

**CITY OF SAN FERNANDO
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2011, MEETING - 7:00 P.M.
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION. AUDIO OF THE ACTUAL MEETING ARE AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Julie Cuellar at 7:06 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Led by Commissioner Jose Ruelas

ROLL CALL

The following persons were recorded as present:

PRESENT: Chairperson Julie Cuellar, Vice-chair Mario Rodriguez, Commissioners Alvin F. Durham, Robert Montañez, and Jose Ruelas

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Community Development Director Paul Deibel, Assistant Planner Edgar Arroyo, and Community Development Secretary Michelle De Santiago

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Alvin F. Durham moved to approve the agenda of April 26, 2011. Seconded by Commissioner R. Montañez, the motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	A. Durham, R. Montañez, J. Cuellar, M. Rodríguez, J. Ruelas
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

CONSENT CALENDAR

Vice-chair M. Rodriguez moved to approve the minutes of February 8, 2011. Seconded by Commissioner J. Ruelas, the motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	M. Rodriguez, J. Ruelas, J. Cuellar, A. Durham, and R. Montañez
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

PUBLIC HEARING 7A:

Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Site Plan Review 2011-03 (SPR 2011-03), Conditional Use Permit (CUP 2011-03), and Variance 2011-04 (VAR 2011-04) – 700 and 753 San Fernando Road, 726 Celis

Street, and 721 Pico Street, San Fernando, Ca 91340 – Aszkenazy Development, Inc., 601 South Brand Boulevard, San Fernando, CA 91340 – The Project proposal involves the adaptive reuse of a former automotive dealership and the construction of either a 92,560 square foot (single-story) or a 105, 623 square foot (partially two-story) commercial development with 449 parking spaces located on-site and on-street. The proposed uses for the project include repair, service commercial, medical, and office occupancies. The project site is comprised of 12 parcels totaling approximately 5.58 acres of land that span three city blocks. The properties identified as part of the project are located on: Truman Street and San Fernando Road between Kittridge Street and Wolfskill Street, San Fernando Road and Celis Street between Chatsworth Drive and Wolfskill Street, and Celis Street and Pico Street between Chatsworth Drive and Wolfskill Street. Properties located are laced within the Truman/San Fernando District of the SP-4 (Corridors Specific Plan) zone. Properties located along Pico Streets are within the R-2 (Multiple-Family Residential) zone. The project site is also within Redevelopment Project Area No. 2.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Assistant Planner Edgar Arroyo presented the proposed project, recommending that the Planning and Preservation Commission adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project and approve Site Plan Review 2011-03, Conditional Use Permit 2011-03, and Variance 2011-04, pursuant to Planning and Preservation Commission Resolution 2011-05 and conditions of approval attached as Exhibit “A” to the resolution (Attachment 1).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

M. Rodriguez thanked staff for such a comprehensive report in such a short amount of time. He expressed his concern with the pedestrian flow along Celis Street and how the trend is to cross in the middle of the street rather than using crosswalks.. He stated that he is not too comfortable with the pedestrian lighting along Celis Street and with the driveways exiting onto Truman Street both left and right hand turns. He stated that when there is heavy traffic on the freeway, Truman Street is used as a thoroughfare. He inquired about buildings 1 and 4 and asked if those buildings were being proposed at a single-story or with two-stories.

E. Arroyo indicated that the proposal included two alternatives that would allow the developer flexibility in constructing buildings one and four in either a one or two-story configuration based on market demand for the units.

M. Rodriguez inquired about the possibility of the second-story being built at a later date should the developer decide to construct buildings one and four at a single-story. Additionally, he expressed concerns about the possibility of graffiti on the proposed architectural element that would be used to locate signage.

J. Ruelas inquired about the design of the roadway and parking stalls that was proposed along San Fernando Road.

E. Arroyo indicated that in order to accommodate the proposed street and parking improvements, the applicant would dedicate a portion of their property to allow for adequate vehicular lanes. Additionally, he added that the street improvements would be provided at the expense of the developer.

J. Ruelas asked if the parallel parking spaces along Pico Street are being counted toward the total amount of parking for the project.

E. Arroyo stated that the parallel parking along Pico Street could not be counted toward the project because it is located in the R-2 (Multiple-Family Dwelling) zone and not the SP-4 (Corridors Specific Plan) zone.

J. Ruelas expressed his concern with the diagonal parking proposed along Celis Street. He suggested that a few of the parking spaces removed to allow for a mid-block crosswalk since the project would provide a surplus of parking in its one-story configuration.

E. Arroyo indicated that the developer is proposing a surplus of parking spaces for the one-story development to allow for adequate parking at different demands times for this project.

A. Durham expressed concerns regarding vehicular circulation along San Fernando Road with the street improvements that are proposed for the roadway.

R. Montañez asked for clarification on the sidewalk configuration and how many parking spaces are being eliminating.

E. Arroyo indicated that the sidewalk would be completely removed and will be reconfigured from 10 feet to 5 feet and a total of five to seven parking spaces being lost.

R. Montañez inquired about the location of the entrance of the proposed gym and the types of signage being proposed for the project.

E. Arroyo indicated that the proposal does allow for a themed sign program for the entire project that will be further refined by Community Development staff should the commission approve the conceptual sign plan that was submitted for consideration.

J. Cuellar inquired about hours of operation for the gym and the types of lighting being proposed for the proposed signage throughout the project.

E. Arroyo indicated that the lighting would be reflective towards the base so not to spill over onto neighboring properties. He advised J. Cuellar that the developer would be able to clarify any questions regarding the hours of operation for the planned tenants.

Ian Fitzsimmons – representative of ADI – 601 S. Brand Blvd., San Fernando, CA 91340 – stated that he too is concerned with the safe crossing of pedestrian along Celis Street and that the traffic engineer will recommend appropriate measures to look at the feasibility of a crosswalk area. With regards to the proposed signage for the site, he indicated that it will consist of a double sided graphic panel illuminated on both sides. He stated that there will be full-time staff to deal with any graffiti issues on-site. Additionally, he stated that for legal reasons he cannot disclose who the tenants are but that the gym would not operate 24 hours a day and that the anchor tenants cannot be confirmed until the entitlements are granted.

M. Rodriguez asked about the likelihood of a two-story building being built for buildings four and seven.

I. Fitzsimmons stated that the likelihood of a two-story building being built for buildings four and seven it is less than 50 percent. Should these building not be built with two-stories at the onset, then there are no plans to build a second-story in the future.

M. Rodriguez asked about parking monitoring for the proposed project.

I. Fitzsimmons indicated that the parking concerns will be addressed as they arise.

P. Deibel indicated that public on-street parking would be available to all visitors.

A. Durham inquired whether parking meters were being proposed for all on-street parking stalling abutting the project.

P. Deibel explained that the intent of the proposed street improvements and revised parking configuration is so that the parking is not limited and is conveniently accessible to patrons of the surrounding businesses, so no parking meters are proposed.

I. Fitzsimmons stated that installing parking meters may be a solution should parking demand increase in the future.

J. Cuellar inquired whether any of the proposed uses were restaurant uses.

I. Fitzsimmons stated that they have not secured tenants for the smaller tenant buildings but that he anticipates one sit down restaurant and three fast food casual restaurants.

A. Durham inquired about the billboard types sign that the set of plans showed on the rooftop of building seven.

E. Arroyo explained that the billboard sign shown on the plans was not one that was being proposed for the project and that building seven, whether built with one or two-stories would not include this type of signage.

I. Fitzsimmons clarified that the billboard type sign on building seven was not one proposed for the project but that the developer was considering its feasibility to allow an opportunity for advertisement in the San Fernando Mall area.

Marc Blodgett- Principal – indicated that most of the concerns the commission had were the same concerns that the applicant had. He stated that left hand turns onto Truman Street are possible, if given the commission would provide a clause to go back and re-visit or add mitigation. He stated that the traffic impact may be less considering that the dealership is no longer in business. Additionally, he recommended walls along the parking area along Celis Street to shield overflow of lights onto the neighboring properties.

R. Montañez expressed that he agrees that traffic should be directed towards San Fernando Road and stated that he likes the proposed project more than the former automotive dealership because it would attract more visitors to the city.

P. Deibel stated that this project would create employment opportunities, both through its construction and subsequent employment by the businesses that would occupy the site.

J. Ruelas stated that he likes the project and the idea of integrating the proposed project and street improvements with the San Fernando Mall area. He stated that the residents of San Fernando wouldn't have to leave the city for more shopping options.

E. Arroyo indicated that the items with regards to street signage and parking would be reviewed by the Public Works Department.

P. Deibel clarified that if the commission agreed they could formulate language to allow staff and the traffic engineer to continue working with the applicant to further refine the proposal.

M. Rodriguez stated that he likes the proposed project but wants to make sure that issues in regards to traffic and circulation are addressed. He expressed his concern with the two-story element and how he doesn't see the need for it.

E. Arroyo indicated that the proposed second-story would be restricted to office uses only.

J. Cuellar indicated that she likes the proposed project and mentioned that the city does need new businesses in the mall area.

P. Deibel suggested that the commission consider additional language to include:

- Preparation of a Traffic Management Plan;
- The feasibility of a pedestrian crossing along Celis Street;
- Explore the feasibility of limiting Kittridge Street to only left turns onto Truman Street;
- Directional signage for traffic; and,
- The submittal of a detailed landscape plan for the proposed project to be more decorative at the base of the pylon sign.

Subsequent to discussion, Commissioner R. Montañez moved to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project, approve Site Plan Review 2011-03, Conditional Use Permit 2011-03, and Variance 2011-04 pursuant to Planning and Preservation Commission Resolution 2011-05 and conditions of approval attached as Exhibit "A" to the resolution as attachment "1". Seconded by Vice-chair M. Rodriguez, the motion carried with the following vote:

AYES:	R. Montañez, M. Rodriguez, J. Cuellar, A. Durham, and J. Ruelas
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

P. Deibel indicated that he didn't anticipate a Planning and Preservation Commission Meeting in May, so the next regular meeting would take place on June 7, 2011.

COMMISSION COMMENTS

None

PUBLIC STATEMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner R. Montañez moved to adjourn to June 7, 2011, Seconded by Commissioner A. Durham, the motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: R. Montañez, A. Durham, J. Cuellar, M. Rodriguez, and J. Ruelas
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

9:24 P.M.
PAUL DEIBEL
Planning Commission Secretary