

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Thursday, April 7, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present

Chairman David Bratt
Commissioner Margie Green
Commissioner Tomas Molina
Commissioner Ted Ross
Planning Manager Fabiola Wong
Associate Planner Jennifer Williams
Planning Secretary Jan Sutton

Absent

Commissioner John Davis

CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Chairman Bratt called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and Commissioner Ross led the flag salute.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 4, 2016 (Bratt absent)
2. February 18, 2016

MOTION: Moved by Green, seconded by Molina to approve the February 4, 2016 minutes. Motion carried 3-0-1-1 (Davis absent, Bratt abstain).

MOTION: Moved by Green, seconded by Molina to approve the February 18, 2016 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. **CONSIDERATION OF MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 15-10** – A request to permit Alcoholic Beverage Manufacturing and Tasting Rooms in the M-1 Zone; Creative Growth Zone, Areas 1, 2, and 4; Specific Plan No. 6, Areas 1, 3, and 4; Specific Plan No. 9, Area 4; Specific Plan No. 21; and Specific Plan No. 24, Areas 2 and 3. **(Continued from February 4, 2016)**

Chairman Bratt stated while he was not in attendance at the February 4th meeting, he has listened to the tape recording and reviewed the minutes and is confident he can participate in the meeting.

Staff report presented by *Associate Planner Jennifer Williams* who went over the history of the hearing process for both brewpub restaurants and microbreweries as directed by City Council. At the February 4, 2016 Planning Commission meeting Staff was given direction to consider looking at alcoholic beverage manufacturing in general, and possibly including Areas 1 and 2 of the Creative Growth Zone (CG-1 and CG-2) in the amendment. While micro-wineries and micro-distilleries are not as prevalent as micro-breweries, they are on the rise, and the State recently passed a craft distillers act that grants a new ABC license starting in 2017. To accommodate the suggested change, the wording has been modified in the Permitted Uses section to allow manufacturing, etc., of “alcoholic beverages” in the industrial zones, and removed the barrel limits since that is more conducive to beer manufacturing, but kept the square footage at 5,000 square feet to keep it from negatively impacting other users in the area. Tasting rooms would still be conditionally permitted as an accessory use to the manufacturing process.

In regards to including this use in the commercial areas of the Creative Growth Zone (Areas 1 and 2), based on some general comments made by the City Council in November and the Planning Commission in February, after further review Staff feels it would be inappropriate to have in the commercial areas and that it should be only in the industrial zones, with the exception of Specific Plan No. 9, Area 4. Most of the CG-2 zone is located in the downtown area, and during the recent four day charrettes for the new Downtown Specific Plan, the discussion centered on how to encourage more restaurants and retail in the downtown area. Staff’s perspective is that the downtown should provide a variety of business options, and having manufacturing in that area would not be conducive to that. Also, most of the tenant spaces are too small to accommodate a larger manufacturing operation, and there were concerns about odors from the process. It has also been the practice of the City Council to not allow stand-alone bars in the commercial areas; alcohol sales are always accessory to a restaurant. She stated the purpose of the CG-1 zone also did not seem compatible to a manufacturing facility. However, both zones would allow a brewpub restaurant to operate and provide a unique dining opportunity to the community.

Associate Planner Williams stated one of the main points for allowing alcohol beverage manufacturing in the industrial zones, and specifying tasting rooms as conditionally permitted, is that there are a number of vacant spaces in areas along Allen Avenue and Arrow Highway, and this gives landlords another option for helping to fill those spaces. She stated there were two alternative resolutions being presented tonight. Alternative 1 contains Staff’s recommendation allowing this use just in the manufacturing zones, with the exception of Specific Plan No. 9. That area was included at the request of the property owner, and while it is a commercial zone, it is only located on one property in the City and the location is unique in that it is physically separated from surrounding zones so it might be a way to see how this use would fit in a commercial zone. Alternative 2 reflects the Commission’s recommendation to also allow this in the CG-1 and CG-2 zones.

Commissioner Molina wanted to clarify that the idea of allowing manufacturing in the CG-1 and CG-2 zones was because the City Council brought it up at one of their meetings.

Associate Planner Williams stated when the City Council reviewed initiating this amendment in November 2015, there were some comments made about those zones, but it was not necessarily direction to permit it there. The thought was at the time there were some vacancies along Village Court that might be conducive to a manufacturing operation, but if it is allowed in the CG-1 zone, that would include all areas of the zone, not just the Village Court area. In Staff’s review it seemed like allowing brewpub restaurants in the commercial areas of the CG zone met the desire of the City Council.

Commissioner Green asked where the CG-4 zone was located, and was there any consideration given in allowing in the CG-3 zone.

Associate Planner Williams showed them on the zoning map where CG-4 was located in the area along Arrow Highway and Eucla and Borrego Court. She stated the CG-4 zone has a little more flexibility than the M-1 zone, but it also includes all the same uses as the M-1. She stated at the February 4th meeting the Commission felt that area was not appropriate as it was almost all residential in nature with just a small amount of commercial area.

Commissioner Molina asked where the old packing house was located.

Associate Planner Williams showed them on the map and stated it was located in Specific Plan No. 23 (SP-23). It was anticipated that when the new Downtown Specific Plan was created that the parcels in SP-23 would be incorporated into that zone.

Chairman Bratt stated he understood the reasoning for not including manufacturing in the CG-2 zone, but concurred with the comments made by the Council in November that it could be feasible in the CG-1 zone along Village Court because of some of the building sizes there, even if it were conditionally permitted. He felt that would be a good fit for a manufacturing and brewery type of business.

Associate Planner Williams stated she believes that was mentioned by one of the Councilmembers, but if it was to be permitted there, it would have to be allowed anywhere in the CG-1 zone. Also from Staff's perspective, based on recent code amendments to bring all of the shopping centers along the freeway corridor into alignment with their allowed uses, permitting it in the CG-1 zone could then also impact the Target center and San Dimas Plaza, so overall it was felt it was best to restrict this to the industrial zones.

Chairman Bratt stated he did not think it was appropriate for San Dimas Station but that along the freeway would be, and would like to at least see the potential to have it allowed there.

Associate Planner Williams stated it would be up to the Planning Commission to decide, but reiterated that if they permit it to be in the CG-1 zone, it would have to be allowed in the entire zone, not just in one area.

Chairman Bratt stated in regards to Specific Plan No. 9 (SP-9), that was originally approved as office uses only. Then the property owner requested an amendment to permit a restaurant for his daughter, so the uses in the zone were changed to allow that, and the restaurant was allowed based on a parking agreement to have off-set hours with an office tenant to accommodate the parking. Since the buildings were designed to be office space, he did not think there was anything large enough there to accommodate a manufacturing use and that this zone should come off the list.

Associate Planner Williams stated this is a unique zone, and when they recently updated the allowed uses there, many of them would only be allowed if the overflow parking lot was available, which was currently in plan check. Staff can remove it from the list of zones if that was the Commission's direction.

Commissioner Ross stated he would be concerned about the odor from that location because the wind direction was prevalent from the west the majority of the time and would blow it towards the residential properties to the east. He stated there was a similar situation in San Diego where a microbrewery was allowed in a residential area and they had so many odor

complaints that they had to close and relocate. He could see the same thing happening here and would like to see that zone removed from the list.

Associate Planner Williams stated if it was removed from SP-9 then it would make it uniform across the zoning in that it would only be allowed in industrial areas and not in any commercial areas.

Chairman Bratt asked if that impacted the ability to allow it in other commercial zones or was each Specific Plan handled separately. He asked if a brewpub restaurant was allowed in SP-9.

Associate Planner Williams stated it would only impact that particular Specific Plan, not the others. She stated SP-9 currently allows a brewpub restaurant to operate there.

Chairman Bratt stated that would make more sense to him in that zone. The existing buildings are not conducive to large-scale manufacturing, and he would recommend the removal of SP-9 from the list of allowed zones but would like to add the CG-1 zone.

Commissioner Ross asked what the timing for rezoning SP-23 was.

Associate Planner Williams stated they just concluded the charrettes for the new Downtown Specific Plan so she was not certain.

Planning Manager Fabiola Wong stated there are a number of issues to be worked out before they had the language for the new zone, including the location of the future Gold Line station. That will be one of the topics at the upcoming City Council Spring Retreat.

Commissioner Green stated she would support removing SP-9 from the list of allowed zones, but was not in support of including the CG-1 zone.

Commissioners Molina and Ross concurred.

RESOLUTION PC-1557 – **ALTERNATIVE 1**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 15-10 TO ALLOW ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE MANUFACTURING AND TASTING ROOMS IN THE M-1 ZONE, CREATIVE GROWTH ZONE, AREA 4, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 6, AREAS 1, 3, AND 4, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 9, AREA 4, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 21, AND SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 24, AREAS 2 AND 3

RESOLUTION PC-1557 – **ALTERNATIVE 2**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 15-10 TO ALLOW ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE MANUFACTURING AND TASTING ROOMS IN THE M-1 ZONE, CREATIVE GROWTH ZONE, AREAS 1, 2, AND 4, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 6, AREAS 1, 3, AND 4, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 9, AREA 4, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 21, AND SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 24, AREAS 2 AND 3

MOTION: Moved by Green, seconded by Molina to recommend Municipal Code Text Amendment 15-10 to the City Council by adopting Resolution PC-1557 Alternative 1, with the deletion of Specific Plan No. 9, Area 4 from the list of allowed zones. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

ORAL COMMUNICATION

4. Community Development Department

Planning Manager Wong stated that Café Rio has opened at the Costco center, and there were a few other tenants hoping to open in the next couple of weeks.

Associate Planner Williams stated there are still some site improvements that need to be completed by the master developer before the other tenants can open.

Planning Manager Wong stated the City Council Spring Retreat will be on April 25, 2016 from 5:00 to 9:00 p.m. which is open to the public. There will be two items on the next Commission agenda to review a CUP for a personal training facility and revisions to the Brasada Tentative Tract Map.

5. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

6. Planning Commission

a. Report on Meetings

Commissioner Ross stated he attended the Planning Commissioner's Academy in San Ramon in March and as a new Commissioner found it to be very worthwhile. While all of the sessions were beneficial, he really liked the mock commission meeting. He found it to be well-executed and very insightful.

Commissioner Green stated she also attended the Academy. She went to ten different sessions, and also found the mock commission meeting to be one of her favorites. She felt they made many good points during that session.

Commissioner Molina stated he too attended the Academy, and commented on the mock commission meeting session, but he really liked the session on CEQA and felt it was very productive. As a first-time attendee he was impressed with how the Academy was managed. He felt it would have been helpful though to have a list of the participants and what cities they were representing. That way if that city had a program you thought might be helpful to San Dimas, you would have the opportunity to try and locate that person to discuss it.

Chairman Bratt stated he has attended some conferences in the past where they did provide a roster and found it to be very helpful.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved by Bratt, seconded by Green to adjourn. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent). The meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Thursday, April 21, 2016, at 7:00 p.m.

David A. Bratt, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: April 21, 2016