

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Thursday, August 21, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present

Chairman Jim Schoonover
Commissioner David Bratt
Commissioner John Davis
Commissioner M. Yunus Rahi
Assistant City Manager of Comm. Dev. Larry Stevens
Senior Planner Marco Espinoza
Assistant City Attorney Lindsay Tabaian
Planning Secretary Jan Sutton

Absent

Commissioner Stephen Ensberg

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: July 17, 2014
 August 7, 2014

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Davis to approve the July 17, 2014 Minutes. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Ensberg absent).

MOTION: Moved by Davis, seconded by Rahi to approve the August 7, 2014 Minutes. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Ensberg absent).

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 299 E. FOOTHILL BOULEVARD, APNS 8665-008-016 & -017 AND A PORTION OF 8665-007-900 & -905:**

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 13-01: A request to amend the General Plan Land Use Designation from "Open Space" to "Residential Low/Medium" to allow for a density level of 6.1 to 8 units per acre; and

MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 13-08: A request to create a new “Specific Plan No. 27” that would allow for the residential development; and
ZONE CHANGE 13-01: A request to change the zone of the site from Light Agricultural (A-L) and Open Space (OS) to Specific Plan No. 27; and
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 72368 (TTM 13-01): A request to subdivide the subject site into 48 single-family residential lots with a number of common use lots to be maintained by the Homeowner’s Association; and
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD CASE NO. 13-20 AND PRECISE PLAN NO. 13-03: A request to develop a gated community with 48 two-story, single-family detached residences. The homes will range in size from 1,620 sq. ft. to 1,953 sq. ft. on lots ranging in size from 2,560 sq. ft. to 2,816 sq. ft.; and
TREE REMOVAL NO. 13-27: A request to remove 53 of the 56 trees from the subject site; a tree replacement plan will be required and be incorporated into the landscape plan; and
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION WITH MITIGATION MEASURES AND A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY: An Agreement to purchase approximately 18,000 sq. ft. of excess area of land within and adjacent to the City’s Horsethief Canyon Park and to not allow for increases in Development fees and certain impact fees relating to the proposed development for a time period of ten (10) years in order to allow for the construction of the project.

Staff report presented by *Senior Planner Marco Espinoza* who stated there are seven applications for consideration tonight, along with the Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Measures and a Development Agreement with the City for the purpose of constructing 48 single-family residences and briefly described the purpose of the various applications. Currently the site houses an equestrian facility with a cell tower; the proposal is to remove all the buildings except for the cell site facility. The property abuts the SFA-16,000 zone to the west developed with one- and two-story homes though their design makes them appear to be 1-1/2 story homes; Horsethief Canyon Park is located to the north, and the Flood Control Channel to the east and south. The property owner has notified the tenants that they are closing the facility and has been helping them to relocate to other facilities. There are approximately 20 owners remaining with about 40 horses. They have offered them some financial assistance and transport within a 15 mile radius.

Because there is access to Horsethief Canyon Park through the site, Staff presented the project to the Equestrian Commission for comment. The Commission felt the proposed multi-purpose trail on the west side was a positive aspect of the project, along with the possible extension at a later date of Walnut Avenue to the park. The Applicant is proposing a gated community with a private street inside of the gate, with seven homes located outside the gate on the public street. The trail will be developed and landscaped by the Applicant and then dedicated to the City for maintenance.

Commissioner Davis asked what happens at the southern terminus of the new trail.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated it will connect to the existing trail along Foothill Boulevard. He showed the elevation designs of the homes, and indicated the Applicant is looking to acquire approximately 20,000 square feet of excess City-owned property at the toe of the slope, most of which is being used by the equestrian facility already. It is not accessible from the park so the City is not opposed to the sale of this excess property.

Commissioner Bratt asked about the timeline of the Development Agreement.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated it is a standard process with most DDAs to give the Applicant a financial guarantee that if it takes time to develop the project fully, that the fees will not increase during that time period.

He stated the first application is the General Plan Amendment to change this property from Open Space to Low-Medium Density Residential at 7.5 dwelling units per acre (dua). The MCTA is to create the language for the development standards of the Specific Plan. The standards were designed to facilitate this project and are similar to the standards contained in the other single-family zones. The Zone Change application is to change the current zoning of Open Space and Light Agricultural to the new Specific Plan to be consistent with the General Plan designation. The Tentative Tract Map is for the actual subdivision of the property into the individual lots and eight common area lots. The new CC&Rs will set the requirement for maintenance of the common areas. There were a number of studies submitted in association with the tract that were reviewed by the Environmental/Subdivision Committee, which determined there were several areas that required mitigation measures.

The DPRB and Precise Plan applications are for the site layout and architectural design of the project. The DPRB has reviewed this proposal three times. At the initial meeting on June 2, 2014 Staff felt there were several design issues to be addressed. The Board continued the item and the Applicant suggested they visit a few sites to see the type of development being proposed. On June 26th the Board visited sites located in La Verne, Brea and Los Alamitos. Then at the July 10th meeting the Board reviewed proposed changes from the Applicant and discussed the properties visited on July 26th. Staff still felt there were a number of issues to be addressed, but sometimes when they tried to correct one problem it created another. The Board felt it might be better to move the project forward at this time to see what the determination of the Planning Commission and City Council would be on the overall concept of the project before focusing further on the details of it, with the understanding that if the project was approved by the Commission and Council it would come back to the Board for final design approval. There are still substantive issues that might affect some of the applications.

The fencing plan includes block walls between each property, and slump stone painted white with brick cap along the southern property line. On the east will be wrought iron fencing for visual openness. The site will have leisure and recreational amenities. There are two floor plans with three different elevation treatments; however, the difference between the elevation options are minor. Staff is concerned with the lack of variation in the design and accent materials and felt overall it made the tract appear too simplistic; they felt there needed to be additional materials used and wall undulations to avoid having a cookie cutter look along Foothill Boulevard.

Commissioner Davis thought design would be under the purview of DPRB and not the Planning Commission.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated it is also part of the Commission's review of the project. The Applicant feels because of the number of colors they are proposing it will help alleviate the feeling of sameness. Staff feels the size and massing of the houses is going to dominate more than the color schemes. This is a new concept for San Dimas and is not the typical single-family development, but Staff feels it should still be built to the same quality standards. One of the substantive issues he referred to earlier is the Board feels the side yard setback needs to be increased; currently it is five feet on each side. One of the elevations has a side entrance front door which can't be seen from the street. The Applicant proposed adding a portico to highlight where the entrance is; however that now puts the portico six inches from the property line which creates another issue. The main concern with the five foot setback was creating a tunnel effect between the houses, and the majority of the rear yards are only 10 feet deep. And while the

driveways in front of the houses are 18 feet deep, some of the elevations have a pop-out that leaves only an eight foot front yard setback.

The project runs along the flood control channel and the design is creating a linear effect that seemed inappropriate for San Dimas in such a visible location. On the Walnut Avenue extension they were proposing to use just one plan and the Board felt there needed to be more variation there, including the possible inclusion of a third plan. The Applicant had also designed some flag lots which is not a desirable design. There has also been an issue with the trash bin location because in some of the plans with the narrow side yard setback it was placing the trash cans five feet away from the neighbor's front door. It was suggested the trash cans be stored in the garage but then that would require a floor plan change in order to maintain the interior clearance required for the vehicles. There are also issues surrounding the undergrounding of the utilities which are still being discussed by Staff and the Applicant. The pending Foothill Boulevard bridge widening is also creating some issues because certain services cannot be run through the bridge. Staff would also like to see the block wall along the south softened with landscaping. The Applicant is proposing to remove 53 of the 56 trees currently on-site and went over the survey and location.

Staff supports the proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Development Agreement because this could be an appropriate location for residential development. Staff is generally in support of the draft Specific Plan; however, based on the concerns surrounding the Tentative Tract Map, and the DPRB and Precise Plan applications, any changes to those proposals would also impact the Specific Plan as it was written to support the Applicant's current submittal. Staff does not support the Tentative Tract Map, DPRB and Precise Plan applications. The Tree Removal application is included in this category because if the project is redesigned to address the concerns expressed by the Board and Staff, there is a potential that more trees can be preserved. Staff is asking the Planning Commission to provide direction on whether to approve, deny or modify the project for further review.

Commissioner Davis asked for clarification on if Staff was supporting the zone change for Low-Medium Residential, or just residential in general. He asked what the density of the homes to the west of the site is.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Low-Medium density is somewhere in the range of 40-51 homes and Staff's analysis is that that range might be acceptable.

Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens stated the density range is generally 6-8 dwelling units per acre (dua) and you can be supportive anywhere in that range. A density of six units would be approximately 12 fewer units than shown on the current plan. In regards to standard equestrian density, that would be 2-4 units per acre. He stated the density of the development to the west is in the 2-3 dua range.

Commissioner Bratt stated his calculations show that a density of 6.1 would be 39 units which is only nine less than the current proposal.

Commissioner Davis asked if the density allowed is written in the Specific Plan.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the zoning will align with the General Plan so there can't be any more units than allowed by the General Plan, and the Specific Plan will identify the density level.

Commissioner Davis stated in reviewing the AL zone it doesn't appear to allow very many uses.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated there are only three or four parcels in town still zoned AL; there is no density designation in the zone, just a minimum lot size. In traditional planning parlance this is called a "holding" zone and the uses are kept narrow and limited, and when an appropriate development is proposed, the thought is that density and development standards will be created with a zone change.

Commissioner Bratt stated the General Plan Amendment, MCTA and Zone Change seem to feed off one another. The General Plan sets the density level at Residential Low, but the MCTA and Zone Change are very specific that the project is 48 units, so if they approve those two applications, does it lock them into allowing 48 units.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated in the case of the General Plan Amendment you are locking in a range of 36-50 units and would be saying you are willing to approve a single-family development in that density range. If the Commission determines that is more density than they want to see on that site, then they need to either pick a different density range or deny the project. Generally when creating a zone using a Specific Plan, the language is written so that only the proposed project, or one close to it, can work in that zone. If someone wanted substantive changes, they would have to amend the code or redesign their project. These three applications drive the project, and it is these applications the DPRB is looking for direction on so they can determine how to address the remaining applications regarding design.

Commissioner Bratt stated the report identifies the lot sizes as 2,600 to 2,800 square feet with 50% lot coverage and asked what the lot coverage would be in a standard housing development.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated in most of the single-family developments approved in the past the smallest lot size has been 7,500 sq. ft. with a maximum 35% lot coverage. Many initial projects are less than the maximum lot coverage because it is common to want to do alterations over the course of time. In larger lot projects such as NJD the lots were approximately five acres with 10% coverage. The most common non-condo project has been in the 7,500 sq. ft. lot range, which is four to five du, with a typical lot coverage of 30%. From the Staff's perspective this is a crucial issue as this is the first small lot, detached single-family proposal in the City. There are four to five applications proposing similar developments so this will be the guiding project.

Commissioner Bratt asked about the five foot side yard setback.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated it is five from each property line so there will be a 10 foot separation between the buildings. In the Town Core the setbacks are 5 and 10 (on the garage side) and 5 and 12 elsewhere in the City. The typical rear yard would be 30-40 feet deep, with a 20 foot front yard setback.

Commissioner Rahi asked if this would have an HOA, and if the homes on Walnut would have access through the gate. He felt they could do a different street layout to include them inside of the gate.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated yes, the HOA would maintain the common areas and the gate, but it would not take care of the trail along Walnut Avenue. He stated the units on Walnut will have pedestrian access and probably vehicular. Originally all the homes were within the gate but there were concerns about traffic stacking from Foothill Boulevard. There have been

discussions about different options to include those homes but it would require the project to be redesigned. It is not an issue for Staff that they are outside of the gate.

Commissioner Rahi felt the issue is that the Applicant wants 48 homes and they won't all fit internally. He felt if there were fewer homes, they might be able to fit all of them inside the gate.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the Applicant probably would have preferred having all the units in the gate, however they weren't able to do that and still have the number of units they wanted. The different characteristics for those homes will be addressed at the State Department of Real Estate and they will probably be required to create a differential assessment for those lots because they are not within the gate; there are no requirements in the City's standards that they all be within the gate.

Commissioner Rahi was concerned that those homes won't have the same access to the HOA common area.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the Commission could determine that it is not a good design and require all the units to be in the gate, or eliminate the gate and have all the streets as public. These are items that would be addressed in the Specific Plan, TTM, DPRB and Precise Plan cases.

Chairman Schoonover stated he was concerned about the lot coverage ranging from 44% to almost 50% when the maximum lot coverage would normally be 35%. He asked what the width requirements were for public and private streets because he was concerned about the 26-foot wide street.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated for public streets curb-to-curb was generally 32-36 feet wide depending on if there was parking allowed on both sides. Private streets would be 28-32 feet wide depending upon parking and turning radius needed for Fire Department vehicles. The Fire Department reviewed the layout and felt 26 feet worked with parking restrictions on both sides.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the 26-foot wide road was in one area that acted more as an alley. The majority of streets will be 36 feet wide with a five-foot wide sidewalk on each side.

Chairman Schoonover asked if guest parking was to be on the street. He also commented on the fact that if the lots are 40 feet in width with a five foot setback on each side which leaves a 30-foot wide house with a 20-foot wide garage, that two-thirds of the frontage is the garage. He asked what the property purchased from the City would be used for.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated since this is considered a single-family development guest parking is not required; however, there are some markings on the plan for approximately 24 guest parking spaces within the project. He stated the purchase of the excess City property helps in creating the project as proposed by connecting in a logical way with the parcel to the east.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated it was Staff's suggestion for the Applicant to consider buying the property. It gives them additional flexibility to improve street widths internally and improve spacing of the units. It also eliminated a potential no-man's land between the rear of some of the houses and the City park which could become a source of complaints and a potential inappropriate gathering place. It was felt it was best to push the project as close to the toe of the slope because there was no other practical use for the property.

Chairman Schoonover asked about the open space calculations presented by the Applicant and if there have been any other developments recently that were small lots like this.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Staff does not agree with the Applicant's identification of the 11,000 square feet around the cell tower facility as open space. There is useable open space, such as the recreation areas, and non-useable such as greenbelts. There are many areas that fall under the second category which is where the discrepancy in the numbers is. The most recent subdivisions on Lone Hill and Baseline were both large lots in excess of 20,000 square feet.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the proposal on Eucla Avenue is not considered a small lot development because it is a condo development with different design standards and expectations.

Chairman Schoonover stated Boardmember Sorcinelli suggested at the July meeting that lots 21 and 25 on the south be eliminated. What would be the purpose of doing so other than spreading the project out.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated his understanding was Mr. Sorcinelli felt it would break up the linear design along the southern property line by creating some green space and keep the homes on the cul-de-sac from facing each other. The other aspect of his suggestion was that maybe by losing some units you could combine some or make a few larger for variety, and you might be able to fluctuate the rear setbacks as well.

Commissioner Davis asked if any of the sample sites they visited were next to foothills or open space.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated no, they were all in developed areas.

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

John Reekstin, Olson Company, thanked the Staff for their hard work with this complicated proposal. This is a highly amenitized Spanish resort concept like you would see in the desert. They felt there was a tremendous amount of open space and would disagree with Staff's determination on the usability of it. When you have this amount of open space it offsets the small lot development and they do not feel their proposal is much denser than a standard 7,500 sq. ft. lot development. The project they are building in La Verne is 8.5 du/a which is similar, but did not feel the project in Los Alamitos was comparable since it is 12 du/a.

He stated they build only in Southern California and provide high quality homes that are LEED certified. He discussed the relocation of the current tenants, and how they held 10 community meetings with the two neighborhoods adjacent to their site. They started with a plan with 60 homes but have reduced it down to 48, and increased the distance to the homes on the west. He stated their first choice would have been to have the gate closer to Foothill so all the homes would be behind it but were unable to do so due to the constraints of the lot. Those homes will sell for a different price and pay different HOA dues, but they will be a part of the community and have full access to it.

The Olson Company stays involved with the HOA for 10 years after construction to guarantee standards are maintained, and that this type of home is in high demand in the San Gabriel Valley as it caters to the lifestyle of people in this area, such as retirees that are downsizing,

empty nesters, young professionals and small families with small children. These are all people who want limited maintenance responsibilities but want upscale amenities.

Denise Ashton, Architect, felt it was important to understand how they approached this project. They have a small access on Foothill and the flood control channel creates a harsh edge, so they wanted the rear yards facing that way. They also have a cell tower facility on the site, along with numerous underground utilities, and are located in a high fire zone so all of these things influenced their design. They see this as a Spanish village nestled in off Foothill Boulevard. Single-family detached housing is in high demand but not everyone wants a large home on a large lot. She stated they redesigned the project after the first DPRB meeting to address concerns about side-by-side window placement, the side entry houses and trash can placement. She felt in a 48 home development it was not unusual to have only two plans, and that there was diversity with the three elevation styles and eight color schemes for every elevation.

Ron Nestor, Architect, stated the concept is an intimate resort village. With the number of elevations and variety of colors they form a family of buildings in a California Spanish style composed of various planes, different roof materials, tile details, etc. There have been concerns about the pot shelf detail being inappropriate but in their mind this is the jewelry of the building and adds character. They have created small courtyards to bring people to the front door in Plan 2, and Plan 1 is a narrower design, and 13 of the Plan 2 homes have had the portico addition so now they will have units that are narrow, medium and broad. He stated they will be using Malibu tile similar to a 1920's style and all of the homes will be LEED Certified and very energy and water efficient which will be in high demand.

Denise Ashton, Architect, stated after the second DPRB meeting they prepared a new plan to address their comments. They have removed an intended four-foot wide v-ditch and included that into the backyards for additional depth, allowing them to stagger some of the units. They also put a swing in the road to help with staggering the front yards and creating an undulating street scene. They redesigned the T-lot and spread some of the homes and took area from the open space to create a pocket park where the tot lot is. Some of the rear yards are now 25 feet deep which will take away the straight view from Foothill. One of the biggest changes was along Walnut Avenue where they incorporated two of the Plan 2's in this area. She showed the entry green near the cell tower which will have seating for the community to use, and described the amenities in the pocket park and on the east side for the community. She stated when you design smaller yards it encourages people to gather at the amenities. She stated the notion of social gathering is huge and this will be a major drawing point of the community.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated they are requesting the Commission recommend approval of all the items with the appropriate conditions and consider the redesigned plan. He stated in regards to the garages being two-thirds of the front elevation, they could be designed to be rear-loaded from an alley but wanted to have a more traditional plan that people are more familiar with. They started with 60 units because that is typical of this type of project but reduced the density as a way to enter into the San Dimas market.

Commissioner Davis asked if they considered any type of front yard activity like a porch for neighbors to visit on.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated they wanted this to have a resort feel and provided the community with amenities for congregating at.

Commissioner Davis stated if this is a private street, then the City's overnight parking restrictions will not apply and asked if the CC&Rs will address that because otherwise he envisions cars parked on the street all the time.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the HOA can restrict street parking if they want to.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated the HOA will strictly enforce parking in the garage to restrict the need for parking on the street.

Commissioner Rahi asked if they had a design that would move the seven houses on Walnut within the gate. He also confirmed that the City's overnight parking restriction would only apply to the Walnut Avenue extension.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated in order to accomplish that they would have to load them from the rear but they wanted to stay consistent with their design of a front entry from the main road.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated that while Staff is aware of the most recently revised site plan, they have not done any detailed review of those changes so a quick analysis indicates that the Applicant appears to respond in part to some of the identified design concerns but probably not in whole and they are unable at this time to take a position on whether the submittal is adequate or not. They have also not been able to review the detailed editing comments on the conditions and will prepare a response depending on direction from the Commission, along with the additional 600-800 sq. ft. to accommodate the two wider units along Walnut Avenue.

Chairman Schoonover asked about the phasing and when the parks would be constructed.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated they are proposing to build the project in five phases, and the parks would most likely be constructed in either Phase 2 or 3. They anticipate the site work will take four to six months, and then they should be able to deliver a phase every three months or so with a total construction time of approximately 15 months. They try to construct from the entrance on back so that new residents do not have to drive through the construction to get to their homes.

* * * * *

Chairman Schoonover called a recess at 9:05 p.m. The Commission reconvened at 9:17 p.m.

* * * * *

Don Green, 127 Maverick, stated he has always been concerned about aesthetics in this area and after Seawest did such a great job with their office project he wants to continue seeing that quality. He was concerned about possible liability issues for the City if they sell the 10 foot strip to the Applicant and they don't maintain the wall properly, there might be flooding coming down the slope in some of the back yards. He was also concerned about the 18-foot driveway with the five-foot wide sidewalk on Walnut not being long enough to accommodate modern vehicles and that they will block the sidewalk. He added he was not opposed to the project and liked the Spanish architecture and felt it would blend with Canyon Trails to the east. He would like to see the horse trail maintained.

Sam Vienna, 1316 Longhorn Drive, stated he appreciated the Commission's concerns about changing the density, and for Olson in keeping the residents informed. He felt the extension of Walnut would make it difficult for residents to exit his tract. He thought they should take the street to the northeast corner and connect to San Dimas Canyon Road through the park. He

was concerned about people on horseback being able to see into his windows, and did not approve of the increased density and was concerned about the water usage needed to support this project. He felt the Commission should take a hard look on what the long term impacts are going to be when building projects like this.

Barbara Alvarez, 1300 Longhorn Drive, stated she is the most affected by this project. She has lived in her home for 35 years and really disliked the project. She was not opposed to developing the land but felt they should consider San Dimas in its entirety and how they wanted it to look like in the future. She did not want two-story homes looking into her backyard, a traffic signal at her fence, and a road going up the hill, and worried about people jumping the wall into her property and having increased burglaries. She did not like that she will only be able to turn right to exit her tract and worried public safety vehicles would have difficulty getting to them. She was concerned about pollution from the added vehicles, and felt that more landscaping should be added to the swale area, requested the homes on Walnut be limited to one story, and if a sump pump was needed for the sewage, that it not be put along the wall of her property.

Randy Bell, 216 Rodeo Court, stated his community is very stressed over this project. He was at Horsethief Canyon Park before coming to the meeting tonight and there were 63 cars in the parking lot and three police cars. The people who go up there are not people we want in the community and if they open the road up, it will be an issue for law enforcement because now there will be two ways out of the park. Olson has treated the neighbors well but asked if we wanted San Dimas to be a high-density community. Olson has on their website they are a high-density developer and is that what we want.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated they value the neighborhood's concerns but have expressed to them that the extension of Walnut to the park is something that is not being considered now but might be in the future by the City. The reason they have the horse trail was because it came up at one of the early meetings that there should be an extension up to the park. He stated they would be happy to add more landscaping along the trail. In regards to the request that the homes on Walnut be limited to one story, originally they had proposed having single-story homes on the west side of the road but then found out there needed to be an 80 foot separation from the horsekeeping areas. They had to move everything to the east and that impacted the number of homes they could have on the site. The new homes will be 80 feet before the back yard walls to the west and then further to the houses themselves on Longhorn. He stated that no matter what is constructed on this site the road will have to be in the same location because there are too many utility restrictions. He stated the neighbors have been great to work with and thinks there are many things Olson can do to mitigate their impact.

Commissioner Davis asked if they had given any consideration to connecting the road off the northeast corner to San Dimas Canyon Road.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated they would have to cut through the park in order to do that and it would also place key restraints on the ability to develop the property. There is public access to Foothill already and anything that is built there has the right to that access.

Commissioner Bratt asked about the comment about a sewage pump and where that would be located.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated they project needs to connect to the County sewer line and the Applicant is looking at options on how best to achieve that. One was to connect to the west through the neighboring property; another was to connect in the park area but would require a pump to take it uphill.

Alan Shore, Civil Engineer for the project, stated if they install a pump, it would be inside the gate in the triangular space and away from the homes.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated in addition to comments from the public that were included in the agenda package Staff received a letter from Barbara Dexter on Baseline Road who felt there should be no new homes constructed until after the drought is over. There were also two residents on Prairie Drive who had to leave but expressed that they were not opposed to the project but did not want to see Walnut extended to the park.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated Staff would make some technical comments in regards to the testimony tonight to clarify for the Commission what is included in the project. In regards to Mr. Green's comments about possible slope issues, the intention is that Olson will construct a drainage facility to capture water from the slope and direct it to a storm drain system. This will be constructed to City requirements and then turned over to the City at the toe of the slope. There might be a small retaining element along the north property line wall and then the standard wall, but the City will maintain the slope. The second is in regards to a possible extension of Walnut Avenue to the park. The requirement on Olson is to extend the road to their north property line and not to the park. Any extension would be a City project and they believe they can get reasonable access from the terminus of Walnut to the dog park area. There would be no reason to require Olson to construct a public road in their project if the future intent of the City wasn't to extend the road to the park.

Another issue is in regards to the intersection of Foothill and Walnut. It is not the easiest intersection to construct since the entrance is offset from existing Walnut on the south side, and will be further constrained when the City widens Foothill across the storm drain channel. There has also been a significant increase of traffic as a result of Caltrans installing signals limiting movement of traffic from the 57 to the 210 freeway, causing people to get off to bypass the interchange. That has pushed the traffic from a Level of Service (LOS) B or C to an F. The City cannot require Olson to pay fully for the signalization of the intersection, only their fair share. When the LOS is F, it is the City's responsibility to correct that. He is fairly certain the City will look at doing the signal project, but it is not a requirement of this project. All the other comments are based on density and design issues. They have had the Applicant do every necessary study to create the appropriate mitigation measures, and they will be expected to maintain the standards the City expects for all projects.

Commissioner Bratt asked if the median on Foothill will be changed as a result of this project.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated they do not have any plans at this time in regards to the median and signals, but at the time they can move forward with a project they would study how the turning relates proximate to the intersection and how it would affect the entry to the 11 home tract to the west and the best way to deal with that.

Commissioner Rahi asked how critical it is to extend the road to Horsethief Canyon Park.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated from the perspective of the Community Development Department the project does not make any sense without providing public access to the largest park in the City. If you look at how the park is utilized, it is located in the northeast portion of the City so most users will be coming from the south and west and currently the only access is from San Dimas Canyon Road. We understand these types of road projects affect people who are already there. The original master plan for the park done in the 1970s, and modified in the 1980s, evaluated an access through this property, and the City undertook negotiations with the Meredith family to see if they could purchase the land for a road. They were unable to reach a conclusion in those negotiations and the City did not want to condemn

the property. The City is receiving more inquiries about other densification projects of a similar nature in the community, and when Staff looks at the appropriateness of changing density, we also think it is important to achieve a meaningful community benefit, and in this case providing access to the largest park in the City merits some densification. Staff is taking a broader perspective that it is a critical element to improve access.

Commissioner Davis asked why that is so important.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated because it is the largest park in the City and the direction of access to the majority of residents is from this direction. The park is also not fully developed and the ability to develop the rest of the park would be better served by better access, and the convenience would be a public benefit to the majority of the community.

Commissioner Davis concurred with Mr. Bell that if you increase the access you will increase crime in the park. He asked if we force the Applicant to have the road in that location, does that change how they could have designed the property, and should we go through the process to determine if we even want that road before we force them into the current design.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the Applicant did change the design once they became aware of the horsekeeping distance requirement from habitable space which took away their ability to put any homes on the west property line.

Commissioner Rahi asked about the requirement for a traffic signal, and stated that the park access would have some benefit but would require the intersection to be signalized.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the study analyzed the existing conditions, existing with the project, and existing with the project with access to the park. None of those conditions created a nexus for the signal to be required as a condition of the project. The project is adding a little over 500 trips per day to the intersection and that is not enough to make it a requirement. However, the intersection requires a signal now and felt the Applicant would like to have it with their project.

Commissioner Davis stated in regards to the General Plan Amendment, he agreed with a number of the residents on what is the character of San Dimas going to be and are we moving towards a higher density community. He did not think a project like this was appropriate for that location and he is not in support of the proposal. He felt if the other Commissioners agreed, then there was no need to go any further.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, asked the Commission to continue the items to allow them to meet further with the surrounding community to discuss their concerns, which would also allow them time to address Commissioner Davis' concerns before the Commission takes action.

Chairman Schoonover stated he appreciated the comments and was not sure that two weeks would allow adequate time to analyze the new submittal, and Commissioner Davis would not be at the next meeting and asked the Applicant if they would be amenable to continuing to September 18th.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated it is at the Commission's discretion.

Commissioner Bratt felt it was important for the Applicant to know that he feels this project is too dense for this area and cannot support the project as proposed. He asked Staff if there was another density level that would be 4-6 du.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the Single-Family Low category is 3.1-6 units per acre.

Commissioner Davis stated if this project does get approved, he would like to see the horse trail moved further away from the neighbor's fence. He asked if Staff would be asking the Commission about extending a public road to the park if they didn't have this project.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated currently the area next to the fence is used for parking. There is an existing horse trail along Foothill Boulevard to the west and east. If the trail is relocated, it is going to be right in front of the new homes.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated they would be bringing forward a proposal for a public street with any proposed development of this property but it would not be brought forward independently.

Commissioner Davis stated he was not in favor of extending access to the park; he felt it was not needed and would be more detrimental than favorable.

Commissioner Bratt concurred and that continuing to enter from San Dimas Canyon Road impacts fewer people. His wife would like to see access here for the San Dimas Rodeo but that is only a two-day event. He would also like to see if the gate can be moved closer to Foothill Boulevard.

Commissioner Rahi felt they should continue this to September 18th.

Chairman Schoonover concurred with previous comments. He stated as a member of the DPRB, what is being presented has changed significantly since their first meeting. He encouraged the Commissioners to go look at the La Verne project, and stated he did not attend the third meeting so he could bring an unbiased eye to Planning Commission. He felt the undulation will help on the south side but is not sure it is significant enough. He is concerned about the lot coverage, and the small side and rear setbacks. He stated they have established development standards in the City and have built some very nice homes with those standards and doesn't think they should reduce those standards, and felt 49% lot coverage was too much. He might be more amenable if there were fewer units and would like to see something in the 3-6 units per acre range. He also does not like that the garage is the dominant feature; he wants to see a house, not a garage. There are houses in his neighborhood with a side entrance and it is difficult to tell how to get to the door and he doesn't think that design works well.

MOTION: Moved by Davis, seconded by Rahi to declare the public hearing remain open and continue to the September 18, 2014 Planning Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Ensborg absent).

ORAL COMMUNICATION

2. Community Development Department

Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens stated they are working on another façade program for the downtown and the Council will have a study session on that before the next Council meeting. NJD is working on their grading plans and may be ready to pull a permit in September. Bonita Canyon Gateway is nearing completion and we are in the midst of finalizing the contribution for the affordable units in the project. The City is also working with a consultant to prepare a marketing campaign for the 10 affordable units in Grove Station/Village Walk.

3. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

4. Planning Commission

Commissioner Bratt asked about the Costco pads.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the two pads on Gladstone should be going to DPRB in September.

Chairman Schoonover greeted the new Assistant City Attorney.

Assistant City Attorney Lindsay Tabaian introduced herself and stated she has been with Alshire & Wynder for six years.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved by Schoonover, seconded by Bratt to adjourn. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Ensberg absent) The meeting adjourned at 10:37 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 4, 2014, at 7:00 p.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: September 18, 2014