CITY OF SAN DIMAS
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Wednesday, October 6, 2004, at 7:30 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present
Vice-Chair Emmett Badar
Commissioner Dave Bratt
Commissioner Howard Levreau
Commissioner Jim Schoonover
Director of Community Development Larry Stevens
Planning Manager Craig Hensley
Associate Planner Joe Vacca
Director of Public Works Krishna Patel
City Attorney Ken Brown
Assistant City Attorney Tracy Noonan

Absent
Chairman Ash Dhingra

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Badar called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:36 p.m. and Commissioner Bratt led the flag salute.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes for September 1, 2004.

MOTION: Moved by Schoonover, seconded by Levreau to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **CONSIDERATION OF FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (FEIR); GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 03-03** – A request to amend the General Plan Land Use Designation from Industrial to Commercial and to amend various goals, objectives and policies set forth in the General Plan; and

MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMEDMENT 03-04 – A request to revise Specific Plan No. 24 including development plan, development standards, plan review and disposition and related Sections to allow commercial development.

Staff report presented by ***Director of Community Development Larry Stevens***, who stated the items before the Commission include the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), which identifies potential impacts, recommends mitigation measures and responds to comments received during the public comment periods; a General Plan Amendment to change the zoning; and a Municipal Code Text Amendment to amend Specific Plan No. 24 from industrial to commercial uses.

The EIR consists of four documents: The Draft EIR dated August 2003; the Recirculated Transportation/Traffic Section dated March 5, 2004; the Revised Recirculated Transportation/Traffic Section dated July 2004 , which was to correct some minor errors in the previous document; and the Response to Comments for the FEIR dated September 2004. The proposed project consists of an approximately 149,000 sq. ft. Costco warehouse store, tire center and gas station; 3,500 sq. ft. fast food restaurant; 7,000 sq. ft. quality restaurant; two retail shop buildings totaling 16,000 sq. ft.; and two major retail shops totaling 45,000 sq. ft. It should be understood that the Precise Plan called for in the revised Specific Plan No. 24 would require the processing of a separate entitlement for the final site plan and architectural approvals. This is not scheduled at this time so plans that are on display are for illustrative purposes only.

Within the environmental document a series of impacts have been analyzed. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) items that are identified as less than significant or able to be mitigated require a lesser level of scrutiny. The document analyzes each of these categories and defines an impact and in most cases defines some type of mitigation measure to achieve a less than significant impact in each category. The areas in which there aren't any significant impacts are: Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Soils and Geology, Hazards and Hazardous Material, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Recreation, Noise, Population and Housing, and Public Services and Utilities.

He stated there are several impacts which are identified as significant and unavoidable even with the introduction of mitigation measures. The first is Air Quality. There are construction, operation and cumulative impacts that because of the size and scale of the project cannot be fully mitigated to reduce them to a level of insignificance. This primarily arises out the size of the project, and any large project in the South Coast Air Quality basin is certain to be found significant and unavoidable because of the degradation of air quality basin-wide. However, sixteen mitigation measures are proposed to try and off-set those impacts as effectively as possible.

The second area of significance is Transportation and Traffic. Once the project is constructed it will cause a significant traffic impact at Lone Hill and Arrow Avenue which cannot be mitigated fully because right-of-way can't be acquired to accommodate additional turning needs. The second category of transportation and traffic which they are unable to fully mitigate involve intersections which are located outside of the City's jurisdiction. These intersections are: Lone Hill and Route 66, Lone Hill and the 210 westbound ramps, Lone Hill and Auto Center Drive, Willow and Gladstone, Valley Center and Gladstone, Lone Hill and Kenoma. There are proposed measures within the environmental document that if fully implemented would reduce the level of service to a level of insignificance. However, they can't guarantee they will be installed because the City of Glendora would have to perform the work. It is our intention to

work with Glendora as is feasible to implement the mitigation measures. The last area of traffic impact involve Willow Elementary School and Gladstone Elementary School and measures are proposed to reduce the impacts; however, the mitigation measures would have to be enacted by the City of Glendora and they cannot guarantee that will happen.

Director Stevens stated traffic is the most significant concern and there are twelve mitigation measures proposed to lessen the impacts:

- Installation of a traffic signal at Lone Hill and the full-access driveway south of Gladstone;
- Fair share contribution from the applicant for the implementation of a second east-bound, exclusive right-turn lane at Lone Hill and Route 66;
- Fair share contribution from the applicant for future improvements at Lone Hill and the I-210 westbound ramps and Lone Hill and Auto Center Drive;
- Fair share contribution from the applicant for future improvements at the intersection of Arrow Highway-Bonita/SR-57 northbound ramp;
- Lone Hill and Gladstone to be improved with an additional northbound left-turn lane, and an additional southbound left-turn lane;
- Fair share contribution from the applicant for future traffic signals at Willow and Gladstone, Valley Center and Gladstone, and Kenoma and Lone Hill.
- Implementation of the creation of a small, one-way frontage road with parking on the west side of Lone Hill in front the residences. This will help the residents to get in and out of their driveways with the increased traffic on Lone Hill;
- Require construction of Mitigation Measure M-3L.8, a median along Gladstone to limit driveway access on either side of Gladstone. He stated staff is proposing a minor modification to this measure which relates to a less than significant impact, and that is to leave the evaluation of the right-turn in, right-turn out restriction for consideration during the Precise Plan process instead of creating a prohibition at this time;
- A current requirement is to limit a specific service driveway at the east side of project to right-turn only, and again is proposing to modify this mitigation for review to be handled through the Precise Plan process;
- Require a truck routing plan for review in conjunction with the project;
- Require proposed traffic signal at west access driveway at Lone Hill be coordinated with the signal at Lone Hill and Gladstone;
- Require a fair share contribution from the applicant for a traffic signal at Valley Center and Gladstone as well as improvements at Gladstone Elementary School. He stated that mitigation is constrained as all of Gladstone is located in the City of Glendora.

Director Stevens stated that with the exception of Arrow and Lone Hill, the twelve traffic issues can be mitigated to a less than significant level if all of these measures are implemented, but again several of these measures are outside of the City's jurisdiction and implementation can't be guaranteed.

There are three items for consideration by the Commission tonight. The first is the Response to Comments document. There have been three formal comment periods, during which 36 letters were received from various agencies and other interested parties. All of the letters are contained in the document and the consultant has prepared responses to each of them. It also includes the Mitigation Monitoring Plan which takes each measure and establishes the responsible agency or project proponent who will oversee that it is completed. He stated the EIR is basically an information disclosure statement, and because there have been certain

items identified that can't be fully mitigated, a Statement of Overriding Consideration will be brought forward for adoption by the City Council.

The second item before the Commission is the General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Map. The project area will change from Industrial to Commercial, while the north side of Gladstone and east of the railroad tracks will remain Industrial. It also includes a revision to Goal Statement L-5 by adding Objective 5.3 and Policies 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 in support of it.

The last item before the Commission is the amendment to Specific Plan No. 24. This plan was originally prepared approximately 1992 with the intent of creating a business park environment, but because of a series of complex and multiple ownerships, it was divided into Subareas. The area on the north side of Gladstone will be renamed Area 2, but maintain its industrial zoning, as will the new Area 3, which was previously Area 8, located to the east of the railroad tracks. There will be a new Area 1 that combines previous areas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, consisting of 20 acres that will be rezoned Commercial. Revisions for Subarea 1 include the following:

- Establishing a group of Permitted Retail and Personal Service Uses;
- Encouraging a big-box user such as Costco;
- Related incidental uses;
- Establishing Conditional Uses, including:
    - drive-thru restaurants as long as they are not within 300 feet of zoned residential property if they have an audible speaker box and operated between the hours of midnight and 6:00 a.m.;
    - alcohol sales;
    - theater projects;
    - banks and savings and loans.
- Establishing Prohibited Uses, including:
    - new car sales agencies;
    - used car sales agencies;
    - medical offices;
    - industrial uses;
    - gambling facilities;
    - residential uses;
    - billboards;
    - game arcades which are not accessory;
    - convenience markets.

Director Stevens stated amended Specific Plan No. 24 also contains exhibits which essentially specify the location of the big box and gas station as shown on the current site plan. The other change in the Specific Plan is to establish various normal development standards. They are also requiring the establishment of architectural guidelines and standards through a separate submittal, and including an illustrative site plan, which is subject to change.

He stated that an Errata Response to Comments sheet was prepared after discovering that a few responses were left out of the published document, so there are additional comments to Letter 23. Letters were also received from the following people that are not directly related to the environmental document, but they will be made part of the official record:

- Sea West Enterprises, located in the project area, expressing concerns about impacts to their business because of the change;
- Rodella Family, 611 N. Lone Hill, expresses support for some of the changes but concerns about traffic, delivery access, noise, lights, rodent and pest control during construction;

- Bonita Unified School District, expressing general comments;
- Maria Krause, 641 Pearlanna, expressing support of the project.

Director Stevens stated staff's recommendation is to conduct and close the public hearing this evening, and continue to a date specific only if necessary based on testimony presented this evening, and direct staff to prepare a resolution recommending certification of the Final EIR, prepare a resolution recommending approval of the General Plan Amendment 03-03 as outlined in the staff report and exhibits, and prepare a resolution recommending approval of the Municipal Code Text Amendment 03-04 as outlined in the staff report.

He stated representatives from ESA, the lead consultant, were present to answer any questions, as well as Joel Falter from Katz, Okitsu who prepared the traffic analysis. There are also representatives from the City Attorney's office, along with the Director of Public Works Krishna Patel.

Commissioner Schoonover asked what the projected timeline for completion of this project was.

Director Stevens stated once the Planning Commission completes their review, this package and the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) will be submitted to the City Council and Redevelopment Agency for final action. The Planning Commission is only making a recommendation to the Council and RDA. A hearing date has not been determined for that hearing though they are looking at the end of November. If action is taken in November and the DDA is executed, then property acquisition will occur and could take upwards of six months. During that time the applicant would be processing the Precise Plan and construction plans for review so permits could be issued once acquisition issues are resolved. Construction is estimated to take four to six months, so if all things go as planned, Costco's goal is to open in November of 2005.

Commissioner Schoonover inquired about Mitigation Measure No. 7 and the several options detailed in regards to the Lone Hill frontage road.

Director Stevens stated staff has held three meetings with the residents to discuss the project and alternatives to their situation. There seems to be a general consensus among the residents but a few minor issues are still to be worked out. Once that happens, the design would be brought forward through the Precise Plan process for approval.

Commissioner Bratt asked if the Commission recommends certification of the FEIR, are they locked into following the mitigation measures.

Director Stevens stated generally speaking, yes. If there is a mitigation measure that relates to an impact that is less than significant, there could be minor adjustments made as long as they don't change the level of impact. On all areas that are identified as significant, there is no flexibility in the mitigation measure.

Commissioner Levreau commended staff and the consultant on the quality of the reports presented. He inquired about the frontage road options for the Lone Hill residents and asked where the land would come from if they were to construct one of the options. He also asked about parking restrictions along the median.

Director Stevens stated they would not be taking any existing right-of-way from the residents; it would be done by shifting part of the right-of-way onto the Costco project to the east and re-doing the median and striping. Parking would be allowed at the curb with a travel lane closest to the median, and while this would be a public street, it was primarily for use by the residents. No parking would be allowed east of the median because that would be a travel lane.

Commissioner Levreau inquired when would the nexus study begin and would approval of the project depend on the completion of the study.

Director Stevens stated they are currently soliciting bids to conduct the study and they anticipate having it when they begin processing the Precise Plan, but there are no guarantees at this time.

Commissioner Levreau referred to Letter #8 from Los Angeles County regarding waste disposal and was concerned that the proposed mitigation stated the applicant shall "consult" with Waste Management for materials and recyclable collection. He felt we were not addressing the issues raised by the county and that the wording could be stronger.

Director Stevens stated there are two types of waste to be dealt with, hazardous and regular. The County is suggesting that certain things are required in regards to hazardous waste, and with regular waste there is concern about landfill capacity. There are requirements for a solid waste management plan to assure recycling as set forth by state law, during construction and afterwards. The area referenced for consultation was in regards to recyclables, specifically used tires from the tire center. Staff did not object to strengthening the language of Mitigation Measure M-3K.8 to state this should be included in the solid waste management plan. In regards to the hauler used, Waste Management has the exclusive contract for commercial accounts in the City of San Dimas.

Vice-Chair Badar stated there was quite a bit of discourse about traffic issues and that a lot of the intersections are in the City of Glendora. He asked if we were working with them on these issues.

Director Stevens stated they have met with Glendora staff about ways to jointly address the traffic that will impact both communities. While they don't have an agreement in place both cities recognize the need to work together to solve the problem. They have discussed doing the nexus study jointly because Glendora has a proposed project at Valley Center and Gladstone which will be plus or minus 300,000 square feet of commercial development impacting the same streets as the Costco project, so there is interest to mutually work together to solve those problems.

Vice-Chair Badar opened the public hearing. Addressing the Commission were:

Peter Clement, Real Estate Development Manager for Costco, who stated they had made a rather lengthy presentation regarding the project a year ago and wouldn't repeat that, but his development staff was available if the Commissioners had any questions. He commended Mr. Stevens on the thoroughness of his staff report and stated he did not have any additional information to add.

Dale Goldsmith, 109 Wilshire Blvd., legal representative for Costco, also commended staff and the consultant for their thorough work. He stated there were three mitigations they would like to see modified. The first was 3A relating to reducing an insignificant impact in regards to

lighting. He felt there were other ways to address this that weren't specified in the mitigation measures and would like to have approval deferred to the Precise Plan process. The second one was Measure 3L which requires a signal at the south driveway along Lone Hill. He believed it should be referring to the center driveway. The third was Measure 3L.7 which would address the existing problem with the houses located on the west side of Lone Hill. While this wasn't a significant impact to the project, they are happy to help with the problem but felt Costco's obligation should be limited to a fair share portion instead of the full measure.

Shannon Yauchzee, 850 Calle Primavera, representing 125 parents from Shull Elementary School, stated they support the Costco project but had concerns they would like to see addressed. He stated he is a licensed engineer and is traffic engineer for a nearby city and has reviewed the study in regards to the impacts at the intersection of Allen and Amelia. Traffic studies have to make educated guesses about trip distribution, but he felt there was a poor assumption when it came to this area. The study stated that northbound traffic on the 57 freeway would exit at Auto Center Drive and then head west to Lone Hill to arrive at the project site. He felt that people would actually turn east to Amelia and head south to Gladstone to avoid congestion in Glendora, thus driving right by the elementary school and increasing the traffic already traveling there. He felt their site was overlooked in the EIR. He stated the parents would like Costco to be a good neighbor and volunteer to pay for these things. He also wanted the Planning Commission to recommend these measures to the City Council.

Arnold Hunt, 1447 Kirkwall, stated he just found out from this presentation that Gladstone Street by his house was located entirely in the City of Glendora. He asked if the portion of Mitigation Measure M-3L.12 which referred to a left turn-turn lane in the vicinity of Gladstone Elementary School would be a lane to turn into the school directly or on Shellman Avenue. He felt one was needed on Shellman because of the heavy traffic entering for the school and park in the area.

Director Stevens stated the mitigation measure requires Costco to make a fair share contribution for the cost of restriping and minor widening of Gladstone to allow for a left-turn lane at Shellman. All of Gladstone north of the south curb line is in the City of Glendora and would require them to do the work. This is similar to what was done at Balton when the Home Depot project was built. While they can't guarantee that Glendora will perform this improvement, they are hoping that they will.

Julie Britzman, 1164 Venton, president of the School Site Council at Shull Elementary, stated they are very concerned that their school does not show up in the traffic studies except for a brief statement that there will be minimal impact on the intersection of Amelia and Allen. She reiterated Mr. Yauchzee's statements that people would turn east exiting the freeway and take Amelia to Gladstone to avoid traffic. She felt they were already seeing an increase in accidents by the school because of development that has occurred in the area. She asked to have flashing yellow lights installed to alert motorists to the school zone and add protected left-turn lights at the signal, as well as conducting a study to hire a crossing guard for the intersection.

Vice-Chair Badar called a recess at 8:59 p.m. The Commission reconvened at 9:12 p.m.

Cynthia Cortez, 1029 W. Gladstone, stated she lived on the north side of Gladstone and they were already experiencing problems with squirrels and gophers on their property and hoped that the City would assist in keeping small animals out of their yards once construction started. She also wanted to know why the zoning was left industrial for her side of the street and not changed

to commercial along with the project area. She stated it is difficult to sell any of the residential units unless someone is buying for an industrial project or is paying cash because the banks won't finance the property since it is not a residential zone. She wanted to understand why they weren't part of the change.

Director Stevens stated that Costco will be responsible for controlling rodents during construction and if the neighbors observe a problem, they should contact the City. In regards to the zone change, the recommendation to leave that area Industrial was based on the surrounding industrial uses to the north and the small lot sizes which would make them less suitable for any commercial use. Most of the lots are 5,000 – 8,000 sq. ft. and are either occupied by small homes or small contractors. The Specific Plan will maintain the standard that will allow residents to continue to live in the non-conforming residential units but not allow improvements to the property. If the Commission feels differently, they can direct staff to make modifications.

Cynthia Cortez stated a couple of her neighbors were approached by someone that wanted to develop a carwash and was willing to buy their properties, but couldn't go forward because the zoning wasn't commercial.

Director Stevens stated if a person acquired multiple properties and had a use that currently isn't on the list, they could approach the City about changing the use list when they submit for their project.

Gerald Kopanke, 727 N. Groveton, was concerned about possible hazardous waste from trucks that have been parked on one of the parcels for 20 years and wanted to know who was going to clean that up. He also felt that the project would require increased Sheriff's personnel and that property values of nearby residential properties would go down. He added that they have been fighting with Caltrans for more than five years about adding a soundwall to the 57 freeway and felt the noise would increase with the addition of the Costco.

Michael Spencer, 633 Country Oak Road, stated he was concerned about Amelia and the lack of recognition for the increased impacts on that street. He felt there has been a significant increase in traffic since the construction of the Home Depot center and encouraged the Commission to look harder at this issue and the impacts on both Shull and Sutherland Elementary Schools.

Anita Tunstall, 433 N. Lone Hill, stated she missed the last meeting with the residents and asked if a final design had been reached on how to mitigate traffic impacts on the houses located on the west side of Lone Hill Avenue. She stated it took her five minutes to exit her driveway yesterday and it would only get worse once Costco was constructed. She wanted to know if the sidewalks would be taken away and where the additional property needed for an extra lane would come from. She was 100% against building a Costco and knew she was outvoted on that issue, but wanted to know how she was supposed to get out of her driveway.

George Garcia, 621 N. Lone Hill, stated his house was located next to the Chevron gas station and that he had problems when they tried to refinance their house and was only offered 70% of his equity because the Costco will negatively affect his property value. He doesn't agree with the project and felt the addition of another gas station would only lower his property value further.

Gary Enderle, 2044 Via Esperanza, asked about the fair share payments and San Dimas' part in that. He also asked if the Planning Commission could make recommendations to remove certain uses from the proposed Prohibited Uses list. He was concerned about generating income for the City and felt a small car dealership could be accommodated on that site and be good for the City financially. He also felt it would decrease projected traffic in that area because it was a less intensive use.

David Chantarangsu, Assistant Director of Planning, City of Glendora, stated they were not opposed to the project but had some concerns regarding the traffic study and have submitted several letters to that effect during the comment periods. He stated Lone Hill is one of only two arterials that service Glendora off the 210 freeway, and the area south of the 210 on Lone Hill provides 25-50% of their sales tax revenue. They recently completed a Specific Plan along Route 66 and made a conscious choice to widen Lone Hill at the 210 overpass. He felt the traffic analysis is understated and the EIR omitted any meaningful analysis in light of the Gold Line that will come through that area. It has been argued in the EIR that the Gold Line project exceeds the analysis time line but felt CEQA mandates that these impacts be considered. He stated there were also two ways to conduct a traffic analysis. One was to use averaging and one was a fitted curve. He felt averaging would under analyze the traffic count and a fitted curve is more accurate. He also wondered if the Planning Commission had the authority to certify the EIR.

Director Stevens stated the Planning Commission will not be the final approval authority, that they will make a recommendation to the City Council.

Gil Gonzalez, 2193 Terrebonne Avenue, asked if the project would have more than one owner because he felt there have been problems in the past with other projects that had multiple owners because of a lack of consistent quality. He also wanted to know if there would be limitations on the hours of operation.

Claudia Piston, 246 N. Country Club Road, Glendora, stated she was not in favor of the Costco and the large scope of the project. She was concerned about elementary schools in the area, especially the two on Amelia. She felt the traffic analysis that stated there would be no impact on Amelia was flawed and asked that any mitigation measures that were requested for Shull Elementary should also be considered for Sutherland Elementary. She wanted the Commission and Council to consider a reduced project alternative that was suggested by the Glendora Planning Commission for a stand-alone Costco, which would reduce trip volume by 3,000 trips a day and would have less impact on surrounding residents.

Ernesto Aguirre, 511 N. Lone Hill, stated most people on the west side of Lone Hill are not in support of this project. He felt the previous comments about reduced property values were correct because a house there that is for sale had to reduce their price $10,000 after three days because no one would look at the property. He also had concerns about delivery hours because traditionally they are very early in the morning and felt this would disturb the neighbors.

Vice Chair Badar asked staff to respond to the comments made during the public hearing.

Director Stevens stated in regards to the issues raised regarding Shull and Sutherland Elementary Schools, the traffic analysis evaluated the potential impact on Amelia by this project and the cumulative projects, and it was determined the Level of Service (LOS) will remain at the current level, which is Level A, the best level of service. While there may be issues around how children are dropped off or picked up at the school, they do not believe project related traffic will

create any environmental impacts related to safety. The testimony indicated these concerns already exist. Reference was made to a fatal accident in 1999, which occurred prior to the installation of a traffic signal at Allen and Amelia. At the time staff expressed concerns that speed levels would increase if a signal were installed in place of the existing four-way stop. The City is aware of the concerns identified tonight and stated there is a process through the School District/City Ad Hoc Committee and the Traffic Safety Committee to address those concerns. Conditions around Shull Elementary were discussed at the last Ad Hoc committee meeting and felt the best way to address them was to continue through this process and not make them part of a potential development that was not part of those concerns.

Vice Chair Badar asked if the Ad Hoc Committee was just with Bonita Unified since Sutherland Elementary was in Glendora.

Director Stevens confirmed Sutherland is in the Glendora School District but thought they had some type of safety committee because they have been involved on issues on Gladstone Street. Issues at Shull will be on the agenda at the next City Traffic Safety Committee and Mr. Patel will send notices out.

Peter Clement, Costco, stated they understand there is a need to address the concerns of the school and that they have a long-standing history of working with schools and the community. In regards to the residents on the west side of Lone Hill, Dale Goldsmith addressed that a little bit, but they have gone out of their way to work with staff and the residents to choose a plan that will work for everyone. Currently they have three proposals but haven't achieved consensus yet. They are willing to give up right-of-way on their side to make things work out. In regards to added police protection, there is a mitigation measure that asks them to put together a security plan for the center which will become part of the REA that all tenants will have to abide by. In regards to property ownership, Costco will own their parcel and sell the remaining seven acres to a developer that will manage that parcel; however, an REA will be executed that will require them to keep the property in good condition. Usually there is an Association, and since Costco is the largest member, they will ensure that things will be maintained. He stated the hours of operation for the gas station would be 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on weekdays and 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends, while the warehouse store would open at 9:30 a.m. for business customers and 10:00 a.m. for the general public on weekdays and close at 8:30 p.m. Saturday hours will be 9:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., and Sunday hours 10:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. During the holiday season there will be slightly extended hours on the weekend. In regards to the potential hazardous waste, one of the first actions will be to clean up the site thoroughly following state regulations prior to construction.

Vice Chair Badar asked what the hours for deliveries would be.

Peter Clement, Costco, stated they have a new policy for large deliveries where they spread them out during the day starting at 6:00 a.m. from their depot in Mira Loma, usually with a lull between noon and 4:00 p.m. Nighttime deliveries are usually made between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. The drivers will drop off the trailers and leave the site and the night crew will unload and stock. Then when the first delivery is made in the morning, the driver will take the empty trailer with him back to the depot.

Director Stevens asked Joel Falter, the consultant used for the traffic study, to speak further on their analysis before continuing to address comments raised by the public.

Joel Falter, Katz Okitsu, stated they calculate the distribution of traffic based on the population of the surrounding area and determine who the likely customers will be and which routes will be utilized to reach this location. They recognize that some people will use Amelia but feel the LOS will be good. Given the way the driveways will operate at the site, it will make more sense for people exiting the 57 freeway to head west to Lone Hill instead of circling around on Amelia because a left-turn from westbound Gladstone will be prohibited.

Director Stevens stated that in general the concerns that are being raised surrounding all four schools are based on existing conditions and are not project generated. The City is going to try to reasonably address those concerns at every school, but it is not proper to address them through the project review process when the project will have minimal impact.

He stated Costco raised concerns about several mitigation measures, one of which was to make the lighting standards less specific. He stated since staff would have the ability to make minor modifications in the Precise Plan process if it doesn't change the standards greatly, they would recommend leaving the mitigation as stated. It was also requested that Mitigation Measure M-3L.7 be eliminated or modified to reflect a fair share solution as it relates to improvements along the west side of Lone Hill, but again staff believes this should remain as written. If monetary contribution is a concern, it should be discussed as part of the DDA to be approved by the City Council

Director Stevens stated that Mr. Clement addressed concerns regarding hazardous waste removal, but they have done a preliminary assessment and it indicates that this should not be a significant problem. In regards to the Sheriff's Department, they have indicated that they do not feel this will cause a need for additional manpower, just appropriate use of existing personnel. The possible impact on home values is not an issue appropriate for consideration in the matter before the Commission tonight, and they are impacted more by the general real estate market than any project that is built on the site. The freeway noise is an existing issue and is not further impacted by this project. The City has been working with Caltrans on installing sound walls, but there is no information to present at this time on that topic.

In regards to the alternatives for the Lone Hill residents, there are three that would create a one-way frontage road with a parking lane in front of the residences. The variations involve how the median is designed, etc., and staff believes this will create safer conditions for ingress and egress from the driveways. Again, this is an already existing problem and may not increase any more with the construction of the project, but the City and applicant will do what they can to mitigate the problem. The actual design would go through the Precise Plan process and staff will meet again with the residents to confirm which option is preferable.

He explained that the fair share analysis will be determined through a nexus study, which might be conducted jointly with the City of Glendora since they will also have a project in the general area. This will consist of costing out the mitigation measures and approximate construction costs, and then compare the existing traffic and the projected traffic growth and assign a percentage to each project.

In regards to the allowed and prohibited uses, the Commission could change any of the items on that list. While staff understands there is an interest from a car dealer to purchase a portion of the property, they do not feel the property would be large enough and the location to residential uses would create a negative impact, which is why they have listed that use as prohibited. If the Costco project were to go away, the City could always reevaluate the list.

Director Stevens stated in regards to the concerns expressed by the City of Glendora, they understand that Lone Hill is a critical street and it also services businesses located in San Dimas. The City will work jointly with Glendora on addressing those problems, but staff does not believe that any further consideration of the Gold Line is warranted as outlined in the Response to Comments. Staff also believes the trip generation rates are reasonable and appropriate and the City of Glendora does not use fitted curve analysis. He felt the best way to address their concerns is to work jointly on mitigation measures whether they were directly related to San Dimas or Glendora. Hours of operation and architectural standards will be addressed through the Precise Plan process.

Therefore, staff's recommendation is to close the public hearing and for the Commission to direct staff to bring back resolutions recommending the certification of the Final EIR with changes to Mitigation Measures M-3K.8, M-3L.8 and M-3L.9, and resolutions recommending approval of the General Plan Amendment and Municipal Code Text Amendment as shown in the exhibits of the staff report.

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

Commissioners Levreau and Bratt commended staff and felt they presented a good document which addresses the concerns.

Commissioner Schoonover stated he was comfortable with the document and felt the public should be commended for participating in the process.

Vice-Chair Badar asked about the prohibited uses and how that could be addressed in the future if circumstances were to change.

Director Stevens stated the Specific Plan could be amended by going through the public hearing process for an amendment, as they are doing tonight.

MOTION: Moved by Schoonover, seconded by Levreau to direct staff to bring back resolutions recommending the City Council: certify the Final EIR document with the changes to Mitigation Measures M-3K.8, M-3L.8 and M-3L.9; adopt Municipal Code Text Amendment 03-04 and General Plan Amendment 03-03. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

Director Stevens stated staff will bring back the resolutions at the November 3, 2004 Commission meeting. When the Precise Plan is ready, staff will schedule that item, probably before the end of the year. The recommendations from the Commission will be sent to City Council, tentatively in November, but notices will be mailed to the public ten days prior to the hearing.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

3. **Director of Community Development**
No communications were made.

4. **Members of the Audience**
No communications were made.

5. **Planning Commission**
No communications were made.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Vice Chair Badar adjourned the meeting at 10:33 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for October 20, 2004 at 7:30 p.m.

_____
Ash Dhingra, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

_____
Craig Hensley
Planning Manager

Approved: