

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Thursday, October 2, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present

Chairman Jim Schoonover
Commissioner David Bratt
Commissioner Stephen Ensberg
Commissioner M. Yunus Rahi
Assistant City Manager for Comm. Dev. Larry Stevens
Senior Planner Marco Espinoza
Associate Planner Luis Torrico
Assistant City Attorney Lindsay Tabaian
Planning Secretary Jan Sutton

Absent

Commissioner John Davis

CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Chairman Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:09 p.m. and Commissioner Bratt led the flag salute.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes: September 18, 2014

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Ensberg to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

PUBLIC HEARING

2. **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: (Continued from September 18, 2014)**

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 13-01: A request to amend the General Plan Land Use Designation from "Open Space" to "Residential Low" to allow for a density level of 3.1 to 6 units per acre (Revised); and

MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 13-08: A request to create a new "Specific Plan No. 27" that would allow for a 38-unit single-family detached residential development (Revised); 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. The Open Space portion of land is excess City land within and adjacent to Horsethief Canyon Park; this land will be acquired by the applicant through a Development Agreement; and

TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 72368 (TTM 13-01): A request to subdivide the subject site into 38 single-family residential lots with ten (10) common use lots to be maintained by the Homeowner's Association (Revised); and

DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD CASE NO. 13-20 AND PRECISE PLAN NO. 13-03: A request to develop a non-gated community with 38 two-story, single-family detached residences on a 6.4 acre site. The homes will range in size from 2,175 sq. ft. to 2,475 sq. ft. on lots ranging in size from 3,010 sq. ft. to 3,430 sq. ft. (Revised); 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 20,000 sq. ft. of excess area of land within and adjacent to the City's Horsethief Canyon Park and to not allow for increases in the 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.

Commissioner Ensberg stated that in preparation for this meeting he has reviewed all the written material prepared by Staff and listened to the tape recording of the August 21, 2014 public hearing and is prepared to participate fully in the discussion tonight.

Staff report presented by *Senior Planner Marco Espinoza* who stated these applications were considered at the August 21, 2014 Commission meeting where the Applicant requested a continuance to tonight to address issues brought up by the Commissioners and the public. The original proposal was for 48 two-story, single-family detached homes in a gated community. The applicant has revised several applications and is now submitting a proposal for 38 two-story, single-family detached homes in a non-gated community. They have also modified the site layout and architectural features of the houses. He pointed out the portion of the project that would be purchased from the City, along with the location of the cell facility that will remain and the uses surrounding the property.

He stated the new site plan does not show the extension of the road to the north property line for future extension of Walnut to Horsethief Canyon Park. While the road itself is not part of the project, the extension to the park is something the City is still interested in pursuing. The other streets within the project will be private and maintained by the HOA. There will be ten fewer homes and the pool amenity has been relocated to the south property line to break up the linearity of the homes. The Applicant has also removed the multi-use trail from the plan. The architecture is similar to the previous submittal, and the General Plan Amendment has been revised from Low-Medium to Residential Low, which is 3.1 to 6 dwelling units per acre (dua). The Applicant is proposing 38 units which is at the high end; at the low end the total would be 20 dua. The text in the MCTA has been modified but Staff has not thoroughly reviewed it at this time as there could still be additional changes. The Zoning Map will still be Specific Plan No. 27; the Tentative Tract Map would be for 38 residential lots with 10 common area lots; and the environmental study will stay predominately the same.

He stated in regards to the DPRB and Precise Plan applications the Board reviewed this several times and still had several areas of concern but sent it forward to the Commission to review the whole project and determine if this would be appropriate for this location. If this is approved by City Council, the project will go back to DPRB for final design review. He added that the Board has not seen the latest revisions. He went over the new pool location and architectural design.

While the Applicant has made some changes they still have not addressed issues concerning mass and bulk, the lack of architectural details, and that the units are entirely stucco when they are not really a Spanish-style design. The lots have been increased in size; however, the size of the houses has also been increased so the setbacks have not been improved. With the increase in width the Applicant was able to remove the side entrance on the Plan 2 home which was an improvement, and while they have made other minor improvements, Staff feels there are still too many unaddressed issues and cannot recommend approval. He went over the different elevations and discussed the remaining issues with the wall undulations and roof planes.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the project has been reduced by 10 homes but the site plan looks almost the same because they increased the size of the homes when they increased the size of the lots, and they did not address the issue of where to locate the trash bins. He spoke about the removal of the multi-use trail on the new plan by the Applicant, but Staff feels it could just be moved 10-12 feet to the east and additional landscape could be added to buffer the neighboring properties, and is recommending that the trail be added back into the project. He stated the Equestrian Commission felt the trail was needed to create a viable connection to the park from Foothill Boulevard.

He stated in regards to the substantive issues from the last meeting, the Applicant did increase the rear setbacks on the southern homes giving them some undulation; however, they achieved that by removing the four foot landscape buffer outside of the rear wall. The side yard setbacks did not increase substantially as requested by the Commission. There are still flag lot issues, and there are two shared driveways. The homes were increased in size but no modifications were made to make space for trash bin storage in the garages. Staff is concerned about the removal of the four foot landscape area outside the southern wall that would help to screen the wall and the two-story homes. The Applicant is still proposing just two housing styles, which have been increased in size and still present massing and scale issues, and have not responded to Staff's request to change the mullions to tan, remove the pot shelves, and add shade structures to the rear yards along Foothill. These are just some of the issues Staff feels still need to be addressed in regards to the design of the project. The Tree Removal application is still the same and Staff has no objection to it.

He understands the Applicant has spent a lot of time on this proposal but there are still a number of substantive concerns where Staff feels it is not at the point where they can consider this the right type of project for this location and is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. If there are details that need to be modified, it can change the applications further, so Staff is asking for direction to either make further changes to the project, to approve, to deny, or continue for further amendments.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if Staff is not supportive because the project is too dense, or would they only support it if the other issues were satisfied.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Staff has not addressed density; their concerns have been design related, especially with the setbacks. When you look at the project it visually appears overcrowded, which could be because of the design, but that is not to say that the number of units is incorrect.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if the Applicant made all the requested changes, what number of units would Staff be satisfied with.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated it would probably be a lower number, but Staff does not have a specific number in mind. If the Applicant tries to redesign the project, it could change the

number. He stated Staff has been trying to give them guidance from the beginning in regards to massing and scale and architectural features, and explained issues that have arisen in the past when the Applicant has tried to respond only partially, such as the issue with the addition of the portico which impacted the setbacks even further.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if increasing the square footage of the houses would increase the cost to the buyers, and asked wouldn't we want to encourage affordability for young buyers, which this project does not appear to do. He asked if adding all these architectural changes would drive up the sales cost, and added that the Glenwood Townhomes all look similar.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated there is no requirement for this project to provide any affordable units. While it might be desirable to encourage affordability, we cannot dictate that they need to sell these units for \$200,000 to make them affordable for young people. Staff's job is to look at the location and the surrounding neighborhood and try to ensure compatibility in the design. He stated that tract homes tend to be cookie cutter in design, and while this may be common in other communities, is this what San Dimas wants and at this location. The Glenwood project is different in that it has a larger setback, there is RV parking provided, and there is much more green space buffering the project.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if we have required trash can storage in the garage in any other project in the city, and if he knew the percentage of homes in San Dimas that are stucco.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the request to have trash can storage in the garage is not a new one, and since the setbacks are so narrow there is no storage space available for them on the side. He stated Staff is not saying they can't use stucco on the houses, they are just asking for accent materials in conjunction with it which is what the Design Review Board has required in the past. Even Spanish-style architecture has many accent features and materials.

Commissioner Bratt stated Staff requested the Applicant do some type of landscaping along the southern boundary as a buffer and it appears their response was to relocate the fence and delete the landscaping.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated there was a comment made at the last DPRB meeting that the rear setback could be increased if the landscape area was removed only because originally the Applicant proposed to have a two-foot v-ditch in conjunction with a two-foot landscape planter, and the Board felt a two-foot planter was not wide enough to be viable. Since then the Applicant has removed the v-ditch which would leave a four-foot planter area, but instead they chose to move the wall to the property line. Staff is asking that it be moved back to the original location because it will create a negative visual impact since there is a chain link fence along the channel and this would put the block wall right next to it. By adding the landscaping it will help to break up the massing of the block wall and provide some screening.

Commissioner Bratt asked if the Applicant was obligated to build the extension of Walnut to Horsethief Canyon Park, and if they have indicated why they are not increasing the side yard setbacks.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the extension of the road would be a City project and they are only asking them to dedicate the street to the north property line of the project, along with the horse trail and the public right-of-way in front the houses on Walnut to allow for the future extension. He stated the Applicant has not addressed why the side setbacks were not increased.

Commissioner Rahi stated even if the Commission and City Council were to approve the project, it would still go back to the DPRB to address the architectural design issues.

Senior Planner Espinoza that is correct but felt the Applicant would like the full support of Staff, not just partial.

Commissioner Rahi felt there are many issues the Applicant has not addressed, and that they need to be clarified with the Applicant. He asked if the project is approved, would the Commission be reviewing the extension of Walnut within their site.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated it is up to the Commission to make their recommendation, and if they feel there are issues that need to be addressed, this is the time to advise the Applicant.

Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens stated the Applicant would make the needed improvements within the project during their phasing and at some point dedicate it to the City. When the actual connection would occur would be a budget decision on the part of the Council.

Commissioner Rahi asked since the gate has been removed, what is the designation of the internal streets, and stated he felt there should be a turnaround at the northern terminus of Walnut.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Walnut Avenue would be a public street and the internal streets will be private streets maintained by the HOA.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the most likely scenario is the Applicant will build Walnut without a finish cap, and then install that when it is dedicated to the City. The extension to the park could be coordinated at the same time as this project or at a later date as the budget allows.

Chairman Schoonover stated there have only been a few single-family developments the last few years and asked what the lot sizes were on those projects, and asked if there were any single-family developments in town with lots similar to the 3,000 to 3,500 square feet being proposed by the Applicant.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the project on Baseline was SFA so the minimum size was 20,001 square feet, with single-story homes approximately 2,400 square feet in size with a three-car garage. On the Lone Hill project the lots were fairly large but a good portion of that was hillside. The pad area ranged from 6,000 to 10,000 square feet, with two-story homes in the 3,000 square foot range. He stated he does not recall any single-family developments having lots as small as this proposal, but that there are some 5,000 square foot lots near Railway.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the area around Railway was subdivided around 1935. Otherwise the smallest lots in town have been in the 7,500 square foot range but they haven't had any like that for the past 10-15 years.

Chairman Schoonover asked if all of these projects have conformed to no more than 35% lot coverage.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated yes, the current standard in the Single-Family zone is 35% maximum coverage.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated there is one exception in the Pioneer Park area that because of the small lot size it may be possible to go up to 40% lot coverage with a single-story structure, so between 30-40% is the common lot coverage for single-family housing.

Commissioner Schoonover stated the Applicant has indicated that today's homebuyer is looking for smaller lots and less maintenance and asked if any survey was done of surrounding cities to see how many requests they have had for this type of community, what has been built and if those homes are being purchased.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated they have not done any surveys because each city may have different goals and community identification. The seven homes on Baseline with large lots sold immediately before they were even constructed. There were questions on if the Lone Hill homes would sell in context with the surrounding neighborhood, but they sold quickly. San Dimas is a desirable community to live in so any new homes tend to sell quickly.

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

John Reekstin, Olson Company, Applicant, thanked them for the additional time to meet with the community and stated they have spent a lot of time with the neighbors over the last four weeks and hoped they now have a design that is responsive to the concerns of the Commission, DPRB and the community. He stated in general Olson has over 25 years of experience designing and building in-fill communities, and they stay involved in them longer than the 10 year period. All of their communities have a basic LEED rating, if not higher. They have been working on this project for 24 months, and have made over 30 changes to the site plan and over 12 architectural submittals and redesigns. They have held over 40 community meetings, been to the Equestrian Commission, the Environmental/Subdivision Committee twice, to DPRB three times and to Planning Commission three times.

He stated they responded to the comments made at the first Commission meeting in regards to density and have reduced the number of units. He stated the DPRB asked that the land use applications be forwarded to the Commission and Council for consideration, as well as direction regarding the site layout, reduction in the number of units, and the addition of a third floor plan. He felt the architectural details would be better addressed by the DPRB but they can certainly discuss it here if the Commission desires. He stated based on the comments at the August 21st Commission meeting that they wanted to see less than six units per acre, they have come back with 5.9 units to the acre. They also heard the comments on lot coverage, setbacks and the south property line. They heard what the community had to say, and that was that they did not want a road extending to Horsethief Canyon Park. While the extension is not part of their project, the first step towards that is dedicating the public right-of-way and the residents know if that doesn't happen, then the road will not be built. They also told them a private road is more beneficial to Olson than a public road. They removed the horse trail because of the comments made by the neighbors on the west, and discussed with the residents their concerns about the two-story homes on Walnut and the location of the sewer route. They were confused by Staff's position of non-support because they felt that was a reversal of what they presented a month ago. He acknowledged there were still a lot of architectural details to be worked out but felt that was not insurmountable.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated there were many physical constraints for the site and he described the challenges they had to work with. He went over the Neilson psychographic findings defining people's preferences within a one mile radius of the site and that the two highest categories were people who desire having pools and patios, and new empty-nesters who tend to be recently retired and are gone for long periods of time. Both categories prefer

one of two unique living preferences, which would be older homes with larger lots containing a pool or patio, or a lower impact lifestyle with HOA maintained amenities, where they can just lock and leave. He felt the architectural style was a reflection of Early California which the City encourages, and was compatible with the Canyon Trails Plaza to the east. The small entrance creates the feel of an enclave, and the Spanish style with stucco is suited for a high fire area. Their vision is to create a highly amenitized, resort-style community. In terms of the Land Use Map, they are now under six units per acre, and the CEQA document states this is consistent with the density surrounding the site.

He stated the new site plan is for 38 units instead of the 48 presented at the last meeting, and they have included a variety of product along Walnut Avenue on larger lots. They could provide larger lots by eliminating some of the open space, but felt the current lot size is appropriate since they are providing the amenities that buyers want. The primary amenity of the pool has been moved to the middle of the project which makes it more accessible to everyone and creates a break in the southern property line. They also introduced a sway in the road which allowed them to stagger the lots and create the requested undulation in this area. They will be planting a large tree in every back yard of the southern lots which will provide a landscape buffer and shade in the yards. He felt the DPRB stated they would rather have the extra four feet in the backyards instead of having a landscape buffer outside of the fence, and they could add vines to the walls as an option. Since the lot sizes have been increased they are now able to have all the front doors facing the streets and the percentage of the front that is garage area has been reduced. He stated the front-load design is very common and it is not normal to have the garage behind the house. The pads have been modified to add more useable space to the backyards, and they have moved the first unit back an additional 15 feet to minimize the visual intrusion to the Alvarez property. He stated they have reduced the lot coverage by 10% and most of the lots are down to 40% lot coverage. He reiterated the changes that have been made that they feel address the concerns of the City and the community.

Ron Nestor, Senior Principal, William Hezmalhalch Architects Inc., stated he has been practicing for 35 years and has designed numerous types of projects, and that over the course of this project they have tried to respond to numerous comments from many different people. The style is influenced by Canyon Trails Plaza, and the material is suited to a high fire zone. He disagrees that the homes are non-descript; he feels they express the simplicity of Spanish style. There is no repeat of color on the 38 homes and they have recessed the garages to reduce their dominance. He stated with the redesign of the project there is now room outside of the garage for trash can storage. He went over the design features and the elevation changes that he felt enhanced the homes. He know they still have work to do but believes they are working towards the objectives of the DPRB and will continue to refine the design.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated they have been working diligently on this new plan for the past four weeks and the primary focus has been on the key land use issues. They understand that architectural detailing is critically important and would like to be back at DPRB to work on the details to make the project better for the community. He stated this now has a lower density, there is no entrance gate, and they have more open space, larger lots, less lot coverage, and an improved view from Foothill Boulevard. He hopes that the Planning Commission will recommend approval of the project to the City Council. He stated they are two conditions they are working on with Staff and if the Commission approves the project, they would like to come back to discuss that in detail.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if they would be able to increase the side setback amount if they reduced some of the open space area. If the Commission said they had to have a larger setback, could they make it work.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated a five-foot side yard setback was very common, and if they increased it another foot or two, it would detract from the overall look of the community. They may be able to adjust space in various areas of the project but may not be able to do so on every lot. If the Commission set a specific setback number, they would have to look at it further to see how to achieve that.

Commissioner Ensberg asked him about the difference in opinion with Staff over the architecture, and asked if they were to make all the changes identified by Staff, how many units would they be able to build and would it increase the cost of the homes.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated they will continue to work with Staff on the architectural details but wasn't clear what the desired number of units would be, and that incorporating the identified changes would increase the cost of the homes. He stated they have reduced the project down to 38 units, and wasn't sure what the ideal number would be.

Commissioner Ensberg stated one of his concerns when he read the report was that there seemed to be a number of outstanding issues that the Applicant didn't seem to address until tonight, but he was hearing him say that they can resolve the issues surrounding the setbacks and design issues.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated their focus has not been on the architectural detail because they felt that was more for the DPRB to review. Their focus has been on the land use, but agrees that Staff still has concerns over some of the details with architecture and landscaping. He felt they could address the setbacks but it may not be uniform on every lot. They feel that a five-foot setback is adequate but if it needs to be expanded, it would be at the expense of open space.

Commissioner Rahi asked how Staff was interpreting the Applicant's slide regarding the lot coverage percentage, and how has the Applicant addressed the view from Foothill Boulevard since it is a Scenic Highway.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the numbers were arrived at by averaging the lot sizes with the footprints of the house designs. If you used the total of each individual lot and then averaged it, the number would be skewed slightly.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated the numbers on the plans are minimum lot sizes so it wasn't very clear. For the new plan the lot coverage for the entire project was an average of 40.2% whereas the old plan was 44% average. They have modified the road with a sway so it staggers the back of the southern houses, and they have added a slight pop-out to the rear elevations. The length of the rear yards has been increased and a tree will be planted in each one. The community pool has been added to this area too so it breaks up the row of homes.

Commissioner Rahi felt a lot of that wouldn't be as visible because of the commercial property in front and that they should also concentrate on improvements to the southwest corner. He also felt there should be a turnaround at the northern terminus of Walnut Avenue because he felt if someone turned north on Walnut accidentally not intending to go to the project, they would not have a way to turn around.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated there will be signage indicating there is no outlet and these are private streets.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated if the Commission wanted to have a cul-de-sac to help people differentiate between public and private streets, then Staff would have to discuss

with the City Engineer how to incorporate that into the Conditions of Approval. From Staff's perspective Walnut is a future through street, it is just the timing of when it will be constructed.

Barbara Alvarez, 1300 Longhorn Drive, stated that most of the neighborhood is supportive of the new site plan, and after many meetings with the developer she can also support this proposal. She stated the Applicant made changes based on comments brought up at the August meeting, and she realizes she has to compromise also since this is private property and the owner has the right to sell it for development. She stated she is not opposed to a trail, she just wanted a green buffer between it and her property. She stated her biggest issue is an extension of the road to the park. She is concerned that she will be surrounded on three sides by streets and that there will be excessive traffic.

Chairman Schoonover reminded her that the extension of the road is not part of the project approval.

Barbara Alvarez, 1300 Longhorn Drive, stated she understands that but knows it is a result of whatever project is going to go in at this location. She stated she liked that the gate has been removed and likes the design of the houses. She is in support of the new plan but is greatly opposed to the road going to the northern property line.

Commissioner Rahi stated even if the road is not extended to Horsethief Canyon Park she will still have three streets around her property.

Barabara Alvarez, 1300 Longhorn Drive, stated that is true but it won't be the same amount of people using it if they cannot get to the park.

Nagy Kattar 132 Maverick, stated he does not have a problem with the project and thinks that Olson is doing a beautiful job, but is concerned about the road going to the park and did not want Maverick to be opened up to it either as it will cause a lot of traffic in their area. They already have people driving up San Dimas Avenue looking for a way to get to the park.

Eileen Ditsler, 217 Rodeo Court, stated Olson has been receptive to their concerns and she is in support of their project. Her main concern is the extension of the road to the park and she is opposed to that, and it would be hazardous for people trying to cross the street. She felt there should be an equestrian trail on Walnut though.

Karen Justice, 200 Rodeo Court, stated she moved to San Dimas 21 years ago because she had a horse and it was important that the equestrian ambiance be maintained. She is in support of having the horse trail but would like the green buffer between it and the houses. She felt the information presented has been ambiguous on when the road would be discussed and stated she is opposed to an extension. She stated that by a show of hands there are 18 other people in the audience that are in opposition to the road being extended to the park.

Randy Bell, 216 Rodeo Court, stated Olson has made a lot of changes to satisfy the needs of the community and Staff and he was in support of the project. He stated he is concerned about ethical behavior, and requiring Olson to dedicate Walnut to the City. He felt Olson has taken the values of the community and put them into this project. In regards to the traffic study, he would like a representative from the company that prepared the report to speak in regards to the road dedication.

Brian DeLeon, 1324 Longhorn Drive, stated he is located on the northern end of the project. His primary concerns with the project were the density and the proposed continuation of the road. He commended Olson on addressing the density issue and meeting with the neighbors

extensively over a long period of time to try and meet their concerns. He likes the new site layout, and he would challenge the Commission on why the extension of Walnut needs to be in place. He moved here eight years ago from Monrovia because there is a lot of walkable space. They use the park extensively and access it from their back yard. He felt if the road is extended, it will impact their safety in trying to get across.

Chairman Schoonover stated there was also a letter from Mr. DeLeon on the dais tonight regarding this issue.

Gary, Avenida Loma Vista, stated he felt there must have been some type of deal made for the City to get a road from the developer because he didn't see any reason for it otherwise. He felt the developer was trying to bypass the City's laws and that the setbacks are too small. He also didn't see any space for guest parking. He felt the density was an issue and did not think they needed to downgrade San Dimas with a small lot development.

John Graham, representing the Meredith family, the property owner, stated they have spent a considerable amount of time with Staff and different departments, and they have been frustrated by the lack of clarity. They have spent a considerable amount of time meeting with the stakeholders trying to convey what is the best use of the property. He was surprised there were issues with the design because they are using a world-renowned architect and he felt this was a fine development. They turned down other offers to purchase the property because the family felt they were not appropriate for the location. They chose Olson because of their commitment to the communities they build. They have also cooperated with the Foothill Realignment project. They have made relocation efforts with the tenants and made permanent adjustments which they may not be able to recover from if this project is not approved. He feels the site plan and density is appropriate and hoped they could move forward.

Gil Gonzalez, 2193 Terrebonne, felt the bottom line is that the owner has a right to sell the property. He doesn't think the zone needed to change from office-professional and that it was not an appropriate use for the land. He felt each house would cost about \$720,000 and asked the Commission to uphold the Staff's position to deny the project. He doesn't object to the architecture, but did not like the setbacks and thought they should just go to a zero lot line. He felt the road should turn right immediately as you enter the project and go up to Horsethief Canyon Park that way.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated he did not have a rebuttal to the comments. He felt the adjacent neighbors are in favor of the project and he appreciates their support.

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

* * * * *

Chairman Schoonover called a recess at 9:26. The meeting reconvened at 9:34 p.m.

* * * * *

Commissioner Ensberg was gratified that the Applicant met with the neighbors numerous times and was sensitive to their needs and adapted the project to address their concerns and now has community support. He felt this was a quality project presented by experienced people. He heard that the setback issues can be resolved for the majority of units, as well as architectural issues, and he did not want to see the price driven up so that young people could not afford to purchase them, even though he still finds the price staggering. The action tonight is not voting on the road, and a vote for the project does not mean support for the road; that is not before them tonight and not a part of his consideration. He used to be on the Equestrian Commission and would like to have the horse trail. He believes the changes made in lowering

the number of units to 38, the quality of the project, and moving the amenities have substantially addressed issues raised by Staff, and stated if Staff is not recommending approval, they should provide clear direction to the Applicant as to what they want. He stated he would support the project based on the Applicant's representation that they can address the setback issue.

Commissioner Bratt stated he also appreciates the Applicant's work with the community and felt a lot of the neighbors' concerns have been addressed; however, he has questioned the density of the project since the initiation request, and to him density is mass. He stated they have lowered the number of units but the units are now larger. He felt the lot coverage was excessive and he didn't think they wanted to encourage that in San Dimas. He was not as concerned with the front and rear setbacks but felt the side setbacks were too narrow. He feels the design is basically a large box and if this is built as presented, all they will get will be a bunch of big boxes side by side. He cannot support the project as designed and thinks they need to increase the side setbacks and work on the design of the units.

Commissioner Rahi felt they were getting close to a project he could support, and appreciates that the Applicant has considered the issues of the neighbors and DPRB, and felt they could work further with Staff to resolve the issues with lot coverage and with DPRB on the design. He felt if they reduced the number of units, they can get the lot coverage in the 35-40% range. He felt he could support the project if they add the multi-use trail back into the project and address the lot coverage.

Chairman Schoonover stated as the DPRB representative he has seen the changes the Applicant has made over time and appreciates their efforts. However, he feels there are significant factors they have not addressed, such as the side yard setbacks. He also felt the lot coverage was too high, and did not think San Dimas wants 3,500 square foot lots. He thinks it would be fine to have housing in this area but did not see this project as compatible with San Dimas. He would like to see the remaining issues addressed so they can move forward.

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Rahi to approve the project provided that the lot coverage not exceed 38.5%, the majority of the units have an increased setback requirement, and the multi-use trail is added back into the project.

Chairman Schoonover stated he is not comfortable approving the project based on a promise to change it. He felt if those were the changes needed, then they should direct the Applicant to bring back a proposal that incorporates them.

Commissioner Ensberg felt they should set the standard to be no more than 38.5% lot coverage, increase the setback on 80% of the lots, and to put the trail back into the plan.

Commissioner Bratt stated he would be more comfortable if the setback was increased on all lots, and asked how Commissioner Ensberg arrived at the 80% figure.

Commissioner Ensberg stated the Applicant said they couldn't do it on all the lots but could on the majority so that is why he picked 80% as the number.

Chairman Schoonover stated the Applicant said in order to do that they would need to reduce the amount of open space. There are four areas of open space, three of which are very awkward and basically unusable for anything else, so that means the pool area which is the main amenity of the community would be reduced.

Commissioner Ensberg stated we should let the Applicant figure out how to present the project but felt the community has compromised to arrive at a position of support and that the Commission should do so too in order to allow the Applicant to move forward.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated what he is hearing is that there are at least three Commissioners that believe the lot coverage is excessive and should be reduced, and the fourth is willing to go with that but wants to provide a target number. The second point he is hearing fairly strongly from three of them is that there needs to be more separation between the houses, or better side yard distancing, and Commissioner Ensberg can agree but would like to move this forward. The third point he is hearing from two of them is concern about the density and lot size, depending on how you want to characterize that.

He stated there is more than one way to increase the distance between the buildings besides reducing open space as suggested by the Applicant. If you reduce the number of units, you can take the width of those lots and redistribute throughout the project to increase separation. You could also reduce the size of the units, or you could do some combination of those two options. If one of these options was chosen, it would probably also help address the concerns over lot coverage and density. He thinks the majority is saying they would like to look to see how willing the Applicant is in looking at an alternative that addresses the building separation. This would not be fundamentally changing the basic concept of the design, like they saw when it went from 48 to 38 units. The fundamental precepts would still be there in the layout and appearance; you may be just reducing two to four lots, or the house size might become smaller. So if you still feel that this is not a good land plan that you can support, it would probably be better to tell the Applicant that now instead of having them go through another design iteration that will still not be successful.

Commissioner Bratt thinks if they combine increasing the side yard setback to ten feet and reducing the lot coverage down to 38.5% he could support the project. His concern is that they indicated before that density is an issue, so they did less units but increased the unit size so it didn't really change. He fears that if they don't have those two issues addressed, the project will just look like it is squeezed onto the site.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated then the question for the applicant is if they require a maximum 38.5% lot coverage and increase the separation between the buildings, is that something they want to try to work on.

John Reekstin, Olson Company, stated there are different ways to achieve the Commission's desires. He cannot guarantee they can hit a set number on the setback or can achieve an average lot coverage. He would like to request a one month continuance to work with Staff to address these concerns and to bring back a revised proposal for the Commission to review. This is not an easy site so he cannot guarantee the outcome.

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to withdraw his original motion and make a substitute motion to continue this item for a month to November 6, 2014 to give the Applicant time to process the comments made tonight and bring back a new proposal. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

3. **CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1022-1048 WEST GLADSTONE STREET WITHIN SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 24 AREA 1 ZONE – REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (SP-24) (APNS: 8383-009-077, -080):**

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 14-05: A request to allow the operation of two eating establishments with drive-through service within the Citrus Station (Costco) commercial center.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD CASE NO. 14-25 AND PRECISE PLAN NO. 14-01: A request to construct an 11,234 square foot and a 6,296 square foot multi-tenant commercial building within the Citrus Station (Costco) commercial center.

TREE REMOVAL PERMIT NO. 14-28: – A request to remove one mature oak tree from the subject site and replace with four (4) replacement oak trees within the Citrus Station (Costco) commercial center.

Staff report presented by *Associate Planner Luis Torrico*, who stated the applications tonight are to allow the construction of the final two pads at the Citrus Station center along Gladstone Street, including a Conditional Use Permit to allow drive-through service for two new restaurants, and the removal of an oak tree that is dying. There will be two multi-tenant buildings, and each will have a restaurant with drive-through service. The project was reviewed by the DPRB on September 11, 2014 and they recommended approval; however, the CUP was not part of their purview. He reviewed the site plan and stated there are no new driveways proposed; access will be from the internal drive aisles. The existing landscape along Gladstone will remain and a decorative block wall will be installed to help screen the drive-through. The parking area will provide a continuous flow to the center and they will participate in a shared parking agreement.

He stated Restaurant No. 1 will have an outdoor eating area with a covered patio and Restaurant No. 2 will have uncovered outdoor eating. SP-24 conditionally allows drive-throughs and if they are within 300 feet of residentially zoned properties, they would have restricted hours and requirements for the speakers. The existing residential properties are actually zoned industrial, which is why there is no restriction on the hours of operation, but they have worked with the Applicant to mitigate the noise from the speakers and he described the conditions imposed. He outlined the hours of operation for the two restaurants and the number of employees, and stated the project complies with the parking requirements for the buildings and the drive-throughs. He showed the elevations of the two buildings and the design features that reflect those used in the existing buildings. The Applicant is proposing to remove the oak tree on the site, and has provided an arborist's report that indicates it is in poor health and slowly dying, there is no guarantee it will respond to preservation efforts, it is not viable to try and relocate it, and its current location would significantly limit development of the site. Staff is recommending approval to remove the tree, but has conditioned that the Applicant provide four large replacement trees consisting of three 24" box trees and one 60" box tree instead of the standard replacement of two 15-gallon trees. Staff recommends the Commission recommend approval of the project to the City Council.

Chairman Schoonover stated Condition No. 38 in Resolution PC-1523 stated the hedge shall be a minimum of 42" in height, but the staff report indicates the decorative block wall shall not exceed 42" in height, and asked if it could be less than that. He also asked what the height of the berm was.

Associate Planner Torrico stated if they wanted to reduce the height of the block wall, they would have to review what the minimum height would be to still buffer the noise from the speaker.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the berm varies in height but the Applicant states that it is 42" high.

Commissioner Bratt asked if the requirement for the decorative block wall the same as used at Panda Express, and why we were not asking there to be a block wall for Building No. 2. He also asked what the hours of operation were actually going to be.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Panda Express was required to have a similar wall.

Associate Planner Torrico stated the purpose of the wall was to screen headlight glare and reduce the speaker noise. Because of the layout of Building No. 2 there is not the same impact on the neighboring properties so it was not required. The hours of actual operation for the restaurants are what is shown in the staff report.

Commissioner Bratt felt even though the surrounding properties were not zoned residential, their use is and didn't think a 24-hour drive through was necessary and would lead to safety-related issues. He would like to see it close at 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner Rahi thought that one of the pads would be for a larger restaurant like Olive Garden and was disappointed that it did not appear they would have another large tenant.

Associate Planner Torrico stated this proposal is smaller than the original plan but at this point in time it is what the market can bear, which has changed greatly since the original approval.

Commissioner Rahi asked if both pads would be developed at the same time, and if a third restaurant were to come in, it appears it cannot have a drive-through, and would the easterly driveway on Gladstone change at all.

Associate Planner Torrico stated both pads would be constructed together, and any additional restaurant tenants would not have drive-throughs. The entry and exit points of the center are not being modified with this proposal.

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

Alex Gonzalez, Applicant, 2390 E. Camelback Road #410, Phoenix, stated he feels the project is complimentary to the center and that most of the new tenants will be food tenants. They are midway through the leasing process but some of the proposed tenants are Panera Bread, Pacific Grill and Fish, Jamba Juice or a similar smoothie café, Café Rio, Krispy Kreme, and they are hoping to add a pizza restaurant. He stated it is key to Krispy Kreme's business to be open 24 hours, and it would just be the drive-through, not the dining room.

Commissioner Ensberg asked if that was standard for doughnut shops.

Alex Gonzalez, Applicant, stated it is standard and hopes they do not restrict the hours.

Steve Rittner, Architect, stated they have worked diligently with City staff to present a quality project and thinks this will be a good addition for the community, the surrounding businesses and the developer.

Gary, Avenida Loma Vista, asked who the owner of the property currently was. He did not agree with removal of the oak tree and stated they went through the same thing with Olive Garden wanting to remove the oak trees that would have been in the parking area. They said it would be a deal breaker if it wasn't removed. He felt there was plenty of parking in the center that they didn't need to remove the oak tree.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the land is owned by Costco.

Chairman Schoonover stated it was discussed at the DPRB meeting that the oak tree was not a healthy specimen and probably would not survive.

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

Commissioner Ensberg stated he was sensitive to Commissioner Bratt's concerns about the hours of operation for Krispy Kreme but that is how these franchises work and restricting the hours would lessen their ability to be successful.

Chairman Schoonover stated he also did not have a problem with the 24-hour drive-through.

Commissioner Bratt stated it was not a deal breaker for him but felt it was more appropriate in a commercial area, and that it would be invasive to the people who live near this site, but he would not want to stop development over this issue.

Commissioner Rahi stated the traffic studies on the original project were based on assumptions for future development and thought there should have been a revised study done based on the actual tenants. He did not see that information in the staff report and asked if there was any information relative to that.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated the original traffic analysis for the EIR for this site was based on this area having 45,000 square feet of retail. What is being proposed is 17,000 square feet, and while restaurant uses generate more traffic, the floor area is a third of what was analyzed so the impact will be less.

Commissioner Rahi felt the report should have had those numbers included, especially with the addition of the drive-through. He also asked how the drive-through lane aligned with the other drive aisles and felt all that should have been looked at with this project.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated they did not do a new CEQA analysis because they had the adopted EIR. He stated they can incorporate a finding in Resolution PC-1523 indicating the traffic generated by the project will be less than the adopted Certified EIR and have the number before they go to the City Council for final approval.

Associate Planner Torrico stated there were several revised site plans submitted during the review process and the turning radius and templates for the drive-throughs were addressed and they will not conflict with the overall parking lot configuration. They can also modify Finding B on the Resolution to reference the on-site circulation and the turning issues.

RESOLUTION PC-1522

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 14-05, A REQUEST TO ALLOW THE OPERATION OF TWO EATING ESTABLISHMENTS WITH DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE LOCATED AT 1022-1048 GLADSTONE STREET WITHIN SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 24 – AREA 1 (SP-24) (APN'S: 8383-009-077 - 080)

RESOLUTION PC-1523

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD CASE NO. 14-25, PRECISE PLAN 14-01 AND TREE REMOVAL PERMIT 14-28, A REQUEST TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO MULTI-TENANT COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS TO INCLUDE AT LEAST TWO RESTAURANTS LOCATED AT 1022-1048 GLADSTONE STREET WITHIN SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 24 – AREA 1 (SP-24) (APN'S: 8383-009-077 - 080)

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Schoonover to adopt Resolution PC-1522 recommending approval of Conditional Use Permit 14-05, and Resolution PC-1523 with minor modifications to the Findings pursuant to the discussion regarding the traffic analysis. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

4. **CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 14-06** – A request to allow the operation of health/exercise club use (Crunch Gym) within Creative Growth Area 1 Zone – Regional Commercial (CG-1), located at 192 Village Court. (APN: 8386-008-057)

Staff report presented by *Associate Planner Luis Torrico* who stated that Crunch Gym is a national operation and will be occupying the 26,000 square feet in the building formerly occupied by Levitz Furniture. They will be sharing the main entrance with Jumping Jacks so there will be no exterior changes to the building. He went over the floor plans and the various activities that will be available to members, and the projected hours of operation. Staff is recommending slightly expanded hours to allow the Applicant future flexibility without having to come back through the approval process. The hours in Condition No. 8 should be corrected to say from 5:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m., not 12:00 p.m. The owner expects less than 100 members at any given time. In terms of parking, the City Council recently amended the CG-1 zone in regards to parking standards at major shopping centers. This building is part of a major shopping center so no additional parking is required. There is sufficient parking in the area so Staff does not foresee any problems.

Commissioner Bratt stated he did not think Staff should be extending the hours of operation beyond what the Applicant is requesting without it coming back for review since the point of the Conditional Use Permit was to allow the Commission to determine what was appropriate.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated over the years Staff has been criticized for putting in the narrower hours of operation, and then if the Applicant wanted to extend their operations by an hour or two, they had to come back with a new application, pay the \$1,000 fee, and wait two months to go through the public hearing process. In a case like this where a minimal change in the hours is not going to impact the surrounding uses, Staff did not feel it was detrimental to allow them the extra leeway without having to come back for review. If this gym was located where the old 24 Hour Fitness used to be that was right next to residential, Staff would never make that determination without coming back for a public hearing.

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

Matthew Grill, Partner in Crunch Gym, stated they are looking forward to opening in San Dimas. In response to Commissioner Rahi, he stated they are different from other gyms in that they are a fitness only facility and focus on using equipment, not amenities like pools or

basketball courts. The number in the report indicating they expect 100 members at a time would be on the very high side, and normally it is less than that.

Commissioner Bratt asked how many members belonged to the La Verne facility.

Matthew Grill, Crunch Gym, stated approximately 4,000.

There being no further comments the public hearing was closed.

RESOLUTION PC-1524

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 14-06, A REQUEST TO ALLOW THE OPERATION OF A HEALTH/EXERCISE CLUB USE (CRUNCH GYM) LOCATED AT 192 VILLAGE COURT WITHIN CREATIVE GROWTH AREA 1 ZONE – REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (CG-1) (APN: 8386-08-057)

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adopt Resolution PC-1524 approving Conditional Use Permit 14-06, with the correction to the hours in Condition No. 8. Motion carried 4-0-1.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

5. Community Development Department

Assistant City Manager Stevens clarified for the Commission that continued items are taken first on the agenda which is why the item for Olson was heard before the new items. He reminded them of the Joint Meeting with the City Council on October 14, 2014 at 5:30 p.m. before the regular City Council meeting to discuss ex-parte communications and meetings held outside of the public hearing process. He stated the next City Council retreat will be held on November 3rd from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

He stated the revised Study Session policy will be going to the City Council on October 14th. They have two requests for a study session from developers, so based on what occurs during the Council discussion there may be additional meetings coming up. He stated Avalon thinks they are about two weeks from completion. Staff is working with the consultant on finalizing the legal documents for the affordable units that will be for sale at Grove Station. NJD is getting close to pulling their grading permit, and the Care Meridian project is currently in plan check.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated they have received the plans for the gas station remodel at 105 E. Arrow Highway for plan check.

6. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

7. Planning Commission

Chairman Schoonover asked if there has been any more interest in the retail shops at Bonita Gateway with the construction of the apartments.

Assistant City Manager Stevens stated they have had discussions with someone wanting to operate a café/bakery operation. There are some issues regarding parking for that type of use

but they are moving forward with options for them. There is more interest in the center now that the apartments are occupied.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adjourn. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent) The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 16, 2014, at 7:00 p.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: November 6, 2014