



**MINUTES**  
**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL/ PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MEETING**  
**MONDAY, MAY 26, 2015 5:30 P. M.**  
**SAN DIMAS COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**245 E. BONITA AVENUE**

---

**PRESENT:**

Mayor Curtis W. Morris  
Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Templeman  
Councilmember Emmett Badar  
Councilmember John Ebiner

Planning Commissioner John Davis  
Planning Commissioner Stephen Ensberg  
Planning Commissioner M. Yunus Rahi

City Manager Blaine Michaelis  
Assistant City Manager Ken Duran  
City Attorney Mark Steres  
Assistant City Manager for Community Development Larry Stevens  
Director of Public Works Krishna Patel  
Director of Parks and Recreation Theresa Bruns  
Senior Planner Marco Espinosa

**ABSENT:**

Councilmember Denis Bertone  
Planning Commissioner David Bratt

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Morris called the Special City Council Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**3. A PETITION TO INITIATE A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONE CHANGE AMONG OTHER DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 21 UNIT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 299 EAST FOOTHILL BOULEVARD. AS PART OF THE PROJECT THE APPLICANT IS ALSO REQUESTING TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY TO PURCHASE APPROXIMATELY 18,000 SQ.FT. OF EXCESS AREA OF LAND WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE CITY'S HORSETHIEF CANYON PARK, AND A POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

Senior Planner Espinosa reported that Saxon and Company Development had submitted a request to have a study session to review their proposed housing project at 299 East Foothill

Boulevard in order to receive authorization to initiate a General Plan Amendment and zone change and the request was granted by the Council. He described the project as 21 detached homes on 6.4 acres with a minimum lot size of 7,500 sq. ft. and the requested change is from open space to single family low density. He also reviewed the various zoning applications that would be required to be submitted. He also reviewed the surrounding land uses and a density analysis of those uses.

Mr. Espinosa reviewed in more detail the applicant's proposal as described in his staff report.

Mr. Espinosa reviewed the 8 Generalized Criteria and Overriding Principals that the City has established to evaluate the request for a zone change. He provided an analysis of the proposed project as measured by the 8 criteria and determined that the proposed project met most of the criteria categories.

Mr. Espinosa provided the Council with four alternatives; continue the item for staff and the applicant to provide more information; authorize a general plan amendment and zone change; authorize the initiation with direction or comments or deny the request because the project does not meet the Generalized Criteria.

In response to a question Mr. Espinosa stated that the zoning on the property was last changed in 1973 from RA 7,500 to the existing open space to accommodate the equestrian center. He also responded that under the current zoning only one house would be permitted and if it were zoned the same as the houses to the west, 11 lots would be permitted.

In response to a question he stated that the purchase of the city owned land would add land to the lots to the north.

Councilman Templeman expressed that he would have concerns with a phased development. Mr. Stevens responded that a condition of development could be to have a phasing plan.

Councilman Templeman also commented that he feels that the wall along Foothill needs to have character, maybe undulation or plant material.

In response to a question Mr. Patel commented that the street would be standard street width. Mr. Stevens added that currently the street is proposed to be private and not gated but that staff has concerns with the street being private.

In response to a question Mr. Espinosa commented that the proposed minimum lot size is 7,500 sq. ft. with the average lot size at 8,400 sq. ft.

Commissioner Davis commented that on discussions of the prior plan there was concern with two story homes close to the existing neighborhood and asked if it is appropriate to restrict the three homes along Walnut to single story. Mr. Stevens responded that there is a long distance, 125', from those homes to the nearest home but they could make a restriction on the tract map.

In response to a question Mr. Espinosa explained the improvements on the pocket park on the southwest corner of the project.

Councilmember Ebner asked if they would be precluded from establishing a floor area ratio since that criteria is not a standard in the existing zone. Mr. Stevens responded that under the existing zoning you could not apply that standard but you may be able to establish it on the tract map or create an overlay zone. In response to a question Mr. Stevens added that a floor area ratio standard could be an additional architectural constraint.

Mayor Morris commented that an overlay zone would not be appropriate for this type of project. Councilmember Templeman agreed.

In response to a question on the Spanish architecture Mr. Stevens stated that the reference to the architectural style is to illustrate the quality of the architecture and not necessarily the proposed style.

In response to a question Mr. Stevens commented that the Council has already agreed that the extension of the road into the park is not a part of the project but the road will be built preserving the right for a possible extension in the future. He added that there would be trail access from Foothill into the park could be considered a public benefit.

Antonio Saxon, representing the developer, commented that they currently have the property under contract with a right to purchase. He provided a history of the community outreach and the previous input from the Commission and Council with the prior application.

Denise Ashton, architect for the project, commented that Saxon is an entitlement company and they heard the comments from the previous process which led them to the proposed project. She described the lot sizes and varied lot widths, included amenities, the trail extension and spacing between the proposed homes and existing homes. She commented that from an architect's point of view a floor area ratio standards restrict design opportunities. She commented that she is concerned with undulation of the wall because of its impacts on lot depth and the appearance of the wall can be addressed with treatments. She commented that the Spanish architecture is a good example but the actual style is clearly up in the air. She commented that the lot widths would be 67' and 75'.

Mr. Saxton summarized that some of the public benefits are the 14% open space on the project and the connectivity to the trail in the park. He added that the housing project to the east is much higher density and their project is consistent with existing density. He added that the south wall will be enhanced with landscaping and the Walnut Street would be dedicated to the City to allow for a possible future extension.

In response to a question Mr. Espinosa stated that the minimum lot width in the code is 70'. Ms. Ashton responded that if they had to adhere to a 70' minimum they would not be able to have any 75' lot widths. Mr. Stevens responded that if they want a different lot width then is in the current code they would need to request a specific plan instead of SF 7,500 zone. Mr. Saxton responded that they are requesting an SF 7,500 zone.

Mr. Stevens commented that if the Council is considering a specific plan instead of SF 7,500 they should give direction now. Councilmember Templeman commented that he has problems with a specific plan because it could open the door for other things to occur that we don't want.

Councilmember Ebiner agreed. There was more discussion on the options of specific plan or existing SF 7,500 zone.

After further discussion Councilmember made the motion to authorize filing applications for the requested General Plan Amendment to Single Family Low (3- 6 du/ac) and Zone Change to SF 7500, along with associated tentative tract map and related applications, generally as set forth in materials presented, with the understanding that applicant and Staff should work towards resolving identified issues. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ebiner and carried by a vote of 4-0 with Councilmember Bertone absent.

#### 4. AJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Ken Duran, City Clerk