

# CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting  
Thursday, April 21, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.  
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

---

## **Present**

Chairman David Bratt  
Commissioner John Davis  
Commissioner Margie Green  
Commissioner Tom Molina  
Commissioner Ted Ross  
Asst. City Manager Community Dev. Larry Stevens  
Associate Planner Luis Torrico  
Planning Secretary Jan Sutton

## **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 Molina led the flag salute.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. April 7, 2016 (Davis absent)

**MOTION:** Moved by Green, seconded by Molina to approve the minutes of April 7, 2016. Motion carried 4-0-0-1 (Davis abstained).

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

2. **CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 16-02** – A request to allow the operation of a 1,100 square foot personal training use at 515 W. Arrow Highway, San Dimas Station North, in the Creative Growth Zone, Area 1 (CG-1). APN: 8386-007-063

Staff report presented by *Associate Planner Luis Torrico*, who stated this was a request to allow a personal training facility in San Dimas Station North, which is conditionally permitted in the CG-1 zone. The tenant space is located on the east side of the shopping center and has been vacant for years. The Applicant started making tenant improvements before he was notified that he required a CUP, but he has been responsive to Staff since then. The layout is basically an open area with a restroom and changing area in the rear. The personal training will consist of small groups utilizing weight racks and pull-up bars. They will operate seven days a week, but expect to only hold classes in the early morning and late evening during the week, and at 9:00 a.m. on the weekends. Condition No. 12 gives the Applicant slightly expanded hours to allow them flexibility to expand their class schedule as business expands.

He stated the classes consist of approximately one-hour sessions with one instructor and no more than six students per session. Because of similar businesses in the center, this is a compatible use. In regards to parking, per the code required parking would be six spaces for a fitness facility; if this was a standard retail space, the required parking would be five spaces, so there is only an increase of one space. However, the recent code amendment excludes major shopping centers from providing additional parking for intensified uses. While there have not been any parking issues in this area of the center, the unit does have access to the back parking lot if the need arises. Staff is recommending approval of Conditional Use Permit 16-02.

**Commissioner Ross** in order to clarify that noise is not going to be an issue, asked what type of weights are they using in the facility. He had also heard a report that not cleaning the mats can be an issue because they can harbor things like staph bacteria. Is there anything that requires them to clean the mats. He also asked if there are lockers in the changing room.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated the Applicant will be using rubber weight plates and rubber mats. This is also not the typical gym where people will be dropping the weights. They did some tests to check the noise level and couldn't hear anything from outside the unit. Staff has included Condition 16 to address any future noise complaints. He stated there are no lockers in the changing area since this is more like personal classes, and in regards to the mats, the Applicant could better answer that.

**Commissioner Davis** asked if we were restricting the weekend hours because we did not want them operating in the afternoons.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated the Applicant only wanted their hours on weekends from 9:00 to 10:00 a.m., but Staff expanded them to noon in case business picks up.

**Commissioner Davis** felt they should just set the hours at 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. seven days a week to simplify things. He stated when they reviewed the CUP for Rockin' Jump there was discussion about using the rear parking lot, and remembered they talked about it with another tenant and thought the door wasn't ADA accessible. He asked if there were any issues with the door in this tenant space.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated Rockin' Jump had to modify their rear door to be ADA compliant, and thought the other tenant did not have a door accessing the rear. He stated Rockin' Jump hasn't really been using the back door but there also haven't been any issues with parking. In regards to this space, there is a condition that the Applicant needs to submit plans to Building and Safety and will comply with all requirements for disabled access, so it will be reviewed through the plan check process.

**Commissioner Davis** asked if there was anything in the conditions that would require them to use the rear parking lot if there are parking conflicts in the future, especially since the parking calculations are based on those spaces. He felt we should be encouraging people to use those back spaces. He also was surprised that the landlord did not advise the Applicant that he needed a conditional use permit before he could occupy his space.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that they did not have a condition requiring the use of the back parking area as the code states there is no required parking if the parking is not impacted. This use was considered to not have any impact since it only requires one more space than a retail tenant would.

**Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens** stated we want to have available access to the rear spaces so that tenants can't argue they can't use them due to lack of access. If there were problems with parking, we would probably contact the landlord or management company to advise them of the concerns so they can address that with their tenants. One way would be to have employees use the back parking so the front area was available to customers.

**Chairman Bratt** felt it would make sense to require that the back door be ADA compliant so they did not have to react to it at a later date, and felt they should require the same improvements here that they did for Rockin' Jump.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated it would best to make those changes with the tenant improvement, and it would probably be easier than with Rockin' Jump because of the configuration of the parking lot.

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

**Richard Pinella, Applicant**, stated most of their classes are held during the week, and they offer the one class on weekends but after that their customers want to be home with their families. Because of their small size they have a different relationship with their customers so if they need them to park in the rear, there won't be any issues with their clientele. In regards to the mats, they are aware of the health concerns and they have machines to clean the mats daily. Their weights are rubberized and they believe after the test there shouldn't be any noise issues, especially with the brick wall between them and the neighboring unit.

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

#### RESOLUTION PC-1559

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 16-02, A REQUEST TO ALLOW THE OPERATION OF A 1,100 SQUARE FOOT PERSONAL TRAINING USE LOCATED AT 515 W. ARROW HIGHWAY WITHIN THE CREATIVE GROWTH AREA 1 ZONE – REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (CG-1) (APN: 8386-007-063)

**MOTION:** Moved by Davis, seconded by Green to adopt Resolution PC-1559 subject to changing the hours in Condition No. 12 to 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. seven days a week, and an added condition that the rear entrance meet public accessibility requirements. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

3. **CONSIDERATION OF TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 70583 REVISION 1** – A request to revise Tentative Tract Map 70583, Brasada, to increase the number of lots from 61 to 65 within the existing grading footprint on property located at the northerly terminus of Cataract Avenue on approximately 270 acres in the Northern Foothills, Specific Plan No. 25, Planning Area One.

\* \* \* \* \*

Commissioner Green stated she lived within 500 feet of the project area and recused herself from the meeting for this item.

\* \* \* \* \*

Staff report presented by **Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens** who stated in late 2010 the City approved various applications to approve the 61-lot Brasada subdivision in the northern foothills. At that time there was an additional property, referred to as the South 40, that was not included in the original tract map so retained its development potential of four residential lots. Currently there are a number of items going through the Plan Check process. At the time of the original approval there were several discussions on options for providing a location for the equestrian facilities that were a requirement of the map. While there were discussions regarding the South 40 for this purpose, they did not reach any resolution on how to deal with that parcel by the time of approving the applications, but there was an understanding that the topic would be re-visited in the future. Many meetings were held with the Applicant over the course of the following years, and a few months ago the Commission reviewed MCTA 12-04 which amended the boundaries of Area 1 to include the South 40 and transfer the development rights into the original project footprint. The required equestrian trail was also relocated to a portion of that property which allowed better access to existing trails to the nearby parks. That amendment was approved by the City Council approximately six weeks ago, and one of the conditions of approval was that the Applicant could submit this applicant to revise the Tentative Tract Map showing where the four additional lots would be located with the existing footprint of the approved grading area.

He stated these lots are shown on pages 10R, 11R and 12R and have the higher lot numbers on the pages. There will be some minor grading changes as it relates to stepping the pads along the street but the perimeter is unchanged from the previous approval. This is a separate discretionary approval so it was sent to various public agencies for comments. There weren't many comments received, and the only substantive ones came from the City Engineer, and L.A. County Fire whose comments were mostly the same as for the original approval.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated most of the grading and street plans have already been signed by the City Engineer, but there will need to be some minor modifications made as a result of this revision. The changes to the lots that are impacted are shown in the table in the staff report. All of the newly created lots meet the minimum standards and the building pads are generally consistent with others in the tract. Most of the homes in the development are one-story in height, though there is a provision to allow a certain percentage of two-story homes. Those lots are specifically delineated in the Tract Map approval; there are no proposed changes to those lots, although eight of them are slightly smaller than originally designed. None of the equestrian lots are impacted by this revision either.

The one concern Staff has is on page 12R is the design of Lots 9 and 63 in regards to the amount of street frontage. The likely location of the houses will be more than 150 feet from the street which will activate the Fire Department requirement for a 20-foot wide driveway. If there is only a 23-foot wide lot frontage, then the whole frontage would be concrete. Staff would like to move a few of the lot lines to increase the frontage to allow for some landscaping to break it up. He met with the Applicant today, and while they agree that the lot lines probably needed to be adjusted, they would like some flexibility instead of a setting a required frontage width, so Staff is submitting this revised language for Condition No. 2 in Resolution PC-1560:

Lots 8, 9 and 63 shall be redesigned to provide a minimum street frontage to adequately accommodate driveways with a minimum width of 20 feet plus a separation of 10 feet between driveways. Final design to be approved by the City Engineer and the Assistant City Manager for Community Development.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated this will allow for reasonable separation between the driveways and have adequate landscaping. Staff would like to change the lot lines now since we don't know who will be developing the lots in the future. He felt the revised condition gives enough flexibility to adjust the lot lines before the final map. Since this is just a revision, he included information on the original approval so there is an understanding that all the original conditions still apply to this as well. Staff is recommending approval subject to the five conditions and the amendment to Condition No. 2.

**Commissioner Molina** stated then this revision will substantially impact Lot No. 8. He asked if the Fire Department was still allowing grass pavers.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated he is not sure exactly how they will make the changes and it may impact Lot No. 8 less than anticipated. They may not get a full 30-foot width but it could achieve the intent of softening the driveway area. It may also be possible that on Lot No. 63 it will be less than 150 feet in length and then they only need a 16-foot wide driveway. He stated the Fire Department doesn't really like pavers but if they are pushed enough, they don't always object. They treat the driveway as a modified fire lane but they don't require signs and curbing, so it may be allowed.

**Commissioner Molina** stated that all the homes on the cul-de-sac would be one-story then.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated that is correct, and the only two-story homes are on page 10R.

**Commissioner Davis** asked when they do the curb cuts in a residential zone, is there a side setback that has to be maintained.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated no, and in theory the apron could cross in front of your neighbor's property because it is located in the public right-of-way. These are private streets and the curb cuts will probably be installed with the street improvements before there are any house plans.

**Commissioner Davis** stated so the way this is written you could have five feet on both Lot 9 and Lot 63 if they comply with the other conditions.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated they could put the driveways on the edges and have a separation of 10 feet in the middle. He stated Staff will try to get an exhibit of the proposed design to put with the preliminary house plans.

**Commissioner Davis** asked if there was anything in this to compel them where to put the driveways.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated as a tract map condition it does not specifically compel them, but there will still be DPRB approval for the houses. At this point he is just trying to get the lot lines to a reasonable location.

**Commissioner Davis** stated this is not increasing the development area, it is just shifting it to create more lots. He asked if it would be creating more traffic.

**Assistant City Manager Stevens** stated on the cover sheet the South 40 is shown on Page 7, and in theory there could have been a driveway coming down from the project to allow development of four lots. They are moving those lots up into the current project area. The traffic impact will not change with this amendment because those lots would have taken access through Brasada anyway. They are moving the required equestrian trail down into the South 40 and recovering what has historically been an equestrian route.

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

**Stan Stringfellow, 2011 E. Financial Way #203, Glendora, Agent for NJD**, stated this is a culmination of a long effort between Staff and him to resolve the trail issues and disposition of the South 40. He stated they used the original map as the basis for this request. Subsequent to the tentative approval there have been a number of precise approvals that have changed the map in a minor way. For example, they eliminated parking bump-outs along Brasada Lane when it was widened from 26 feet to 28 feet. There may also be some minor changes made when the grading and other plans are finalized. In regards to the driveways, the Architectural Design Guidelines encourage the use of permeable driveways. He doesn't know if the Fire Department will look at that, but as part of their secondary access they had to prepare it to carry the load and felt it was not expensive to put in some type of permeable drive that met their requirements. He stated these changes were in conjunction with the agreement to transfer the density rights and to eliminate the East/West Equestrian Trail through Brasada and move it to the South 40 which will culminate in a complete loop of the trail system. He felt this has been a good effort to preserve the balance of the South 40.

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

**Commissioner Davis** stated he concurs with the revised condition in that it will give the Applicant the flexibility they need. If the driveways are not concrete, that would be even better. He was also glad with how the South 40 acres was being preserved, and was in support of the proposal.

#### RESOLUTION PC-1560

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF REVISION NO. 1 TO TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 70583, A REQUEST TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF LOTS FROM 61 TO 65 WITHIN THE EXISTING GRADING FOOTPRINT ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHERLY TERMINUS OF CATARACT AVENUE ON APPROXIMATELY 270 ACRES IN THE NORTHERN FOOTHILLS

**MOTION:** Moved by Davis, seconded by Ross to adopt Resolution PC-1560 with the amended wording for Condition No. 2, recommending approval of Revision No. 1 to Tentative Tract Map No. 70583. Motion carried 4-0-0-1 (Green abstained).

\* \* \* \* \*

Commissioner Green returned to the meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **ORAL COMMUNICATION**

### **4. Community Development Department**

*Assistant City Manager Stevens* stated the City Council semi-annual staff retreat will be next Monday in the Council Chambers Conference Room from 5:00 to 9:00 p.m. and went over some of the items that will be on the agenda. He stated Café Rio has opened at the Costco center, and Krispy Kreme and Five Guys will be opening in the next week or so. There have been some issues with completing the site improvements that the need to be completed first. Care Meridian is under construction, but there have been some construction quality issues so it is moving forward slowly.

### **5. Members of the Audience**

No communications were made.

### **6. Planning Commission**

No communications were made.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Moved by Davis, seconded by Green to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Thursday, May 5, 2016, at 7:00 p.m.

---

David A. Bratt, Chairman  
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

---

Jan Sutton  
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: May 19, 2016