



AZUSA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 26, 2008
7:05 P.M.

NOTICE: *A copy of the following public hearing staff reports and Initial Studies, if applicable, for the Planning Commission projects will be available for review during regular working hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday - Thursday at the Planning Division and during regular hours of the Azusa City Library. Any questions regarding any agenda item may be answered by the Planning Division at (626) 812-5299. The Planning Commission Meetings are held at 7:00 p.m. in the Azusa Civic Auditorium at 213 East Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, California.*

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dierking called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Alva led the flag salute.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: RENTSCHLER, ALVA, DIERKING, DODSON and ROSALES.

Members Absent: NONE

Commissioner Sandra Rentschler was included in the meeting via Teleconference Call from the following location:

Hyatt Regency Sacramento
1209 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 443-1234
Fax: (916) 321-3099

STAFF PRESENT:

Director of Economic and Community Development, Bruce Coleman; City Manager, Fran Delatch; Assistant City Manager, Robert Person; Senior Planner, Susan Cole; BBK Attorney, Michael Torres; Planning Consultant, Lisa Brownfield; and Assistant Planner, Kim Pilmer.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of March 12, 2008

Commissioner Rosales: Can a Commissioner make a motion to approve the minutes for a meeting that they did not participate in?

Michael Torres, City Attorney: Yes.

PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
March 26, 2007

Page 2

Commissioner Rosales: Requested the minutes to be corrected to reflect both actions for the approval of the Feb. 13th and Feb. 27th minutes.

Commissioner Rosales: Requested line summary of the Commission's questions of staff and the answers.

The consideration of the Planning Commission minutes of March 12, 2008 was continued to April 16, 2008 Planning Commission meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. Mike Lee: 636 Lee Place, Azusa, CA: Requested that Azusa should solicit a family restaurant similar to the "Home Kitchen" in Glendora. Was concerned about graffiti on the soldier's banners on Azusa Avenue.
2. Art Morales, City resident: Agreed with Mr. Lee's comments about the graffiti on soldier's banners. Concerned that city residents can not request an item be put on the City council agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Coleman stated that staff received a request to move item F(2) out of order, to hear it before item F(1), and to move item I(1) out of order, to hear it before item F (1).

Chairman Dierking: Agreed to the new order of the agenda items.

1. DRAFT ORDINANCE AMENDING PORTIONS OF THE CITY OF AZUSA DEVELOPMENT CODE CONCERNING VEHICLE PARKING AND STORAGE, ON PRIVATE PROPERTY; AND TEMPORARY SIGN AND TENT REGULATIONS.

Mr. Person presented the staff report.

Commissioner Dodson: Requested clarification of the language "temporary signs shall not interfere with the operation of doors or windows."

Mr. Person: The object is that any temporary sign would not interfere with the operation of doors or windows, so that access would not be blocked and ventilation would not be hindered.

Commissioner Dodson: Can the ordinance regulations regarding window signs could be enforced fairly?

Mr. Coleman: Yes, the Police Department requested the restriction because of visibility concerns.

Chairman Dierking: What the enforcement mechanisms are with respect to the signage issue?

Mr. Coleman: Community Improvement Division enforces the Development Code.

Commissioner Dodson: Are A-frame temporary signs covered?

Mr. Coleman: Existing sign prohibitions cover A-frame signs.

PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
March 26, 2007

Page 3

Commissioner Dodson: Is the height of suspended temporary signs was being measured to see if they meet the required minimum 8 feet above walking surfaces etc.?

Mr. Person: Community Improvement requested this type of specificity so that they would be able to enforce the ordinance.

Commissioner Alva: Are real estate signs regulated?

Mr. Person: Stated that real estate signs are regulated by the Department of Real Estate, not the City's Development Code.

Commissioner Rentschler: Was a view analysis was done to help in the determination of the setback for parking a recreational vehicle.

Mr. Person: No, however, an engineering perspective was presented to City Council.

Chairman Dierking: Are there any limitations imposed on off-site human directional signs.

Mr. Person: Stated that he believes that is one of the issues where the First Amendment right protections apply.

Chairman Dierking: Questioned counsel if the city could impose reasonable time, manner and place restrictions on public property regarding real estate signage.

Mr. Torres: There is a string of case law regarding the standards and regulations a city can impose on real estate signage. Mr. Torres stated that time, place, and manner would be permissible for First Amendment protected signage.

Chairman Dierking: What is the time limitation for temporary signage?

Ms. Cole: 30 days per annual year.

Chairman Dierking: Is there a fee for a temporary sign permit?

Ms. Cole: Stated that the fee is \$64.51 along with a deposit of the same amount, which is given back to the applicant upon the removal of the temporary sign.

Chairman Dierking opened the public hearing.

Peggy Martinez, 339 N. Alameda: Stated that she was on the Committee and commented on the safety issues Commissioner Rentschler raised regarding setbacks for RVs.

Chairman Dierking closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Rentschler: Did staff originally recommend the setback to park a recreational vehicle to be a minimum of 8 feet from the property line?

Mr. Person: Yes, but the City Council supported a zero setback from the property line.

Chairman Dierking: Requested that the notes provided by Commissioner Rosales and excerpts from the Development Code subject to changes should be attached to the Staff Report for the next meeting.

The item was continued to the April 16, 2008 Planning Commission meeting.

PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
March 26, 2007

Page 4

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS ITEM I (1):

1. CONSIDERATION OF A FINDING OF GENERAL PLAN CONFORMITY TO ALLOW THE DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY BY THE CITY OF AZUSA TO EL PROYECTO DEL BARRIO.

Mr. Person presented the staff report.

Commissioner Dodson: Did not receive the Exhibit "B" cited in the attached Resolution.

Mr. Person: Stated Exhibit "B" is a copy of the 1931 Quitclaim deed that governs the use of the property; while the question being posed to the Commission is whether the disposition of the property is in conformance with the General Plan. He stated that the Commission can carry this item over to the next meeting, and staff can provide the requested documents.

Chairman Dierking: Can a representative of the non-profit present at the next meeting?

Mr. Person: Staff can request that.

The item was continued to the April 16, 2008 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Alva excused himself due to a medical problem.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. DESIGN REVIEW DR-2007-43, VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP TTM-069751, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT GPA-2007-01, ZONE CODE AMENDMENT ZCA-226 AND ZONE CHANGE Z-2007-01, AND ADDENDUM TO THE GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT.

APPLICANT: CITY OF AZUSA

LOCATION: 700 BLOCK OF N. DALTON AVENUE, AZUSA CALIFORNIA

Lisa Brownfield, Hoggle Ireland: Presented the staff report.

Commissioner Rosales: How many parallel parking spaces will be provided along the street in front of the Senior Center?

Ms. Brownfield: The amount can be counted on the site plan.

Commissioner Rosales: Are the properties listed on the first table in the staff report owned by the Agency?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Commissioner Rentschler: Why the density for the project factors in lots 2 and 3, when those properties will eventually be deeded back to the city?

PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
March 26, 2007

Page 5

Ms. Brownfield: All four of the lots combined are considered part of the project, and in order for the infrastructure improvements to be made on lots 2 and 3, they have been included in the density calculation for the project.

Commissioner Rentschler: Was the DNAC was aware of the method being used for calculating the density for this project?

Mr. Coleman: Yes.

Chairman Dierking: Can any members of the DNAC in the audience explain how the issue of blended density was addressed in the meetings?

Mercedes Castro, Member of the DNAC: It was her understanding that the density was based on a per/acre calculation.

Chairman Dierking: Did the calculation take into account the Senior Center property?

Mr. Coleman: No.

Commissioner Rentschler: Why is it appropriate to remove the median and narrow Dalton Avenue as a traffic calming measure?

Ms. Brownfield: Traffic engineering studies have found that median strips are not traffic calming because they give drivers a sense that they have protection from oncoming traffic, and they actually go faster

Commissioner Rentschler: Were any studies done for Dalton Ave?

Mr. Coleman: A traffic study was conducted for the project and made reference to the potential benefits for having traffic calming on that street.

Commissioner Rentschler: What is the difference between a program EIR and a project EIR?

Ms. Brownfield: A project EIR addresses impacts specifically related to the project and analyzes those impacts in a very detailed fashion. A program EIR looks at things on a broader scale, city wide or TAZs (Traffic Area Zones) where multiple city blocks are grouped together.

Commissioner Rentschler: Which of type of EIR is most commonly used to develop a site?

Ms. Brownfield: A project EIR is most commonly used, but if a program EIR is specific enough, and incorporates larger planning issues related to that site, it is possible to use the program EIR and supplement it with an addendum or a supplement EIR.

Chairman Dierking: What are the inclusionary housing requirements for redevelopment projects?

Mr. Torres: Stated that generally, inclusionary housing is encouraged in projects to provide for different income levels.

Jose Ometeotl, Tierra West Advisors: California Redevelopment law requires 15% of all privately developed units to be made affordable within a Redevelopment Project area, but that it's a requirement for the agency, not a requirement of each specific developer. Of that 15%, 40% of the 15% must be reserved for very low income, with the balance split between low and moderate income units.

PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
March 26, 2007

Page 6

Chairman Dierking: How is the city doing at providing inclusionary housing?

Mr. Coleman: The last time housing in the city was analyzed was at the time of the implementation of the Housing Element, and at that time, the City had a surplus.

Chairman Dierking re-opened the public hearing.

Mercedes Castro, 680 E. Alostia: Many of the questions asked by the Commissioners were brought up in the DNAC meetings, including the height of the proposed buildings and the removal of the median on Dalton. As the President of the Azusa Chamber of Commerce she and the 264 members the City to continue progress on this project.

Mike Lee, 636 Lee Place: Concerned about the proposed project negatively impacting seniors using the senior center.

Art Morales, City resident: There is nothing wrong with the city preparing for the project by getting the necessary entitlements.

Peggy Martinez, 339 N. Alameda: The proposed project is a concept that may change, but that the entitlements are necessary to move the project forward. The money the City will gain from this project will enable the City to do future projects.

Chairman Dierking closed the public hearing.

Chairman Dierking: What is the project's floor area ratio?

Ms. Brownfield: The FAR is 1.39, and an FAR of 1.5 is currently allowed for mixed-use developments.

Chairman Dierking: Are there any special considerations for the window placement on the first floor retail spaces.

Ms. Brownfield: The design considerations for the first floor retail intended to increase the pedestrian orientation, which encourages increased window space.

Fran Delach, City Manager: Addressed the Commission to explain the circumstances surrounding the change in the project developer.

Commissioner Rosales: Motioned to approve the proposed Tentative Tract Map, General Plan Amendment, Zoning Code Amendment, Zone Change, and Addendum, with the requested corrections.

Chairman Dierking called for a two minute recess.

Chairman Dierking reconvened the meeting at 10:24 p.m., and re-announced the motion made by Commissioner Rosales.

Commissioner Dodson seconded the motion.

AYES: RENTSCHLER, DODSON, ROSALES.

PLANNING COMMISSION Minutes
March 26, 2007

Page 7

NOES: DIERKING
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT: ALVA (ABSENT DUE TO CONFLICT)

The item was approved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

No unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS:

No new business.

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

1. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 3, 2008- COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ITEMS.

Mr. Coleman briefly summarized the Community Development items discussed at the March 3, 2008 City Council meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Commissioner Rentschler thanked Martin Quiroz for organizing the teleconference.

Commissioner Dodson mentioned that the Valero across the street from City Hall has wrought iron bars on the doors and windows and stated that he recalled other businesses being required to place security bars or gates behind their doors and windows.

Mr. Coleman: Stated that he would ask Code Enforcement to look into that issue.

ADJOUOURNMENT

Commissioner Dodson motioned to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Commissioner Rosales.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:33p.m.

UPCOMING MEETING:

April 16, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.