

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adopt Resolution PC-1510 recommending the City Council approve General Plan Amendment 14-01, including the Environmental Documents, the Mitigation Measures and Monitoring. Motion carried 4-1 (Davis voted no).

RESOLUTION PC-1511

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 13-06 AMENDING CHAPTER 18.538 SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 23 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE TO CREATE A NEW "PLANNING AREA III" THAT WILL ALLOW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adopt Resolution PC-1511 recommending the City Council approve Municipal Code Text Amendment 13-06, including the Environmental Documents, the Mitigation Measures and Monitoring.

Chairman Schoonover clarified this is the resolution that would allow up to 50% tandem parking.

Assistant City Manager Stevens clarified that this resolution is to approve the text which creates Planning Area III which will allow residential development consistent with the plans that have been submitted, such as allow three-story buildings, tandem parking based on the percentages contained in the text, setbacks, the use, etc. It does not require a gate or prohibit one, so if there are aspects of that you would like to adjust, it should be included or revised in this motion.

Commissioner Ensberg stated the motion is to approve as presented and stated by Staff.

Assistant City Attorney Steres stated the motion would be to adopt as presented with the couple pages of addenda on the dais that clarified the height, parking, and striking out the paragraph that referred to schools. The Commission can also make a motion to amend it, but if there is no second, then the minutes will reflect that. If there is a second, you vote on the amendment first, and if it goes down in defeat the record will reflect that so that the Council can see where the Commission suggested amendments and how it came out, and depending on what amendments were passed, they would be included in the final motion.

MOTION: Moved by Schoonover, seconded by Davis to amend the tandem parking to 28% of the enclosed parking as originally proposed.

Assistant City Manager Stevens asked how many units have tandem parking.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated 20 out of the 47 units.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated that would be 42%. If they require a number that is less than 42%, then they will have to figure out what adjustments need to be made to the project to comply with that standard. The 50% was written because unusual percentages are difficult to calculate. If they want a new number, it should be a logical number.

Commissioner Ensberg stated he was opposed to changing the percentage because that is an integrated part of the project and if they start pulling pieces out of the proposal, it will create chaos.

Motion failed 2-3 (Bratt, Ensberg, Rahi voted no).

MOTION: Moved by Davis to limit the height of the buildings to two-story. Motion failed for lack of a second

Motion to approve Municipal Code Text Amendment 13-06 as originally stated, including the Environmental Documents, the Mitigation Measures and Monitoring passed 3-2 (Davis, Schoonover voted no).

RESOLUTION PC-1512

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF ZONE CHANGE 14-01, A REQUEST TO CHANGE THE ZONING FROM MULTIPLE FAMILY (MF-15) TO SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 23, AREA III ON THE APPENDAGE PORTION OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED 155 NORTH EUCLA AVENUE (APN: 8386-006-029)

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Rahi to adopt Resolution PC-1512 recommending the City Council approve Zone Change 14-01, including the Environmental Documents, the Mitigation Measures and Monitoring. Motion carried 4-1 (Davis voted no).

RESOLUTION PC-1513

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 72590 (TTM 13-02), A REQUEST TO PROCESS A TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES FOR 47 ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL UNITS LOCATED AT 155 NORTH EUCLA AVENUE (APN's: 8386-006-010, 025, 026, 027, 028 and 029)

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Rahi to adopt Resolution PC-1513 recommending the City Council approval Tentative Tract Map 72590 (TTM 13-02), including the Environmental Documents, the Mitigation Measures and Monitoring.

Commissioner Bratt asked if this is where they can address the gate issue.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated that would be under the DPRB standards. The Tentative Tract Map creates a one lot subdivision and 47 condos which can be sold as individual units by virtue of the map. There are also a series of development conditions, some of which are replicated in the design review approval.

Assistant City Attorney Steres stated this is also where the CC&Rs are required.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked if the Commission decides to lower the number of units, can they do that without having to amend the map.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated if for some reason there is a change in the project as it goes through the process that required a reduction in the number of units, as long as it is generally consistent and not more than the 47 units, you could probably determine that the map was consistent with such a change.

Motion carried 3-2 (Davis, Schoonover voted no).

RESOLUTION PC-1514

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD CASE NUMBER 13-31 AND TREE REMOVAL PERMIT 14-05, A REQUEST TO DEVELOP 47 TWO- AND THREE-STORY TOWNHOMES ON APPROXIMATELY 3.65 ACRES IN A GATED COMMUNITY AND THE REMOVAL OF 58 TREES FROM THE SITE LOCATED AT 155 N. EUCLA AVENUE (APN: 8386-006-010, 025, 026, 027, 028 and 029)

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated this resolution approves the project design, the buildings, the architecture, the gate, landscape, etc. It does not include a requirement for a trail, so if the Commission feels that is an appropriate suggestion, they would have to approve a modification.

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Rahi to adopt Resolution PC-1514 recommending the City Council approve Development Plan Review Board Case Number 13-31 and Tree Removal Permit 14-05 as written and presented, including the Environmental Documents, the Mitigation Measures and Monitoring.

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Davis to amend the motion by deleting the entrance gate from the project.

Commissioner Ensberg stated he feels they have approved gates on other projects and did not see a reason to not approve it here; it is a part of the project that makes sense and did not feel it should be changed at the last minute.

Commissioner Davis stated this is the first time it has been presented to the Planning Commission and he feels they are allowed to make any changes they feel are appropriate.

Motion carried 3-2 (Rahi, Schoonover voted no).

Chairman Schoonover stated he is still not supportive of the tandem parking but he will not pursue it any further.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated Staff will add a condition to address the gate amendment.

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adopt Resolution PC-1514 recommending the City Council approve Development Plan Review Board Case Number 13-31 as amended, and Tree Removal Permit 14-05 as written and presented, including the Environmental Documents, the Mitigation Measures and Monitoring. Motion carried 3-2 (Davis, Schoonover voted no).

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the Planning Commission recommendations will be presented to the City Council in August. The City Council will conduct a de novo hearing where the project will be presented to them as a new public hearing. The Council is not bound to follow the Commission's recommendations, and wanted the residents to know if they had concerns, they should express them to the City Council for consideration.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

2. Assistant City Manager for Community Development

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the Olson project on Foothill will likely be heard by the Commission at the second meeting in August. He stated the first phase of the apartments at Loma Bonita has been released for occupancy and they expect the occupancy release for the final phase will be in the next 60-75 days. At the next City Council meeting will be the request to authorize services to facilitate the sale of the 10 City-owned units in Grove Station/Village Walk.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated they have received an application for the two pad buildings along Gladstone at the Costco site which proposes to have two restaurants with drive-thrus and two to three shop spaces. The mixed-use project at San Dimas Avenue and Commercial on the west side has been sold and the new developer has submitted plans for plan check. Staff still has not received any plans for plan check for the gas station at San Dimas Avenue and Arrow Highway.

3. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

4. Planning Commission

Commissioner Davis asked the status of LucaBella.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the current delay with LucaBella completing the process is with ABC. They have not picked an opening date yet because of that, and thought it might be sometime in early August.

Commissioner Ensberg stated he will be out of town for the second meeting in August.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Davis to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Thursday, August 7, 2014, at 7:00 p.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: August 21, 2014